



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2013

No. 161

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 13, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable VICKY HARTZLER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

DEVASTATING EFFECTS OF SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. TURNER. Madam Speaker, yesterday in Dayton, I hosted a community forum regarding the impacts of sequestration on Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in the Dayton community. We had a distinguished group of local leaders who participated in the event. The expert panel included Colonel Cassie B. Barlow, 88th Air Base Wing and installation commander; Jeffrey C. Hoagland, president and CEO of the

Dayton Development Coalition; Chris Kershner of the Dayton Chamber of Commerce; and Carl Francis of Dayton Defense, a nonprofit group that is an advocacy group for the defense community in Dayton, Ohio. Each of these local leaders explained how sequestration has affected our community in 2013, and what the effect would be if the sequester continues. For a community like Dayton with such a strong relationship to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio's largest single-site employer, the message was devastating.

The Budget Control Act of 2011, which I voted against, was signed into law on August 2, 2011. The Budget Control Act established a series of spending caps and forced reductions designed to indiscriminately reduce government spending by nearly \$2 trillion over 10 years. These forced reductions, also known as sequestration, greatly impact our national security by requiring the Department of Defense to reduce its budget by roughly \$500 billion. Already in its second year, this poorly conceived and flawed process continues to compromise our defense capabilities and greatly impacts military communities like Dayton, Ohio.

Reducing Federal spending is important, but the sequester, as proposed by President Obama, applies 50 percent of the cuts to less than 18 percent of the spending. The Department of Defense represents less than 18 percent of overall Federal spending. Due to the President's sequester, this year roughly 14,000 Air Force civilian men and women have been furloughed in the State of Ohio as a direct result of the sequester. These forced furloughs have not only cost our State tens of millions of dollars in lost revenue but have negatively impacted nearly 30,000 men and women who work at Wright-Patterson and reside in our community. If allowed to continue, I fear the effects of sequestration will devastate the region

and potentially result in a loss of 13,000 jobs. The loss of jobs, matched with reductions in spending, could cost our community in Dayton roughly \$8.6 billion.

While it is important to note the impacts to Dayton, we must also take into consideration the impacts to our national security and the future of our country. The President promised sequester would not happen, and yet, the Department of Defense suffers under the effects of these drastic cuts. As many of the experts pointed out, sequestration will greatly compromise military readiness and modernization for years to come. Without a ready and able force, our military will no longer possess the capabilities necessary to rapidly and effectively respond to conflicts around the globe.

During recent testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, the various service chiefs have made numerous statements outlining the devastating effects. Of note, the Army has been forced to cancel all combat training center rotations for those brigade combat teams not slated to deploy to Afghanistan or to be part of the global response force. That means that we only have two out of 42 combat Army brigades fully trained and ready to deploy in a crisis.

The Navy has canceled multiple ship deployments as a result of the devastating budget cuts, including the USS *Harry S. Truman* Carrier Strike Group that was scheduled to deploy to the Middle East earlier this year. Due to the cuts in training and maintenance, we have had to reduce deterrent presence in order to retain the ability to surge our ships if needed in a crisis.

Important modernization efforts are also taking a hit as a result of sequestration. Air Force leaders have told Congress that "modernization forecasts are bleak." These modernization efforts are critical as many of the assets in our current inventory are decades old.

□ 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.

H7001

It is imperative that we find spending cuts to offset sequestration on the Department of Defense. Our military leaders have come to Congress on numerous occasions to explain the limitations the budget cuts are putting on our national security. It is legislative malpractice for this Congress to continue to put our Nation at greater risk. The President needs to come to this Congress with a proposal to offset sequestration in a responsible manner so the Department of Defense can be restored, our national security protected, and the community of Dayton, Ohio, no longer suffers the effects of sequestration.

SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Safe Climate Caucus to say that climate change is making extreme weather worse and costing us in lives and dollars.

Last week, Typhoon Haiyan, the strongest storm to make landfall in recorded history, struck the Philippines with sustained winds of almost 200 miles per hour. Thousands are reported dead and missing.

Haiyan, Sandy, Irene, Katrina, wildfires, floods, droughts.

If you flip a coin 20 times, it is possible that an honest coin will land on heads every time, but you should start to suspect that there is something wrong with that coin.

Sure, the recent extreme weather event might be coincidence, but as superstorms continue again and again, you should suspect that something is wrong with our climate. We should begin fixing our broken world, not be pretending that all is well.

This week marks the beginning of the 19th U.N. climate change conference in Warsaw, where representatives from more than 190 nations will be discussing climate change and how the world should be responding.

For international climate negotiations to succeed, the U.S. should take the lead, and leading internationally will require us to start here at home.

TIME IS RUNNING OUT FOR THE SIERRAS

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, this summer the biggest fire in the history of the Sierra Nevada Mountains burned 400 square miles of forest land. The fire left behind an unprecedented swath of environmental devastation that threatens the loss of not only the affected forest land for generations but sets events in motion that could threaten the surrounding forests for many years to come.

The fire also left behind as much as a billion board feet of dead timber on

Federal land that could be sold to raise hundreds of millions of dollars, money that could then be used to replant and restore the devastated forests. In addition, processing that timber would help to revive the economy of the stricken region. But time is already running out. Within a year, the value of the timber rapidly declines as the wood is devoured by insects and rot. That's the problem: cumbersome environmental reviews and the litigation that inevitably follows will run out the clock on this valuable asset until it becomes worthless.

Indeed, it becomes worse than worthless—it becomes hazardous. Bark and wood-boring beetles are already moving in to feast on the dead and dying timber, and a population explosion of pestilence can be expected if those dead trees remain. The beetles won't confine themselves to the fire areas, posing a mortal threat to the surrounding forests in the years ahead.

By the time the normal bureaucratic reviews and lawsuits have run their course, what was once forest land will have already begun converting to brush land, and by the following year, reforestation will become infinitely more difficult and expensive.

Within 2 years, several feet of brush will have built up, and the smaller trees will begin toppling on this tinder. It is not possible to build a more perfect fire stack than that. Intense, second-generation fires will take advantage of this fuel, sterilizing the soil, eroding the landscape, fouling the watersheds, and threatening the surrounding forest for many years to come.

Without timely salvage and reforestation, we know the fate of the Sierras because we have seen the result of benign neglect after previous fires. The trees don't come back for many generations. Instead, thick brush takes over the land that was once shaded by towering forests. The brush quickly overwhelms any seedlings struggling to make a start. It replaces the diverse ecosystems supported by the forests with scrub brush.

For this reason, I have introduced H.R. 3188, which waives the time-consuming environmental review process and prevents the endless litigation that always follows. It authorizes Federal forest managers, following well-established environmental protocols for salvage, to sell the dead timber and to supervise its careful removal while there is still time.

The hundreds of millions of dollars raised can then be directed toward replanting the region before layers of brush choke off any chance of forest regrowth for generations to come. It is modeled on legislation authored by Democratic Senator Tom Daschle for salvaging dead and dying trees in the Black Hills National Forest, a measure credited with speeding the preservation and recovery of that forest.

This legislation has spawned lurid tales from the activist left of uncon-

trolled logging in the Sierras. Nothing could be further from the truth. This legislation vests full control of the salvage plans with Federal forest managers, not the logging companies. It leaves Federal foresters in charge of enforcing salvage plans that fully protect the environment.

The left wants a policy of benign neglect: let a quarter-million acres of destroyed timber rot in place, surrender the ravaged land to beetles, and watch contentedly as the forest ecosystem is replaced by scrub land. Yes, without human intervention the forests will eventually return, but not in the lifetimes of ourselves, our children, or our children's children.

If we want to stop the loss of this forest land and if we want to control the beetle infestation before it explodes out of control, the dead timber has to come out soon. If we take it out now, we can generate the funds necessary to suppress brush buildup, plant new seedlings, and restore these forests for the use and enjoyment of our children. If we wait for the normal bureaucratic reviews and delays, we will have lost these forests to the next several generations. That is a choice. Congress must make that choice now, or nature will make that choice for us.

HONORING PUERTO RICO'S MILITARY VETERANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Madam Speaker, Monday was Veterans Day, when our Nation pays tribute to those who have served honorably in the Armed Forces. Today, I rise to express my gratitude to the soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines from Puerto Rico, both those who are living and those who have left us.

Since World War I almost a century ago to Afghanistan today, American citizens from Puerto Rico have built a rich record of military service. If you visit any U.S. base, you will see warriors from Puerto Rico fighting to keep this Nation safe, strong, and free. They serve as officers and enlisted personnel; as special operators; in infantry, artillery, and armored units; as pilots and aviation technicians; in intelligence; on ships and submarines; in combat support positions; and in every military specialty.

In his book, "Puerto Rico's Future: A Time to Decide," former U.S. Attorney General Dick Thornburgh observed:

Historically, Puerto Rico has ranked alongside the top five States in terms of per capita military service.

□ 1015

In the forward to that book, former President George H.W. Bush noted:

This patriotic service and sacrifice of Americans from Puerto Rico touched me all the more deeply for the very fact they have served with such devotion, even while denied

a vote for the President and Members of Congress who determine when, where, and how they are asked to defend our freedoms.

As I address this Chamber, men and women from Puerto Rico are serving in harm's way in Afghanistan and other locations. Since the attacks of 9/11, island residents have deployed about 35,000 times in overseas contingency operations. Many have deployed on multiple occasions. Each time they go, they leave behind spouses, children, and parents. As veterans will tell you, military life requires enormous sacrifice from their loved ones, those quiet heroes who support our uniformed personnel who must live and work in their absence and who pray for their safe return. On Veterans Day, we honor not only those who fought, but their families, as well.

There is a frame on my office wall containing photographs of servicemembers from Puerto Rico that have fallen in the last 12 years. I often look at those photos, row after row of young faces, usually posing in their dress uniforms against the backdrop of the American flag. Those images make me sad, but they also give me strength. They inspire me to keep working for my people. They remind me what courage is and what sacrifice means. And they help me remember why representing Puerto Rico in Congress is the greatest honor I have ever known.

I have met many veterans from Puerto Rico. I have found that they value deeds over words. They expect their elected leaders to produce results, or at least to work tirelessly towards that end.

I am proud of the record we have compiled on behalf of veterans from Puerto Rico. We have obtained funding to renovate the VA hospital in San Juan, to improve existing clinics and build new clinics throughout the island, and to provide vehicles so that residents of our State veterans home can visit their families and travel to medical appointments. We also achieved Puerto Rico's inclusion in a Federal initiative to encourage the hiring of unemployed veterans.

And I am working to honor a military unit that perhaps best exemplifies the service that residents of Puerto Rico have rendered to this Nation. Congressman BILL POSEY of Florida and I have introduced legislation to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment known as the Borinqueneers, a unit composed mostly of soldiers from Puerto Rico that overcame discrimination and won admiration for their performance in the Korean war. Our bill has nearly 160 bipartisan cosponsors, and there is a companion bill in the Senate that has also garnered strong support. I hope all my colleagues will join me in honoring this special group of veterans.

This Veterans Day, I renewed my commitment to fight for the men and women who have fought so valiantly for us, and I thank them from the bottom of my heart for their service. I do so again today.

COLLEGE STATION'S 75TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. FLORES. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the 75th anniversary of the city of College Station, Texas.

College Station has been and is the home to tens of thousands of Texas families, students, businesses, and residents throughout the years, and I am proud to offer my congratulations on this milestone.

College Station was an unincorporated community for over 60 years before officially being incorporated as a city on October 19, 1938.

In 1869, the Houston and Texas Central Railway was built through the area; and in 1871, College Station was chosen as the location for what would eventually become one of the largest public universities in the Nation, Texas A&M University.

The city got its name because the A&M campus was the focal point of community development at the time. In 1877, the area was designated College Station, Texas, by the postal service, deriving its name from the train station located to the west of the campus. Since incorporation in 1938, College Station's population has grown to over 97,000 today. Over the past 75 years, College Station has served as a vibrant, supportive, and safe community for thousands of families.

Texas A&M University is still the city's main focal point and the largest employer in the city. The university is rich in tradition and history; and due to its supportive fan base, sporting events bring in hundreds of thousands of tourists each year.

College Station is also the home to the George Bush Presidential Library and Museum, one of the region's most popular tourist attractions.

College Station is a fast-growing city with a thriving economy. It has recently been recognized as one of the Nation's best places for businesses, jobs, families, and retirees. College Station prides itself on having the fifth lowest property tax rate among similar-sized communities in the State of Texas, and the city was recently ranked No. 5 nationally on Forbes' list of the best small places for businesses and careers.

College Station is among the safest, the most family-friendly places in Texas, maintaining one of the best safety ratings in the State. College Station has also been a community that comes together and shows support when needed, whether it was the collapse of the Aggie bonfire in 1999 or the loss of one of our constables in August of last year. Our community comes together in the midst of terrible adversities to support one another.

The residents and leadership of College Station work hard to make their city one of the best places in Texas to work, live, and maintain an enjoyable and fulfilling life. It is my honor to

represent the residents of this great city.

Madam Speaker, please join me in commemorating the city of College Station and its proud residents on their 75th anniversary.

Before I close, I ask that all Americans continue to pray for our country during these difficult times and for the military men and women and first responders who protect her. God bless the American people, and God bless College Station, Texas.

IN HONOR OF MARTYL LANGSDORF

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

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Martyl Langsdorf, who created the image of the now iconic Doomsday Clock for the June 1947 cover of the bulletin of the Atomic Scientists.

The Bulletin was founded by a group of University of Chicago scientists who had worked on the Manhattan Project, including Martyl's husband, physicist Alexander Langsdorf.

Martyl's clock remains a singular reminder of the risks that we face from nuclear weapons and the effects of climate change.

A renowned landscape painter and longtime resident of Schaumburg, Illinois, Martyl died at the age of 96 on March 26, 2013, and will be remembered tomorrow at the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists' Fifth Annual Doomsday Clock Symposium here in our Nation's Capital.

Fittingly titled "Communicating Catastrophe," the symposium will reflect Martyl's sensitivity to the urgency of existential threats and her brilliance in using art and design "to move past the numbness and create new ways of feeling, just as we tap science for new ways of knowing," in the words of Bulletin Executive Director Kennette Benedict.

Martyl's legacy continues as members of the Bulletin's science and security board annually assess the state of world affairs and use the hands of the clock to signal humanity's capacity to meet challenges of nuclear weapons and climate change.

World attention to the Doomsday Clock confirms the impact of what designer Michael Beirut, in a 2010 tribute to Martyl entitled "Designing the Unthinkable," called "the most powerful piece of information design of the 20th century."

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the late Martyl Langsdorf for raising the world's awareness about grave threats and also the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists for providing information and rational analysis that points to a safer world.

To close on a personal note, it was at one of Martyl Langsdorf's annual peony parties at her garden in Schaumburg, during a long conversation with wise old lawyer and Bulletin

stalwart Lowell Sachnoff, that was one of the first times I began seriously considering my own stepping away from my career in science to begin one in public service.

OBAMACARE CANCELATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLDING. Madam Speaker, President Obama promised the American people that if you liked your health care plan, you could keep your health care plan. Period. No exceptions.

Now, as the ObamaCare exchanges have opened and enrollment has begun, there are hundreds of thousands of people in North Carolina who are finding that the President's promise doesn't hold true. According to the North Carolina Department of Insurance, over 183,000 policies have already been terminated, impacting over 473,000 people and their families across the State.

When ObamaCare supporters talk about the new health care law, they focus on the number of people who previously did not have health care and will now be covered. What you don't hear them talk about is the people who already had health care and are losing it now. They don't talk about the canceled policies and the alternative plans offered that are vastly more expensive and far from comparable. This is extremely misleading, Madam Speaker, and this administration has demonstrated a lack of transparency when it comes to the real impacts of ObamaCare.

Madam Speaker, I have heard from hundreds of constituents whose health care plans are going up in cost or being canceled altogether. A man in his sixties from Zebulon, North Carolina, wrote to my office that his wife's current plan, which costs \$292 a month, will be discontinued because it does not comply with ObamaCare standards. She will be moved to a comparable plan that doubles her monthly payment. On top of the increased cost, the new plan is not tailored to their needs. The couple is in their sixties, retired, and their children are adults; yet their new plan includes newborn care, plus dental and vision for dependent children.

A constituent from Cary, North Carolina, wrote in with similar concerns. He and his wife currently pay about \$715 a month for their health care plan and were informed that it was being canceled. Their new plan will cost them double annually and will no longer include vision care, but they are now both covered for maternity care. He wrote that his present policy is better and more suited for two people in their sixties, and "it just doesn't seem quite fair that two people who have always been responsible and done without things in order to afford health care insurance and save enough to re-

tire should now be faced with this." Madam Speaker, I agree.

Men and women of all ages across my home State and the country are feeling the negative impacts of ObamaCare. I received a letter from a mother in Wake Forest, North Carolina, who got a notice that her monthly premium for a family of four is going from \$624 a month to \$1,207 a month. This is as much as their mortgage payment. Now her family is forced to pay the steep increase or choose a plan that includes a smaller premium, but with fewer benefits and much higher deductibles. So much for keeping the health care plan she liked.

Another constituent from Cary wrote that a difference in cost between his current BlueCross BlueShield plan and the lowest option under ObamaCare is about \$700 a month, tripling his current rate. How is this comparable to the plan he already has and now cannot keep?

Madam Speaker, these are real people who have real problems with ObamaCare. President Obama needs to listen to North Carolinians and American families across the country. Stories like this indicate that what President Obama said simply wasn't true. People are being forced into plans that include coverage they don't need or want, and they are not being able to keep the doctors and plans they had for years. ObamaCare gives little choice and puts many in an impossible financial situation.

Madam Speaker, this is simply not right. The American people want to be able to keep their doctors and health care plans that they were promised, and they were promised this by the President. That promise should be upheld.

OBAMACARE

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

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, we all have heard the promise over and over again:

If you like what you have, you can keep it.

It is probably the most often repeated promise since Barack Obama has been President. For 5 years now, that promise has been made, and unfortunately, now millions of Americans are realizing that that promise has been broken over and over again. Over 100,000 Louisiana families are seeing that broken promise.

In fact, we had a social media site called Share with Steve where we asked people in Louisiana's First Congressional District to share their stories with me, and the stories that I have heard have been compelling and heartbreaking. In fact, I started sharing some of those stories with the Secretary of Health and Human Services. When Secretary Sebelius was before us in the House Energy and Commerce Committee just a little over a week

ago, I shared some of those stories with her.

One of those stories was Shaun from Covington, and I read Shaun's story of the health care that he has now lost for his family because of the President's health care law. Of course, you have got Secretary Sebelius who is running the President's health care law and all of these broken promises that we are hearing about. I said, What would you tell Shaun, Madam Secretary, who has now lost the good health care he has for his family when you promised him that he would be able to keep that health care?

□ 1030

Unfortunately, all we got was a smug response from a bureaucrat in Washington, and her response to Shaun was, Well, you can just go shop around in the health care exchange.

Well, first of all, that is not the promise that she and the President made to Shaun. The President promised Shaun he could keep his health care if he liked it. And Shaun likes his health care and doesn't want to lose it and, even more, doesn't want to have to go to some Web site that doesn't even work to go buy a plan that his family doesn't need. What Shaun conveyed to me after that interaction with the Secretary was that what he is being presented now are options that are even more expensive and don't include the kind of coverage that his family wants.

So I think what is most insulting to Americans is not only now that they are losing that health care, that President Obama broke that promise, that sacred promise between a doctor and a patient, but now you are hearing this elitist Washington politician response where you have got these bureaucrats and politicians in Washington telling people like Shaun, We didn't think your plan was good enough.

So not only have they broken the promise, but now they are deciding what they think is good enough for a patient and their doctor. And so a family in a place like Covington, Louisiana, that I represent, or all around the country, that had good health insurance, that liked the plan that they had, is being told not only that they can't keep it, but that some Washington bureaucrat didn't think their plan was good enough, even though they thought their plan was good enough.

So this is what is wrong with government-run health care. This is why we fought this bill back in 2009 when it was going through the Energy and Commerce Committee and here on the House floor when you had then-Speaker NANCY PELOSI saying you have got to pass the bill to find out what is in it. Of course American families are now seeing what is in it, and they don't like what they are seeing in this bill.

Later this week, we are bringing up a bill on the House floor that I am proud to cosponsor that allows you to keep

the plan that you have if you like it. Of course, the President's promise really should have been if Barack Obama likes your plan you can keep it, because that is the only way you can keep your plan is if the Federal Government approves of it even if you like it and you lose it.

What we are also seeing, of course, over on the Senate side, and even here on the House floor, many people who voted for the President's health care law are acting as if they had no idea this was going to happen. Of course they knew this was going to happen. If you read the bill, you could tell that people would lose the good health care they liked. There were reports coming out in 2010 that said millions of Americans will lose the health care they like, and yet now you have Senators over there and even some House Members who voted for the President's health care law acting like they had no idea this was going to come to pass. Of course they knew that millions of Americans would lose the good health care that they like. They just didn't think maybe that people would realize that it was the President's health care law that caused it and hold them accountable. And so now people are starting to be held accountable, as they should.

But, Madam Speaker, there is a better way. In fact, I am proud to have led an effort to bring forward the American Health Care Reform Act, a true alternative to the President's health care law that actually starts addressing the problems to lower costs, to allow people to keep the good health care plans that they like, and to give people real options.

In fact, our bill has over 100 cosponsors now, including medical doctors who serve in Congress who helped draft this bill, who understand that the doctor-patient relationship should continue to be maintained and be that sacred relationship that it used to always be before the government started coming in between people's health care, before IRS agents started coming in between people's health care.

So this bill allows people to buy insurance across State lines, giving people real flexibility, real choice, real competition in health care, where people will be competing for your business to dramatically lower costs, to allow people to have the option to buy their own health care instead of going through their company, and they will be able to have the same tax benefits that a company gets. So if they buy a health care plan on their own that is better than what their employer provides, they will be able to deduct that cost, which they can't do today. It allows small businesses and even individuals to pool together and get the buying power of a large corporation. This is the way we should be doing this, Madam Speaker, not this government-run approach.

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, millions of Americans are now experiencing firsthand the failures of a massive undertaking to roll out the Affordable Care Act. While well-intentioned, our colleagues who had a Democrat supermajority in the White House, the Senate, and this House pushed through a partisan bill ignoring warnings of those like myself who have worked in the health care field for decades.

Prior to being elected to Congress, I spent nearly three decades in a non-profit health care setting, serving my neighbors who were facing life-changing disease and disability. When it was time to weigh in on public policy, Members like me were muzzled. We were told to pass a bill to see what was in it. Well, that is exactly what happened, despite our continued dissent.

Phones are ringing off the hooks in Members' offices. Constituents who have lost their health insurance policies and experienced unaffordable premium hikes are angry. They were made a promise by the President that they could keep their health plans. Now, reportedly, more than 5 million individuals have lost their policies. Undoubtedly, this is just the beginning of Americans not being able to keep the insurance that they like.

One of my constituents, Sam, from Erie County, Pennsylvania, has been affected. He has been on the same policy that has provided him with adequate coverage, exactly what he was looking for, for years. He no longer has access to that coverage.

Or Lisa and her husband, both self-employed and hailing from Punxsutawney in Jefferson County, Pennsylvania. They have five children—two in college, one in high school, and two working. After receiving notice that their effective and affordable health insurance policy was canceled, they have now been saddled with cost increases of over \$20,000 a year.

How about John from Clearfield County, who emailed my congressional office this week after being informed by his insurer that, due to changes under the Affordable Care Act, his policy is now canceled. He owns a small business that no longer qualifies for the group plan under the law's requirements.

Then there is Sonya from northeast Pennsylvania, right on the shores of Lake Erie. She has had the same policy for the last 4 years, and it is being canceled. She stated that it is unfair she should have to buy more expensive insurance; not to mention, she says, it will cost much more over the long run when you factor in her new deductible.

Madam Speaker, this is an outrage. These are just several of countless examples—I want to say “endless examples”—of real harm being experienced

by hardworking Americans, my constituents, as a result of this flawed law.

Madam Speaker, the time I have been granted on this floor is not sufficient for me to share the growing number of voices from the Fifth District of Pennsylvania who are having their policies canceled and being forced to buy insurance that they can't afford, that they don't want and they don't need.

Those at the White House that masterminded this catastrophic attack on insurance affordability and choice released their preliminary numbers for winners and losers yesterday. Nationwide, roughly 100,000 have obtained insurance policies through the national and State exchanges combined. Many of these individuals, unfortunately, are now experiencing the sticker shock of significant costs when premiums and deductible expenses are combined and considered. The sad part is that these are the winners. That is just how bad this health care law is. Americans deserve access to health insurance that they choose and can afford.

Madam Speaker, a large block of Members in this body are standing up and putting forward solutions to these failures, including some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Senator MARY LANDRIEU, a Democrat from Louisiana, recently announced she would propose legislation to ensure all Americans could keep their existing insurance coverage under ObamaCare. But “it's not just red-State Democrats,” as Politico reports today. Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN, a Democrat from California, yesterday announced she would support the bipartisan effort to allow Americans to keep the plans they know and like.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, these proposals that are being put forward by my Democratic colleagues mean that we would have to change the law. Unfortunately, Senate Leader REID doesn't like the optics of having this debate on its merits, even if it would help Americans keep the insurance they know and like, as the President repeatedly promised.

I want to thank the growing number of my colleagues for doing what is right and placing good policy before politics. This law is flawed. It is sinking by its own weight. Now we must act to fix its fatal flaws. If we don't, those who want to protect the political reputation of the White House will allow it to continue, no matter how much harm is caused upon the American people.

Madam Speaker, the American people deserve better.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 40 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Rabbi Joshua Gruenberg, Congregation Beth El Yardley, Yardley, Pennsylvania, offered the following prayer:

Our God and God of our ancestors, Everlasting Spirit of the Universe, may it be Your will that the Members of this House faithfully represent all citizens of this great Nation. As they strive to govern this land, guide them, O Lord, with the pillars of humility and respect.

Help them to live up to the legacy of those who have come before and to always honor those men and women who have made the ultimate sacrifice to keep this Nation strong and free.

Remind all citizens of our great Nation to put people over politics, to elevate democracy over dogma, to value discussion over discord, and to cultivate compromise instead of conviction.

Bless the Members of this hallowed body with the knowledge that what binds us together is stronger than what may pull us apart, that serving You is best accomplished by serving others.

Dear God, please allow Your blessing of health and of peace to envelop our great Nation.

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.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. WAGNER 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.

WELCOMING RABBI JOSHUA GRUENBERG

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and introduce a good friend and community leader in my home district, Rabbi Joshua Gruenberg, and to thank him for offering today's invocation.

Rabbi Gruenberg made the trip here to the Nation's Capital with his wife, Elissa, and his two children, Kayla and Samuel. I am proud and pleased to welcome the rabbi and his family to the House of Representatives.

Rabbi Gruenberg is the chief spiritual leader at Temple Beth El in Yardley, Pennsylvania. Since he joined the temple in 2011, I have gotten to know the rabbi quite well. He has participated in several of my local roundtable discussions on issues, including Israel and the Middle East, and has come down to Washington to visit with me and to offer counsel.

Rabbi Gruenberg is a warm and welcoming Bucks County leader. He has helped build on a strong foundation at Temple Beth El that will last for decades to come.

I am proud of the work he has done in our community and am privileged to call him my friend.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The Chair will entertain 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

OBAMACARE HURTS FAMILIES

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans have received cancellation notices for their insurance policies as a result of ObamaCare's failed legislation. The Wall Street Journal anticipates this number to reach 10 million by January 1.

Citizens living in the Second District of South Carolina are experiencing the brunt of the administration's deception. Becky from West Columbia is shocked that her world-class cancer care is at risk. Frank from Lexington will be forced to buy new health insurance with higher premiums of 33 percent. Joe from Aiken has been notified that his wife will be removed from their current health care plan January 1. He writes:

The only problem is that now we have two premiums to pay, two deductibles to meet, and an additional thing to worry about while we are trying to raise kids and be responsible adults.

These real-life problems are affecting all American families. We must stop the damage by passing the Keep Your Health Plan Act to assist families and promote jobs.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. Our prayers are for the people in the Philippines for typhoon recovery.

TYPHOON HAIYAN

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the typhoon in the Philippines has left a wake of unimaginable devastation.

Those living in the areas hardest hit by the storm are embarking on the excruciating process of trying to pick up the pieces. Members of the San Diego region's large Filipino community are determined to send aid to their native country. They are collecting clothing, food, and encouraging cash donations.

The feeling of helplessness from my constituents that have family living in the area where the typhoon hit is profound. It is important that people understand where their efforts are most needed and where their donations will be best used.

It is in these difficult moments like this where we witness unbridled compassion and empathy, and I am pleased that the humanitarian efforts, which our military and aid communities do so well, are under way, and at least 13 other countries have joined the effort as well.

The help is not arriving as fast as those suffering from hunger, cold, illness, and homelessness need.

The Filipino Americans in our districts are looking to us to continue our role as leaders in humanitarian aid. Let's continue to help those most in need.

OBAMACARE HURTS THE HARDWORKING MIDDLE CLASS

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

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, I have received far too many heartbreaking stories from the people of Missouri's Second District about how government-run health care is impacting their lives.

Today, I rise to put a face on the horrors of ObamaCare and tell Jim and Kim Curtis' story, who hail from Arnold, Missouri.

This is their story in their own words:

We, the working middle class, are the ones who are being hurt by this law. We struggle

every day to make ends meet. But now, because of ObamaCare, we received a notice from the insurance company that the plan we currently pay for does not meet the guidelines, and we will no longer be covered on January 1, 2014.

Now we have to find an extra \$500 to \$600 minimum per month to cover the insurance that is comparable to what we had before. I have no idea how we will afford that kind of money and pay our bills and mortgage each month.

Mr. Speaker, this is just one of millions of examples of real people being hurt by ObamaCare.

TYPHOON HAIYAN

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

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in solidarity with the people of the Philippines in the wake of the devastation caused by Super Typhoon Haiyan.

I just returned yesterday from my district, Guam, where we have a large Filipino population trying to reach relatives, all to no avail. Remember, we are the closest neighbors to the Philippines.

The images that we see on TV are horrific and unimaginable. We are strong allies with the Philippines and have deep historic and cultural ties.

As we have done in the past, we will stand by our allies in need, and I commend the Obama administration for rushing to the aid of the Filipino people. Also, I commend the efforts of the Filipino community of Guam, the Government of Guam, and the local non-profits and businesses for mobilizing to provide resources to their counterparts. Like Operation Tomodachi, we are rushing to the aid of the Philippines. This is how we demonstrate our commitment to the Pacific partners.

I appreciate and commend the efforts of our Federal Government to send significant resources to the impacted areas of the Philippines, and I urge this Congress to reaffirm this commitment to the Philippines and to support providing resources necessary to help them recover.

HERE A GLITCH, THERE A GLITCH

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare has been nothing short of a painful government illness.

On the first day Americans were due to enroll in their health care plan, they just couldn't do it. Errors flashed across their computer screens. It was a glitch here, a glitch there, everywhere a glitch, glitch, glitch.

Out of the 500,000 Americans that should have been enrolled by now, only a handful were able to sign up thanks to technical incompetence, negligence, and those glitches.

Americans will be penalized if they can't sign up, but how are you supposed to when the Web site doesn't work?

Computer glitches should take minutes to fix, not weeks. These glitches are just a sign of things to come when the government takes over America's health. If the government can't even get the Web site right, how will government get health care right for the American people?

ObamaCare has the compassion of the IRS, the competence of FEMA, and the efficiency of the post office.

And that's just the way it is.

TYPHOON YOLANDA

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

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Northern Mariana Islands know the terror when a typhoon strikes. We know how difficult are the days and months of recovery after, but none of us has known a storm with the power and intensity of Typhoon Yolanda.

So our hearts and our prayers go out to the people of the Philippines who are suffering through this terrible tragedy that swept down upon them.

We have families and friends there. Some, thank God, we know are safe. The fate of others we wait to learn and whether their homes are standing, whether they have food, water. All we know for certain is the people of the Philippines need our help. America is rising quickly to assist. Our government immediately committed \$20 million. Disaster teams are on the way.

Much more will be needed from our government and from individuals alike, but I am sure we will all do whatever we can to assist the survivors who have lost so much and now face the long task of rebuilding their homes and lives.

OZARK NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAYS GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, the National Park Service released a draft general management plan for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways in Missouri's Eighth Congressional District. The general management plan seeks to limit my constituents' access to the rivers that they have enjoyed for generations.

This plan from the National Park Service would shut down public access points to the rivers, eliminate motorized boat traffic from certain areas, further restrict boat motor horsepower in other areas, close several gravel bars, and propose additional areas to be designated as Federal wilderness.

The outcry I have heard from my constituents is unanimous. They believe the Ozark National Scenic Riverways are already overmanaged

and my constituents do not want the National Park Service to further intrude on their access to their public rivers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the park service to reject changing management practices on the Ozark National Scenic Riverways so that my constituents can continue enjoying their rivers.

OBAMACARE

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

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, many of my Republican colleagues are still obsessed with ending health care for the American citizen.

I come here today to tell you the administration, experts, and my colleagues in Congress are working on making sure that all Americans have insurance.

I say to you while they talk about "glitch, glitch, glitches," yes, we are all disappointed with that. When they talk about the face of the stories, let me tell you that last week during our week at home, I held a tele-townhall conference, and many of my constituents called in and asked questions about the Affordable Care Act. Do you know why? Because they had a college student who can stay on their insurance. Do you know why? Because there were women who had pre-existing conditions now that can be covered. Do you know why? They were seniors. They were mothers. They were parents. That is what the Affordable Care Act is about.

So I say to you to listen closely, America, because the Affordable Care Act will make a difference, and that is what we should have in this wonderful America that we live in.

□ 1215

OBAMACARE'S CANCELATION NOTICES

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, since the Affordable Care Act was first introduced, President Obama claimed time and time again, if you like your insurance, you can keep it. Yet, over the last six weeks, I have heard from numerous constituents across western North Carolina that that, in fact, was not what they were experiencing; that, unfortunately, they had canceled policies because of ObamaCare.

Steve, a pastor in Hickory, received notice his plan with a premium of \$695 was being canceled. His new plan's premium? \$1,500.

Marsha in Claremont had her current plan canceled. The replacement plan was 133 percent more in cost.

Milton, a retiree from Denver, had his policy canceled. The replacement not only has higher deductibles and copays, but it also precludes him from seeing his current doctor.

I heard from Terri, a self-employed woman in Newton, whose premiums were \$359 a month until ObamaCare canceled these plans, and her new premium is \$759 a month.

I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join with us in passing the Keep Your Health Care Plan to hold the President to his word that, if you like your plan, you can keep it.

NOVEMBER IS NATIONAL ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize November as National Alzheimer's Disease Awareness Month.

Over 5 million Americans nationwide are living with Alzheimer's, a disease that afflicts the victim but also the family, a disease whose origins are unknown but whose end is absolutely certain. It is a disease that takes your mind, your dignity, and, eventually, your life. In 2013, Alzheimer's will cost the Nation \$203 billion. This number is expected to rise to \$1.2 trillion by 2015.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the work of the Western New York Alzheimer's Association and local advocate Nancy Swiston, who worked so hard this month and year-round to highlight the effects of Alzheimer's disease.

Alzheimer's disease is a public health crisis that can't be ignored. I urge my colleagues to raise awareness about Alzheimer's in their own communities and to support the bipartisan HOPE for Alzheimer's Act to improve diagnosis and treatment of Alzheimer's disease.

CONGRATULATING MONTANA CHAMPION OF CHANGE VANCE HOME GUN

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Vance Home Gun, a member of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes from Arlee, Montana.

Vance was recently recognized as the 2013 Center for Native American Youth "Champion of Change" for his work to preserve the Salish language in his school and his community. I had the opportunity to meet with Vance just last night and learned more about the work he is doing on the Flathead Reservation.

Vance was introduced to a Salish language camp by his aunt when he was just 11 years old and has been determined ever since to become a fluent speaker in his tribe's language. He has been working with tribal departments, organizations, and youth groups for the past 6 years to help preserve the Salish language. Vance teaches language classes at high schools and leads an or-

ganization that utilizes peer-to-peer methods to teach language and culture.

I commend Vance for his commitment to preserving and increasing awareness of this important part of his tribe's culture and history, and I congratulate him on his well-deserved award.

Vance Home Gun, well done.

ACA IMPLEMENTATION

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

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, despite my significant frustration with the rollout of the Affordable Care Act, I remain committed to increasing access to affordable health care for every Granite Stater. To that end, I support efforts to ensure that folks who like their current health plan can keep them for another year.

In New Hampshire, Granite Staters already have the option of renewing their current plans; and I believe that families across the country should be able to do the same, and I will support good-faith efforts to do that.

But the Affordable Care Act is not a perfect law, and I am committed to improving it. Make no mistake; we cannot go back to the days when insurance companies were free to deny insurance coverage for people with preexisting conditions, or simply because they were female and their rates would be higher, or to drop people from their plans because they got sick, or to drop people from their plans because they grew older and were not living in their own home with the family.

I will continue to work with anybody who is serious about making this law work and to ensure that Granite Staters have access to the quality, affordable health care that they deserve.

FREEDOM TO SPEAK YOUR MIND WITHOUT FEAR OF RETRIBUTION

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

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, I got a letter from someone in my district. It says:

You have probably heard about health care reform and wondered what it means to you. This letter is to let you know that your MyChoice health insurance plan from BlueChoice HealthPlan is non-grandfathered. This means you purchased it or made significant changes to it after March 23, 2010—the day the Affordable Care Act became law. As a result, the law requires that your insurance plan expire.

This is not the saddest part of this letter, the fact that this woman was made a promise that no one is keeping to her. The saddest part of this letter is she asked me not to use her name here today.

Someone does need to be held accountable for making promises to citizens that are not kept. But beyond

that, someone needs to be held accountable for allowing an environment to grow up where citizens of this country are afraid to have their name spoken on the floor of this House for fear of retribution from their government.

We will deal with health care. We will do the very best that we can. But beyond that, we need to figure out a way to create an environment where people are free to speak their minds on issues such as this.

WE STAND IN SUPPORT OF THE PEOPLE OF THE PHILIPPINES

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, following one of the worst natural disasters to hit landfall, we stand as a world community in support of the people of the Philippines.

Last week, Typhoon Yolanda tore through the Philippines, tragically taking thousands of lives and leaving millions without food, water, or shelter. The road ahead will be difficult, but the resilient spirit of the Filipino community far and near will overcome this challenge.

As the representative of one of the largest Filipino communities in the United States, my heart goes out to the families in my communities whose loved ones suffered through this dreadful storm. My office is working to connect families with the State Department to help them locate and get news about their loved ones.

I am pleased by the significant humanitarian efforts from both my home district and around the world. We are a Nation founded and guided by the principles of humanity.

We must not forget our brothers and sisters in the Philippines, for far too many are still without food, water, and shelter. If the infrastructure is down, come on. Let's start thinking outside of the box and do everything in our power to provide food and water and critical support today.

RHODE ISLAND NURSES INSTITUTE

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of the Rhode Island Nurses Institute Middle College Charter High School, the first middle college established in Rhode Island, and the first American charter school that is dedicated to the nursing profession.

My grandmother Lucy Cicilline was a proud nurse at St. Joseph's Hospital for many years.

As a 4-year program, this institution helps to bridge the gap between high school and college, providing students who have graduated ninth grade with an innovative learning experience that allows them to graduate with a high

school diploma and nursing credentials so they can enter the workforce successfully.

The Rhode Island Nurses Institute Middle College Charter High School first opened its doors 2 years ago and today provides a quality education for 272 young people from my home State of Rhode Island.

If we are serious about getting our economy back on the right track, we need to find new, innovative ways to make sure that young people have the opportunity to go to college or begin their careers equipped with the skills they need to compete in a global economy. The Nursing Institute Middle College is showing us one way to achieve this goal.

I want to applaud the work of Chief Executive Officer Pamela McCue, their entire faculty, staff, and all of the students.

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, opponents of the Affordable Care Act in Congress have spent the past few weeks reveling in the problems of the Federal exchange Web site, healthcare.gov.

In my State of Kentucky, where we have created our own exchange, we have had tremendous success. As of last week, nearly 415,000 people had explored the Web site and assessed their options. More than 42,000 are now enrolled in health plans, many of them for the first time; and 843 small businesses have begun applying for coverage for their employees, with 309 of them already able to offer coverage to their workers.

We are 6 weeks into a 6-month open enrollment period, and while the failures of the Federal health care Web site are frustrating, they are far from fatal. The true danger to the more than 42,000 Kentuckians who have gained coverage under the law—and the hundreds of thousands more who will—is what opponents of the law are proposing in its place: a return to the broken system that failed tens of millions of Americans each year.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues and the American people to keep a healthy perspective. We did not enact the Affordable Care Act to launch a Web site. We did it to ensure that every American has access to affordable, quality care, and we should all work together to accomplish that goal.

SUPPORT FOR THE TYPHOON VICTIMS

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from California, Guam, and CNMI in expressing our support for those devastated by superstorm Typhoon Yolanda/Haiyan.

We do know that the United States has already committed \$20 million and that PACOM has mobilized. The U.N. has estimated that it may probably cost \$300-plus million to send aid to the Philippines. We know that our military has shown that its humanitarian and disaster relief capabilities are bar none, and they showed that on March 11, 2011, when the Tohoku earthquake hit Japan.

Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress must stand ready to support the efforts to aid the people in the Philippines. Hawaii's Filipino community is the largest minority that we have, and many have relatives from the area. Typhoon Haiyan ripped through the Visayan area, which is where our first immigrants came from.

We need to show the world, Mr. Speaker, that the United States is again the great Nation that it is because it does not turn its back on people in need.

SHIA KILLINGS IN PAKISTAN

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, the relationship between the United States and Pakistan has been a long and mutually beneficial relationship, in general. But I rise today, based on the representations of many of my constituents, to raise concerns about the status of religious minorities.

I support a strong U.S.-Pakistan relationship, and I have experienced kindness and generosity from the Pakistani people myself and their beautiful diversity.

In addition to Pakistan's Sunni Muslim majority, there are Shia Muslims, Ahmadi Muslims, Christians, Hindus, and others. Pakistan is a country with rich religious diversity.

However, the situation for many religious minorities is of grave concern, and this is particularly true for Shia Muslims, although all have expressed concern. Shias face daily discrimination at work, school, and in the political process.

According to the Human Rights Commission of Pakistan, more than 500 people were killed last year in sectarian attacks against Muslim sects, mainly Shias. This year, nearly three Shias have been killed every single day; three people have been killed simply because of how they practice their faith.

Mr. Speaker, this is a crisis, and something must be done. I urge the people of Pakistan and their leadership to do something about it now.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE SPECIAL DIABETES PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the importance of

the Special Diabetes Program, which represents 35 percent of the Federal investment in type 1 diabetes research, and to encourage my colleagues to support a multiyear renewal of the program at current funding levels.

Type 1 diabetes among Americans under the age of 20 rose by 23 percent between 2001 and 2009. People with type 1 diabetes, including one of my constituents, 8-year-old Charlie, need daily finger sticks and insulin injections to stay alive.

As part of the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation's "Promise to Remember Me" campaign, I recently met with Charlie and his father and another constituent, Nancy, whose 17-year-old daughter also has type 1 diabetes, to discuss their daily struggle with the disease and their hopes for better treatment options and, someday, a cure.

The Special Diabetes Program has delivered groundbreaking research for type 1 diabetes, including artificial pancreas systems, a revolutionary technology in the research pipeline that will automatically control blood sugar levels, keep patients healthier, and help avoid many dangerous and costly long-term complications due to diabetes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the program.

□ 1230

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2655, LAWSUIT ABUSE REDUCTION ACT OF 2013, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 982, FURTHERING ASBESTOS CLAIM TRANSPARENCY (FACT) ACT OF 2013

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 403 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 403

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2655) to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommend.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 982) to amend title 11 of the United States Code to require the public disclosure by trusts established under section 524(g) of such title, of quarterly reports that contain detailed information regarding the receipt and disposition of claims

for injuries based on exposure to asbestos; and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to my friend from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I think back to a time when I was a teenager and I came into the gallery, and I am convinced that I came in during a rule because the reading clerk was standing there, reading line after line after line of material I didn't understand at all, and I thought, Why in the world is line by line by line the legislation being read? Haven't the Members already looked at that legislation? Haven't they already had time to study it?

What I know now, Mr. Speaker, 3 years with the voting card of the people of the Seventh District of Georgia, is that the rule is the only piece of legislation in this entire body that has to be read word for word here on the floor of the House.

My colleague from Florida and I spend a lot of hours up there in the Rules Committee sorting those things out, but the rules matter. The process matters.

I will be able to confess to you, Mr. Speaker—and I think sometimes we get

that process done a little better, sometimes we get that process not done quite so well, but today we have a rule that brings two very important pieces of legislation to the floor. This structured rule provides for H.R. 982, which is the Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency Act, the FACT Act; and it brings a closed rule for H.R. 2655, the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2013.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I was just talking with a group about what the Rules Committee does, and I have talked about the importance of an open process and how closed rules don't give folks as much opportunity to express their views on the floor.

It is going to be a closed rule on the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act, H.R. 2655, because for 11 days, Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee solicited amendments from the entire body. It asked anyone who had any ideas about how to improve this legislation to submit those amendments so that we could consider them in the Rules Committee, and over that period of 11 days, Mr. Speaker, not one Member of this body offered any ideas about how to improve this bill. We would have liked to have made amendments in order for this bill, but none were submitted. So while we say this is a closed rule on H.R. 2655, it is only because no amendments were submitted to improve upon it.

Now on H.R. 982, the FACT Act, Mr. Speaker, we had five amendments submitted, all Democrat amendments. One was withdrawn. So there were only four that were in order for our meeting last night. One was confessed to actually just try to eliminate the effectiveness of the bill altogether. So we excluded that one because if folks don't like the bill, they can just vote "no." They don't have to destroy the bill from within; they can just vote "no" on final passage. But all of the other amendments that were submitted we made in order. Now these are not amendments that I intend to support on the floor, Mr. Speaker, but I do think it is important that people's voices be heard.

So, again, three amendments are made in order. That is 75 percent of all the amendments that were submitted, and they are all amendments offered by my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle. The Rules Committee thought it was important to make those amendments in order.

Now we will talk a lot, Mr. Speaker, in the debate that comes after the rule about the content of these bills. One deals with frivolous litigation and whether or not judges will be required to allow folks who had to defend against frivolous lawsuits to recover the costs of those suits.

Today, Mr. Speaker, if someone files a frivolous lawsuit against you, you can have that lawsuit tossed out, but you have to go back to the court a second time to recover all of the costs that it took you to have the frivolous lawsuit tossed out. It is a tremendous burden on small businesses in our Nation. This bill seeks to solve that.

The FACT Act, our asbestos litigation act, aims to provide some transparency to the asbestos trust funds. I don't know if you are familiar, Mr. Speaker, but when it was discovered all of the health damage done by asbestos, the lawsuits began immediately and would have driven every one of those companies that either used asbestos or produced asbestos into bankruptcy, leaving no money at all for victims who had health problems that they then sought compensation for.

So federally we created, within Federal bankruptcy courts, these asbestos trust funds that allowed these companies, these manufacturers of asbestos, these folks who utilized processes that included asbestos, to deposit money into a trust fund and not go out of business but to provide certainty that victims would be able to recover from those funds in the future.

There is some concern, Mr. Speaker, that the process, as it exists today, does not allow for folks to see who is getting those dollars and whether or not the victims who have the most urgent needs are receiving those dollars first. Our great concern, Mr. Speaker, is that when those trust funds are depleted, they are gone forever. As you know, asbestos-related illnesses often don't present themselves for years down the road, so we have a stewardship obligation to these trust funds to keep them protected for future claimants.

This bill requires a degree of transparency, a quarterly report from the trustees of these trust funds to see who is making claims on these funds, who is receiving claims out of these funds, again, just so we can be good stewards of those trust funds and ensure they are available for future years.

I don't sit on the Judiciary Committee, Mr. Speaker, but I heard from the ranking member of the Constitution Subcommittee last night. I heard from the chairman of the full committee last night in the Rules Committee as we held a hearing on both of these bills. I am glad that we are able to bring them to the floor today, Mr. Speaker. Two bills, a structured rule. One rule is closed because no amendments were provided. The other bill is receiving 75 percent of all of the amendments that were submitted. Just one amendment was excluded by that rule.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I thank my good friend from Georgia for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the gentleman, and he was very clear about, one, the process and, two, the basic substance of both measures that are on the floor today. To a relative degree, I agree with much of what he has said. I know that my friend from Georgia is an advocate of an open process, and with all due respect to him and the

committee, structured rules—whether Members have offered suggestions for change or not—are not open rules. However, in this particular case, he is correct that of the five amendments that were offered by Members of my party, three of them were made in order, and none were offered on the first of the two measures.

Mr. Speaker, with only 15 days left in this session of the 113th Congress, we are here yet again doing more of the same, which is nothing. It has been reported that some among my friends across the aisle have even joked that the House shouldn't be in session in December at all.

Instead of addressing our Nation's serious immigration needs—and I might add a footnote there. There is a substantial loss to our economic undertakings by virtue of us failing to do the things that we can and should do either comprehensively or step by step to deal with the immigration circumstances of this great Nation. We could be passing ENDA, as the Senate did last week, where we could end discrimination in the workplace.

Or we could do something that all of us know needs to be done: we could work on ending sequestration. I was at two meetings this morning, one dealing with homelessness and the other dealing with the need for food, and in each instance, the parties that were the experts cited how sequestration has impacted their nonprofit organizations in trying to assist the homeless and the needy as it pertains to food. So we could be working on trying to stop this meat-ax approach that is set in motion. Yet we find ourselves passing bills that won't do anything and aren't going to go anywhere.

In fact, H.R. 2655, as my colleague has pointed out, no Member offered any amendment to it. It is so bad that nobody even wanted to fix it. The bill is nothing more than a partisan solution to a problem that doesn't exist.

The American Bar Association, the preeminent bar association among lawyers in every category in the United States of America, wrote the following:

No serious problem has been brought to the Rules Committee's attention. There is no need to reinstate the 1983 version of rule 11 that proved contentious and diverted so much time and energy of the bar and bench.

The ABA continued that the bill "is not based on an empirical foundation, and the proposed amendments ignore lessons learned."

□ 1245

The proposed changes would "impede the administration of justice by encouraging additional litigation and increasing court costs and delays."

This bill not only prevents judges from calling balls and strikes; it forces members of the bench to call balks on every pitch before the ball can even reach the plate.

The Judicial Conference, the preeminent conference of the United States courts in this country that is

the body responsible for proposing the necessary changes in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, asked Federal judges about these proposed changes. Eighty-seven percent of the judges asked prefer the existing rule 11 to the 1983 version; 85 percent of them support the safe harbor provisions; 91 percent oppose mandatory sanctions for every rule 11 violation; 84 percent think that attorneys' fees should not be awarded for every rule 11 violation. And here is the big one: 85 percent believe the amount of groundless litigation has not grown since promulgation of the 1993 rule.

These are men and women who face these issues on a daily basis. They know better than most—and almost anyone in this House of Representatives—and believe that rule 11 has plenty of teeth as is.

This bill would substitute the judgment of Congress for that of our judges. When the Judicial Conference of the United States opposes the changes in this bill, you would have to wonder who the bill is really benefiting.

It is not just the judges who oppose this bill. There is a long list of groups that include attorneys, consumer protection groups, civil rights organizations, and public interest advocates, all in opposition to this bill.

As late as this morning, I received an additional letter from the National Employment Lawyers Association. In sum and substance, they feel that they represent farms, fields, schools, factories, executive offices, military services, hospitals, and many others; and they feel that they are a unique voice in this category. They stand in opposition because they think it will proliferate the amount of litigation that is unnecessary in our overburdened courts as it is.

The court already has discretion to award sanctions, attorneys' fees, and expenses. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2655 will create more hurdles with which deep-pocketed businesses can drag out litigation that is already too expensive and time consuming.

My friends across the aisle have produced a number of anecdotes in support of this bill; but most of the cases cited are demand letters or State law cases, neither of which are subject to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Furthermore, lawsuits are too complicated to explain with a quip of carefully selected and characterized facts. Just because a particular fact pattern is entertaining or seemingly silly does not mean the case is without merit. Just because a case makes for a good headline doesn't mean that real people weren't really injured.

The most famous example that I can think of is the woman who sued McDonald's for her coffee being too hot. When you say it like that, it sounds like you want coffee to be hot when you get it. But what is skipped over when we say it that way is that the coffee caused third-degree burns,

and the lady had to be hospitalized for 8 days, received skin grafts, and then 2 years of medical treatment. Well, that hot coffee doesn't sound so silly when you look at it from that standpoint.

Speaking of bills opposed by the people they supposedly help, the second portion of this rule, H.R. 982, the FACT Act, is ironically titled because it was drafted without regard to any of the facts. There is no evidence of systemic fraud or that systemic failures encourage fraud. The GAO in its study was unable to identify endemic and overt instances of fraud that would justify these kinds of changes.

Most of the information supporters seek is available through the standard discovery process.

This bill seriously compromises the privacy of victims in order to provide offenders with litigation shortcuts. Claims of wanting to increase transparency are really laughable, since the offenders involved in these suits are allowed to maintain their privacy. This bill further victimizes people who have already been through so much.

Human error is not fraud. Isolated incidents are troubling, but fraud prevention procedures are already in place and functioning adequately.

Asbestos victims oppose this bill. My friends across the aisle would have known, if they had provided victims an opportunity; but they did not provide that opportunity. I asked the chair of this committee last evening whether or not the victims had been afforded an opportunity to make a presentation. When I pointed out to him that staff had allowed that they could have a private meeting, but they did not have an opportunity to testify during the proceedings, he agreed with me.

That seems to be a favorite tactic of my Republican friends. They have done this to asbestos victims, and they have done it to judges.

When it came to shutting down the government, they ignored the overwhelming desire of hardworking and working-poor Americans. They continued to ignore economists and the downgrading of our credit rating over the debt ceiling. They disregard the science of climate change, despite erratic, catastrophic weather patterns and rising sea levels.

I am sure that all of us recognize the most recent typhoon that has devastated the Philippines. I am hopeful that we, along with others in the world, will hasten to the rescue. America is always to be commended for our efforts when tragedies strike other nations, and I would call on other nations who have not done so to become adherent to the kind of philosophy that we have. And I hope that we can help those in the Philippines to recover rapidly.

If my friends continue to ignore the world as it is in favor of the red-tinted paradise they believe it to be, they will have no one to blame but themselves when the country decides it is time to ignore them.

I wish to say one additional thing regarding the privacy concern.

Yesterday, I called Comcast Television. The Miami Heat, champions of basketball for the last 2 years, were playing last night. So I thought that I would order the NBA game last evening.

Well, lo and behold, last evening and this morning, before I left to attend meetings, the Comcast system is down and it is not working. I was told that I would get a phone call yesterday; and I didn't get any phone call. So I called this morning and I was told I would get a phone call today, but I missed the game last night. Incidentally, the Heat won. I did see that in the paper this morning.

But I am concerned about the privacy measures because when I called Comcast, after giving them my account number and after telling them who I was and what my address was—and this is through three different automatic systems—then the young man came over the telephone. And when he came over the telephone after doing all of this—the account, my name, where I live again—he then asked me for the last four digits of my Social Security number.

The wife of a former colleague of ours who died of mesothelioma, Bruce Vento, has written actively, along with others, for us to see how this identity problem might persist if we pursue this course.

This bill would make the private information of asbestos poisoning victims readily available on the Internet, and therein lies the difference. Different now is that any information anybody needs is already in the courthouse. And they can go to the courthouse and achieve that information. But this is part of what we mean when we say this bill “re-victimizes” asbestos victims all over again.

If an employer or identity thief wants to get the information in a regular lawsuit, they have to physically now go to every courthouse in the country and look through paper records. But with this bill, if ALCEE HASTINGS applies for a job at X Corporation, the manager at X can search for my name on the Internet, learn that I got money from an asbestos trust, and then decide, if he or she wanted, not to hire me out of some misplaced fear that I am someone who just goes around suing their employer. Or they could refuse to hire me because they fear I will be sick a lot or drive up their group health insurance.

An identity thief could learn the last four digits of my Social Security number. That is the same piece of information that I gave to Comcast yesterday and that my bank and credit card companies use to verify my identity during customer service calls.

What part of that do you not understand that, if you put it on the Internet, then anybody can utilize it?

Risking employment discrimination and identity theft for asbestos poi-

soning victims just because my colleagues on the other side want to stick it to the trial lawyers seems awfully crass to me.

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

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

I say to my friend that I absolutely share his passion for privacy protection. In fact, I had to leave a hearing we were having in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee today, Mr. Speaker, where we were looking at the ObamaCare Web site and talking to the chief information officers and the chief technology officers about how this Web site had gone live without having been fully vetted for security protections; talking about how, even as we sit here today, we have not fully run through those security processes.

I share the gentleman's concern. The gentleman is an attorney as well. I remember when I was in law school and they gave you access to the LexisNexis database when you showed up to law school. You could dial up anybody in the country. It is giving you a credit report and showing you Social Security numbers.

We really do have to have a national conversation, Mr. Speaker, about where we are headed. Those last four digits that were once my private knowledge are out there all over the Internet today. My birthday is broadcast everywhere on the Internet. My mother's maiden name is out there. All of those things that folks used to ask me to protect me have now become part of the public domain. And what the gentleman says about a need to focus on that and protect folks is absolutely right, and we absolutely need to do that.

There was only one amendment last night that was offered to deal with privacy. It was going to give a unique identifier to folks, instead of listing names, so that we could have the transparency to see if folks were trying to game the system and take opportunities away from future victims. That amendment was withdrawn. We didn't have an opportunity to talk about that.

But my great hope is that this bill will pass the House today and that we will be able to have a similar bill come out of the Senate. If regular order has a chance to prevail on Capitol Hill, conference committees will give us another chance to take a bite at that apple.

I think the gentleman brings up very real concerns; and, again, we will have an opportunity to talk about those today.

The gentleman says, Mr. Speaker, there are some bills that are just so bad, nobody wants to fix them. I want to say to the gentleman that I am sympathetic to that sentiment. There are a few that I could rattle off right now that are so bad, I wonder if it is even possible to fix them.

But the bill the gentleman was talking about was the bill to eliminate friv-

olous lawsuits, Mr. Speaker. When we had these penalties in place back for 10 years between 1983 and 1993, more than 70 percent of judges said that they utilized this procedure and that they awarded damages in frivolous lawsuits. Seventy percent of judges, Mr. Speaker, utilize this provision that we are trying to bring back into being to punish filers of frivolous lawsuits.

This is not a bill for Big Business, Mr. Speaker. This is a bill that has been key voted by the National Federation of Independent Businesses. If you know NFIB—and I know most of my colleagues do—this is the trade association that represents the mom-and-pop shops, Mr. Speaker. These aren't the big, working-out-of-a-glass-building-downtown folks that you think are out to get the consumer. These are our friends and neighbors. These are folks who are employing our sons and daughters. These are folks who create most of the jobs in this country.

And they don't key vote a lot of bills, Mr. Speaker. You can go to their Web site—NFIB—and see the number of bills that they key vote. But they have picked this one out.

□ 1300

My colleague from Florida says that some people believe it is so bad that it can't be fixed. They have heard from lawyer association, after lawyer association, after lawyer association which says it doesn't like it, but we are hearing from the mom-and-pop shops which can't defend against it.

Understand, Mr. Speaker, that today, if a frivolous lawsuit is filed against you—and I don't mean “frivolous” because I think it is silly. There are lots of those out there. That is going to be a much higher number. I mean “frivolous” because the judge in the case says it has absolutely no merit on either the facts or the law. When the judge says it has no merit whatsoever, but you have had to pay to defend yourself against it, this bill says the fellow who filed it ought to make you whole.

Punitive damages are something we often hear about from the trial lawyer bar. This bill doesn't have punitive damages. This bill doesn't say, if you try to bankrupt the mom-and-pop company that is down the street from me, we are going to punish you. I think probably it should, but they didn't want to go that far. They said, if you are trying to destroy, with a frivolous lawsuit, the mom-and-pop company down the street, you have to make it whole. If a judge decides that your case has no merit—not a possibly of merit, but no merit—on either the facts or the law, the poor small business owner who is being harassed by that lawsuit should at least have the chance to be made whole at the end of that process. The National Federation of Independent Business—small mom-and-pop shops—is who cares about this legislation.

Again, folks are going to vote “yes,” and folks are going to vote “no,” but I

think it is important that we say, Mr. Speaker, that this is the purview, those things that are important. The gentleman from Florida says, hey, there are more important things we could be working on. I happen to agree with him. There really are important things that we need to have on the floor of this House, but if you are the small business owner who is about to lose your entire lifetime of work because someone has filed a frivolous lawsuit against you, I promise you there is no more important bill in your life than the one that is before us today.

I also have to say, Mr. Speaker, to my friend who talks about sequester that I think that is an important thing. I happen to be the Rules Committee designee to the Budget Committee, and I happen to be the chairman of the Republican Study Committee Budget and Spending Task Force. In fact, we are having a meeting with Maya MacGuineas on the Fix the Debt campaign next Monday afternoon to talk about what those options are for dealing with long-term problems. The Budget Committee right now is in conference with the Senate, trying to find a way to restore funding to discretionary spending programs that we all believe have been ham-handedly reduced. Instead, they are trying to find savings on which we can agree on those long-term mandatory spending programs that rarely, Mr. Speaker, have an opportunity to see aggressive oversight, to see the things that can improve them, to see the things that can preserve their long-term fiscal viability.

I would say, finally, Mr. Speaker, to my friend from Florida that, as the designee to the Budget Committee and as the chairman of the Budget and Spending Task Force, I don't believe it is the failure to raise the debt ceiling that threatens America's credit rating. I think it is out-of-control spending that threatens America's credit rating. It only takes a stroke of a pen here for us to raise the credit limit to infinity, but I promise you that that is not in the best interests of the American economy.

We all know we have spending challenges in this country. We all know that we have made promises to veterans, to seniors, to the infirm, to the poor that we don't have the money to keep. I think that is immoral. If you don't want to help somebody, then say you don't want to help somebody, but do not promise someone that you will be there for him in his time of need and pull the rug out from under him when he needs the promise to be fulfilled the most. We can do better. This body has done better.

In 1983, Republicans and Democrats came together and extended the fiscal lifetime of Social Security by not doing things that hurt seniors in that day but by doing things that raised the retirement age for me—I was 13 at the time—from 65 to 67. That is a pretty modest step that made a big impact in

the life of the Social Security trust fund.

There are big issues that we need to discuss here on the floor. I hope we will bring those issues to the floor. Our committees in the House moved things in a responsible way, step by step, throughout the summer. We could use a little partnership from the other side of the Hill, but I hope we will focus on what we have before us here today, Mr. Speaker—an opportunity to make a difference for future victims who are applying to the trust fund and an opportunity to make a difference today for small businesses which are being victimized by frivolous litigation.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), my classmate, colleague, and good friend.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill.

I am acutely aware of the devastating impact that asbestos exposure has had on working men and women in this country because I represent an area with several shipyards. In the last few decades, in my district alone, several thousand local shipyard workers have developed asbestosis, lung cancer, and mesothelioma from asbestos exposure that occurred between the 1940s and the 1970s. Hundreds of these workers have already died, and asbestos deaths and disabilities are continuing due to the long latency period associated with the illness.

Now, I believe that we cannot consider legislation affecting victims of asbestos exposure without remembering exactly who caused the problem. Court findings show that companies made willful and malicious decisions to expose their employees to asbestos. There are several examples:

In one case in 1986, after hearing both sides, the New Jersey Supreme Court declared:

It is, indeed, appalling to us that the company had so much information on the hazards of asbestos workers as early as the mid-1930s and that it not only failed to use that information to protect the workers, but more egregiously, it also attempted to withhold this information from the public;

A few years earlier, the Superior Court, Appellate Division of New Jersey held in the same case:

The jury here was justified in concluding that both defendants, fully appreciating the nature, extent, and gravity of the risk, nevertheless made a conscious and cold-blooded business decision, in utter and flagrant dis-

regard to the rights of others, to take no protective or remedial action;

In 1999, the Florida Supreme Court found:

The clear and convincing evidence in this case revealed that, for more than 30 years, the company concealed what it knew about the dangers of asbestos. In fact, the company's conduct was even worse than concealment; it also included intentional and knowing misrepresentations concerning the dangers of its asbestos-containing product.

That is who we are talking about, and those are the types of companies that will benefit from this legislation.

Now, any suggestion that people are getting paid more than once is absolutely absurd. The fact of the matter is, because of the bankruptcies, most of them are not getting anywhere close to what they actually would have been awarded, and the bill before us does not help those victims. It actually hurts them.

The bill is nothing but a scheme to delay the proceedings and to allow the victims to get even less than they get now. Because of the delay, many of the victims will die before they get to court. This helps the guilty corporations that have inflicted this harm on innocent victims because, if the plaintiffs die before they get to court, their pain and suffering damages are extinguished. If you can delay cases enough so that the plaintiffs will die before they get to trial, the corporations will not only get to delay their payments, but when they finally have to pay, they will have to pay much less.

These people are the ones who made those conscious and cold-blooded business decisions. They are the ones who will benefit from the bill at the expense of the innocent, hardworking victims. Regrettably, many of those victims are our veterans because they were working on Navy ships.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to oppose the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3383, which is my good friend Representative ESTY's measure, the Caregivers Expansion and Improvement Act of 2013.

To discuss her bill, I now yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. Thank you to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, last week, when I was back in my district, I didn't hear about asbestos. I didn't hear about rule 11 sanctions. I heard about how harmful the government shutdown was, about the need to pass comprehensive immigration reform and of the hope that this Congress would focus on job-creating measures, but I also heard from folks in my district about the costs they face in caring for their beloved family members—veterans, who have proudly served our country.

Many of these veterans receive care at home, as they prefer, but some families are simply not able to provide home care for financial or other reasons. Now, these veterans could seek long-term institutional care through the VA, but that is much more expensive. The VA's FY14 budget request estimates that long-term institutional care costs the VA over \$116,000 per veteran per year. Caregivers of the post-9/11 victims are eligible for a stipend, which costs much less than the cost of long-term care. More than 10,000 veteran caregivers and their families have been helped so far, and that is a very good thing, but there are more who should qualify. There are more veterans in need, and we shouldn't leave them behind.

I introduced the Caregivers Expansion and Improvement Act, which would expand the eligibility for veterans' caregiver benefits to family caregivers of all veterans. According to the CBO, approximately 70,000 caregivers of pre-9/11 veterans could be eligible for this program, and let's stop kidding ourselves into believing we are not already spending more taxpayer dollars to provide care through other VA programs.

Let's work together on a solution for all of our veterans, some of whom, in fact, were exposed to asbestos and suffer from mesothelioma. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can consider the Caregivers Expansion and Improvement Act in order to honor our obligation to care for our veterans, an obligation which did not end on Veterans Day.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say to my colleague that I very much appreciate her concern about the family members of veterans.

So often, we craft a one-size-fits-all solution in this body, and if you want to care for your loved one at home, there is very little help for you. Now, if you want to institutionalize your loved one—if you want to dump your loved one off on the State—then we have a program for you, but if you want to nurture your loved one but you just need a little help, if you want to keep your loved one by your side but you just can't do it alone, there are very few opportunities that you have within our Federal system today. One exception to that is the PACE program, which was championed by Bob Dole back in the day, that allows you to bridge some of the different Federal programs that are available to you and to utilize those within your home, within your family, rather than having to institutionalize your loved one.

I don't think there is a man or a woman in this body, Mr. Speaker, who does not both have a tremendous amount of respect and admiration for our veterans but who also feels a debt of service to our veterans. I will point out that we always talk about the hyperpartisan U.S. House of Representatives. We moved our Veterans Affairs'

spending bill in this House back on June 4. On June 4, we passed it in this House with only four Members voting "no." Talk about things that bring you together, Mr. Speaker, as opposed to divide you. That is the kind of commitment that this institution has to our veterans.

I can't tell you why we haven't been able to get that signed into law. I know the Senate has not yet acted on that bill. I think it would be something that would bring them together, too, and I would recommend that to them, but of the 435 Members of this body, only four Members voted "no" on our bill to try to fulfill that commitment in order to make sure our veterans—our returning men and women—have the kinds of resources that not just they deserve but that we have committed to them.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would advise my colleague at this time that I have no further speakers and that I am prepared to close if he is prepared to close.

Mr. WOODALL. I am prepared to close.

□ 1315

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I understand why we are here. I understand that my friends across the aisle evidently don't mind wasting this body's time, their resources, and money passing bills that are going to go nowhere.

In fact, later this week, I know we go to the Rules Committee on Thursday on a provision that is going to take its 46th vote to defund, delay, or repeal the Affordable Care Act and the patient protections and budget savings contained within it.

We have all got our roles to play. It is a shame, in my judgment, that my friends across the aisle would rather reenact some of the same tired political drama rather than actually accomplish something. We can do a great deal more here in the House to address the significant needs that our country has.

Let me tell you how this particular measure is going to play out. The rule is going to pass. It will be debated here on the House floor today, both measures having to do with asbestos and with so-called lawsuit measures. After they pass the House of Representatives, then it is bound over to the United States Senate where nothing is going to take place.

Now, I am not prescient—I don't have any way of predicting the future—but this particular methodology for legislation back and forth is just as much a problem when the House passes something that the Senate doesn't do anything about as when the Senate passes something that the House doesn't do anything about. I can calculate the numbers on both sides. I just personally think it is wrong for us not to let this process work its will on behalf of the American people.

Therefore, passing legislation just to have portions of either of our bases satisfied is not my idea of something to do. What we are doing here today is nothing other than wasting time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment to the resolution, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. I urge a "no" vote on the rule and the underlying bills, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say to this body there are actually more that my friend from Florida and I agree on than what we disagree on. I might not say that at a townhall meeting back home, but I will say that to you here, because at its core we all share a vision of what this Nation can be, what this Nation should be; but we do get mired in the rhetoric.

It is interesting that we have a bill today that those folks who represent mom-and-pop businesses say is so important to them they are going to make sure that every single Member of this House knows that they are keeping score on this and they want a "yes" vote on that legislation. Yet we have other bills here that the trial lawyers are saying are so important to them that they are going to write letter after letter after letter saying this is not in the best interest of the country, we should move in a different direction.

I will tell you, those are exactly the kinds of bills that we ought to be working on. Now, are there bigger-picture bills out there? Absolutely there are. I would like to see a bill that solves Social Security forever, where we end this business about Social Security is going to go bankrupt, and once and for all we solve that issue so no senior is ever concerned about that again.

We don't have that bill on the floor today. We have an opportunity to stop frivolous lawsuits.

I would like to see a bill on the floor that balances the Federal budget. I am old fashioned that way, Mr. Speaker. I think if you want to spend it, you ought to raise it. If you don't want to raise it, then don't spend it.

But we don't have that bill on the floor today. We have a bill to make sure that trust funds intended to protect victims of a horrible, horrible perpetration by industry have an opportunity to collect what little money there is left from those businesses that perpetrated those harms. I think we should support that bill today.

Mr. Speaker, one step at a time we really can make a difference. I have been reading with great dismay that some of the colleagues that I was elected with 3 years ago have decided they

are not going to run for reelection. They have been here 3 years, and they have found that while they came here to make America a better place, while they came here to serve the men and women back home, while they came here to make sure their children grew up with the same freedoms and opportunities that they grew up with, they have decided that it might not be happening.

We can and we must do better. In fact, we had a committee hearing last night. My colleague from Florida (Mr. WEBSTER) said, I think “comprehensive” ought to be a dirty word. Comprehensive ought to be a dirty word, because when I hear “comprehensive,” Mr. Speaker, what I hear is we are throwing everything in, and the kitchen sink, and I want you to pass all or nothing on the House floor.

It doesn't have to be that way. I promise you if you put together a 2,000-page bill, Mr. Speaker, there are going to be parts of it that my constituency does not believe are in the best interest of America. But if we pass bills 10 pages at a time, 20 pages at a time, maybe even 30 pages at a time, Mr. Speaker, if we move one idea at a time, we get a “yes” or “no” vote from both sides of the aisle, we send it to the Senate, we pass it in the Senate, and the President puts a signature on it, we can make a difference.

I believe that that momentum matters. I hope we get a “yes” vote on the rule. I hope we get a “yes” vote on these underlying bills. I hope we get bills coming out of the farm bill conference. I hope we get bills coming out of the budget conference. I hope we get bills coming out of the Water Resources and Reform Development Act conference. I hope we move these things before we begin to build that momentum.

We are at a stumbling place, Mr. Speaker. There is an impediment in our way. I read some White House sources this week that said they recognize that we have not come through on the promise of “if you like your insurance, you can keep it.” They were looking for solutions, but they weren't going to come to Congress to look for solutions. They were going to look for administrative solutions, and they were going to try to fix it on their own.

As we have heard on this floor many times, the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land; ObamaCare is the law of the land. An administrative branch shouldn't just be able to unilaterally change the law of the land. The Constitution gives that responsibility to us. We have got to step up and take responsibility for those things that the Constitution invests in us, and article III courts are one of those things. We are taking that responsibility up today.

Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity not to be Republicans and Democrats, but to be representatives of Americans in the greatest body in this entire land, the closest to the American people—

the U.S. House of Representatives. We have a chance to announce our position, the House position, and move that to the Senate and then, lo and behold, we have an opportunity to work with the Senate not to adopt a Republican position or a Democrat position, but a congressional opinion, an article I constitutional opinion that we then march down Pennsylvania Avenue and say to the Executive, be he or she a Republican or a Democrat, this is what the people have to say; we need your signature on that. They can say “yes” or “no.”

We have set up these roadblocks, Mr. Speaker, where it is not House and Senate; it is Republican and Democrat. It does not serve this institution well. It does not serve America well.

I hope we are going to have bipartisan votes on these two bills today, Mr. Speaker. We are exercising a constitutional responsibility to direct the courts. We can vote “yes,” we can vote “no,” but it is not something that is peripheral to what we are about. It is something that is essential to the responsibilities that the Constitution has placed with us.

I promise my colleagues this institution will be a better institution if we pull out that rule book called the United States Constitution more often and start with those priorities that it has invested in us, not the priorities that some interest group has invested in us, not the priorities that the news media has invested in us, not the priorities that a Republican Party or a Democratic Party have invested in us, but the priorities the United States Constitution invests in us, we will restore the faith of the American people in this institution.

These two bills do that, Mr. Speaker. I encourage a strong “yes” vote on the rule that has made in order all of the amendments that were offered, save one. Let this body work its will. Support this rule. Support the underlying bill. Vote your conscience on the amendments to make the bills better if you want to, but let's get our constitutional responsibilities done.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 982, The F.A.C.T. Act.

This intrusive legislation which misuses the word “transparency,” would invade the privacy of asbestos victims by requiring the posting of personal exposure and medical information online and create new barriers to victims receiving compensation for their asbestos diseases.

We have witnessed decades of uncontrolled use of asbestos, even after its hazards were known, have resulted in a legacy of disease and death. Hundreds of thousands of workers and family members have been exposed to, suffered or died of asbestos-related cancers and lung disease, and the toll continues. It is estimated that each year 10,000 people in the United States are expected to die from asbestos related diseases. This is an outrage—and to add to their misery—they have to deal with the onerous provisions of H.R. 982.

Asbestos victims have faced huge barriers and obstacles to receiving compensation for

their diseases. Major asbestos producers refused to accept responsibility and most declared bankruptcy in an attempt to limit their future liability. In 1994 Congress passed special legislation that allowed the asbestos companies to set up bankruptcy trusts to compensate asbestos victims and reorganize under the bankruptcy law.

But these trusts don't have adequate funding to provide just compensation, and according to a 2010 RAND study, the median payment across the trusts is only 25 percent of the claim's value. With compensation from these trusts so limited, asbestos victims have sought redress from the manufacturers of other asbestos products to which they were exposed.

Although the proponents of this legislation assert that it is intended to protect asbestos victims, not a single asbestos victim has expressed support for H.R. 982. As the widow of our former colleague Representative Bruce Vento (D-MN), who passed away from mesothelioma, stated H.R. 982 “does not do a single thing” to help asbestos victims and their families?

H.R. 982 disturbs a reasonably well-functioning asbestos victim compensation process. Entities facing overwhelming mass tort liability for causing asbestos injuries may, under certain circumstances, shed these liabilities and financially regain their stability in exchange for funding trusts established under Chapter II of the Bankruptcy Code to pay the claims of their victims, under certain circumstances. 3 H.R. 982, however, interferes with this longstanding process in two ways. The FACT Act would require these trusts to: (1) file a publicly available quarterly report with the bankruptcy court that would include personally identifying information about such claimants, including their names, exposure history, and basis for any payment made to them; and (2) provide any information related to payment from and demands for payment from such trust to any party to any action in law or equity concerning liability for asbestos exposure.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this utterly intrusive legislation.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 403 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Strike all and insert the following:

Resolved, That immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3383) to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend to all veterans with a serious service-connected injury eligibility to participate in the family caregiver services program. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as

ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

Sec. 2. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3383.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution. . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WOODALL. With that, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 195, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 573]

YEAS—224

Aderholt	Forbes	Luetkemeyer
Amash	Fortenberry	Lummis
Amodei	Fox	Marchant
Bachmann	Franks (AZ)	Marino
Bachus	Frelinghuysen	Massie
Barletta	Gardner	McCarthy (CA)
Barr	Garrett	McCaul
Barton	Gerlach	McClintock
Benish	Gibbs	McHenry
Bentivolio	Gibson	McKeon
Bilirakis	Gingrey (GA)	McKinley
Bishop (UT)	Gohmert	McMorris
Black	Goodlatte	Rodgers
Blackburn	Gosar	Meadows
Boustany	Gowdy	Meehan
Brady (TX)	Granger	Messer
Bridenstine	Graves (GA)	Mica
Brooks (AL)	Graves (MO)	Miller (FL)
Brooks (IN)	Griffin (AR)	Miller (MI)
Broun (GA)	Griffith (VA)	Miller, Gary
Buchanan	Grimm	Mullin
Bucshon	Guthrie	Mulvaney
Burgess	Hall	Murphy (PA)
Calvert	Hanna	Neugebauer
Camp	Harper	Noem
Cantor	Harris	Nugent
Capito	Hartzler	Nunes
Carter	Hastings (WA)	Nunnelee
Cassidy	Heck (NV)	Olson
Chabot	Hensarling	Palazzo
Chaffetz	Holding	Paulsen
Coble	Hudson	Pearce
Coffman	Huelskamp	Perry
Cole	Huizenga (MI)	Petri
Collins (GA)	Hultgren	Pittenger
Collins (NY)	Hunter	Pitts
Conaway	Hurt	Poe (TX)
Cook	Issa	Pompeo
Cotton	Jenkins	Posey
Cramer	Johnson (OH)	Price (GA)
Crawford	Johnson, Sam	Radel
Crenshaw	Jordan	Reed
Daines	Joyce	Reichert
Davis, Rodney	Kelly (PA)	Renacci
Denham	King (IA)	Ribble
Dent	King (NY)	Rice (SC)
DeSantis	Kingston	Rigell
DesJarlais	Kinzinger (IL)	Roby
Diaz-Balart	Kline	Roe (TN)
Duffy	Labrador	Rogers (AL)
Duncan (SC)	LaMalfa	Rogers (KY)
Duncan (TN)	Lamborn	Rogers (MI)
Ellmers	Lance	Rohrabacher
Farenthold	Lankford	Rokita
Fincher	Latham	Rooney
Fitzpatrick	Latta	Ros-Lehtinen
Fleischmann	LoBiondo	Roskam
Fleming	Long	Ross
Flores	Lucas	Rothfus

Royce	Smith (NJ)	Walberg
Runyan	Smith (TX)	Walden
Ryan (WI)	Southerland	Walorski
Salmon	Stewart	Weber (TX)
Sanford	Stivers	Webster (FL)
Scalise	Stockman	Westmoreland
Schock	Stutzman	Whitfield
Schweikert	Terry	Williams
Scott, Austin	Thompson (PA)	Wilson (SC)
Sensenbrenner	Thornberry	Wittman
Sessions	Tiberi	Wolf
Shimkus	Tipton	Womack
Shuster	Turner	Woodall
Simpson	Upton	Yoder
Smith (MO)	Valadao	Yoho
Smith (NE)	Wagner	Young (IN)

NAYS—195

Andrews	Grayson	Nolan
Barber	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Barrow (GA)	Green, Gene	Owens
Bass	Grijalva	Pallone
Beatty	Gutiérrez	Pascarell
Becerra	Hahn	Pastor (AZ)
Bera (CA)	Hanabusa	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Bishop (NY)	Heck (WA)	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Higgins	Peters (CA)
Bonamici	Himes	Peters (MI)
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Peterson
Bralley (IA)	Holt	Pingree (ME)
Brown (FL)	Honda	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Horsford	Polis
Bustos	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Huffman	Quigley
Capps	Israel	Rahall
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Richmond
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Cartwright	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez, Linda
Chu	Kennedy	T.
Ciulline	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Clay	Kind	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Clyburn	Kuster	Schneider
Cohen	Langevin	Schrader
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Serrano
Costa	Levin	Sewell (AL)
Courtney	Lewis	Shea-Porter
Crowley	Lipinski	Sherman
Cuellar	Loeb	Sinema
Cummings	Loeb	Sires
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Slaughter
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	Lowey	Speier
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Swalwell (CA)
Delaney	(NM)	Takano
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (CA)
DelBene	(NM)	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	Lynch	Tierney
Dingell	Maffei	Titus
Doggett	Maloney,	Tonko
Doyle	Carolyn	Tsongas
Duckworth	Maloney, Sean	Van Hollen
Edwards	Matheson	Vargas
Ellison	McCollum	Veasey
Engel	McDermott	Vela
Enyart	McGovern	Velázquez
Eshoo	McIntyre	Visclosky
Esty	McNerney	Wasserman
Farr	Meeks	Schultz
Fattah	Meng	Waters
Foster	Michaud	Watt
Frankel (FL)	Miller, George	Waxman
Fudge	Moore	Welch
Gabbard	Moran	Wilson (FL)
Gallo	Murphy (FL)	Yarmuth
Garamendi	Nadler	
Garcia	Napolitano	
	Negrete McLeod	

NOT VOTING—11

Campbell	Matsui	Schwartz
Culberson	McCarthy (NY)	Wenstrup
Herrera Beutler	Neal	Young (AK)
Jones	Rush	

□ 1406

Mr. HIMES, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Messrs. LARSON of Connecticut and SCOTT of Virginia changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HALL changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. 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 223, noes 194, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 574]

AYES—223

Aderholt	Goodlatte	Noem
Amash	Gosar	Nugent
Amodei	Gowdy	Nunes
Bachmann	Granger	Nunnelee
Bachus	Graves (GA)	Olson
Barletta	Graves (MO)	Palazzo
Barr	Griffin (AR)	Paulsen
Barton	Griffith (VA)	Pearce
Benishek	Grimm	Perry
Bentivolio	Guthrie	Petri
Bilirakis	Hall	Pittenger
Bishop (UT)	Hanna	Pitts
Black	Harper	Poe (TX)
Blackburn	Harris	Pompeo
Boustany	Hartzler	Posey
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Price (GA)
Bridenstine	Heck (NV)	Radel
Brooks (AL)	Hensarling	Reed
Brooks (IN)	Holding	Reichert
Broun (GA)	Hudson	Renacci
Buchanan	Huelskamp	Ribble
Bucshon	Huizenga (MI)	Rice (SC)
Burgess	Hultgren	Rigell
Calvert	Hunter	Roby
Camp	Hurt	Roe (TN)
Cantor	Issa	Rogers (AL)
Capito	Jenkins	Rogers (KY)
Carter	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (MI)
Cassidy	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Chabot	Jordan	Rokita
Chaffetz	Joyce	Rooney
Coble	Kelly (PA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Coffman	King (IA)	Roskam
Cole	King (NY)	Ross
Collins (GA)	Kingston	Rothfus
Collins (NY)	Kinzinger (IL)	Royce
Conaway	Kline	Runyan
Cook	Labrador	Ryan (WI)
Cotton	LaMalfa	Salmon
Cramer	Lamborn	Sanford
Crawford	Lance	Scalise
Crenshaw	Lankford	Schock
Daines	Latham	Schweikert
Davis, Rodney	Latta	Scott, Austin
Denham	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner
Dent	Long	Sessions
DeSantis	Lucas	Shimkus
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Shuster
Diaz-Balart	Lummis	Simpson
Duffy	Marchant	Smith (MO)
Duncan (SC)	Marino	Smith (NE)
Duncan (TN)	Massie	Smith (NJ)
Ellmers	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (TX)
Farenthold	McCauley	Southerland
Fincher	McClintock	Stewart
Fitzpatrick	McHenry	Stivers
Fleischmann	McKeon	Stockman
Fleming	McKinley	Stutzman
Flores	McMorris	Terry
Forbes	Rodgers	Thompson (PA)
Fortenberry	Meadows	Thornberry
Fox	Meehan	Tipton
Franks (AZ)	Messer	Turner
Frelinghuysen	Mica	Upton
Gardner	Miller (FL)	Valadao
Garrett	Miller (MI)	Wagner
Gerlach	Miller, Gary	Walberg
Gibbs	Mullin	Walden
Gibson	Mulvaney	Walorski
Gingrey (GA)	Murphy (PA)	Weber (TX)
Gohmert	Neugebauer	Webster (FL)

Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)

Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall

Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOES—194

Andrews
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke
Clay
Clever
Clayburn
Cohen
Connelly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Deutsch
Dingell
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeke
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan

O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

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, November 13, 2013.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on November 13, 2013 at 11:24 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 1499.
That the Senate passed S. 1512.
That the Senate passed S. 1557.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

Karen L. Haas.

FURTHERING ASBESTOS CLAIM TRANSPARENCY (FACT) ACT OF 2013.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 982, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 403 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 982.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1420

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 982) to amend title 11 of the United States Code to require the public disclosure by trusts established under section 524(g) of such title, of quarterly reports that contain detailed information regarding the receipt and disposition of claims for injuries based on exposure to asbestos; and for other purposes, with Mr. BISHOP of Utah in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for the first time.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

NOT VOTING—13

Campbell
Culberson
Doggett
Herrera Beutler
Jones

Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
Neal
Rush
Schwartz

Tiberi
Wenstrup
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1416

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

I rise today in support of a bill that will help those asbestos victims that must look to the bankruptcy process to seek redress for their or their loved ones' injuries. Unfortunately, on too frequent an occasion, by the time asbestos victims assert their claims for compensation, the bankruptcy trusts formed for their benefit have been diluted by fraudulent claims, leaving these victims without their entitled recovery.

The reason that fraud is allowed to exist within the asbestos trust system is the excessive lack of transparency created by plaintiffs' firms. Due to a provision in the Bankruptcy Code, plaintiffs' firms are essentially granted a statutory veto right over a debtor's chapter 11 plan that seeks to restructure asbestos liabilities. Plaintiffs' firms have exploited this leverage to prevent information contained within the asbestos trusts from seeing the light of day.

The predictable result from this reduced transparency has been a growing wave of claims and reports of fraud. The increase in claims has caused many asbestos trusts to reduce the recoveries paid to asbestos victims who emerge following the formation of the trusts. For example, the T.H. Agriculture and Nutrition asbestos trust cut its recovery rate from 100 percent to 70 percent, and the Owens Corning trust sliced its recovery rate from 40 percent to 10 percent.

In addition, instances of fraud within the asbestos trust system have been documented in news reports, State court cases, and testimony before the Judiciary Committee. The Wall Street Journal conducted an investigation into asbestos trusts where it found, among other things, that hundreds of plaintiffs filed claims against asbestos trusts asserting one injury while simultaneously asserting a completely different injury before the State courts.

Reports directly from many State courts are uncovering similar conduct. For example, in Ohio, one judge described a plaintiff's case as "lies upon lies" after discovering that the plaintiff received hundreds of thousands of dollars from various asbestos bankruptcy trusts while alleging in court that a single product caused his illness. In Virginia, a judge stated that a similar case over which he presided was the "worst deception" he had seen in his 22-year career.

The FACT Act, introduced by Congressman FARENTHOLD, will combat this fraud by introducing long-needed transparency into the asbestos bankruptcy trust system. The FACT Act increases transparency through two simple measures. First, it requires the asbestos trusts to file quarterly reports on their public bankruptcy dockets. These reports will contain very basic information about demands to the trusts and payments made by the trusts to claimants. Second, the FACT Act requires asbestos trusts to respond

to information requests about claims asserted against and payments made by the asbestos trusts.

These measures were carefully designed to increase transparency while providing claimants with sufficient privacy protection. To accomplish this goal, the bill leverages the privacy protections contained in the Bankruptcy Code and includes additional safeguards to preserve claimants' privacy.

A State court judge with 29 years of bench experience described the privacy protections within the FACT Act as far stronger than those afforded in State court, where asbestos plaintiffs often pursue parallel claims. The FACT Act also was deliberately structured to minimize the administrative impact on asbestos trusts. Indeed, according to testimony before the Judiciary Committee from an expert on asbestos litigation and the asbestos trusts, preparing the quarterly disclosure requirements would be "very simple" and would "take minutes."

The FACT Act strikes the appropriate balance between achieving the transparency necessary to reduce fraud in an efficient manner and providing claimants with sufficient privacy protections. We cannot allow fraud to continue reducing recoveries for future asbestos victims. The FACT Act is a simple, narrow measure that will shed much-needed sunshine on a shadowy system.

I thank Mr. FARENTHOLD for introducing this legislation and urge all of my colleagues to vote for the FACT Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Members of the House, we are confronted with a very simple proposition today. What we have here is a piece of legislation that seeks to address a non-existent problem and is strongly opposed by asbestos victims, the trusts charged with administering compensation to victims, privacy advocates, consumer groups, labor organizations, and legal representatives of future claimants.

I will point out that I have one of the longest lists of organizational opposition that I have seen in a long time, more than 11 organizations, starting with the Asbestos Cancer Victims' Rights Campaign and then going to the Asbestos Disease Awareness Organization, the AFL-CIO, the United Steelworkers, AFSCME, Public Citizen, the U.S. Public Interest Research Group, the Environmental Working Group, the Alliance for Justice, the American Association for Justice, and many others.

What we are doing here is beginning this debate by asking who actually supports this bill and why are their interests being put ahead of asbestos victims.

To begin with, the bill's reporting and disclosure requirements are an assault against asbestos victims' privacy interests. The bill mandates that the trusts publicly report information on

the claimants that could include their name, address, work history, income, medical information, exposure history, as well as the basis of any payment that the trust made to the claimant.

□ 1430

Given the fact that all this information would potentially be available on the Internet, just imagine what insurance companies, potential employers, prospective lenders, and data collectors could do with this private information.

Essentially, what this bill does is allow asbestos victims to be re-victimized by exposing their health information to the public, including those who seek information for illegal purposes.

And so I ask all of the thoughtful Members of this body to join me in strongly and vigorously opposing the measure before us today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the chairman of the Regulatory Reform Subcommittee.

Mr. BACHUS. I appreciate the chairman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for Mr. CONYERS. He has been my chairman and is now my ranking member.

I, too, see this as a very simple proposition. However, I have a different point of view. I believe that sunshine is the best disinfectant, and I think that light can expose things that need to be exposed; and that is, really, the essence of this bill. This bill is about transparency. It is about revealing how much people are being paid in a claim.

America is a country that helps deserving people in their time of need, and for that reason, when we had tens of thousands of asbestos exposures which caused serious injury and death, a trust fund was specifically set up to compensate those individuals whose health had been harmed. However, as with almost anything we establish, there are those that would take advantage, there are those who would commit fraud, there are those who would abuse it. And that is the case here.

There have been inconsistent claims. Trust fund money has been diverted from these victims and from future victims to where it should properly go—to those people that truly could demonstrate health needs. Instead it went, in many cases, to the undeserved.

Don't take my word for it. An article published by The Wall Street Journal just this past March revealed that nearly half of all trusts have reduced payments to new victims at least once since 2010, partly in an effort to preserve assets for future victims. The same article cited a number of disturbing examples of money being drained from the system by waste and fraud—it is not something we made up—leaving less to those who truly suffered. We have had judges appear and tell us about those problems. We have had others.

For example, the article disclosed that, after virtually no examination

and no transparency, over \$26,000 was awarded to a person who never existed. It also found that 2,700 claimants to the Manville Trust alone—just one of many trusts—couldn't have been older than 12 years of age at the time they said they were exposed to asbestos in an industrial job.

The FACT Act would combat fraud through sunshine by increasing transparency and accountability in the system. In doing so, it strengthens the asbestos trust fund and system for present and future claimants. It would improve information-sharing in the trust fund process while fully respecting privacy—and let me stress that—fully respecting privacy and protecting confidential medical information, which is very important when personal health is involved.

As we have said many times, sunshine is a disinfectant. I said it at the start of the speech, and I will say it now.

This is a commonsense, bipartisan bill that would help asbestos victims get the compensation they need and deserve by protecting the asbestos trust fund from fraud, waste, and abuse.

Let me close by commending Mr. FARENTHOLD from Texas and Mr. MATHESON from Utah for bringing this bipartisan legislation. I urge you to support them and others and bring this bill to the floor and pass it to increase accountability.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to thank my good friend, SPENCER BACHUS, a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee, for participating here on the floor with me. I want him to know that the privacy part of his remarks are not too relevant at this point because this bill allows the name, the disease, and all related facts to be published. It can be picked up by the Internet; and so assurances of privacy are of little usefulness here.

I am so glad to know that Mrs. Sue Vento, the widow of our former colleague, Bruce Vento, is here with us in the gallery. She has been working along with us in strongly opposing H.R. 982.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud now to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank my friend, Mr. CONYERS.

Mr. Chairman, it is deeply troubling to see that today the House of Representatives might vote to pass the so-called FACT Act, or Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency Act. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill because it is not about transparency. It is not about accountability. It is absolutely not about justice. The FACT Act is nothing more than a thinly veiled attack on the rights of cancer victims and their families. That is the only way I can describe a piece of legislation that undermines the constitutional rights of asbestos victims and even threatens the privacy of victims and their families.

The FACT Act does nothing to protect the rights of victims like Genevieve Bosilevac, who was diagnosed with mesothelioma just a few days before her 48th birthday in 2009, and widows like Judy Van Ness, who lost her husband to asbestos-caused disease.

Victims of mesothelioma do not have the luxury of time. This brutal form of cancer is hard to detect until it has progressed significantly and all too often already compromised vital internal organs.

Despite the dire implications of this diagnosis, the FACT Act would place additional burdens on victims and even delay court proceedings to the point that a victim would die before receiving any financial assistance through the asbestos trust fund.

If anything, this body should be looking at ways to make it easier to identify legitimate asbestos victims and fast-track their cases. Instead, we are doing the opposite.

This legislation might as well have been written by the asbestos industry because it only provides these companies with new tools to evade justice and their responsibility to victims. Even more incomprehensibly, the FACT Act would require the asbestos trust fund to turn over personally identifying information about victims and even their children.

For the families whose lives have already been torn apart by disease from asbestos exposure, this legislation would create an online Web site that lists victims' sensitive information, including financial histories and even partial Social Security numbers.

I implore my colleagues to recognize that these families have been through enough. There is nothing we in this Chamber can do to fill the void that has been left in the hearts of so many Americans who have lost loved ones due to exposure.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. DEUTCH. What we can do is ensure that we have a justice system that protects the rights of victims and puts the constitutional rights of our citizens ahead of special interests.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the FACT Act.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), the author of the legislation.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Thank you, Chairman GOODLATTE.

Quite frankly, I am personally offended by the claim that this bill is against victims. It is for the victims. It is preserving the asbestos trusts for those yet undiscovered victims from people who would defraud the system.

This is a simple, short two-page bill. We are asking for no more information than you have to supply when you file a lawsuit in any court. We are asking for your name and the basis of your

claim. We are asking that the expenditures be listed of the trust in a method that people can check to make sure somebody isn't claiming twice for the same injury so we don't have double dippers.

This is for the victims. We are going to try to stop unscrupulous attorneys and folks they rope in from filing false claims. We don't want to stop anybody who has a legitimate claim.

The asbestos trust has been riddled with fraud. It even comes down to Corpus Christi, Texas, the district I represent, where there were early cases where a Federal judge, Janis Jack, a Clinton appointee and a friend of mine, ruled there was fraud with doctors. The courts are dealing with that.

We are trying to deal with multiple claims and bring simple transparency. We are not asking for detailed medical information to be released. We are just asking for the basis of the claim, and that is pretty simple information.

We are not asking for Social Security numbers. We are not asking for any financial information, other than the amount that is being claimed. This is public record in any other lawsuit in the country, and it is not an invasion of privacy. It is a protection of the system that was set up to compensate victims of mesothelioma and other asbestos-related exposure diseases that don't manifest for years after the exposure. We have got to protect this for future generations.

The FACT Act is a simple, two-page bill that leverages all the privacy protections already in the Bankruptcy Code and simply asks that we know who is getting what out of these trusts so they can't get them from multiple trusts for the same injury or they can't file a claim in State court. It is to try to stop double dipping and fraud.

Unfortunately, when they were set up, there weren't enough safeguards in place to run by plaintiffs' attorneys, who get percentages of compensation off of that. So we are trying to get this taken care of. The plaintiffs' attorneys have a big impact in creating and managing these trusts, and we are just trying to get some simple oversight.

Mr. BACHUS put it quite well when he said that sunshine is the best disinfectant. We are asking to shine the light of day on these claims so we can protect future victims. We don't want to deny anybody who is a legitimate claimant what they are entitled to. We want to get them compensated and make sure there is enough money there for everyone.

This is a bill for the victims. It is a bill to stop fraud, waste, and abuse.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased now to yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Houston, Texas, (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, with all of the protests, I think there is nothing more that we can say other than that it is a

very cruel decision to move forward this particular legislation. It really implodes and violates the process of litigation between plaintiffs and defendants, petitioners and those who are in opposition, because we have an infrastructure of a court system that allows those who participate in that court system to guide the evidence that is being presented under the representation of their counsel.

The Sixth Amendment provides for individuals to have a right to counsel, and what this legislation is trying to do is implode that relationship and ask for information that could be given in the regular order of a court process.

This is intrusive legislation under the false guise of transparency and, in actuality, would invade the privacy of asbestos victims by requiring the posting of personal exposure and medical information online and erect new barriers to victims receiving compensation for their asbestos diseases.

This cancer-driven disease, this asbestos-driven disease, is a silent killer. For a long time, the victims don't even know that they are being impacted by asbestos that is causing cancer.

We have witnessed decades of uncontrolled use of asbestos; and even after its hazards became widely known, disease and death still persist because people work in it and they do not know. And so they have been forced to hire counsel merely to provide for their families or themselves in the waning hours and days of their life.

Hundreds of thousands of workers and family members have been exposed, suffered, or died of asbestos-related cancers and lung disease; and the toll continues. And yet we have legislation like this that wants to clearly undermine the legal system, the justice system, which means I go into a court, I have a lawyer, there is someone opposed to my position, they have a lawyer, and we submit information under the basis of that litigation or that settlement or that negotiation.

□ 1445

Why do Americans have to be subjected to another abuse while they are suffering and dying?

This is an abuse. H.R. 982 is asking for information that can already be gotten. As I indicated, these individuals have been exposed, suffered, or died from asbestos-related cancer. It is estimated that, each year, 10,000 people in the United States are expected to die from asbestos-related diseases. How much more of an outrage do we have to place on their families—and burdens—to ask them to give information about their sicknesses and other issues that are squarely within the realm of their counsel? Call up their lawyers and ask for it. This is an outrage that they have to deal with this onerous provision.

Time and again, asbestos victims have faced huge obstacles, inconvenient barriers, and veiled but persistent resistance to receiving compensation

for their diseases. That is why they organized in the manner that they did. It is because they were dying, dying, dying, and there was no response.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield the gentlelady an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. It is particularly galling that many of the major asbestos producers refuse to accept responsibility and that most declared bankruptcy in an attempt to limit their future liability.

I ask my colleagues to vote “no” on this legislation. How much more can we put on these poor victims? If you want information, go to their counsel. Go into the courthouse. They will provide it. Let's give them relief. I oppose this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 982, the F.A.C.T. Act. This intrusive legislation which misuses the word “transparency,” would invade the privacy of asbestos victims by requiring the posting of personal exposure and medical information online and erect new barriers to victims receiving compensation for their asbestos diseases.

We have witnessed decades of uncontrolled use of asbestos, and, even after its hazards became widely known, disease and death still persist.

Hundreds of thousands of workers and family members have been exposed to, suffered or died of asbestos-related cancers and lung disease, and the toll continues. It is estimated that each year 10,000 people in the United States are expected to die from asbestos related diseases. This is an outrage—and to add to their misery—they have to deal with the onerous provisions of H.R. 982.

Time and time again, asbestos victims have faced huge obstacles, inconvenient barriers, and veiled but persistent resistance to receiving compensation for their diseases and it is important to note that asbestos litigation is the longest-running mass tort litigation in the United States.

It is particularly galling that many of the major asbestos producers refused to accept responsibility and most declared bankruptcy in an attempt to limit their future liability. In 1994 Congress passed reasonably balanced special legislation that allowed the asbestos companies to set up bankruptcy trusts to compensate asbestos victims and reorganize under the bankruptcy law.

But these trusts don't have adequate funding to provide just compensation, and according to a 2010 RAND study, the median payment across the trusts is only 25 percent of the claim's value. With compensation from these trusts so limited, asbestos victims have sought redress from the manufacturers of other asbestos products to which they were exposed—the original tortfeasors.

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration, better known as OSHA noted two decades ago that

“It was aware of no instance in which exposure to a toxic substance has more clearly demonstrated detrimental health effects on human than has asbestos exposure.”

We see the harm that asbestos causes when people become sick—ordinary Americans who did extraordinary things to get this disease—like go to work every day to support their families.

And although the proponents of this legislation assert that it is intended to protect asbestos victims, I have not heard of a single asbestos victim who has expressed support for the H.R. 982, the FACT Act.

As the widow of our former colleague Representative Bruce Vento (D-MN), who passed away from mesothelioma, stated H.R. 982 “does not do a single thing” to help asbestos victims and their families.

H.R. 982 does not help and actually disturbs a reasonably well-functioning asbestos victim compensation process. Entities facing overwhelming mass tort liability for causing asbestos injuries may, under certain circumstances, shed these liabilities and financially regain their stability in exchange for funding trusts established under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code to pay the claims of their victims, under certain circumstances.

H.R. 982, however, interferes with this longstanding process in two ways. The FACT Act would require these trusts to: (1) file a publicly available quarterly report with the bankruptcy court that would include personally identifying information about such claimants, including their names, exposure history, and basis for any payment made to them; and (2) provide any information related to payment from and demands for payment from such trust to any party to any action in law or equity concerning liability for asbestos exposure.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this utterly intrusive legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining on both sides.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 18½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan has 20½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the mischaracterization of this legislation as it is somehow imposing burdens on the victims of asbestos. In fact, it is quite the opposite.

First of all, the information disclosed under the FACT Act is very basic and is less information than would be disclosed during the normal course of a State court lawsuit, in which many asbestos bankruptcy claimants pursue simultaneous claims, but they don't tell the bankruptcy courts about that, so these trusts need to tell them that.

Secondly, the FACT Act includes strong privacy protections, including prohibiting the disclosure of confidential medical records and full Social Security numbers. To be clear, the FACT Act does not require asbestos trusts to require or to disclose asbestos victims' Social Security numbers.

The FACT Act also leverages existing privacy protections in the Bankruptcy Code to give the presiding bankruptcy judge broad discretion to prevent the disclosure of information that would result in identity theft or in any other unlawful activity. Indeed, a judge with 29 years of bench experience testified before the Judiciary Committee that the FACT Act provides more protection in terms of the confidentiality of asbestos claimants' records than the legal system is able to do.

By requiring the disclosure of basic information regarding claims submitted to the asbestos trusts, the FACT Act will facilitate a reduction in fraud that will allow future asbestos victims to maximize their recovery, but they will not be able to do that if we continue to have money taken from these trusts for duplicative claims, fraudulent claims, and claims without merit.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Atlanta, Georgia, HANK JOHNSON, and I would indicate his very deep concern for asbestos cancer victims.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 982, the so-called FACT Act.

The FACT Act would require asbestos trusts to publicly disclose extensive amounts of private information about asbestos victims on a public Web site. These quarterly reports would have to describe each demand the trust received, including the name and exposure history of a claimant and the basis for any payment from the trust made to such claimant. Also required to be publicly disclosed by the trusts are a claimant's home address, work history, income, medical information, and even the last four digits of a claimant's Social Security number.

Any person, including every crook in the world with Internet access, could use this information for any and all illicit purposes. That criminal or mischievous person could be your neighbor. He could be your daughter's ex-boyfriend—you know, the one you never liked and barred from coming to the house. He could be an employee on the job, somebody who is vying for your job. He could be anybody who wants to do harm to you or your family.

It is a serious threat to asbestos victims' security and privacy, and it is an unfair and unnecessary advantage bestowed upon the asbestos manufacturers. The truth of the matter is that such information is available to the tortfeasors during the course of the litigation. Federal and/or State Rules of Civil Procedure allow a defendant to gain all relevant information during the discovery process about a claimant's exposure. Moreover, a defendant's discovery request should never justify the publication of a plaintiff's entire medical history.

Yesterday, I offered an amendment that would have protected the privacy of asbestos victims and their families, but, unfortunately, the Republicans on the Rules Committee did not allow the House to consider my amendment today. It is disappointing that my Republican colleagues who pretend that they support Americans' rights to privacy are now willing to throw privacy rights under the bus while they stand with Big Asbestos and as they again victimize the victims by trampling on the privacy rights of those same vic-

tims and those families. Without adding important privacy safeguards, nothing would stop rampant identity theft or the misuse of a claimant victim's personal information, including that victim's entire medical history.

Why is it necessary for a claimant to have to give up his right to privacy just because he seeks to recover damages arising from exposure to asbestos?

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Thank you.

Asbestos victims who seek compensation for their injuries should retain the same privacy protections as other patients, as well as other people who make claims for personal injury.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a moment to address some claims that my friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle have made.

The FACT Act is simple. There are two pages of text to the FACT Act. There is no requirement of any action whatsoever by the victims of asbestos. The trusts are the only ones that are required to do something. Let me just read to you exactly what the requirement is. It doesn't include a broad release of personal information. It is very simple:

A trust described in paragraph 2 shall, subject to section 107, file with the bankruptcy court not later than 60 days at the end of every quarter a report that shall be made available on the court's public docket with respect to such quarter. It describes each demand the trust has received from a claimant, including the name, exposure history of a claimant and the basis for any payment from the trust made to such claimant, and it does not include any confidential medical record or the claimant's full Social Security number.

All we are asking for in this bill is that the trusts let us know who they are paying the money to and what they are paying it for so we make sure people don't double dip so that there is plenty of money there for future claimants.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARENTHOLD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. How do you determine claimants individually with that level of information that you just described?

Mr. FARENTHOLD. It gives you their names and potentially a part of their Social Security numbers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. It is not their full Social Security numbers. It is not their confidential medical records. It is the basis of their claims.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARENTHOLD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Part of your medical record goes into that public file; is that not correct?

Mr. FARENTHOLD. It is a limited basis of the claim.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. So the gentleman is incorrect.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. It is not part of the medical record. It is just the basis of the claim. It would be simply: claiming mesothelioma from exposure at "this" location. It is that basic information that would allow other courts to determine that the person who is making the claim is not double dipping, that he has not already made that claim.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee, STEVE COHEN, a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, there is one fact that is indisputable, and that is the procedure by which this particular bill came to the floor. It is a procedure whereby the majority had three witnesses and the minority had one, and none of the witnesses were victims.

There are two major asbestos victims' groups. They would be the people most interested in preserving the funds for victims—the Asbestos Cancer Victims' Rights Campaign and the Asbestos Disease Awareness Organization. One is headed up by the widow of a former Member of this House, Mrs. Vento. Her husband, Congressman Bruce Vento, died of mesothelioma. They oppose this bill, but the fact is, indisputably, that they were not allowed to testify.

If this bill, indeed, were for the victims, the victims should have had an opportunity to testify. The chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. BACHUS, of which I am the ranking member, valiantly tried to rectify that error by allowing them to testify, but he was overruled.

The fact is that the procedure that brought this bill to the floor was flawed. Accordingly, I submit that the bill should be flawed because the victims should have had the opportunity to speak. If it is for the victims, if it is for preserving funds, the people who are proponents shouldn't have been afraid of the victims' organizations going on record and giving testimony and testifying.

This whole proceeding today is conceived in an attack on the victims—not allowing the victims to speak and not allowing transparency in the hearing process. This is allegedly about transparency. It is not. It is about covering up and not allowing freedom of speech from the people who are most affected—those who had loved ones die from mesothelioma.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the mischaracterization of the process followed in the Judiciary Committee.

The FACT Act and the problems it addresses have been the subject of three separate hearings: one before the Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution on September 9, 2011, on the issue generally, and two legislative hearings before the Judiciary Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law—one during the 112th Congress and another this year on March 13.

The minority used these opportunities to call witnesses who were representatives from the asbestos plaintiffs' trial bar to voice their concerns with the bill. In fact, the minority called the same witness for two out of the three hearings. Now they claim that asbestos victims were never provided an opportunity to testify. The Judiciary Committee provided ample opportunities to include asbestos victims' views on the legislation on the record, and there are many letters and statements from asbestos victims in the record as a result. Additionally, the committee offered a special procedure to asbestos victims in order to provide an occasion for the victims to personally inform Members and staff of their views, which they refused.

It has become necessary to act with expediency and move this important legislation forward. Each day that passes is a day on which fraudulent claims can be prosecuted against the asbestos trusts, thereby reducing the recovery to legitimate asbestos victims. This legislation will benefit victims by reducing fraudulent claims and by ensuring that asbestos trusts provide the maximum recovery to future asbestos claimants.

Mr. COHEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Would you explain to me then why the victims were never allowed to testify on the record in this Congress and were never given an opportunity even though the subcommittee chairman valiantly and heroically tried to rectify that?

Mr. GOODLATTE. In reclaiming my time, that is not accurate. The claimants were offered a process by which they could come and speak to the members of the committee.

Mr. COHEN. In private.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I have the time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia controls the time.

□ 1500

Mr. GOODLATTE. The minority had the opportunity to have an asbestos victim testify if they wished to do so and chose instead to have a plaintiff's attorney who had already testified in a previous hearing do so.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, we had one witness; the majority had three

witnesses. Ours had to try to explain the legal effects.

The fact is the proponents of the bill who claim it is for the victims should have had the right to have the victims be there. The special procedure they had was an in camera hearing not on the record. That is not right. If you want to propose something for the victims, you give them an opportunity to testify on the record—and they all opposed the bill to a one.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member for his leadership.

This bill represents an unjustified corporate giveaway being built on the backs of hardworking individuals from all across this country who in many cases were unwittingly victimized by asbestos exposure. It is an unwarranted, unnecessary, and unconscionable effort to benefit Big Business and the asbestos industrial complex, which in many instances has unleashed mesothelioma, lung cancer, and other diseases of mass destruction on Americans all across this country who are hardworking and, in most instances, simply trying to make a living for themselves and for their families.

It is being done allegedly to create greater transparency and in the name of litigation reform. Yet the record reflects that there is no evidence of systematic fraud, no evidence of systematic waste, no evidence of systematic abuse, no evidence of systematic overpayment to victims of asbestos exposure.

This is wrong, it is shameful, it is a bill that is dead on arrival in the Senate; and that is why I respectfully urge all of my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to myself to respond to the allegation that fraud has not been documented.

Fraud has been documented in news reports, State court cases, and testimony before the Judiciary Committee. The Wall Street Journal conducted an investigation that found thousands of disparately filed claims. Court documents in many States, including Delaware, Louisiana, Maryland, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Virginia, attest to widespread fraud.

Additionally, the Judiciary Committee heard testimony over the course of three hearings during which witnesses repeatedly testified that fraud existed within the asbestos trust bankruptcy system. Keep in mind that the fraud reported to date has been in spite of the lack of disclosure that currently pervades this system. The increased transparency the FACT Act introduces will go a long way in uncovering previously undetected fraud and preserving assets for future asbestos victims.

Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the FACT Act. This bill aims to address a fraud problem and ensure that true asbestos victims obtain maximum recoveries for their injuries.

My district is home to many asbestos lawsuits. Currently, a lack of transparency has led to fraud in the asbestos bankruptcy trust system and diverted millions of dollars away from those who should have the ability to receive these recoveries. This lack of transparency discourages a free flow of information resulting in fraudulent claims that deplete funds that are intended for legitimate victims.

This bill requires these trusts to file quarterly reports, which include the claimant's name, basis for the claim, payments made, and the basis behind those payments. It protects privacy by prohibiting disclosure of sensitive medical records and Social Security numbers.

In order to help ensure future victims will have access to the money they deserve, these problems cannot be allowed to continue. This is why I stand today in support of the FACT Act.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the leader of the Democratic Caucus, Ms. PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on so many issues.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the debates that we have on the floor of the House affect millions of Americans: families, senior citizens, veterans, students, and children. We all bring stories of men and women and families from our districts—the challenges facing our neighbors, the urgent need to solve them.

Today, we address an issue that takes the lives of thousands of Americans each year: asbestos exposure. Yet we do not have to look back only to our districts on this scourge; we only need to look into the lives of some who have served in this body.

I am very honored today, as I know some of my colleagues are as well, that Susan Vento, wife of our former colleague Bruce Vento who served with such distinction in the Congress with some of us some years ago, is with us. Bruce Vento was affected by asbestos exposure. It took his life.

I wish to place in the RECORD Susan Vento's letter, Mr. Chairman, and just to say that in the letter Susan says:

During the consideration of this legislation in the Judiciary Committee, two other women who have been affected by the ravages of asbestos and I requested to have a chance to testify about how the legislation would affect people like us. Our request was denied. To date, not one victim of asbestos exposure or an affected family member has been allowed to be heard on this legislation. The only people who would be directly affected by this bill have been completely shut out of the process.

It goes on to say the so-called FACT Act—and this letter doesn't say "the

so-called.” That is my characterization. The letter says:

The FACT Act drastically erodes the decades of work Bruce and so many of you have invested in helping those who could not help themselves. If this bill passes, it will be a serious setback for Americans who expect their elected representatives to work on their behalf. Instead of helping those who suffer from the diseases caused by asbestos, it will reward those who have perpetuated the diseases.

I would also like to talk about another of our colleagues who is affected by this: Congresswoman CAROLYN MCCARTHY. CAROLYN MCCARTHY serves in this Congress with us. She is a distinguished Congresswoman from the State of New York. Congresswoman MCCARTHY’s father and brother were career boilermakers. Each night, they brought home asbestos fibers in their clothes. Over time, exposure to this asbestos affected Congresswoman MCCARTHY herself. Today, she is battling asbestos-related lung cancer.

Her story is like the stories of countless Americans across the country. It is up to us to strengthen the health of those suffering from exposure. It is up to us to act in their names, whether they suffer from cancer today or face the prospect of severe illness in the future.

Yet the Republican measure we consider today does not meet this challenge. Like far too many Republican bills in this Congress, this legislation only serves to make matters worse for the American people. The so-called—there it is again—the so-called FACT Act actually harms the American people—that is a fact—and hinders the ability of asbestos victims to obtain compensation.

How does it do this? This bill would deny cancer victims the assistance and simple justice they deserve. It would even delay compensation beyond the life of a person suffering from asbestos-related cancer and illnesses. It would invade the privacy of thousands of Americans, and it would pose a particularly detrimental impact on veterans of the United States Armed Forces who have been disproportionately affected by asbestos.

Contrary to the claims of the bill’s proponents, there is no need for this bill. State laws provide for adequate disclosure. There is no evidence of systematic fraud in the asbestos trust system.

In short, this bill is unnecessary, it is mean-spirited and will never become the law of the land.

The Republican majority has little time left on the legislative calendar this year: just 13 days between now and December 31, according to the schedule they have given us. In that short window, the House should focus on the most pressing challenges—priorities like job creation, economic growth, comprehensive immigration reform, or deficit reduction. Instead, our Republican colleagues have chosen to waste time on another message bill to nowhere.

In the name of Bruce Vento and Congresswoman MCCARTHY, in the name of our friends, family members, and constituents facing the daily challenges of asbestos exposure, let’s work together on steps to strengthen the health of the American people. Let’s preserve the privacy and well-being of asbestos victims and all American families.

We can do this by voting “no” on this legislation.

PLEASE OPPOSE H.R. 982, THE FURTHERING ASBESTOS CLAIM TRANSPARENCY ACT (FACT ACT)

NOVEMBER 11, 2013.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: My name is Susan Vent, and I’m writing to express my strong opposition to H.R. 982, called the Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency Act (FACT Act). My husband was the late Congressman Bruce F. Vento who served for almost 24 years in the House of Representatives representing Minnesota’s Fourth Congressional District. He died from mesothelioma in 2000 within eight months of being diagnosed.

Mesothelioma is an aggressive cancer caused by asbestos exposure. Bruce was exposed through his work as a laborer years before we met or became involved in public life. He told his constituency about his diagnosis in early February 2000 when he announced why he would not run for re-election. On February 14, he had his lung surgically removed and then began an aggressive treatment regimen at the Mayo Clinic.

It was not enough. My husband died three days after his 60th birthday in October 2010, just eight and one-half months after the diagnosis. With his death, our country lost a hard-working and humble public servant years before his time. Bruce’s parents, children, grandchildren and I lost so much more.

Bruce dedicated himself as a tireless and effective advocate for the environment, for working people and for the disadvantaged. During his time in Congress, he was well respected by members of both parties. He served as ranking member and chairman of the Natural Resources Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands and also served on the House Banking Committee.

During the consideration of this legislation in the Judiciary Committee, two other women who have been affected by the ravages of asbestos and I requested to have a chance to testify about how the legislation would affect people like us. Our request was denied. To date, not one victim of asbestos exposure or an affected family member has been allowed to be heard on the legislation. The only people who would be directly affected by this bill have been completely shut out of the process.

This legislation is premised on a myth that fraud is a problem in asbestos-related litigation and that transparency must be required of those suffering from asbestos-caused diseases and their families. Such transparency would require mesothelioma patients and their families and others suffering from asbestos-related diseases to divulge personal information on public websites, including portions of their Social Security numbers, information about their personal finances and information about their children. Extensive and reputable research has disproved the fraud claims.

I find it highly ironic that the asbestos industry is seeking transparency, of all things. If the companies that are pushing this bill really cared about transparency, they wouldn’t have concealed what they knew regarding the lethal nature of exposure to asbestos and hundreds of thousands of Americans would not have died from such cruel diseases, including my husband.

If Congress is striving to be transparent about asbestos, please pass legislation to reduce exposure to asbestos in work-settings, schools, hospitals, and other settings, increase awareness of the risks of asbestos exposure including secondary exposure, and significantly increase federal funding for medical research to fund diagnoses and treatments for mesothelioma, asbestosis and other asbestos-related diseases.

The FACT Act drastically erodes the decades of work Bruce and so many of you have invested in helping those who could not help themselves. If this bill passes, it will be a serious setback for Americans who expect their elected representatives to work on their behalf. Instead of helping those who suffer from the diseases caused by asbestos, it will reward those who have perpetuated the diseases.

I thank you for your consideration. I hope you will stand with me in support of Bruce’s memory and in opposition to this bill.

Sincerely,

SUSAN VENTO.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased now to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlelady from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to the ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak against H.R. 982.

This legislation requires that asbestos trusts, which were set up to manage a company’s asbestos liability exposure, disclose names and personal information of any individual who is seeking compensation from such trusts.

The negative health effects associated with asbestos have been under investigation since the early 1990s. Premature death, lung cancer, and mesothelioma are known effects of asbestos exposure. While asbestos industry officials were aware of these negative health impacts since the 1930s, it wasn’t until the 1970s that evidence emerged that the industry concealed these dangers from the public.

Lawsuits resulted; and in 1973 the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit upheld the first successful asbestos liability suit. Today, hundreds of thousands of claims have been filed, amounting to billions of dollars in damages.

The key principle behind this legislation is to prevent duplicative and fraudulent claims from being filed against companies. However, there is zero evidence to support any allegation of endemic fraud in the filing of asbestos claims. In fact, in 2011, during an examination of asbestos trusts, the Government Accountability Office, the GAO, did not find any evidence of such fraud.

Make no mistake, this bill does nothing to enhance transparency and simply increases the burden on the victims who are seeking compensation for asbestos exposure and the related side effects. Instead, the FACT Act simply makes it more difficult for asbestos victims to receive compensation for

their injuries. The individuals who file asbestos disease claims do so in order to receive compensation to pay for medical bills or to make up for lost income when they are too sick to work.

Many others were not as fortunate and ultimately died from the consequences of asbestos exposure, leaving family members and friends behind.

The FACT Act not only fails to enhance transparency, but it may also expose these victims to added fraud and abuse. This bill would require asbestos trusts to publish the claimants' name, address, work history, income, and even personal medical information onto the Internet, where it can be accessed by people all around the world. This gross invasion of privacy could unwittingly expose these victims to identity theft or other forms of fraud, while completely failing to enhance the operation of these trusts to compensate legitimate victims.

Mr. Speaker, the FACT Act is a terrible piece of legislation that undermines the safety and privacy of many Americans, while giving unjustified deference to companies that have wittingly exposed individuals to asbestos. Instead of focusing on legislation that creates jobs or enhances U.S. competitiveness abroad, House Republicans continue to waste our time with poorly crafted bills that have obvious ties to industry. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote no on this legislation so that we may continue to compensate legitimate victims of asbestos exposure.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California, Mr. ERIC SWALWELL.

□ 1515

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I thank the ranking member for his leadership on this issue, and I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 982, the FACT Act.

It is a fact that asbestos can be found in thousands of products and locations. It is a fact that asbestos is a deadly carcinogen which kills about 10,000 Americans a year. It is a fact that trusts were set up so victims could still be compensated even when asbestos companies went bankrupt. It is also a fact that there is no evidence of systemic fraud or abuse in these asbestos trusts. It is also a fact that H.R. 982 would put tremendous new administrative burdens on these trusts. It is a fact that the result of this bill would make it more difficult for victims of asbestos exposure and their families to achieve justice.

With all of these facts, the evidence is clear: the FACT Act is a fact in name only, and instead, what it claims to do is really a fiction. It is just another part of the majority's historic and ongoing hostility to victims and their attorneys who are trying to achieve justice through our courts.

Instead of working to make it easier for victims to be compensated, instead of working on a whole host of other problems facing the American people, we are targeting innocent asbestos vic-

tims who are merely trying to be compensated for a wrong done to them.

I urge all of my colleagues to reject this misguided legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, we are prepared to close. If the gentleman from Michigan is prepared to close as well, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close. I think the case has been made that the asbestos victims do not benefit from this bill, that there is no widespread fraud or abuse, that all of the victims and their organizations are, in fact, strongly opposed to H.R. 982, and so are we. It is for that reason that I urge Members of the House to soundly reject this measure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, a lot of assertions have been made by the other side of the aisle with regard to the FACT Act. Let's make clear what we are talking about here.

This is a bill that in its totality doesn't cover two full pages of double-spaced type in legislative language. It simply requires that trusts that have been established to preserve the assets of companies that have gone bankrupt and have paid funds into these trusts, that future claims, future real, legitimate claims, will have resources available to them when it is a known fact and established by testimony before the Judiciary Committee and by investigations in a number of publications, including *The Wall Street Journal*, and by reports from various State courts in more than a half-dozen States, of fraud, duplicative claims.

These are what we are concerned about, and this is simply good legislative reform for protection of these assets for future availability. Otherwise, these trusts, which are already reducing the amount that they can pay to legitimate asbestos victims, will run out of money altogether before all of the legitimate claims have been addressed.

That's what the purpose of this legislation is. The opponents of the FACT Act have offered creative and far-ranging allegations against a measure that only seeks to introduce a modest amount of transparency into an opaque system. We know these allegations to be unfounded. The allegation that it hurts asbestos victims is unfounded. We know this because by increasing transparency and deterring fraud, the FACT Act helps asbestos victims by protecting trust funds for future claimants.

The allegation there is no widespread fraud is unfounded. We know this because there has been fraud documented in news reports, State court cases, and before the Judiciary Committee.

I urge my colleagues to reject the unfounded allegations offered today by critics of the FACT Act, and vote in support of this simple transparency measure.

I might add, this does not in any way delay the claim of anyone with a legitimate claim, either in State courts or in the bankruptcy courts. What it will do is it will root out those who are making duplicative claims, who are trying to double dip at the same time there are people with legitimate claims that will not have any money available to them because, as we know, and as was mentioned by many of the speakers here today, asbestos is a problem that has affected many, many Americans, and it is something that can be latent for a long period of time. We want to make sure that those victims who come along at the end of this process, who discover late in their lives that they also suffer from mesothelioma and related cancers, and other diseases caused by asbestos, have the opportunity to recover, not just those who want to abuse this system by hiding their claims and not allowing proper discovery of duplicative claims and fraudulent claims.

I urge my colleagues to support this well founded, good legal reform.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 982.

The average adult takes about 20,000 breaths a day. Most of us don't think much about those breaths. But for those living with asbestosis or mesothelioma, they think about every one of them. They struggle to breathe, they struggle to get medical treatments that are often painful, and they struggle financially. And they have struggled for decades for justice and some have died before receiving it.

Asbestos victims and their families have a right to believe that the House of Representatives—the people's House—would not put further barriers in their way. And that is why H.R. 982 is so disturbing.

This bill would threaten asbestos victims' privacy by putting their personal information on a public website. Exposed to asbestos, they would now be exposed to identity theft and fraud.

The Rand Institute estimates that the median payment to asbestos victims is just 25 cents on the dollars—with some as low as 1.1 percent. Yet, H.R. 982 would divert dollars away from compensation to burdensome paperwork requirements that go far beyond current law and bypass long-established rules of discovery. Asbestos companies face no similar "transparency" requirements.

The proponents of this bill say it is necessary to put victims' privacy at risk; delay and lower the payments they need to live because of fraud in company trusts—but there is no evidence of fraud.

This is an unjustifiable bill—and it is a dangerous bill. I urge my colleagues to reject it.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule, and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 982

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 “Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency (FACT) Act of 2013”.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS.

Section 524(g) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(8) A trust described in paragraph (2) shall, subject to section 107—

“(A) file with the bankruptcy court, not later than 60 days after the end of every quarter, a report that shall be made available on the court’s public docket and with respect to such quarter—

“(i) describes each demand the trust received from, including the name and exposure history of, a claimant and the basis for any payment from the trust made to such claimant; and

“(ii) does not include any confidential medical record or the claimant’s full social security number; and

“(B) upon written request, and subject to payment (demanded at the option of the trust) for any reasonable cost incurred by the trust to comply with such request, provide in a timely manner any information related to payment from, and demands for payment from, such trust, subject to appropriate protective orders, to any party to any action in law or equity if the subject of such action concerns liability for asbestos exposure.”.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.

(a) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) **APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.**—The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to cases commenced under title 11 of the United States Code before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill is in order except those printed in House Report 113–264. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 113–264.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 9, insert “that does not have a claims audit program intended to ensure that claims are valid and supported and that is” after “trust”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 403, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment ensures that H.R. 982 will not apply to trusts that have an internal claims audit program to en-

sure that claims are valid and supported.

Proponents of H.R. 982 argue that its reporting and other information-sharing requirements are necessary in order to ensure that asbestos victims are not committing fraud by recovering money both from trusts and through the tort system, thereby “double dipping.”

While proponents of the bill have yet to point to any empirical evidence of endemic fraud within the asbestos trust claims process, H.R. 982, if enacted, will impose unnecessary burdens and costs on trusts and will expose claimants’ private information to the unnecessary risk of inappropriate exposure, exposure that their loved ones have already suffered from.

H.R. 982’s additional requirements on trusts will raise their administrative costs significantly. Money used to pay these costs ultimately means less money to compensate asbestos victims.

This is particularly problematic in light of the fact that defendants can already obtain the information they want using existing discovery tools without undermining compensation for legitimate claims.

The reporting requirements in H.R. 982 also raise privacy concerns. This provision requires that a claimant’s name and exposure history be made part of a bankruptcy court’s public docket, meaning that anyone can access such information for any purpose, including purposes that have nothing to do with compensation for asbestos exposure.

I recognize that the bill specifically prohibits trusts from making public any medical records or full Social Security numbers, although it does require the last four digits of the Social Security number to be used.

I also recognize that limited additional privacy protection is available under rule 107 of the Bankruptcy Code.

Nonetheless, these measures are insufficient to fully protect the claimant’s privacy. As noted by my colleagues, once out in public, such information can be used for any purpose. Potential employers, insurance companies, lenders, and even those who may seek to harm an asbestos victim in some way can have access to this information without the victim’s permission or knowledge.

In light of these concerns, and notwithstanding the lack of any evidence of systemic fraud, my amendment ensures that to the extent that a trust already has measures in place to ferret out potential fraudulent claims, it should not have to bear the costs, burdens, and privacy risks presented by H.R. 982’s requirements.

If, in fact, proponents of H.R. 982 are primarily concerned about potential fraud in the asbestos trust claims process, then they should have little trouble supporting this amendment that recognizes processes already in place to address fraud while also addressing some of the concerns of those who op-

pose the bill. Accordingly, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would exclude asbestos trusts that have in place internal audit systems from the requirements of the FACT Act.

There has not been any evidence presented to establish that trusts with internal reporting systems are free from fraud. On the contrary, a GAO report found that trust audit processes are designed to ensure compliance with internal trust procedures, not to remedy the fraud that the bill seeks to address. Simply put, internal audits will not be able to detect whether disparate claims are filed among several asbestos trusts or in the State courts.

Excluding certain asbestos trusts from the FACT Act would eliminate critical sources of information that can facilitate the reduction of fraud. Furthermore, the amendment would not address the problem presented by plaintiffs who assert inconsistent allegations between the State court tort system and the asbestos trusts. I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, the Cohen amendment to limit the bill to asbestos trusts that do not have an internal fraud detection system is very appropriate. That is because, according to the Government Accountability Office, which has studied this and filed a report, they have found that in every trust that had an existing internal quality control to detect fraud, there was no evidence of systematic fraud found, and so I want to compliment the gentleman from Tennessee for bringing this to our attention. We think that it makes a better attempt at regulating and protecting victims of asbestos, and so I am very pleased to support it, and I hope that it becomes part of the bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), the chief sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The amendment has nothing to do with the problem we are trying to address. Listen, all well-managed trusts, non-profits, and businesses should have an internal audit procedure to detect fraud within that organization.

What we are trying to combat with the FACT Act is fraud between organizations, where an unscrupulous attorney or claimant will file multiple claims with multiple trusts, or in State court and in Federal court, in bankruptcy court, and with the trust. So an

auditor for one trust is going to have no idea what is going on in State court or in other trusts. This is a red herring to get us away from the purpose of this bill: to protect victims by preserving the funds that have been set aside to compensate victims from waste, fraud, and abuse.

This is a victims' rights bill that the proponent of this amendment, I believe, is trying to undermine with an amendment that would exempt most trusts because, as I said, any well-run organization ought to have internal and external audit procedures in place.

□ 1530

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment that undermines the purpose of the bill and support the FACT Act.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond.

The gentleman from Houston mentions this is a "victims' rights bill," but all the victims' rights organizations are against it. There is something wrong. Something smells, and it is not Denmark.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. The point I am trying to make is that the existing victims have been compensated, and I am glad they are compensated; but there isn't an organization in place for people who don't know they have the disease.

Mr. COHEN. Sure there isn't, because a group that is unknown, they don't know who they are.

The victims' organizations are concerned about victims in the future. They have suffered. They project into the future. They want to help other people put into their position. They are reaching out in a benevolent manner.

Mr. Vento's widow and her organization and the other organizations are against it. They had no voice. The only voice they have is through Representatives, and they ask the Representatives to vote "no."

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I simply would reiterate that the fact of the matter is that when you don't know who future victims are going to be and you make a claim that somehow this is going to enrich businesses when, in fact, the businesses are bankrupt and they paid their money into a fund, that this is in the interest of determining what people who have not yet made claims have and in the interest of justice in making sure that people who have false claims or duplicative claims and are making claims to more than one trust for different claims about the same illness or claims in State court, as well as in the bankruptcy court, need to be uncovered. That is what this seeks to do. If some victims are doing that, that is not a defense to this legislation, to say we shouldn't have transparency in the providing of benefits to people who have truly been harmed.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and support the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 113-264.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, beginning on line 5, strike "if" and all that follows through "exposure.", and insert the following:

(i) the subject of such action concerns liability for asbestos exposure; and

(ii) such party agrees to make available (upon written request) information relevant to such action that pertains to the protection of public health or safety to any other person or to any Federal or State entity that has authority to enforce a law regulating an activity relating to such information.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 403, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment would ensure that the transparency the bill's supporters demand from the victims of the asbestos industry will also be applied to the corporations that have inflicted so much damage and so much suffering over the years.

The amendment would require that a defendant seeking the information required by the bill must himself provide information about threats to the public safety or health. This information must be provided to any other person or to any Federal or State entity that has the authority to enforce the law regulating activity relating to such information.

This would go a long way to addressing the longstanding efforts by these corporations to conceal the facts surrounding their actions from the public, from their victims, and from government agencies charged with enforcing health and safety laws.

Too often, cases are settled specifically in order to prevent evidence of wrongdoing from becoming public. More importantly, because of the secrecy of these settlements, other people who have been injured have no way of gaining important information about their exposure, their illnesses, or

the settled liability of the companies that made them sick.

Information about the concealment of wrongdoing never becomes public, and the people who have suffered have no way of knowing about the wrongdoing that caused their suffering or its extent. Governmental agencies that are charged with protecting the public health, whether in the workplace or the home, are deprived of the information they need to enforce the laws we have enacted.

If the sponsors of this legislation really mean what they say about the need for transparency and accountability, they will support this amendment. There has been too long a record over too many decades of concealment, disassembly, and lawlessness, and too many lives destroyed because of that illegal conduct for us to tolerate the continued coverup. This amendment will go a long way toward remedying that situation and toward correcting the unjust imbalance in the current system.

Without this amendment and the openness and clarity it would provide, this bill would favor only those who inflicted the harm and would give them yet another advantage over the victims. We should stand with the people whose lives have been destroyed, not with the corporations whose illegal and immoral conduct destroyed those lives.

This amendment would prevent a situation where as part of a settlement compensating a victim it is agreed to keep key information relevant to the public health and safety secret so that more people will not be victimized.

When such terms of the settlement are kept secret, other people will not learn that a given product contains asbestos or that a given product leaked asbestos and, therefore, will not know that they potentially were harmed, and government agencies may not learn facts necessary to exercise their responsibility to protect the public.

At the very least, we should be evenhanded and demand of the wrongdoers the same transparency that this bill demands of their victims, a transparency which will enable other victims to understand their remedies and will enable government agencies to better enforce the law. Unless you want to assist tortfeasors and wrongdoers in concealing the effects of their wrongdoing, you should support this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, one of the principal issues discussed over the course of three separate hearings before the Judiciary Committee was the existing impediments to information contained in the asbestos trusts.

In particular, these impediments include obstacles that asbestos trusts institute against the prosecution of valid State court subpoenas for trust information.

The FACT Act addresses these issues by requiring affirmative, minimal disclosures from asbestos trusts and allowing for access to additional information at the cost of the requesting party. The amendment does not address these underlying problems and instead places broad additional burdens on defendants seeking to prosecute discovery requests in State courts. Specifically, it requires defendants potentially to comply with a host of unrelated requests from unknown parties. These defendants include small businesses that played a very minor role, if any, in asbestos manufacturing, but are the last wave of companies in the plaintiffs' firms never-ending search for a solvent defendant.

The burden this amendment imposes on a defendant is highly atypical, unnecessary, and would unduly impair a party's ability to assert a defense. The FACT Act, by contrast, provides transparency where previously it did not and provides defendants with the same access to information as plaintiffs. The legislation merely levels the playing field so all parties, including other asbestos trusts and State court judges, have access to the same information.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

In reply to the gentleman from Virginia, the amendment refers to "such party agrees to make available information." Such party is asbestos trusts, not a small business. So I don't know what he is talking about with small business requirements being imposed by this amendment, and the amendment deals with information that the trust must make available. It does not deal with the underlying burdens that the bill places on victims, which is what the gentleman was referring to. This has nothing to do with small business.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the distinguished ranking member of the committee.

Mr. CONYERS. Thank you, Mr. NADLER, for your very important amendment.

As has been reported by the Fifth Circuit in the First Appellate opinion upholding the product liability against a manufacturer of asbestos-containing products, the Government Accountability Office reported:

In the course of the first successful personal injury lawsuits against asbestos manufacturers, the plaintiffs' attorney introduced evidence that these manufacturers had known but concealed information about the

dangers of asbestos exposure, or that such dangers were reasonably foreseeable. And in the nearly four decades since, litigation over personal injuries resulting from exposure to asbestos has resulted in hundreds of thousands of claims filed and billions of dollars of compensation paid.

I urge support of the Nadler amendment.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The underlying bill imposes burdens on victims of asbestos poisoning because of an unsubstantiated allegation that the trusts, set up by the tortfeasors, by the giant corporations that caused the problem, may be suffering some fraud, although there is no specific about that.

The amendment simply says that if we are going to request information of the victims, we should request minimally that the representatives of the tortfeasors, the trusts, tell us the information that will prevent further people from being harmed.

I urge support of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The FACT Act does not impose burdens on the victims of asbestos. It imposes a minimal disclosure requirement upon the trust, a disclosure requirement that will benefit both plaintiffs and defendants in various courts litigating asbestos claims.

Therefore, these new burdens that would be imposed by the defendant, which are substantial and onerous burdens, not the minimal informational disclosure that would help to identify duplicative claims in various courts, is a massive additional burden added to this legislation.

For that reason, I oppose the legislation, oppose the amendment, and urge my colleagues to join me opposing the amendment and supporting the underlying legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113-264.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Beginning on page 3, strike line 9 and all that follows through line 6 on page 4, and insert the following:

"(8)(A) A trust described in paragraph (2) shall, subject to subsection (B) and section 107, provide upon written request and subject to payment (demanded at the option of the trust) for any reasonable cost incurred by the trust to comply with such request, to any party that is a defendant in a pending court action relating to asbestos exposure, information that is directly relates to the plaintiff's claim in such action.

"(B) A defendant requesting information under subparagraph (A) shall first disclose to such plaintiff and such trust, subject to an appropriate protective order—

"(i) the name of each asbestos-containing product mined, manufactured, sold, or purchased by the defendant at any point in time and the name and location of each worksite under such defendant's control at any point in time at which such asbestos was mined or such product was manufactured; and

"(ii) each location at which such product was sold or purchased by such defendant;

except that such information shall not include any information that is a trade secret."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 403, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, we are here today for several reasons, and my friends on the other side of the aisle have their high calling and reasons of great merit that they argue, but I think we have a more devastating and prevailing reason that we are opposed to this legislation.

Frankly, as I indicated earlier in my remarks, there are thousands and thousands of asbestos victims who are suffering from lung disease or cancer. Many of them were diagnosed late. Many of them, unfortunately, have passed. Their families are still victims. They have lost everything that they have had in trying to treat them, and now we add what we are used to saying in the community: insult to injury.

We come with an enormously burdensome and unfair initiative. So today I rise to introduce an amendment that I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to consider because it is fair.

The amendment would apply the transparency rules that they are seeking from those victims who are barely receiving dollars out of a trust that is the final result of numbers of bankrupt companies. We are asking to equally apply these transparency rules to asbestos industry defendants by requiring asbestos companies to report information about the location of their asbestos-containing products; and the amendment, out of respect for trade secrets, will exempt that.

□ 1545

So today we are asking for transparency on both sides. H.R. 982 is one-sided in that it maintains the rights of asbestos defendants to demand confidentiality of settlements and protects an asbestos defendant's right to continue to hide the dangers of their asbestos products from asbestos victims and the American public. A typical asbestos defendant who settles a case in

the tort system demands the utmost confidentiality along with the right to file for bankruptcy as a condition of the settlement in order to ensure that other victims cannot learn how much they paid or for which asbestos products the defendant is paying compensation.

By no means do we want to help those who are hurting. We certainly don't want to give them a leg up by understanding what the process of compensation is.

These same defendants now, under this particular bill, want the victims to disclose specific settlement amounts with the trusts along with product exposure information and work history. How unfair is that? On my dying bed, I have to offer and find a basis of giving you a settlement, or my family has to give it to you in the midst of our crisis.

The asbestos health crisis is the result of a massive cover-up; therefore, we are asking today for simple fairness. If there is confidentiality on the defendant's part and they ask for information on those who are suffering, then I believe, minimally, defendants can give information about the location of the asbestos-containing products to ensure that our victims are not exposed any longer.

Furthermore, the trust information is already public, and I would ask why this bill is even necessary. And then the further point of controversy is that this bill seeks to override State law regarding discovery disclosure of information.

So I am asking my colleagues to be fair, to recognize the hurt and the pain, and to support the Jackson Lee amendment, which simply asks for those defendants, those companies, to give us the location of the asbestos-containing products.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Jackson Lee amendment which would require the Asbestos Industry to Report Information about Dangerous Asbestos Products.

WHAT DOES THE AMENDMENT DO?

The Amendment would apply the transparency rules in the bill equally to asbestos industry defendants by requiring asbestos companies to report information about the location of their asbestos-containing products. And the amendment includes a "trade secrets" exception.

WHY SUPPORT THE AMENDMENT?

H.R. 982 is one-sided in that it maintains the rights of asbestos defendants to demand confidentiality of settlements and protects an asbestos defendant's right to continue to hide the dangers of their asbestos products from asbestos victims and the American public. A typical asbestos defendant who settles a case in the tort system demands confidentiality as a condition of settlement in order to ensure that other victims cannot learn how much they paid or for which asbestos products the defendant is paying compensation. These same defendants now want the victims to disclose specific settlement amounts with the trusts, along with product exposure information and work history, that they do not themselves provide nor would have provided before the trusts were created. If transparency were the true goal of

this bill, then why doesn't the bill require settling defendants to reveal information important to public safety and health?

The asbestos health crisis is the result of a massive corporate cover-up. For decades, asbestos companies knew about the dangers of asbestos and failed to warn or adequately protect workers and their families. "The 1966 comments of the Director of Purchasing for Bendix Corporation, now a part of Honeywell, capture the complete disregard of an industry for its workforce that is expressed over and over again in company documents spanning the past 60 years. . . . if you have enjoyed a good life while working with asbestos products, why not die from it?"

Now, the same industry responsible for causing this crisis is asking Congress to protect them from liability. If such a bill is going to pass the U.S. House, the bill should at least force asbestos defendants to reveal information about their asbestos products, where they are in use, and how many Americans continue to be exposed to those products.

Trust information is already public. Trusts already disclose far more information than solvent defendants do about their settlement practices and amounts—the settlement criteria used by a trust and the offer the trust will make if the criteria are met are publicly available in the Trust Distribution Procedures ("TDP") for that trust. Trusts also file annual reports with the Bankruptcy courts and publish lists of the products for which they have assumed responsibility. If asbestos victims are going to be forced to reveal private medical and work history information in a public forum, to the very industry that caused their harm, asbestos defendants should at least be required to reveal which of their products contain asbestos and how many people are being exposed.

The bill seeks to override state law regarding discovery/disclosure of information. State discovery rules currently govern disclosure of a trust claimant's work and exposure history. If such information is relevant to a state law claim, a defendant can seek and get that information according to the rules of a state court.

What a defendant cannot do, and what this bill would allow, is for a defendant to engage in fishing expeditions for irrelevant information which has no use other than to delay a claim for as long as possible. Thus, the bill must be amended to only apply to defendants willing to reveal important information about their asbestos-containing products.

Lastly, let me add that the asbestos defendants would not be required to disclose trade secrets under the amendment. The asbestos defendants would only be required to disclose information about which of their products contain asbestos, where they are in use, and how many people are being exposed. The amendment would not force asbestos defendants to reveal industry trade secrets or place them at a competitive disadvantage in the marketplace. Instead, this amendment ensures transparency from both the asbestos victims and asbestos defendants since transparency is the stated goal of the bill.

I urge my colleagues to Support the Jackson Lee Amendment.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, the FACT Act addresses a number of issues, including State court litigants' inability to obtain information from federally-supervised asbestos trusts and the general lack of disclosure that is allowing fraud to be committed against these trusts. The FACT Act addresses these problems by introducing transparency into the asbestos bankruptcy trust system.

The amendment dramatically undercuts the transparency provided under the bill by completely eliminating the quarterly reporting requirements. This removes an important and efficient disclosure component provided by the FACT Act and would eliminate sister asbestos trusts' access to information that is critical for the defense against fraudulent claims. Additionally, the amendment would place disclosure requirements on the State court parties requesting information from the asbestos trusts. These disclosure requirements are unnecessary, unusual, and would severely constrain a party's availability to defend itself in State court litigation.

Plaintiffs and plaintiffs' firms already have the ability to gain access to the defendant's information through the traditional discovery process; however, it is the defendant's inability to gain access to information submitted to the asbestos trusts that has created an environment that is conducive to fraud. The FACT Act merely levels the playing field so all parties, including other asbestos trusts, State court litigants, and State court judges have access to this information and the same information.

I would point out that, when one brings a lawsuit seeking damages from another entity that they make a party to that lawsuit, they are not entitled to anonymity in doing so. The purpose of the complaint, the initial pleading filed in the lawsuit, is to disclose who it is that is seeking the damages and what damages they are seeking.

All we are asking for in this legislation is that trusts that have been entrusted with funds that are to be made available for the exclusive purpose of helping the victims of asbestos problems have the opportunity to have information that they would have if it were a normal plaintiff's filing in a lawsuit. That is what we seek to have disclosed.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and to support the underlying bill.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. And the gentleman from Virginia?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from

the great State of Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to commend the creative inquiry of the gentlelady from Texas in examining this measure to make it clear to us, through her amendment, that this places disclosure burdens on trusts and asbestos victims but not on the corporations, and that is what she seeks to deal with. So this bill helps this be accomplished. And what is so critical about it is that we now have a more balanced approach than is currently in the bill. So please support the Jackson Lee amendment.

I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his important remarks.

Mr. Chairman, let me quickly say, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. Ranking Member, you were superbly right. The plaintiffs in litigation have had their right of exchange of information. What our friends are trying to do on the other side of the aisle is to make the trusts, now, a courtroom where information is dragged out of the victim, but it is not asked for from the defendants, the ones who have filed for bankruptcy, the ones who have left the victims to suffer and to fend for themselves.

I ask my colleagues to make this fair and require the asbestos company to give us where the asbestos-remaining products are so that we can save lives. If there is transparency, if the FACT bill would be fair, they would then have information coming from both parties, not only the victims, the plaintiffs, but they would have it coming from the asbestos companies that have driven up the numbers of those suffering from lung disease and cancer.

I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

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

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR
AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL
ORGANIZATIONS,

Washington, DC, November 12, 2013.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I am writing to express the strong opposition of the AFL-CIO to H.R. 982, the "Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency Act" (FACT Act). This legislation would invade the privacy of asbestos victims by posting personal exposure and medical information online and create new barriers to victims receiving compensation for their asbestos diseases. The AFL-CIO urges you to oppose this harmful bill.

Decades of uncontrolled use of asbestos, even after its hazards were known, have resulted in a legacy of disease and death. Hundreds of thousands of workers and family members have suffered or died of asbestos-related cancers and lung disease, and the toll continues. Each year an estimated 10,000 people in the United States are expected to die from asbestos related diseases.

Asbestos victims have faced huge barriers and obstacles to receiving compensation for their diseases. Major asbestos producers refused to accept responsibility and most declared bankruptcy in an attempt to limit their future liability. In 1994 Congress passed special legislation that allowed the asbestos companies to set up bankruptcy trusts to compensate asbestos victims and reorganize under the bankruptcy law. But these trusts don't have adequate funding to provide just compensation, and according to a 2010 RAND

study, the median payment across the trusts is only 25 percent of the claim's value. With compensation from these trusts so limited, asbestos victims have sought redress from the manufacturers of other asbestos products to which they were exposed.

The AFL-CIO is well aware that the system for compensating asbestos disease victims has had its share of problems, with victims facing delays and inadequate compensation and too much money being spent on defendant and plaintiff lawyers. We have spent years of effort trying to seek solutions to make the asbestos compensation system fairer and more effective. But H.R. 982 does nothing to improve compensation for asbestos victims and would in fact make the situation even worse. In our view, the bill is simply an effort by asbestos manufacturers who still are subject to asbestos lawsuits to avoid liability for diseases caused by exposure to their products.

H.R. 982 would require personally identifiable exposure histories and disease information for each asbestos victim filing a claim with an asbestos trust, and related payment information, to be posted on a public docket. This public posting is an extreme invasion of privacy. It would give unfettered access to employers, insurance companies, workers compensation carriers and others who could use this information for any purpose including blacklisting workers from employment and fighting compensation claims.

The bill would also require asbestos trusts to provide on demand to asbestos defendants and litigants any information related to payments made by and claims filed with the trusts. This would place unnecessary and added burdens on the trusts, delaying much-needed compensation for asbestos victims. Such a provision allows asbestos defendants to bypass the established rules of discovery in the civil justice system, and provides broad, unrestricted access to personal information with no limitations on its use.

Congress should be helping the hundreds of thousands of individuals who are suffering from disabling and deadly asbestos diseases, not further victimizing them by invading their privacy and subjecting them to potential blacklisting and discrimination. The AFL-CIO strongly urges you to oppose H.R. 982.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL,
Director,
Government Affairs Department.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time in opposition to the amendment.

I just have to say that this amendment goes well beyond the scope of this legislation in terms of what it would do in terms of discovery in State courts and gathering various types of information that is already readily and easily discoverable in those proceedings, including, if necessary, in the bankruptcy court.

What it doesn't get at, and the FACT Act does, is information that is not otherwise available to all of the parties to all of those proceedings to determine whether there are duplicative claims, whether there are fraudulent claims, whether there are claims where one party is claiming to have the same disease caused by two different places of employment or having claimed the same disease caused by two different instrumentalities in two different places. That is what we need to know. That is why the FACT Act is necessary.

I oppose the amendment, urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FARENTHOLD) having assumed the chair, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 982) to amend title 11 of the United States Code to require the public disclosure by trusts established under section 524(g) of such title, of quarterly reports that contain detailed information regarding the receipt and disposition of claims for injuries based on exposure to asbestos; and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1617

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. WALORSKI) at 4 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.

FURTHERING ASBESTOS CLAIM TRANSPARENCY (FACT) ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 403 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 982.

Will the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1618

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 982) to amend title 11 of the United States Code to require the public disclosure by trusts established under section 524(g) of such title, of quarterly reports that contain detailed information

regarding the receipt and disposition of claims for injuries based on exposure to asbestos; and for other purposes, with Mr. BISHOP of Utah in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113-264 by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) had been postponed.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113-264 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. COHEN of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment No. 3 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 198, noes 223, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 575]

AYES—198

Andrews	Cummings	Himes
Barber	Davis (CA)	Hinojosa
Barrow (GA)	Davis, Danny	Holt
Bass	DeFazio	Honda
Beatty	DeGette	Horsford
Becerra	Delaney	Hoyer
Bera (CA)	DeLauro	Huffman
Bishop (GA)	DelBene	Israel
Bishop (NY)	Deutch	Jackson Lee
Blumenauer	Dingell	Jeffries
Bonamici	Doggett	Johnson (GA)
Brady (PA)	Doyle	Johnson, E. B.
Braley (IA)	Duckworth	Kaptur
Brown (FL)	Edwards	Keating
Brownley (CA)	Ellison	Kelly (IL)
Bustos	Engel	Kennedy
Butterfield	Enyart	Kildee
Capps	Eshoo	Kilmer
Capuano	Esty	Kilmer
Cárdenas	Farr	Kind
Carney	Fattah	Kirkpatrick
Carson (IN)	Foster	Kuster
Cartwright	Frankel (FL)	Langevin
Castor (FL)	Fudge	Larsen (WA)
Castro (TX)	Gabbard	Larsen (CT)
Chu	Gallego	Lee (CA)
Cicilline	Garamendi	Levin
Clarke	Garcia	Lewis
Clay	Gibson	Lipinski
Cleaver	Grayson	Loeb sack
Clyburn	Green, Al	Lofgren
Cohen	Green, Gene	Lowenthal
Connolly	Grijalva	Lowe y
Conyers	Gutiérrez	Lujan Grisham
Cooper	Hahn	(NM)
Costa	Hanabusa	Luján, Ben Ray
Courtney	Hastings (FL)	(NM)
Crowley	Heck (WA)	Lynch
Cuellar	Higgins	Maffei

Maloney,	Peters (MI)	Sinema	Turner	Weber (TX)	Wolf
Carolyn	Peterson	Sires	Upton	Webster (FL)	Womack
Maloney, Sean	Pingree (ME)	Slaughter	Valadao	Westmoreland	Woodall
McCollum	Pocan	Smith (WA)	Wagner	Whitfield	Yoder
McDermott	Polis	Speier	Walberg	Williams	Yoho
McGovern	Price (NC)	Swalwell (CA)	Walden	Wilson (SC)	Young (IN)
McIntyre	Quigley	Takano	Walorski	Wittman	
McNerney	Rahall	Terry			
Meeks	Rangel	Thompson (CA)			
Meng	Richmond	Thompson (MS)			
Michaud	Roybal-Allard	Tierney			
Miller, George	Ruiz	Titus			
Moore	Ruppersberger	Tonko			
Moran	Ryan (OH)	Tsongas			
Murphy (FL)	Sánchez, Linda	Van Hollen			
Nadler	T.	Vargas			
Napolitano	Sanchez, Loretta	Veasey			
Neal	Sarbanes	Vela			
Negrete McLeod	Schakowsky	Velázquez			
Nolan	Schiff	Visclosky			
O'Rourke	Schneider	Walz			
Owens	Schrader	Wasserman			
Pallone	Schwartz	Schultz			
Pascarell	Scott (VA)	Scott (VA)			
Pastor (AZ)	Scott, David	Watt			
Payne	Serrano	Waxman			
Pelosi	Sewell (AL)	Welch			
Perlmutter	Shea-Porter	Wilson (FL)			
Peters (CA)	Sherman	Yarmuth			

NOES—223

Aderholt	Gingrey (GA)	Miller (MI)
Amash	Gohmert	Miller, Gary
Amodei	Goodlatte	Mullin
Bachmann	Gosar	Mulvaney
Bachus	Gowdy	Murphy (PA)
Barletta	Granger	Neugebauer
Barr	Graves (GA)	Noem
Barton	Graves (MO)	Nugent
Benishek	Griffin (AR)	Nunes
Bentivolio	Griffith (VA)	Nunnelee
Bilirakis	Grimm	Olson
Bishop (UT)	Guthrie	Palazzo
Black	Hall	Paulsen
Blackburn	Hanna	Pearce
Boustany	Harper	Perry
Brady (TX)	Harris	Petri
Bridenstine	Hartzler	Pittenger
Brooks (AL)	Hastings (WA)	Pitts
Brooks (IN)	Heck (NV)	Poe (TX)
Broun (GA)	Hensarling	Pompeo
Buchanan	Holding	Posey
Bucshon	Hudson	Price (GA)
Burgess	Huelskamp	Radel
Calvert	Huizenga (MI)	Reed
Camp	Hultgren	Reichert
Cantor	Hunter	Renacci
Capito	Hurt	Ribble
Carter	Issa	Rice (SC)
Cassidy	Jenkins	Rigell
Chabot	Johnson (OH)	Roby
Chaffetz	Johnson, Sam	Roe (TN)
Coble	Jordan	Rogers (AL)
Coffman	Joyce	Rogers (KY)
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (MI)
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Rohrabacher
Collins (NY)	King (NY)	Rokita
Conaway	Kingston	Rooney
Cook	Kinzinger (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cotton	Kline	Roskam
Cramer	Labrador	Ross
Crawford	LaMalfa	Rothfus
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Royce
Daines	Lance	Runyan
Davis, Rodney	Lankford	Ryan (WI)
Denham	Latham	Salmon
Dent	Latta	Sanford
DeSantis	LoBiondo	Scalise
DesJarlais	Long	Schock
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Schweikert
Duffy	Luetkemeyer	Scott, Austin
Duncan (SC)	Lummis	Sensenbrenner
Duncan (TN)	Marchant	Sessions
Ellmers	Marino	Shimkus
Farenthold	Massie	Shuster
Fincher	Matheson	Simpson
Fitzpatrick	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (MO)
Fleischmann	McCaul	Smith (NE)
Fleming	McClintock	Smith (NJ)
Flores	McHenry	Smith (TX)
Forbes	McKeon	Southerland
Fortenberry	McKinley	Stewart
Fox	McMorris	Stivers
Franks (AZ)	Rodgers	Stockman
Frelinghuysen	Meadows	Stutzman
Gardner	Meehan	Thompson (PA)
Garrett	Messers	Thornberry
Gerlach	Mica	Tiberi
Gibbs	Miller (FL)	Tipton

Turner	Weber (TX)	Wolf
Upton	Webster (FL)	Womack
Valadao	Westmoreland	Woodall
Wagner	Whitfield	Yoder
Walberg	Williams	Yoho
Walden	Wilson (SC)	Young (IN)
Walorski	Wittman	

NOT VOTING—9

Campbell	Jones	Rush
Culberson	Matsui	Wenstrup
Herrera Beutler	McCarthy (NY)	Young (AK)

□ 1646

Messrs. BENISHEK, BENTIVOLIO, REED, LUCAS, DeSANTIS, PETRI, HASTINGS of Washington, and SMITH of Nebraska changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. PETERSON, PETERS of California, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Messrs. GARAMENDI, GRIJALVA, and McDERMOTT changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 226, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 576]

AYES—194

Andrews	Cummings	Hinojosa
Barber	Davis (CA)	Holt
Barrow (GA)	Davis, Danny	Honda
Bass	DeFazio	Horsford
Beatty	DeGette	Hoyer
Becerra	Delaney	Huffman
Bera (CA)	DeLauro	Israel
Bishop (GA)	DelBene	Jackson Lee
Bishop (NY)	Deutch	Jeffries
Blumenauer	Dingell	Johnson (GA)
Bonamici	Doggett	Johnson, E. B.
Brady (PA)	Doyle	Kaptur
Braley (IA)	Duckworth	Keating
Brown (FL)	Edwards	Kelly (IL)
Brownley (CA)	Ellison	Kennedy
Bustos	Engel	Kildee
Butterfield	Enyart	Kilmer
Capps	Eshoo	Kind
Capuano	Esty	Kirkpatrick
Cárdenas	Farr	Kuster
Carney	Fattah	Langevin
Carson (IN)	Foster	Larsen (WA)
Cartwright	Frankel (FL)	Larsen (CT)
Castor (FL)	Fudge	Lee (CA)
Castro (TX)	Gabbard	Levin
Chu	Gallego	Lewis
Cicilline	Garamendi	Lipinski
Clarke	Garcia	Loeb sack
Clay	Grayson	Lofgren
Cleaver	Green, Al	Lowenthal
Clyburn	Green, Gene	Lowe y
Cohen	Grijalva	Lujan Grisham
Connolly	Hahn	(NM)
Conyers	Hanabusa	Luján, Ben Ray
Cooper	Hastings (FL)	(NM)
Costa	Heck (WA)	Lynch
Courtney	Higgins	Maffei
Crowley	Himes	
Cuellar		

Maloney, Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McIntyre
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Michaud
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Negrete McLeod
 Nolan
 O'Rourke
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters (CA)

Peters (MI)
 Peterson
 Pingree (ME)
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Richmond
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppertsberger
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman

NOES—226

Aderholt
 Amash
 Amodei
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Benishek
 Bentivolio
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Broun (GA)
 Buchanan
 Bucshon
 Burgess
 Calvert
 Camp
 Cantor
 Capito
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Coble
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Conaway
 Cook
 Costa
 Cotton
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Daines
 Davis, Rodney
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foyx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach

Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Grimm
 Guthrie
 Hall
 Hanna
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings (WA)
 Heck (NV)
 Hensarling
 Holding
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurt
 Issa
 Jenkins
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Kelly (PA)
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline
 Labrador
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Lankford
 Latham
 Latta
 LoBiondo
 Long
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 Matheson
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Messer

Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Perry
 Petri
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Poe (TX)
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Radel
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Royce
 Runyan
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schock
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Southerland
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stockman
 Stutzman
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)

Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg

Waldenski
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)

Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (IN)

Walden
 Jones
 Matsui
 McCarthy (NY)
 Rush

NOT VOTING—10

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR
 The CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1653

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE
 The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.
 The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE
 The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
 The CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.
 The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 226, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 577]

AYES—195

Andrews
 Barber
 Barrow (GA)
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Bera (CA)
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clarke
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney

DeLauro
 DelBene
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Duckworth
 Edwards
 Ellison
 Engel
 Enyart
 Esthoo
 Eshy
 Farr
 Fattah
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Garcia
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hanabusa
 Hastings (FL)
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Holt
 Honda
 Horsford
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.

Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Kildeer
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Kuster
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Loney
 Lujan Grisham (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McIntyre
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Michaud
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal

Negrete McLeod
 Nolan
 O'Rourke
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Peterson
 Pingree (ME)
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Richmond
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz

Ruppertsberger
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Spier
 Swalwell (CA)

NOES—226

Aderholt
 Amash
 Amodei
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Benishek
 Bentivolio
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Broun (GA)
 Buchanan
 Bucshon
 Burgess
 Calvert
 Camp
 Cantor
 Capito
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Coble
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Conaway
 Cook
 Costa
 Cotton
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Daines
 Davis, Rodney
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foyx
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar

Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Grimm
 Guthrie
 Hall
 Hanna
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings (WA)
 Heck (NV)
 Hensarling
 Holding
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurt
 Issa
 Jenkins
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Kelly (PA)
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline
 Labrador
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Lankford
 Latham
 Latta
 LoBiondo
 Long
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 Matheson
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Messer

Olson
 Palazzo
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Perry
 Petri
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Poe (TX)
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Radel
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Royce
 Runyan
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schock
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Southerland
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stockman
 Stutzman
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Walden
 Walorski
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman

Wolf Woodall Yoho
Womack Yoder Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Campbell Jones Rush
Culberson Matsui Wenstrup
Herrera Beutler McCarthy (NY) Young (AK)

□ 1658

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MEADOWS) having assumed the chair, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 982) to amend title 11 of the United States Code to require the public disclosure by trusts established under section 524(g) of such title, of quarterly reports that contain detailed information regarding the receipt and disposition of claims for injuries based on exposure to asbestos; and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 403, reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

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

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

Mr. OWENS. I am opposed to the bill.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Owens moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 982) to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Redesignate section 3 as section 4.
Insert after section 2 the following:

SEC. 3. PROTECTING THE PRIVACY OF U.S. SERVICE MEMBERS AND VETERANS AND ENSURING CLAIMS ARE PAID BEFORE DEATH.

Paragraph (8) of section 524(g) of title 11 of the United States Code, as added by section 2, shall not apply with respect to a claimant who is or has been a member of the Armed Forces of the United States.

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

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

This motion to recommit very simply exempts veterans and Active Duty servicemembers from the reporting requirements of the underlying bill.

We celebrated Veterans Day 2 days ago with much thanks and praise. Now we propose to punish those very same folks whom we praised. Under the guise of transparency, H.R. 982 requires quarterly reports of claims and payouts made against asbestos trust funds, which provide remedies to victims of asbestos exposure while allowing companies to continue to operate. A strict set of fraud prevention steps already exists when seeking an asbestos claim. In fact, a 2011 GAO report did not find any evidence of overt fraud during its examination of asbestos trusts.

Mr. Speaker, 30 percent of asbestos victims are veterans. Let me repeat that: 30 percent of asbestos victims are veterans. The reporting requirement created by this bill will delay claims payments to these men and women who have served their country and are now suffering from deadly diseases, including lung cancer and mesothelioma, because of asbestos exposure. Victims of mesothelioma typically only live 4 to 18 months after diagnosis. This final amendment will ensure we do not unnecessarily delay a claim to a veteran with just months to live.

In addition to the delayed payment of claims, the personal information required to be submitted in these quarterly reports poses a serious threat to privacy by forcing asbestos trust funds to reveal, on a public database, personally identifiable information about asbestos victims and their families. Why would we subject a gravely ill veteran battling a disease like cancer to the additional risk of identity theft?

This motion to recommit very simply exempts veterans and Active Duty servicemembers from the onerous and invasive reporting requirements of the underlying bill. These heroes have sacrificed for our Nation. Join me in protecting their privacy and ensuring their asbestos claims are paid before death.

We will punish those whom we praise, and that is simply unacceptable. I urge support for this final amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, the FACT Act is a simple measure to address an obvious problem. The lack of transparency that exists in the asbestos bankruptcy trust system cannot be allowed to continue. Fraudulent claims are diluting the ability of too many trusts to provide for the recoveries of future asbestos victims, including our Nation's veterans, who must often rely solely on the bankruptcy process to obtain a recovery for their asbestos injury.

The FACT Act will help preserve the finite amount of trust resources available for all future victims by increasing transparency in the asbestos bankruptcy trust system, thereby facili-

tating a reduction in fraud. The FACT Act achieves transparency through a measured approach, carefully crafted to provide strong privacy protections and respect states' rights, and strong privacy protections for veterans and all other victims.

This will not delay compensation to asbestos victims but will ensure that the true victims, including victims who will be identified in the future as suffering from asbestos injuries, are not kept from having compensation. These trusts are being used up as a result of fraudulent claims. The asbestos bankruptcy trusts need additional transparency so they can root out fraud and protect recoveries for future asbestos victims. The FACT Act provides this vital sunshine in a simple, efficient manner. It is a 2-page bill.

I commend my colleagues, Mr. FARENTHOLD of Texas and Mr. MATHE-SON of Utah, for bringing forward this bipartisan legal reform. I urge my colleagues to vote against this motion to recommit and to support the FACT Act.

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. OWENS. 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, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on the passage of the bill, if ordered, and approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 197, nays 224, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 578]

YEAS—197

Andrews	Clyburn	Foster
Barber	Cohen	Frankel (FL)
Barrow (GA)	Connolly	Fudge
Bass	Conyers	Gabbard
Beatty	Cooper	Gallego
Becerra	Costa	Garamendi
Bera (CA)	Courtney	Garcia
Bishop (GA)	Crowley	Grayson
Bishop (NY)	Cuellar	Green, Al
Blumenauer	Cummings	Green, Gene
Bonamici	Davis (CA)	Grijalva
Brady (PA)	Davis, Danny	Gutiérrez
Bralley (IA)	DeFazio	Hahn
Brown (FL)	DeGette	Hanabusa
Brownley (CA)	Delaney	Hastings (FL)
Bustos	DeLauro	Heck (WA)
Butterfield	DelBene	Higgins
Capps	Deutch	Himes
Capuano	Dingell	Hinojosa
Cárdenas	Doggett	Holt
Carney	Doyle	Honda
Carson (IN)	Duckworth	Horsford
Cartwright	Edwards	Hoyer
Castor (FL)	Ellison	Huffman
Castro (TX)	Engel	Israel
Chu	Enyart	Jackson Lee
Ciçilline	Eshoo	Jeffries
Clarke	Esty	Johnson (GA)
Clay	Farr	Johnson, E. B.
Cleaver	Fattah	Kaptur

Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Kuster
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney, Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McIntyre
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Michaud
 Miller, George

Moore
 Moran
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Negrete McLeod
 Nolan
 O'Rourke
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Peterson
 Pingree (ME)
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Richmond
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider

NAYS—224

Aderholt
 Amash
 Amodei
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Benishek
 Bentivolio
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Broun (GA)
 Buchanan
 Buehson
 Burgess
 Calvert
 Camp
 Cantor
 Capito
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Coble
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Conaway
 Cook
 Cotton
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Daines
 Davis, Rodney
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores

Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Frelinghuysen
 Gardner
 Garrett
 Gerlach
 Gibbs
 Gibson
 Gingrey (GA)
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (MO)
 Griffin (AR)
 Griffith (VA)
 Grimm
 Guthrie
 Hall
 Hanna
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hastings (WA)
 Heck (NV)
 Hensarling
 Holding
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Huizenga (MI)
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurt
 Issa
 Jenkins
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Kelly (PA)
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline
 Labrador
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Lankford
 Latham
 Latta
 LoBiondo
 Long
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer

Lummis
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 Matheson
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKeon
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Messer
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller, Gary
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nugent
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Perry
 Petri
 Pittenger
 Radel
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus

Schrader
 Schwartz
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Titus
 Tonko
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Vislosky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

Royce
 Runyan
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schock
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)

Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Southerland
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stockman
 Stutzman
 Terry
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Wagner

Walberg
 Walden
 Walorski
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—9

Herrera Beutler
 Jones
 McCarthy (NY)
 Campbell
 Culberson
 Franks (AZ)

□ 1716

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

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.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 199, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 579]

AYES—221

Aderholt
 Amash
 Amodei
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Benishek
 Bentivolio
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Broun (GA)
 Buchanan
 Buehson
 Burgess
 Calvert
 Camp
 Cantor
 Capito
 Carter
 Cassidy
 Chabot
 Chaffetz
 Coble
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Conaway
 Cook
 Cotton
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Daines
 Davis, Rodney
 Denham
 Dent
 DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores

DeSantis
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Ellmers
 Farenthold
 Fincher
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fleming
 Flores

Hurt
 Issa
 Jenkins
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Kelly (PA)
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kinzinger (IL)
 Kline
 Labrador
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Lankford
 Latham
 Latta
 LoBiondo
 Long
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer

Murphy (PA)
 Neugebauer
 Noem
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Nunnelee
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Perry
 Petri
 Pittenger
 Pitts
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price (GA)
 Radel
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)

Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Royce
 Runyan
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schock
 Schrader
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Southerland

Stewart
 Stivers
 Stockman
 Stutzman
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walorski
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (IN)

NOES—199

Andrews
 Barber
 Barrow (GA)
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Bera (CA)
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clarke
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cook
 Cooper
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cummings
 Daines
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Duckworth
 Edwards
 Ellisor
 Engel
 Enyart
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farr
 Fattah
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Garcia
 Gibson

Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Grimm
 Gutiérrez
 Hahn
 Hanabusa
 Hastings (FL)
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Holt
 Honda
 Horsford
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jackson Lee
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Kuster
 Langan
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lee (CA)
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lipinski
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
 Lynch
 Maffei
 Maloney, Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McKinley
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Michaud
 Miller, George
 Moore
 Moran
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal

Negrete McLeod
 Nolan
 O'Rourke
 Owens
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor (AZ)
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters (CA)
 Peters (MI)
 Pingree (ME)
 Pocan
 Poe (TX)
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rahall
 Rangel
 Richmond
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schwartz
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Titus
 Tonko
 Tsongas
 Van Hollen
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Vislosky
 Walz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watt
 Waxman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell	Jones	Wenstrup
Culberson	McCarthy (NY)	Young (AK)
Franks (AZ)	Peterson	
Herrera Beutler	Rush	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1726

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

SUPPORTING THE RIGHT TO COUNSEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution (H. Res. 196) supporting the Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution, the right to counsel, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1730

PASS THE KEEP YOUR HEALTH PLAN ACT

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, Midge, one of the women I represent from Alexander County, wrote me to say:

I am one of the many . . . policy holders whose policy was canceled due to ObamaCare mandates.

My policy was great, affordable, and I liked it. The most similar policy Blue Cross can put me on has higher deductibles, higher co-insurance, and coverage that I don't need.

For this new coverage, Midge and her husband are going to have to pay 81 percent more. Midge closed off her letter to me with this simple request:

Please do all you can to help us be able to keep the plan we like as we were promised by our President.

Letters like Midge's are pouring in from across the country to Democrats and Republicans alike. That is because promises aren't partisan issues, and promises matter to the American people.

Let's require the President to keep this central ObamaCare promise by passing the Keep Your Health Plan Act.

RECOGNIZING THE SPIRIT OF THE AMERICAN FARMER

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the spirit of the American farmer.

A 31-year-old farmer from Hammond, Illinois, tragically succumbed to cancer in September of this year. Kyle Hendrix was an avid golfer, farmer, and family man who left behind a wife and two young children.

His untimely passing brought out the best in his rural Piatt County community. In the middle of the harvest season, his friends and family organized a tribute of over 60 tractors and other pieces of farming equipment that lined up along Bement Road to honor Kyle's life. And all of the equipment, worth millions of dollars, had the keys left in the ignition overnight without a single worry.

Thanks to the photographer, Matt Rubel, who captured the moment, the story has now gone viral. Matt said:

It seems to me that farming communities all over the country may still hold the key to what makes this country a shining beacon in a world of trouble.

Matt, I agree. This rural community story is a tribute to rural American values.

My thoughts and prayers go out to Kyle's family and friends, and may God grant him favor.

PROTECTION OF THE RIGHTS OF CONSCIENCE AND RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRIDENSTINE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of all of our difficult debates that are occurring in this body and throughout Washington, whether it is about the right type of health care reform or how to stop the ever-expanding Federal debt which threatens both our economic as well as national security, and as important as these debates are, it should not be lost on us, though, that there is a grave struggle for the protection of a fundamental proposition of human dignity and a basis for civilization itself. This is the protection of the rights of conscience and religious freedom.

Even in the midst of all of our other debates, many Americans are concerned about the heart-wrenching stories of individuals who have been detained, condemned, incarcerated, often tortured, sometimes for years, throughout the world, even under the sentence of death for some, simply for the peaceful exercise of their religious rights.

Mr. Speaker, given the scale of human suffering endured and extensively documented in this past century alone, it is often difficult to grasp that humanity, in the 21st century, with all of its technological advances at our disposal, has not yet learned some very basic lessons.

These lessons of the 20th century, after two horrific world wars and other unspeakable human tragedies, including the Holocaust and the slaughter of tens of millions of persons under the repressive and cruel Communist regimes, should not be lost. They are indispensable in pressing forward toward a more hopeful future, one based upon the unchanging principles that underlie a free and noble society.

One of these basic lessons is that religious freedom is a foundation for social stability, security, civility, as well as economic prosperity, because it is built upon a foundation of respect for human dignity. Mr. Speaker, this is why we should, this body and the administration, we should all redouble our efforts to ensure that that first principle of religious liberty is integrated as a critical element of American foreign policy generally, and is prioritized in the day-to-day work of the diplomacy of this country.

With our position of Ambassador-at-Large for International Religious Freedom now being vacant, we should act quickly to quell any potential sense of ambiguity about where the United States stands on this important issue.

Let me first make an important distinction, Mr. Speaker: Religious freedom is not the same as freedom to worship, which is a much more restrictive concept and should not be confused. We are not merely concerned about allowing people to worship, think freely in their own minds or in their own home or in their own church, but about championing the free exercise of religion, grounded in human dignity, in its fullness, robustly, in the public square, as is guaranteed by our own Constitution in the First Amendment.

Religious freedom, the cornerstone of our civil society, is something that we can actually still take for granted, though, in the United States; although, this freedom has been eroding here in recent years. It is a painful irony that our own Department of Health and Human Services is mired in litigation over challenges to fundamental laws and basic standards of religious freedom in health care policy. Even here, this right is fragile.

So think of the many people throughout the world, in countries where the precepts of religious liberty are routinely and often egregiously violated

by the state, persons who must witness or endure cruel abuses for exercising this right of conscience.

Mr. Speaker, the prominent case of Pastor Saeed Abedini in Iran is a good example. He is an American citizen who is currently under house arrest in Iran for his Christian faith, and it is one of the more urgent cases worldwide. He and his family need our thoughts and prayers now. And we have been given the recent news that he has been moved to a notorious prison, reportedly confined in a small cell with hardened and ruthless criminals, with no access to sanitation or desperately needed medication.

In the United States, thankfully, we are starting to see a groundswell of concern over such barbaric treatment of Pastor Saeed. And, ironically, this again is so close to the anniversary of the storming of the United States Embassy in Tehran in 1979.

We are not alone in our appeal to something higher. Together with many good people of faith throughout world, or people who have no faith throughout the world, many are calling for his immediate release and safe return to his family. But, unfortunately, this is not an isolated case.

Beyond our intuitive understanding of right and wrong, we must also say that religious freedom is not simply a matter of exercise of a principle of justice. We know that it is inextricably linked to security and stability.

According to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, those nations that work to respect human dignity tend to perform more strongly on a broad scale of metrics than command and control societies, where freedoms are restricted and economic prosperity can seem unattainable, especially for those individuals who are marginalized and subjected to wrongful religious discrimination. The metrics in countries where religious freedom abounds are so much stronger in multiple areas of well-being versus in controlled societies where religious freedom is oppressed. Religious liberty is a principle tied to both security and stability in civil society itself.

Areas of the Middle East, for example, where religious minorities have traditionally served as a leavening influence for all peoples, they are now under severe distress. Can civil society really have a chance under such conditions as minority faith groups flee from persecution in their ancient homelands?

Now, Mr. Speaker, the United States has been one of the world's greatest champions of religious freedom, and we cannot afford to backslide or be seen as ambivalent in this regard, especially at this fragile time of our history, when social upheavals and economic dislocations demand principled leadership from this Congress and the President.

Pursuant to the International Religious Freedom Act passed by Congress in 1998 and signed into law by President Clinton, the State Department is

required to provide a detailed annual report on the status of religious freedom throughout the world. The current report, which covers last year, provides a robust overview of recent trends and concerns. It also leaves us with the enormous challenge of confronting serious and escalating levels of abuse, particularly in environments where impunity reigns and powerful forces align to intimidate and brutalize vulnerable faith communities. Not only have affronts to religious freedom over the past year been widespread, but sadly, Mr. Speaker, they are escalating.

Before I review some of the key concerns highlighted during this past year, let me take a moment to recall a courageous official in the country of Pakistan who made a profound impression upon me a number of years ago when I went to Islamabad, along with the House Democracy Partnership, which is an effort of this United States Congress to partner with emerging democracies to help in any way, share technical expertise as to how to properly run a legislature or a parliament.

While in Pakistan, I had some time with the Interior Minister, whose name was Mr. Shahbaz Bhatti. Mr. Bhatti was a man of great humility, great decency, great courage. I worried for a time, Mr. Speaker, because where we met was out in the open in a public setting, and him being seen as proximate to a United States official, I just wondered if this might be problematic for him, given the stress between our two countries.

Our conversation turned to some basic requests. He wanted to create student exchange opportunities for individuals representing Pakistan's minority faith communities. He proposed establishing a three-judge panel for blasphemy trials, which, as is commonly reported, are sometimes used for persecuting minorities or the settling of personal grievances. These were neither grandiose nor unreasonable propositions.

Mr. Speaker, as we continued our conversation, again, although brief, this man of deep faith—he was a Catholic—impressed me significantly. He not only showed great humility, he showed a great desire, in his public commitment and witness, to protecting the rights of all religious minorities, even beyond his own faith tradition.

About a year later, I was getting ready to give a speech to a group of Nebraskans who had gathered for the Nebraska Breakfast, which we hold many times throughout the year here. Any Nebraskan who is in town is welcome to meet with the entire delegation. It is an important 70-year tradition that we have enjoyed in our State.

So, as I was gathering my thoughts, a message came to me that Mr. Shahbaz Bhatti had been murdered, had been executed, had been martyred in Pakistan simply for exercising the legitimate authority of standing up for the minority faith communities in that country.

□ 1745

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, my face must have been ashen as I was preparing to speak to the community where I come from. I told them about Shahbaz Bhatti. I changed what I was going to say and added a few lines as best I could about, again, his courage, his decency, and how in our few moments together, he had deeply impacted me.

Mr. Speaker, over the past year, the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom has identified several countries that “have engaged in or tolerated particularly severe violations of religious freedom.” This is their report, Mr. Speaker. If you look closely, you can see a photo, a picture, a placard held by people who were probably in attendance at Shahbaz Bhatti's funeral. It has his picture on it.

These violations, documented by the Commission, include “systematic, ongoing, and egregious” examples of torture, prolonged arbitrary detention, or “other flagrant denials of the right to life, liberty, or the security of persons.” These tier one countries, as they are called, which the Commission has urged the Secretary of State to designate as countries of particular concern, include Burma, Eritrea, Iran, North Korea, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Uzbekistan, and China. Try going a week without buying something that wasn't made in China. Moreover, the Commission also identified other countries who are “on the threshold” of such status. These included Iraq, Nigeria, Pakistan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, there is a large minority community where I live in Lincoln, Nebraska, made up of persons who come from the country of Iraq, who fled that country due to persecution. They have made their home where I have made my home, and they contribute greatly to the well-being of our society.

There is one minority faith group there in Lincoln, an ancient religious tradition called the Yazidis. One of the elders of that community came to see me one day because the Yazidis have traditionally lived very quietly in Iraq. They have not created the conditions on which they should in any way be targeted by anyone else, but the community had come under great distress and was also under persecution and attack. One of the elders of the Yazidi community said this to me: “Congressman, we protected the Christians. Now we ask the Christians to protect us.”

To emphasize the deep and abiding concerns over religious violence, the Commission has also launched the Religious Violence Project, which has recently focused its efforts on both Nigeria as well as Pakistan, where targeted religious violence has torn at social foundations and created an atmosphere of widespread fear and intimidation. Over the past year in Nigeria, for example, where the Islamic militant

movement called Boko Haram is considered the “primary perpetrator of religiously related violence and gross religious freedom violations,” there have been 50 churches attacked, killing some 366 people. Thirty-one attacks have been documented on Christians, killing 166 people. Among the other violence, 23 attacks on Islamic clerics or senior figures critical of that group have killed some 60 people.

Over 18 months going back from July of 2013, the Religious Violence Project tracked some 203 incidents of sectarian violence that resulted in more than 700 deaths and attacks by militants and terrorist organizations in Pakistan, primarily against their Shia community. Attacks on other minority populations in Pakistan included the Christians, Ahmadis, Hindus, Sikhs, and other groups that were subjected to targeted bombings, shootings, and rapes.

Mr. Speaker, the trend toward the type of violence that has been documented by the Commission in recent years is profoundly disturbing and should be addressed in a thoroughgoing manner by member countries at the United Nations and at all appropriate venues of international engagement, in a credible and reliable manner. Interestingly, Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times just reported that yesterday, several of the 14 new States elected by secret ballot to the United Nations Human Rights Council are widely considered by human rights advocates as violators of personal freedoms. The new countries elected to the Human Rights Council are Russia, China, Cuba, Saudi Arabia, Algeria, and Vietnam. Again, they are considered by human rights advocates to be violators of personal freedoms.

In view of this development, it concerns me that our own administration has downgraded the status of the State Department’s Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom. This is an important position, Mr. Speaker. It is a reflection of who we are as a Nation. Also, the position of the special envoy to monitor and combat anti-Semitism remains unfulfilled in our government as well. I would like to see us elevate the principle of religious freedom as a core measure of civil society and diplomatic intent, institutionalizing this as a priority with the Department of State and building upon the very commendable work of our last Ambassador, who is now gone, Ambassador Suzan Johnson Cook.

The time to do this is now. Otherwise, we risk sending a very dangerous signal that, again, really doesn’t fit who we are as a Nation. We must care about this fundamental principle of the rights of conscience and religious liberty. We cannot afford to convey a message that religious freedom really doesn’t matter all that much to us while so many lives throughout the world hang in the balance, while so many people still look to us for the ideals which bring about civil society

in its fullness, where we respect one another’s differences, work them out through comity, work them out through legislative debate and not at the point of a sword or at the end of a gun.

Mr. Speaker, the world is screaming for meaning. Religious liberty is a cornerstone of human dignity and a foundation for civil society itself. We don’t think about it very often, but it is true here. We don’t think about the fact that we could enter our church or synagogue or mosque each Sunday, Friday, Wednesday freely, for the most part, without threat of fear of intimidation, without the government listening to us, without persons seeking to do us harm.

People can preach and teach as they see fit within the civil society to try to reflect their deeply held faith traditions out of respect to not only those who follow them but those whom they wish to convince or tell their story to. This is a great tradition in America. We have our differences, but we respect those. We actually honor that right, the right of conscience to speak freely and the right of religious liberty in the public square.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be interesting to point out that it is the image of Moses who looks down upon me right now as I am speaking, who looks upon this body as we deliberate, one of the great lawgivers of all time who actually also happened to be a great religious leader of all time.

Our country is replete with the strong condition for the exercise of religious liberty both at home, within our churches, and in the public square. This is one of the reasons that people are so attracted to America, because it is a principle consistent with human dignity. It appeals to the hearts of all persons to be able to exercise freely who they are and what they would like to believe with respect to others.

This is a great tradition that we have institutionalized in law and have tried to project through our diplomacy. That is why it is so important that we actually fill this open Ambassador’s position and we do so now, and we elevate the ideals of religious liberty and the rights of conscience as a core part of our diplomatic outreach in order to give people hope, a hope that they are yearning for, a hope that they need, and a hope to give balance and equality in the 21st century to a world that is very unsure as to where it is going next.

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

SANCTIONING IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity and the

privilege to be able to be here in the well of the greatest deliberative body on Earth, the United States House of Representatives, to talk about what I believe is one of the most crucial issues facing the national security not only of the United States but for freedom-seeking people all across the world.

You know, I had a tremendous privilege. This last week, seven Members of Congress—Democrat, Republican, and myself—were privileged to be on a trip that was life-changing in many ways. We had the privilege of going to Israel. We met with leaders of Israel. We met with the people of Israel, and we talked about issues of national security.

Israel is a Nation that has been literally under attack since the time of its founding of the modern Jewish State in May of 1948. Very wisely, the United States President at the time—a Democrat, Harry Truman—gave Israel what she needed more than anything else: to be able to show the world that she could be an independent, sovereign power. It was this: President Harry Truman recognized Israel as a sovereign, independent nation. That told the world that the United States of America would have Israel’s back because we recognized her right to exist, unlike Israel’s current neighbors—many of whom, particularly in Hamas and the Palestinian Authority—to this day continue to deny Israel’s right to exist and Israel’s right to defend herself. As is often said, Israel lives in a very tough neighborhood. We had the privilege to find out more about the concerns and the issues that face our greatest ally in the world that we have, and that is the Jewish State of Israel.

While we were there, Mr. Speaker, our delegation was able to quite literally witness world history as it happened. Secretary of State John Kerry decided to add Jerusalem to his itinerary in addition to Cairo. He went to Jerusalem because he was in the process of speaking about the Palestinian-Israeli talks for a so-called two-State solution, but something even more important that week was at stake, and it was this: a meeting in Geneva, Switzerland. It was a meeting of the nations that talked about whether or not the economic sanctions that have worked so well to prohibit Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons—the question was, Will those sanctions now be lifted?

As we went through the course of our time in Israel last Thursday, we were about to have our scheduled meeting with Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu. The meeting had been rearranged, and rightly so; because Secretary of State Kerry was in town, the prime minister adjusted his schedule. We, Members of Congress, adjusted our schedule so that the Prime Minister could meet with Secretary Kerry according to his timetable. That was the right thing to do.

When we filed into the office that we usually meet the Prime Minister in late Thursday afternoon, it was very

evident when we sat down that something was clearly amiss. The first remark from the Prime Minister was, had we heard the news? We looked at each other, we looked at the Prime Minister, and we said, What news would that be? We had been in meetings all day long. We had no idea what he was talking about. Just prior to our meeting with Prime Minister Netanyahu, he had been briefed on the events in Geneva, Switzerland. Israel was not there. They were not present at the P5+1 meetings.

The news wasn't good. It wasn't good at all. As a matter of fact, the Prime Minister said to us, Iran is getting the deal of the century. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister had the attention of the seven Members of Congress—Democrat and Republican—sitting around that table.

He went on to say some very firm words. This is a poster that was created by Senator MARK KIRK of Illinois. He said this to us: This is a very, very—and he said it a third time—very bad deal. It is not only a bad deal for Israel because, as he told us, you know, we are only the little Satan, according to Iran. You, the United States, are the big Satan in Iran's eyes. In other words, if you think this is bad for us in Israel, imagine what this will be for the United States.

□ 1800

And so, Mr. Speaker, I would like to focus just a little bit on the chart that Senator KIRK put together because I think it talks and speaks very eloquently of why the P5+1 deal was very, very bad and why the Prime Minister of Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu, was rightly concerned about not only the national security of the Jewish State of Israel, but the national security interests of the people of the United States and of freedom-loving people around the world.

Let's look at this very important document that was put together by Senator KIRK. Iran's deal of the century: what is it that Iran would get?

What is remarkable, Mr. Speaker, is what Iran would get in this deal. They would get, in cash, \$3 billion. As a matter of fact, some of the literature that I have read since Thursday when we were with the Prime Minister has said that upwards of \$50 billion would be freed and available to Iran; but, at minimum, they would have access to \$3 billion in cash.

Remember, this is an actor, the state of Iran, which was found illegally creating nuclear material for their stated purpose of creating a nuclear weapon to use to wipe out not only Israel, but the United States of America off the face of the map.

If there is anything that history has taught us, Mr. Speaker, it is this: it is that when a madman speaks, freedom-loving nations should listen.

The leader in Iran is called the supreme leader. He is not called that for no reason. It isn't the president of the

country who is truly the throne in Iran. It is the religious leader named Khomeini. The presidents come and go, but Khomeini, the supreme leader, remains the same.

His announced intentions are completely clear. Iran seeks to be the hegemon. In other words, Iran seeks to be the dominant power in not only the Middle East region, but they also have evidence of dabbling in the far East in China, in the Philippines, and in South America. They intend to have their fingers in places all over the world because they intend to dominate. They intend to dominate with the shia religion. They intend to dominate through the use of nuclear weaponry through the most vile form of violence that there is in the world in order to achieve their objectives.

So, again, let's look at what Iran would have gotten had the nation of France not intervened and put a stop to this disastrous effort and agreement that would have had the potential of changing the course of human history.

Again, here is what Iran would get. They would get \$3 billion in cash, at minimum. Some report upwards of \$50 billion in cash. They would get \$9.6 billion in gold reserves for the Iran regime; over \$5 billion in petrochemicals for the nation; \$1.3 billion in automobiles. Iran is heavily engaged in the production of automobiles and this would have given them that revenue. Also, enriched uranium for one bomb.

Why in world would P5+1, the nations that met in Geneva, Switzerland, allow Iran to have enriched uranium for one bomb, when they have already stated their intention if they have that bomb?

We also know that Iran has plans to be involved in having intercontinental ballistic missiles. In other words, they not only want a bomb, Mr. Speaker, but they want a delivery system. And they need a delivery system that goes just so far to be able to get to Israel, but they seek a delivery system, Mr. Speaker, that could take their bombs to United States targets as well. United States targets here in the homeland, but United States targets as well overseas.

And it just doesn't end with Iran, Mr. Speaker. If Iran gains a nuclear weapon, what the world must know is that the weapon will not simply remain within the boundaries and in the hands of a nuclear Iran. Oh, that it would be, that would be bad enough.

What we do know is that Saudi Arabia has already had to make plans to defend herself. She already has a preorder into a nuclear Pakistan, foreign order for a nuclear weapon, because Saudi Arabia knows they will be a target from a nuclear Iran if Iran obtains that weapon. So, therefore, we will see another nation—Saudi Arabia—that will have to have a nuclear weapon.

But it won't stop with Saudi Arabia, Mr. Speaker. We know that each will be seeking a nuclear weapon.

Let's not forget that prior to July 4, 2013, the violent terrorist organization

known as the Muslim Brotherhood was the legitimate government of the state of Egypt. Imagine the violent terrorist organization known as the Muslim Brotherhood with a nuclear weapon. Also, imagine Turkey with a nuclear weapon.

Imagine then that we are no longer talking nation-states. What we could be talking about very well with Iran having a nuclear weapon would be some of its umbrella protectorates, i.e., Hezbollah. The terrorist organization primarily located in Lebanon, just north of Israel's border, also would, in all likelihood, have access to a nuclear weapon or have one located on Israel's northern border.

Syria could also have a nuclear weapon; and from there we could be talking about, Mr. Speaker, al Qaeda having a nuclear weapon, with miniaturization. Perhaps the al-Nusra Front, perhaps Boko Haram or any of the other myriad terrorist organizations that there are around the world.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the entire paradigm of the world's structure could change quite literally. And for what? What is it that we would have gotten out of this very bad deal that the United States was about to enter into? It makes no sense.

We would have gotten zero centrifuges dismantled.

What is a centrifuge? That is what is used by Iran to enrich uranium; the fissile material that is required to create a nuclear bomb. We would have gotten zero dismantled. Iran would have continued to maintain control and ownership of their centrifuges. Let's face it and let's not kid ourselves: if those centrifuges would have continued to run and spun enriched uranium, we would have gotten zero ounces of uranium shipped out of Iran.

That is the whole ball game, Mr. Speaker.

The estimate today, as we stand here, is that Iran already has enriched uranium to the tune of 9 to 10 tons—well over the amount needed to have a nuclear bomb.

You see, that must be the first condition, not the last and not one that is off the table. That is the first condition to lift any sanction. We must first make sure that all of the enriched uranium leaves the nation of Iran because, again, we know their stated intention. That must go.

We also get out of this deal zero facilities closed. We know there are multiple facilities against and in violation of U.N. resolution after U.N. resolution after U.N. resolution. Iran has continued to be one of the biggest violators of U.N. resolutions that there is in the world today. One nuclear facility after another, including a plutonium facility, a heavy-water reactor in Iraq—that doesn't have to close.

Why would we do this? Why would we allow them to continue the means of production for nuclear weapons when we get nothing in return? They get \$3 billion. Some say \$50 billion. We get nothing in return. Are we mad?

Thank God for the French. Thank God for the French foreign minister, who said this was a sucker's deal. Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said this is a very, very bad deal and said it is the deal of the century. Why would we continue to reward bad behavior and a bad actor? Why would we allow no delay on the plutonium reactor? Why would there be no stop in missile testing?

Let's face it, what do they want the missiles for? Who is attacking Iran right now? And yet we would allow them to continue to test missiles and the delivery system for a nuclear weapon?

No stop in terrorism. Who is the exporter of terrorism? It is Iran. Who exports terrorism to Lebanon? It is Iran, through Hezbollah. Who exports terrorism in Syria, where Bashar al-Assad has killed over 100,000 of his people? It is Iran. Imagine Iran with a nuclear weapon and the terror that would be exported once they have that nuclear weapon and no stop in the human rights abuses.

All of this they get. They get a plutonium reactor, 3,000 new centrifuges, the enriched uranium for a bomb.

While we were over in Israel this last week, we had heard from the Prime Minister that there are well over 18,000 centrifuges running today. The first level of purity that is reached in uranium is 3.5 percent. The second level that is reached is 20 percent. From there it is a hop and a skip literally only weeks to get to 90 percent purity, which is what is required for a nuclear bomb. We are virtually sitting on the edge of a nuclear Iran, with no wiggle room left.

Finally, we are beginning to see the beginning of the economic sanctions coming to work, just when they are coming to bear, just when Iran is about to buckle at the knee, come to the table, and actually agree to something over here on this side of the scorecard. You see, Mr. Speaker, it is a big goose egg on this side of the scorecard—what the freedom-loving people of the world seek, what the American people seek, what the Jewish people of the State of Israel seek. We get zero on this scorecard while the Iranian nuclear program is allowed to continue at pace, moving forward toward the ultimate goal of the nuclear weapon and the means of delivery. And all the while working on miniaturization so that the nuclear warhead can deliver its deadly, lethal target to the most vulnerable people in the world.

And wouldn't it be horrible and wouldn't it be sick if a city here in the United States would be a recipient of one of those nuclear warheads? Why? Because in the midst of foolishness, the P5+1 thought it would be a good idea to let the Iranians continue their nuclear program.

May it never be.

There was an article that was just published. It was published by someone that I have great admiration for in The

Wall Street Journal—a very smart guy by the name of Bret Stephens. Bret had a column that came out. He talked about, again, this last weekend and the fact that the world dodged a bullet, just barely—not because of the Obama administration's efforts, I am sorry to say, and not because of the efforts of the United Kingdom, I am sorry to say, but because of the French. And we have them to thank.

The talks unexpectedly fell apart at the last minute when the French Foreign Minister Laurent Fabius publicly objected to what he called a sucker's deal, meaning the United States was prepared to begin lifting sanctions on Iran in exchange for tentative Iranian promises that they would slow their multiple nuclear programs.

Now, this is very important that I read this, Mr. Speaker, because Bret Stephens goes on to say in his article:

Not stop their nuclear program, not suspend their nuclear program, mind you, much less dismantle them, but merely reduce their pace from run to jog when they're on mile 23 of their nuclear marathon.

He said:

It says a lot about the administration that they so wanted a deal that they would have been prepared to take this one.

And what this deal would have meant, quite simply, Mr. Speaker, is that we would have seen an Iran with a nuclear bomb very soon, and the means to deliver it and put the world on edge.

May it never be. Thank God for the French.

That is what happens when the line between politics is a game of perception and policy as the pursuit of national objectives dissolves.

I think this was a very important weekend. And it is important to know that this isn't over. You see, what happened is that there was a delay. A delay, I suppose, for what? To buy the vote of the French, to take their arm and twist it behind their back?

□ 1815

Because now the pressure is on France and the P5+1. The pressure is on France. Seven days from today, Mr. Speaker, there will be another meeting. Our Secretary of State, John Kerry, who insists that this deal and that he and the United States aren't blind and aren't stupid with this deal—he insisted this on "Meet the Press" last Sunday. He is stating that he believes that there will be a deal with Iran and that there will be one quickly.

My question would be, Mr. Speaker, to the Secretary of State or to anyone in the Obama administration who is in the process of working on this deal with a nuclear Iran: Is this what the deal is that you are intending to strike? We get zero, and Iran gets the ability to develop a nuclear bomb. What is the deal? What is in that?

I think we need to ask the lead negotiator, whose name is Wendy Sherman. She is President Obama's lead negotiator, chief nuclear negotiator, in this very crucial negotiation which has the potential to change the course of history.

In 1988, Wendy Sherman was a social worker. She worked on the Dukakis campaign. She worked at the Democratic National Committee. This is the person who is striking this deal right now on a nuclear Iran. She also was the CEO of the Fannie Mae Foundation. It was a charity that was shut down 10 years later for what The Washington Post called "using a tax-exempt contribution to advance corporate interests."

From there, Wendy Sherman went to the State Department. There she served as the point person in nuclear negotiations with North Korea. She met with Kim Jong Il, himself. She found him witty and humorous, a conceptual thinker, a quick problem-solver, smart, engaged, knowledgeable, self-confident. She called him a "regular guy." She was found working for her former boss at the Albright Stonebridge Group before she went to the No. 3 spot at the State Department. From there, the arc of her career has gone to her now being in charge of this effort of giving away the ability to Iran to be able to continue on a pace to develop a nuclear bomb.

Again, may it never be.

When we were in Israel on Friday evening, we found out, Mr. Speaker, that the Obama administration had gone much further in this effort than even we had thought, because the story came out in the Daily Beast in an article by Eli Lake. He said that in this very bad deal with a nuclear Iran that once the current President was elected in June, Rouhani, that the Obama administration began then to already ease the sanctions on Iran. It is something that I think none of us could even begin to imagine. Even without consulting Congress, the Treasury Department issued notices in June that they would no longer be checking on those who are violating the sanctions' deals.

In other words, there wouldn't be the type of sanctions going out and the type of punishments, if you will, for bad actors who were doing trades with Iran. In other words, beginning past June, according to the article that came out on Friday, the Obama administration was already evening out the scorecard. In other words, they were already giving bonuses to Iran.

Why?

Because Rouhani was seen as a "moderate," someone the Obama administration could work with. Even in September, President Obama, himself, wanted to be able to meet and talk and discuss without any precondition at all with the leader of Iran.

You see, there is a read that happened among the leadership in Iran. They looked at the United States. They tested our pulse. They tested the pulse of the Obama administration, and they saw that they could get what Benjamin Netanyahu called a very, very, very bad deal for freedom-loving people across the world. As a matter of fact, the leadership in Iran saw something

else. They saw that they could get a sucker's deal—in the words of the French diplomat and negotiator—but that is not what the American people want, Mr. Speaker.

They want to know that when they tuck their children in bed at night that the world will be secure for them and that they won't have to worry about a nuclear weapon coming within the borders of the United States of America or of any nation. No one wants to see a nuclear nightmare, but the Obama administration needs to recognize that, in order to alleviate the burden of a nuclear nightmare, we must never, ever, ever allow Iran to have a nuclear bomb and the means to deliver that bomb.

You see, when we were in Israel, Mr. Speaker, we were told by some of the leadership in Israel that there are 25 nations that have the civilian capability of having nuclear power but that only five nations enrich uranium in order to have the fissile material. When you have a responsibility, you have to act responsibly, and those nations have acted responsibly with the fissile material. The argument from Iran is quite different. Iran says they have an indigenous right to enrich uranium, that all nations do.

All nations don't have the right when they have spoken irresponsibly, when they have acted in violation of U.N. resolution after U.N. resolution, when they have said "no" to International Atomic Energy Commission inspectors coming to Iran to check on what Iran is doing in regards to uranium enrichment, in regards to nuclear reactors or to the plutonium heavy-water reactor. The door is slammed in the faces of the inspectors. When they ask to come in, they are told "maybe some other time." Think of that with your teenager. You want to go in and check on your teenager's room, and your teenager says, "Maybe not this time, Mom. How about you try me tomorrow?" Does that raise a few suspicions in your mind? Usually, it does. In the case of the security of the people of the world, that should definitely raise our concerns.

So why would we give the benefit of the doubt to a nation that has thumbed its nose at the United Nations Security Council? that has thumbed its nose at the International Atomic Energy Commission inspectors? Why would we give them the benefit of the doubt? Why would the Obama administration give them the benefit of the doubt?

When Wendy Sherman has negotiated what is arguably one of the biggest failures in North Korea, with North Korea's obtaining nuclear weaponry and missile capability, that is absolute failure—failure for the world and failure for this negotiator. Now the same negotiator is trying to strike this deal where it looks, to me, like Iran is getting it all—it is a clean sweep—and the freedom-loving people of the world are getting a goose egg. This is a very bad deal.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time to pull Wendy Sherman back and off of this

project. This isn't working. I think the United States should pull back and not be a part of the P5+1. I think we need to take a big step backwards and take a deep breath and do a thorough review of the history of Iran and of Iran's violations.

This is bipartisan, Mr. Speaker. This is not Republicans beating up on the Obama administration. There are numerous Democrats, including Senator MENENDEZ on the Senate side, including many of my colleagues on the Democrat side of the aisle. They are pro-Israel. They are pro-American national security. They don't want to see a nuclear Iran any more than Republicans do. This is not a partisan issue, Mr. Speaker. This is completely bipartisan. In fact, I believe, if we were to put a resolution on the floor of this House that were to call on the Obama administration to say "no" to this very, very, very bad deal—to a sucker's deal in the words of the French diplomat—I believe that we would see a very strong bipartisan agreement.

Why?

Because, as a body—Democrat, Republican—we are truly, not just in word but in deed, pro-Israel. We are first pro-United States, first pro our national security interests. That is totally bipartisan.

I am privileged to sit on the House Intelligence Committee. We deal with the classified secrets of the Nation. I compliment my colleague DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER as much as I compliment my colleague MIKE ROGERS, the chair of the committee, because they have made a decision that, when it comes to America's national security, the partisanship gets checked outside the door. We are completely bipartisan when we go on that committee, as it should be.

So, when it comes to making sure that a rogue—perhaps even an evil—regime does not have access to a nuclear weapon, that is probably the most bipartisan move that could ever come out of this body, and I believe that it will because I trust my Democrat colleagues to also believe and understand that a nuclear Iran is a very, very bad idea. I believe the Senate will see it the same way. I think we will see, again, agreement on both sides of the aisle because this is about America. This is about our national security. It is about the security interests and the future of the world. It is about the national security interests of our friend, the Jewish State of Israel. It is about her survival. It is about making sure that violent terrorist organizations never, ever, ever, ever, ever have access to nuclear fissile material and the means and capability of creating a nuclear bomb and delivering it on innocent people anywhere across the world.

We want a peaceful world, and we will not have a peaceful world if madmen have a nuclear weapon. It is a bipartisan issue—it is a peace issue—and it is an issue, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that should capture our attention.

Might I ask how many minutes I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 7 minutes remaining.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to again refer to one of my colleagues who has also eloquently written on this subject, and I would like to give her credit as well. She is a former Member of this body but a wonderful Member with whom I had the privilege of traveling to the Middle East. She was defeated in her last election, but she served this body very well. She is a Democrat colleague. I have great respect for her. She and I traveled to Israel. We traveled to Pakistan. We traveled to Kuwait. Her name is Shelley Berkley, and she is from Nevada. I would like to read a few of the words from former Representative Shelley Berkley.

She said that the deal that is in the works with Iran is far worse than anyone could have possibly imagined. She said that the details are still emerging on this deal that was nearly put together over the weekend in Geneva, and she said:

By all accounts and despite all denials, the United States is actively pursuing a catastrophic agreement with Iran. It is one that would facilitate the nuclearization of one of the most extreme, violent, and anti-American tyrannies on Earth, with consequences that will be regretted for generations.

You see, Shelley Berkley of Nevada gets it. She understands that this isn't a short-term action. She understood that if Iran obtains a nuclear weapon that this will change the course of history for generations, and it is one that would be near impossible to roll back because, again, of the idea of proliferation. It wouldn't be just Iran who has it, as if that isn't bad enough; it would be rogue terrorist organizations across the globe.

Former Representative Shelley Berkley writes:

The centerpiece of the deal from the West's perspective is Iran's agreement to convert its stockpiles of 20 percent enriched uranium to fuel for civilian use and to halt further enrichment to 20 percent for 6 months.

Now, it is interesting. We just met this last week with the leader of intelligence in Israel. He told us that part of this very, very, very bad deal would include Iran's not firing up their heavy-water plutonium reactor in Iraq—"Araq," some people say. He said the joke on all of that is that this reactor won't even go on line for use until next August, so Iran gives up absolutely nothing in this deal. You see, it is a scam. They don't even have an ability over the next 6 months to fire up this reactor. So Iran's agreeing not to develop any plutonium from that reactor is a zero. It is a goose egg. It is a nonstarter.

These are the negotiators? I know one thing. I wouldn't want them negotiating my salary at my next job. They don't get it. They don't understand what is at stake—or do they? That is how important this is.

□ 1830

“The entire question of 20 percent enriched uranium,” says former Representative Shelley Berkley, “is a smoke screen.”

For many years, making a bomb went like this: first you spent a lot of time enriching uranium to 3.5 percent purity. That is difficult, but that is exactly what Iran would be allowed to continue to do. Then you enriched what you had created to 20 percent purity. When you had enough of that—and the centrifuges Iran has now are better and faster and quicker than what they had before, five times faster, as a matter of fact—you would be in a position to easily and quickly convert that material to 90 percent purity that is good enough for a nuclear warhead.

In recent months, Iran has advanced dramatically in both the number of centrifuges—again, nearly 19,000 centrifuges today at its disposal and their efficiency. Today, experts say that in just a few weeks’ time Iran could go from 3.5 percent all the way to 90 percent, which is “bingo,” bomb-making material for Iran. The whole issue of 20 percent enrichment has become absolutely irrelevant. Instead, the most important questions are how much 3.5 percent enriched uranium they have and whether they are allowed to keep their centrifuges spinning. If the answer to both is yes, they are moving forward on a bomb.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, if we have a deal with Iran, the number one parameter that must be included—and I spoke with both the current intelligence director and the former intelligence director of Israel, and they both said: A nonnegotiable is that Iran has to give up the 9 to 10 tons of enriched uranium that they have on hand. Why wouldn’t you? Why wouldn’t they be forced to give up the fissile material to make a bomb? It only makes sense.

Number two, they need to give up the ability to make further enriched uranium. Those are the centrifuges. That has to go as well.

The world is saying if you want to have the material, the nuclear material, that you need for a peaceful civilian use of power, if you want, for instance, nuclear reactors, that is fine. The world has no problem with nuclear power for true electricity, or if they want radio isotopes for cancer research, no problem. But that means that the material comes into Iran, and it is used for a civilian purpose, and we have inspectors. That is reasonable.

We have countries like Spain that have civilian-use nuclear reactors. They bring their uranium in, and they don’t enrich it themselves, and there are inspectors. The same with Sweden. The same with other countries.

This is fine to have nuclear reactors for electricity. We would back that, but what we will not back, what we must not ever back is the ability for Iran to create a nuclear bomb. That does not change in the current Obama

administration effort of the deal that came out and was thankfully put on hold by the French at Geneva at this P5+1.

The new agreement would allow Iran to continue to freely enrich to 3.5 percent at its Natanz and Fordow facilities. That is beyond all comprehension. How can you have a deal if Iran is continuing to enrich their uranium at two facilities and to continue building centrifuges that can easily and quickly be installed?

“At the end of the 6-month period,” Representative Shelley Berkley writes, “Iran would be even closer to breakout capacity.” Meaning the ability to build a nuclear warhead so quickly that no one could mobilize forces in time to stop it.

In other words, what we would have given Iran last weekend is the luxury of time, time to develop a deadly nuclear weapon. It takes time for a nation, the United States, Israel, the United Kingdom, Canada, any nation, it takes time for a nation to mobilize, to come against a bad actor nation, like Iran, in its development of a nuclear weapon.

Again, that is why this is so important—this chart that was created by Senator MARK KIRK. He accurately reported what the score will be for the world. We will get nothing, and Iran will get everything; and that must not be.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for activities associated with the ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Native American code talkers.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. POLIS. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Before I get to my remarks, I briefly want to address the nuclear proliferation issue in Iran. The gentlelady from Minnesota, as well as myself, and the vast majority of Members of this body, have been supportive of crippling sanctions against Iran. Many of us believe that that has helped drive Iran to the negotiating table.

We hope for, of course, a peaceful outcome that takes nuclear weapons off the table and prevents Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons; and, of

course, we continue to keep the use of force on the table if our diplomatic solution fails to be enacted that reaches President Obama’s objective of preventing Iran from developing nuclear weapons.

The issue has had strong bipartisan support, nearly unanimous, here in this Chamber, with regard to continuing the pressure on Iran to rejoin the responsible nations and renounce the acquisition of nuclear weapons.

But I am here today to talk about something closer to home, Mr. Speaker, in fact, at home, Mr. Speaker, namely, the need to act on immigration reform. It has been 138 days since the Senate passed a commonsense bipartisan immigration reform bill. I was proud to be part of a bipartisan group of Members here in the House that introduced H.R. 15, a companion bill to the Senate’s immigration reform bill that makes additional improvements on outcome-based border enforcement and would address our broken immigration system and replace it with one that reflects our values as Americans, helps create jobs here at home, reduces our deficit by over \$100 billion, and restores the rule of law here in our country, which is currently being undermined by the presence of 10 million, 15 million, 8 million—nobody knows how many people are here illegally.

The issue will not resolve itself, Mr. Speaker. I call upon this body to act immediately and bring to the floor H.R. 15 and pass comprehensive immigration reform.

Later on in my remarks, given that this is the week of Veterans Day, I will be talking about the contributions that many members of our military have made who are from immigrant backgrounds, including the talent that our military is missing out on today, including DACA, or deferred action recipients, who are able to work legally in our country, but are not allowed to serve in our military.

H.R. 15 would solve that issue, and we will be talking about the many contributions that immigrants have made and continue to make with regards to our military.

My colleague, Mr. TONKO from New York, is here; and I would be happy to yield to him for a moment.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, Representative POLIS, for bringing us together for what I believe is very thoughtful discussion about immigration reform, for we are by definition a Nation of immigrants.

I believe that the passion that is the luring card to America is that American Dream. People for decades and centuries throughout the history of this Nation have pursued that American Dream with the opportunity to climb those economic ladders, those opportunities that present themselves in this country, where we are emboldened by immigrants; and certainly the military is no exception.

Tonight, we will be talking about the empowerment that comes with H.R. 15,

which is a very thoughtful piece of legislation. I am a cosponsor on that legislation. I believe it is important for us to follow suit that the bipartisan spirit in the Senate has already initiated.

The opportunities for us to allow for, some suggest, 11 million, if not more, immigrants to pursue that path to citizenship is an empowerment tool. It is great for our economic recovery. As was mentioned by Representative POLIS, it provides for a great dent in our deficit. It allows for us over the 20 years to come to experience tens of billions of reduction in the deficit, which is no short feat to be ignored. It is important for us to understand the economic vitality that sound immigration reform produces for this Nation.

We are in need of many of the skill sets that our immigrants bring. You talk to the agriculture industry and those skill sets are there. You talk to the medical industry, you talk to the engineers that are required in this Nation, and many immigrants are assuming those roles. So it is important.

We look at the tremendous history in this Nation of the military, the empowerment that came to this Nation, that comes to this Nation as we speak. There are our daughters and sons on the battlefield protecting our liberties, promoting our freedoms in this Nation to freedom-loving nations around the world.

There has been an awesome sector within that military force that either is immigrants or those who are residing in this country and are not yet United States citizens. They have made a statement in the military history of this Nation. They have made a very strong statement of support of this Nation and all for which she stands. They have defended the banner that unites us as the United States flag. They have certainly made their mark.

As of 2009, I am informed that there are some 114,000-plus foreign-born individuals serving in the military. Twelve percent of them were not even United States citizens. So it makes a very powerful statement.

I am a grandson of immigrants. My grandfather, William Tonko, served in World War I. I am proud of that history that he helped to write. He did that as an immigrant coming to this Nation, understanding that as he left Poland that there would be this American Dream that he could pursue.

My colleague made mention of the DREAMers—a tremendous bit of nomenclature that we put on to people who were born here, perhaps, or came as youngsters and are denied opportunities.

We have within the context of H.R. 15 the opportunity to empower DREAMers. They are allowed with certain programming now that we have with the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, with that program they are enabled to, perhaps, get a reprieve from deportation or be able to secure a work permit; but they cannot serve in this Nation's military.

H.R. 15 would empower the DREAMers, people who know no other country, who have been raised here and want to serve but cannot.

There are great improvements made in H.R. 15. I am proud to stand here with my colleagues who will speak in support of H.R. 15. It, I believe, provides a shot in the arm for our economic recovery. It provides military strength, as has been proven throughout our history. Twenty percent of all Medal of Honor recipients have been immigrant servicemembers.

The track record is there. The data are speaking to the empowerment that comes to the military with those who have that passion. That passion of immigrants, that passion of naturalized citizens, that whole effort of those who are looking to be naturalized, believing in this Nation and all for which she stands is a tremendous statement of who we are as a Nation and our definition as a clustering of immigrants with this quilt work of Americana that allows for the economic climb for the opportunities, the ladders of opportunity, called the American Dream."

That is the passion that fills our hearts and souls. They have given to this military, they have given to the fight for freedom, they have given to the fight to protect our liberties. H.R. 15 goes a long way to recognize that and further strengthen this Nation.

I am happy to join my colleagues tonight in support of H.R. 15.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from New York for his leadership on the immigration reform issue and his impassioned words.

We also have with us this evening one of the original cosponsors of H.R. 15, a leader on immigration reform, the gentlelady from Washington, Ms. DELBENE.

□ 1845

Ms. DELBENE. This is an important moment for immigration reform. My district in Washington State is very representative of why we need reform. We have a northern border and a diverse economy with a rich agricultural industry, including dairy and berry farmers. In the southern part of my district, there are some of the world's most innovative companies, including technology, advanced manufacturing, biotech, and countless startups. These businesses have been making the case that fixing our immigration system must be a top priority for our economy.

Whether it is an ultrasound manufacturer who needs an acoustic engineer or a video game developer looking for a 3-D modeler, companies in my district are in need of specialized high-skilled workers. We have to ensure that foreign graduate students can stay here to start new companies or support ongoing research that will lead to future breakthroughs in many areas.

Also, farmers need immigration reform in order to find a stable, skilled, and reliable workforce to help us grow our food and our economy.

That's why I helped lead the introduction of H.R. 15. This is a bipartisan bill with 190 cosponsors. In light of Veterans Day earlier this week, I can think of no better way to honor our Active Duty military servicemembers who are immigrants—currently, there are more than 65,000 immigrants, or 5 percent of the force—than by taking action on immigration reform.

Unless Congress takes action, there are many DREAMers who were brought here as children and are undocumented who want to serve their country but cannot do so as the military can currently only enlist people who have legal status.

The Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program that we talked about earlier that the administration announced last year allows many DREAMers to apply for a reprieve from deportation and a work permit, but it does not confer legal status, which means that recipients of this deferred action remain ineligible to serve.

The American people want our broken immigration system fixed, and they are tired of congressional inaction. The time to act is now, and I join my colleagues in asking us to act as quickly as possible.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentlelady from Washington for her leadership on this issue. This body's continual refusal to act on immigration reform sadly comes at a tremendous cost to our country and to our security as a Nation.

The financial costs, according to the CBO—it is estimated that the Senate bill would reduce our deficit by over \$135 billion, grow millions of new jobs, and boost our economy.

In fact, in the 4 months since the Senate bill was passed, we have already missed over \$5 billion in revenue and tens of thousands of jobs, jobs that Americans could use that have not been created, that don't exist today, because of this body's failure to act.

In the spirit of Veterans Day, it is important to highlight the tradition of military service that the gentleman from New York and the gentlelady from Washington talked about. At a time when the military is facing recruitment issues, making sure we have the very best men and women to wear our uniform and defend our Nation, many individuals who fall under the deferred action program are not allowed to serve in our military. We are talking about DREAMers, young people who grew up here, might have been here since 2 or 5, and know no other country, are as American as you or I, many of whom want to give back, want to risk their life to protect their country, the only country they know, the country that they love, and yet, the military is not allowed to recruit them, and they are not allowed to serve.

It has been estimated that more than 30,000 young immigrants would join the military and qualify for legal status if we passed comprehensive immigration

reform. Key provisions of H.R. 15, our immigration reform bill, would have important and lasting benefits for our Armed Forces, and it has broad support from the military.

For example, the bill would allow deferred action childhood arrivals to enlist in all branches of the U.S. military, including the National Guard, and be provided with an expedited path to citizenship in recognition of their service to our great Nation.

Many immigrant servicemembers have become exemplary soldiers. Until 2009, only citizens and permanent residents were allowed to serve. In 2009, the Department of Defense introduced the Military Accessions Vital to the National Interest program, which allowed visa holders with high-level skills to enlist in the military and earn U.S. citizenship through their service.

We are fortunate as a Nation to have talented and hardworking immigrants who want to serve in the military, but this opportunity today is largely restricted to special visas for medical professionals and language experts. While that improves the security of our country, it would be improved even more by passing H.R. 15 to benefit from the great potential and the tens of thousands of would-be servicemembers who are asking to give back to our country, who are asking to put their lives on the line to defend the country they love, the country they know, the country that they want to serve. Millions of aspiring Americans who want nothing more than to pay their fair share, who want nothing more than to give back to our country, to make our country stronger.

It is time for us to find a way for DREAMers, for hundreds of thousands of other talented people, to pursue their dreams in the only country they know. Whether their dreams take them to the front lines of combat defending our Nation or to the front lines of competitive jobs in the private sector, or to other forms of public service, failure to take action only perpetuates an underground economy in which our Nation fails to benefit from the great depth of human capital and talent that resides in immigrants that are already here, are already in many cases working, and already in many cases are contributing members of the communities that they live in. It is simply a matter of formalizing that process and restoring the rule of law so that we have a legal way of facilitating the flow of immigrants to our country.

I can reconcile that we are both a Nation of immigrants and a Nation of laws. Those two values that we have as Americans, a Nation of immigrants and a Nation of laws, far from being mutually exclusive, are complementary. H.R. 15 and the comprehensive Senate bill honor that tradition. That is why more than 70 percent of the American people support comprehensive immigration reform. It is why I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that placed before the floor of this House, H.R. 15 would

pass today, would pass tomorrow, would pass next week.

I had the opportunity to ask Mr. GOODLATTE, as well as the chair of the Rules Committee, Mr. SESSIONS, yesterday in the Rules Committee what the plan was for immigration reform, why we were bringing forth bills with regard to asbestos, a legitimate problem to be sure, a bill that has passed this Chamber before, and a bill that will not likely be taken up by the Senate, but a bill that comes under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee, why are we spending days and days debating this bill rather than actually solving a problem of immigration reform.

Mr. Speaker, I know there are victims of asbestos poisoning, I know there are companies that want to resolve this issue, but I can tell you honestly, I haven't heard from any constituents who called my office begging Congress to take up asbestos reform. It is an issue; we should deal with it. I hope there is a bipartisan approach. But not one, not one of my constituents, last week, last month, last year, not one, called my office and said: We demand action. We demand action on asbestos reform.

Not one. Thousands—thousands—not only have called my office, have attended rallies in my office. I have never had thousands of people with the archbishop, with my good friend from Chicago, LUIS GUTIÉRREZ, who joined us in my district, thousands packed a church for immigration reform. Thousands packed a church for immigration reform. Not one call, not one phone call, not one email, asking Congress to pass asbestos reform. A thousand people in an afternoon. We had to close off promotion because it filled up so much, not to mention the thousands if not tens of thousands of emails and phone calls and letters saying, solve this issue. Solve this issue, Congressman. Solve this issue, Congress; we don't like the fact that there are 10 million people here illegally. We don't like that we dishonor the rule of law. I don't like the fact that my cousin is in detention and might be deported even though he has American kids to support. I don't like that.

You know what, Mr. Speaker? When we consider how unpopular this Congress is, it is no wonder that instead of acting on issues that Americans care about, we are discussing issues that, yes, we can discuss, of course, spend a day, spend 2 days. Are they going anywhere? I don't know, but issues that I haven't heard about. I certainly haven't had a church with thousands of people in my district calling for that issue. That's why we need to act.

Mr. TONKO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLIS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. TONKO. The gentleman from Colorado speaks of the tremendous support of the American public to do immigration reform. I think it is very easy to understand. It is explained by

the deep-rooted sense of heritage in this Nation for everyone. Many of us can identify with immigrant roots. I believe that is what drives the desire to have this reform put into play. We talk about the overwhelming polls for support for this effort, and we are halfway through this battle because the Senate has made a major statement with the measure that they have brought forth, and so we can meet that opportunity here in the House of Representatives.

Earlier, the gentleman from Colorado talked about the military strength that comes with immigrants, and cited many of the facts that really speak favorably to the shot in the arm that they give the military. We think of some of those unique skills that they bring to the military as the immigrant servicemembers. We talk about the opportunity to draw upon their second language proficiency. That is very important in service to the military. Certainly their greater cultural understanding, which is again a benefit that is borne by the military because of immigrants or those looking in some way at some time to be naturalized. They could join the military and provide that strength. We have a long history of decorated service, with 20 percent of all Medal of Honor recipients having been immigrant servicemembers. The list goes on and on. There is a lower attrition rate. There is proven data that are available.

So this is a powerful statement, and when we think about the heritage of this Nation, when we think about that American quilt, there are so many patches brought together under one common banner of different cultures, of races, of nationalities, that really make a statement of who we are. So this is just a natural move forward to have an immigration reform policy developed here this year in Congress.

Mr. POLIS. I would ask the gentleman from New York, just to make sure my district isn't atypical, have you gotten more letters or calls about the need to take up asbestos reform or immigration reform?

Mr. TONKO. We have had many, many requests to move with immigration reform. It is one of the greatest bits of requests that we get.

Mr. POLIS. Not to put you on the spot, but would you say it is more or less than people who have demanded that Congress act on asbestos reform?

Mr. TONKO. It is much more.

Mr. POLIS. So your district is similar to mine in that respect.

Mr. TONKO. You are absolutely right. These are very legitimate, justified issues to talk about, but when it comes to immigration reform, people are saying: Look, let's get this done. We have many people who are developing great intellectual skills, they are getting great higher ed opportunities, and we are not taking advantage of that. We are not incorporating them into the American peoplescope. We

have people who are assisting the agricultural industry, the engineering industry, the technical industry, the innovation economy, the medical health care industry, people need to fill these efforts with this immigrant power that is available.

It is great to join you on the floor. I know there are many who want to speak their voice here, and rightfully so, because this is a very pertinent issue right now. Reform is very much required, and let's get it done.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I have a letter to submit to the RECORD from the Evangelical Immigration Table, and to quote in part, the Evangelical Immigration Table and the faith-based community, with strong support from the Catholic Church as well as from evangelical churches across the spectrum, have been strong supporters of immigration reform, from the pews and here in the Halls of Congress. The Evangelical Immigration Table endorsed value-driven immigration reform that respects the God-given dignity of every person, protects the unity of the immediate family, respects the rule of law, guarantees secure national borders, ensures fairness to taxpayers, and establishes a path toward legal status and/or citizenship for those who qualify and those who wish to become permanent residents. I am proud to say that H.R. 15 honors the values of evangelical leaders, of Catholic leaders, of Jewish leaders, of Muslim leaders, of Americans across the faith spectrum, ensuring that our values as Americans and as people of faith are reflected in our immigration system.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE, The time has come to fix our broken immigration system. We are pleased that the Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees have worked on several bills each addressing a part of the immigration reform puzzle. As leaders of evangelical churches and organizations we write to offer our support and encourage further bipartisan cooperation towards enacting common sense immigration reform.

Evangelical leaders from across the country came together in June 2012 to form the *Evangelical Immigration Table*. The Table has issued broad principles for reform, which have been endorsed by prominent evangelical pastors, denominational heads, leaders of national parachurch ministries, and university and seminary presidents. We are working across the country to educate and mobilize our fellow evangelical Christians in support of a just and fair bipartisan policy solution to immigration that:

Respects the God-given dignity of every person,

Protects the unity of the immediate family,

Respects the rule of law,

Guarantees secure national borders,

Ensures fairness to taxpayers, and

Establishes a path toward legal status and/or citizenship for those who qualify and who wish to become permanent residents.

We applaud the significant progress toward legislation that would secure our borders, marshal additional resources for border enforcement and internal enforcement, and require the Department of Homeland Security to submit, implement and report on a detailed border security plan. The bills take

steps to elevate respect for the rule of law—strengthening E-Verify, establishing a legal guest worker program for agricultural workers, a more workable program for science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) visas, and increasing passport and visa security. We are encouraged by reports of other bills being drafted that would address the need for more low skill visas and the legal status of children, adults, and asylees; addressing these needs is vital to fixing all the components of the current system.

The work the House has done on immigration reform thus far is commendable. However, we remain concerned about several provisions of H.R. 2278, The Strengthen and Fortify Enforcement Act (SAFE Act), that could have unintended consequences adversely affecting religious communities, law enforcement agencies, and the people they are called to serve. The SAFE Act, in its current form, criminalizes unlawful presence and includes broad prohibitions on “harboring” undocumented immigrants that could make criminals of the family members of undocumented immigrants and others, including fellow church members, who assist them with everyday activities. This is a significant problem for our pastors, faith leaders and others in our community, who as an extension of their faith, care in tangible ways for the immigrants (regardless of status) within their community. Pastors, faith leaders and others in our communities should not have to decide between following the law and giving water to a thirsty traveler in the desert, providing food to those who are hungry or giving rides to church for those without transportation. While collaboration and communication between federal, state, and local law enforcement is an essential part of effective policing, it must be structured in a way that fosters buy-in from those agencies and does not compromise their rapport and cooperation with immigrant communities.

As you continue to work towards a complete legislative solution for immigration reform, you and your staff are in our prayers. We appreciate the complexity of designing a system that meets our country's needs and that can meet with broad public acceptance. Through Bible reading, prayer, and public education campaigns we have mobilized a broad base of evangelical support for immigration reform. But while Congress debates reform proposals, immigrant families and workers continue to suffer under our broken system. Now it is time to finish the job. Please prioritize work to finalize immigration reform legislation this year.

May God bless you and your staff in the days ahead.

Sincerely,

THE EVANGELICAL IMMIGRATION TABLE

□ 1900

I now yield to the original sponsor of H.R. 15, a leader in this House on the fight for immigration reform, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GARCIA).

Mr. GARCIA. I would like to thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Madam Speaker, every day thousands of Americans risk their lives for our Nation, despite the fact that our broken immigration system rips them apart, rips their families apart by deporting their mothers, fathers, siblings, and spouses.

In my home State of Florida, Rita Cote, the wife of a gulf war veteran, was detained by local law enforcement when she was translating between police and her sister, her sister who had been a victim of domestic violence. In-

stead of arresting her sister's assailant, Rita was held without a warrant, without being charged, and without seeing a judge for 7 days before being transferred to ICE custody.

This is the spouse of a veteran, of someone who is serving in our Armed Forces. No one deserve this treatment, but certainly not someone who has faced the challenges of being a military spouse. Our Nation's veterans were willing to make the ultimate sacrifice to protect us. The least we could do is protect their families.

At the same time, there are thousands of young people who would give anything to defend our country, the only country they have ever known. While these individuals with green cards cannot serve in the military because DACA doesn't allow for it, they are willing to do it; yet we do not allow it. These kids are an asset to our Nation, and it is simply bad policy to turn them away.

Since 2002, almost 90,000 military servicemembers have become citizens. We should be welcoming them with open arms. All of those willing to fight and risk their lives for our great Nation deserve that respect.

This is an issue that underscores the urgency with which we must pass immigration reform. Fixing our immigration system isn't about justice and fairness. It is about enhancing our national security and military readiness.

There are enough Members in the House that understand the benefits of immigration reform. There are enough people who know that it benefits our Nation's prosperity and understand that we will do this inevitably. But with every day that passes, this problem gets bigger. The consequences of inaction become more costly. This body needs to stop hiding behind empty promises and start doing the job we were sent here to do.

We recognize the sacrifices of America's veterans. Let's remember their loved ones who are left in the shadows.

I want to remind my colleagues across the aisle that there is enough blame to go around, but here is what is clear: a Democratic Senate took up comprehensive immigration reform and passed a bipartisan bill. This would not be the bill that I would love. This would not be the bill that the gentleman from Colorado or the gentleman from California would love. Many of us could probably write a better bill; yet we took up this bill, and it got passed. The President has said he would sign that bill. And before this House, we have a bipartisan bill that has 190 signatures. If the Speaker would allow it to come to the floor, it would pass.

Mr. Speaker, we need you to yield here. You did it on Hurricane Sandy relief, you did it on the budget and fiscal crisis, you did it on VAWA; and it is time to do it now. Let the will of this body happen. Let us vote, and we will vote it through. The consequences are grave not only for our country, not

only for the millions who suffer, not only for the veterans, not only for their spouses and family; but they are going to have a great consequence for your party. The time has come to let this be voted on.

We have been given an unprecedented opportunity to fix our broken immigration system and make our Nation stronger. Now is the time to pass immigration reform.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Miami for his impassioned words.

It is rare, in my experience here, that more than two-thirds of the Senate can agree to solve an issue. They always talk about reaching the 60-vote threshold. There are only 54 or 55 of one party. How do we get to 60? This was 68 votes, more than two-thirds of the United States Senate. This House could act tomorrow.

As you know, Madam Speaker, what many Americans wonder is if it could pass, why aren't we debating it? Why aren't we discussing it? What we spend our time on and the bills that we debate in this Chamber are determined by the majority leader and the Speaker. That is why we need their ability to bring these bills to the floor. If people want to stand in opposition, let them be public with that and say they don't want to solve immigration. But I am confident that the votes exist today with support of more than a third of the Republicans in the Senate. I think the numbers would be similar here. I think it could be a quarter, it could be a third, it could be 20 percent of the Republicans in this body that would agree it is time to fix our broken immigration system.

I yield to the gentleman from Miami.

Mr. GARCIA. I just wanted to agree with the gentleman from Colorado.

What is clear is that there are enough votes here to pass this. What is clear is if this comes to the floor, this will pass. What is clear is that Mr. CANTOR wants a bill to pass. What is clear is that there has probably been no bill with broader support—probably since I have been in Congress, probably since the gentleman from Colorado got here. We not only have the Chamber of Commerce on our side, but we have the AFL-CIO, who is on the other side of the spectrum. We have the farm workers, and then we have the growers. We have almost every sector, including the religious sector. All of them are looking for a solution here, and there is only one man standing in the way. That is the Speaker.

We ask, Mr. Speaker, for you to yield to the will of this body, yield to the majority, and yield to what is right for our Nation. We demand a vote. The Nation deserves a vote. Our country deserves a vote.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

It is not the desire, I don't think of any of us, of the Democrats, of our leader, of our Members, for this to be a political issue that one side is demonized on, that is used to generate polit-

ical support. Rather, we would like to solve it. We would like this issue to go away. We would like to fix our broken immigration system; but if that doesn't happen, of course candidates are going to run on fixing it and the American people, with overwhelming support, will elect candidates who want to fix it.

If Members of this body won't lead, frankly, Madam Speaker, they will need to get out of the way, whether by their choice or whether by the people's choice. The Americans are demanding action.

I yield to the gentleman from California, a leader on immigration reform.

Mr. TAKANO. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding time.

The issue of immigration reform is a top priority for our Nation and rightly so. It will not only help our economy grow, but it will also help families stay together.

I was taken aback earlier today when Speaker BOEHNER said that the Republican-controlled House has "no intention of ever going to conference on the Senate immigration bill."

That is clearly at odds with what the American people want and what the American people need.

I just want to recount a bit of my own history.

Mr. POLIS. One way to honor the Speaker's word and not go to conference would simply be to take up the Senate immigration bill and advance it directly to the President. Perhaps we can also call upon the Speaker to honor his word in not having to go to conference by actually bringing the Senate bill before this body.

The conference would not be necessary; is that correct? It would go right to the President.

Mr. TAKANO. I believe so. Just bring it directly to the floor. We can bring that Senate bill directly to the floor and let the House work its will.

The topic of our Special Order had to do with immigration reform in the military and veterans.

I recount a very poignant part of my own family's history. All of my grandparents, both my parents were interned during World War II without trial in Japanese American internment camps.

Despite this great injustice, many children of these immigrants, young men, volunteered for military service. They fought in the 100th Infantry, in the 442nd, suffered some of the greatest casualties, and were most recently awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for their service. These were young men who wanted to demonstrate their loyalty to this country and were given an opportunity to fight for our country. I think it is tragic that young DREAMers under deferred action are not allowed to serve the country that they love, where the language of English is mainly the language they speak, and the culture they know is that of our country, America.

Just like the men of the World War II generation, Japanese Americans who

fought for this country and all Japanese American fighting units, I believe that the children of immigrants today want that opportunity.

Over the past few months, I have received hundreds of letters from residents in my district, letters from business owners, husbands, wives, and perhaps even most distressing, children. One letter I received is from a local teenager who wrote to me about her mother who will likely be deported back to Mexico in 2015. She said:

It is going to be very hard to bring her back to California. Her four kids need her back. She is a single mother. She is the only person we have close to us.

Another letter I received said:

My stepfather's mother died of heart problems, so he had to go back to Mexico to her funeral. He was there for a couple of days, and when he tried to come home, it was hard for him to come back over to California. It has been a while since we have seen him. My mom misses him terribly. She cries every time she talks to him on the phone. It has been 2 months since he left to Mexico, which probably means he lost his job. He is the main provider for our family. This is very stressful and hard on my mom because she is not able to pay the bills. It is hard for her to support us and be strong at the same time. I hate to see her suffer and be sad all the time. Families should not be ripped apart like this. Other families should not have to go through what my family is going through.

Madam Speaker, these are letters from children whose families are being ripped apart.

I also received a letter from a wife and a mother saying:

I myself am one of those many families that unfortunately have to go through this injustice. My husband was deported on his way to work about 3 years ago, and during these few years, it has been really hard for my new 5-year-old daughter and me. The stress I go through every day is unhealthy, and, unfortunately, my daughter has to go through it, as well. My daughter really wants to be with her father, and it really hurts to see her go through this situation.

These are American families that we can help by passing immigration reform.

The last letter I would like to read is from one of the largest employers in my district, the Blue Banner Company, a grower and shipper of California citrus. They wrote to me and detailed the difficulties of a recent crop of theirs when they faced a 30 percent to 35 percent labor shortage. Because of the labor shortage, less fruit was harvested from the trees in a timely manner. Because the fruit was harvested not at peak time, it was sent to be juiced instead of sold fresh for eating by consumers. This resulted in a total loss for their growers of \$3.4 million to \$3.8 million.

The letter goes on to say:

We, California agriculture, desperately need a legal workforce from which to hire.

Reforming our immigration system will help businesses such as Blue Banner by providing a workforce that is ready and willing to work. Let's pass immigration reform and help families stay together and help businesses obtain the workers they need.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, we have here another leader from the great State of California (Mr. CÁRDENAS), my friend.

□ 1915

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Thank you very much for bringing together this important discussion on this floor of our Nation's Capitol.

I think it is really important, Madam Speaker, for us to remind ourselves that the only thing that is stopping comprehensive immigration reform is the fact that, Madam Speaker, the leadership of this House is unwilling to allow the vote to take place.

Today I am proud to join my colleagues to talk about the need for immigration reform but, more importantly, the cost America bears as Congress does nothing.

We were sent to Washington to solve our Nation's problems, but Republican leadership has announced we are done and will not take up immigration reform this year. Madam Speaker, it is November 13. We are not done. We have 6 more weeks to work, just like all Americans. Why don't we just continue doing our job?

Members of our Armed Forces don't get the liberty to say when they are done. There are no vacations or timeouts for them. They proudly wear the U.S. flag on their shoulder and continue to protect our freedoms, even when the leadership in our Congress decides that they no longer want to work.

As of June 2009, for example, there were over 114,000 foreign-born individuals in our United States armed services serving our country. Over 95,000 of those individuals were naturalized U.S. citizens. They were not born in this country, but they went through the process of becoming citizens and serve our country proudly. More than 10,000 of those servicemembers are not U.S.-born citizens. They stand on the front lines because they believe in what America stands for. Let's get to work, pass comprehensive immigration reform, and earn the honor of their service and their sacrifice.

Every day we await action on a comprehensive immigration reform bill, millions of dollars in potential revenue is lost to Americans in our country. Our farms do not have a stable workforce. Far too many high-tech companies are short the workers they need to continue to innovate and grow American jobs.

Our schools attract the best and the brightest from around the world, but when they get their degrees and want to stay in this great country, they are sent away, not allowed to start businesses and hire American citizens.

In all, the full economic potential of undocumented immigrants as workers, taxpayers, consumers, and entrepreneurs is being lost because they are unable to earn legal status. And when we grow the American economy, we create more jobs for Americans.

As many in Congress continue to deny the pressing need for comprehen-

sive immigration reform, the broken U.S. immigration system continues to tear families apart, while simultaneously draining the Federal budget and robbing our American economy. Talking about comprehensive immigration reform is not enough. It is time for Democrats and Republicans to vote together on this floor and pass a solution that will serve all of America. The time for reform is now.

The system is broken, and fixing it in an intelligent, bipartisan way is something that a majority of Americans want. Americans understand that deportation, or even self-deportation, is not an option. They support a pathway to citizenship. Even more support a pathway to legal residency. The American people want this solution.

With the introduction of H.R. 15 in our House, a bipartisan bill for comprehensive immigration reform, we have reached a significant milestone for commonsense immigration reform. The bill is practical and fair and holds everyone accountable. The bill strengthens the border, strengthens the economy, and provides a pathway to citizenship for people who have lived, worked, and raised their families right here in the United States of America.

We cannot wait any longer. It is time for Speaker BOEHNER to bring a comprehensive immigration reform bill to the floor of this House and let the will of the American people have its way. America deserves a solution. We are ready for a vote. It is time that our House do the will of the people, that we have a comprehensive immigration reform bill come to this floor and allow Republicans and Democrats to vote their conscience and pass that bill.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from California.

And just to highlight how we can improve our security as a Nation and honor the tradition of contributions that veterans have made to the security of our Nation, by simply allowing young people loyal to our country, who have lived here and it is the only country they know, who are able to work legally under DACA, simply allowing them, if they choose to, to put their lives on the line for the country that they love, that will make us all safer, Madam Speaker, and is part of H.R. 15 and comprehensive immigration reform.

I yield to another leader in the effort to fix our broken immigration system, a gentleman from a large district in Texas that covers a lot of the border, my good friend, Mr. GALLEGU.

Mr. GALLEGU. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Madam Speaker, thank you so much for the opportunity to speak.

This past Veterans Day, I had the opportunity to recognize and to thank those who served in the military with a duty to defend our country. I and all of us, I think, who serve in this Chamber have a duty to these veterans to defend their needs here in the U.S. Congress, and that would include the need for comprehensive immigration reform.

I am very privileged to represent a portion of San Antonio, Texas, known as Military City, USA. This past weekend, at a Veterans Day ceremony at Fort Sam Houston National Cemetery, there was a different aspect of that celebration for veterans, because this past weekend, as we honored veterans on Veterans Day at Fort Sam Houston National Cemetery, there was also, at that same site, that same location, that same time, a naturalization ceremony, where 18 people, servicemembers, were naturalized.

Eddie Rivers, Theophilus Botchway, Lily Alexandra Caceres, Tashique Williams, Kwaku Bosoah, Kenneth Francis, Jr., Nabieula Samura, Maria Cervantes Ramos, Carena Garabet Akridge, Larry Ndungu, Elkanah Yator, Mario Alexis Mares, Omar Ruiz Perez, Guillermo Chavez Cardenas, Marlon Chris Gabriel, Petra Maria Thompson, Gabriel Adjetey, all of those were involved in the Veterans Day naturalization ceremony.

They came from Dominica, Ecuador, Germany, Ghana, Honduras, the Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Kenya, Mexico, Sierra Leone, Trinidad and Tobago and Syria.

You see, each year about 8,000 non-citizens join the U.S. military. Their sacrifices throughout history have been many. Immigrants who served in the U.S. military are enlistees like Lance Corporal Jose Gutierrez, who was the first U.S. serviceman killed in combat in Iraq some 10 years ago. Mr. Gutierrez, who was a native of Guatemala, arrived in the U.S. without documents at the age of 14. He received his U.S. citizenship posthumously, after his supreme sacrifice.

Others, like Alfred Rascon, emerged from the war as high achievers. Mr. Rascon, who was an undocumented immigrant from Mexico, was assigned to Fort Sam Houston for basic and for specialist medical training. He was awarded the Medal of Honor during the Vietnam war. He became a U.S. citizen, and he later served as Director of the United States Selective Service System.

The list of stories of noncitizens who have served in the U.S. military is a very long list. Enlistments by immigrants are highest during times of war. At the end of the last decade, Madam Speaker, there were over 100,000 foreign-born individuals serving in various aspects in various capacities in our Armed Forces. That is why it is so important to recognize the contributions of immigration to our national security.

On social media, through Twitter and Facebook, I made it known that I was at this ceremony on Veterans Day in San Antonio, where not only were we honoring veterans, but there was a citizenship and naturalization ceremony at the same time. And there were many comments about, How is this possible?

Well, it is and it has been. In the years since 9/11 and the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, we have, in fact, relied on immigrants in our military.

Since 2002, over 89,000 military service-members have become U.S. citizens. Immigrants in the military and other agencies critical to our national security have served as translators, for example; and through their understanding of local communities and through their understanding of local customs, they have helped collect intelligence which better protects Americans, not only at home, but also abroad.

Unfortunately, today the House leadership said that they would not consider immigration reform this year, and, frankly, that is a real tragedy. They said they wouldn't even consider looking at the Senate bill as a starting point to negotiate.

H.R. 15, of which I am a cosponsor, has 190 other cosponsors and 25 or so Republicans who have vowed to support it, and thus, the votes are there to pass immigration reform.

In this time of excessive partisanship and excessive bickering, we have to find a way forward to do the right thing for our country, for our kids, and for our future. We have to figure out a way to succeed, even if we succeed sometimes in spite of ourselves.

Especially in today's political climate, so many of us here in the House, we repeatedly talk about our commitment to principles, our commitment to fighting for what we, as individual Members, believe in. But the reality is that, in a House with 435 people and with 100 Members of the Senate and an all-or-nothing attitude, many times it produces nothing, and that all-or-nothing attitude kills immigration reform. That all-or-nothing attitude produces nothing for children who have known no other home than the United States and are here through no fault of their own. It produces nothing of the estimated \$775 billion in revenue and \$125 billion in payroll from immigrant-owned businesses, and it produces nothing of the \$175 billion in deficit reduction in the first 10 years after immigration reform is enacted or another \$700 billion in deficit reduction in the 10 years after that.

Immigrants are so important to our country in so many ways. We say it all the time. We say it all the time. Ours is a Nation of immigrants. Immigration reform is critical to our economy, to our families, and, yes, even to our national security.

□ 1930

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative POLIS.

Earlier tonight when we started this hour, I made mention of how proud I am of my grandfather, who was an immigrant from Poland. He added, along with his military colleagues, to the muscle of the military might of this Nation, and together, they were able to help serve this Nation so as to proclaim victory in the war that was to

end all wars. But we know that that wasn't the case.

Nonetheless, with that contribution to this country behind him, he returned home. He returned to build a life. He returned to build a family. He returned to build a community. He returned, like all of our veterans, to build a Nation. Why would we want to stop this pathway to progress? Why would we want to stop this pathway to economic vitality? Why would we want to stop this pathway to citizenship?

You know, it is no wonder that so many from various perspectives have come forth, imploring us in this House, imploring the Republican leadership, to set an agenda that includes immigration reform. For everyone from the Chamber of Commerce to the Farm Bureau, from labor to the farm community to the working families of this Nation to so many of the businesses that have asked for sound immigration reform, let's not stand in the way of progress. We only ask the Republican majority in this House to set the tone, open to the discussion, because if it is brought to the floor, I am convinced that we will recognize, as Representatives, as leaders of this Nation, the true definition of this Nation, a land of immigrants.

With that, I yield back to Representative POLIS and thank him for leading us in this very important discussion here this evening.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for his impassioned words.

Here in the spirit of Veterans Day week—of course we all honor our veterans every day of the year. This past Monday was Veterans Day. This week, in particular, we are honoring those who serve our Nation. I would like to share the stories of several immigrants who serve in our Armed Forces.

This is Augustus Maiyo, who serves in Colorado with the U.S. Army World Class Athlete Program at Fort Carson. I am proud to say that he won the Marine Corps Marathon last year and led the team to victory. He is a runner and has done remarkable times and ended up winning it. He was fortunate to get the run done right before Hurricane Sandy impacted our Nation. We are proud, of course. I want to thank Augustus Maiyo for his service and for being a role model for so many others.

One of the hats I wear in Congress is I cochair the U.S.-Nepal Caucus, and I am particularly proud to be able to share the story of Saral Shrestha, a Fort Bragg soldier from Katmandu, Nepal, who was selected as the 2012 Soldier of the Year. He came to the United States in 2007 from Nepal. He went to college in Nebraska, joined the Army in 2009, and was deployed in Afghanistan.

We should be proud of the contributions that our 2012 Soldier of the Year has made, himself an immigrant, an inspiration to all the men and women who serve, including those who were born in other nations.

As many of you know, the contest for Soldier of the Year is a very rigorous competition. Shrestha has been promoted to sergeant since he began the competition. We are particularly proud that the announcement was made during the Association of the United States Army annual meeting in Washington, D.C.

There were many others, Madam Speaker, that we would like to be able to share the stories of, who want to lay down their lives to defend our country and to serve with distinction but, under current law, are prevented from serving in the Armed Forces, even though under the deferred action program they are able to work, they are able to attend school in our country, and all that many of them ask is to be able to risk their lives to defend the country they love, the country they know, the United States of America. H.R. 15 and the Senate bill address this situation and would allow these brave young men and women to serve.

It is time, Madam Speaker. It is time to bring this bill forward. It is time to have a simple "yes" or "no" vote. It is what the American people are demanding. The American people are not demanding that we spend our precious hours and days debating asbestos reform. The American people are not demanding that we only work a dozen days before the end of the year here in Congress. The American people are demanding that we solve problems.

More than 70 percent of the American people support comprehensive immigration reform. It would improve the security of the Nation. It would honor the service of our veterans. It would secure our borders. It would reflect our values. It would improve our economy. It would reduce the deficit—and it would create jobs for Americans. What is not to like? Let's pass comprehensive immigration reform now.

I yield back the balance of my time.

DEFENDING ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, one thing becomes very clear from our study of history, and that is that things that nations do have consequences. Things we do individually have consequences, and things we do as a Nation have consequences. That is why some people remember that on May 30, 2010, there were six flotilla ships—and this is from the U.N. release, a report into last year's raid, how events unfolded, dated 2 September 2011.

It points out that on May 30, 2010, six flotilla ships leave Cyprus for Gaza in an attempt to break Israel's naval blockade. The Turkish cruise liner Mavi Marmara is chartered by Islamic charity IHH and carries 581 of the 700

flotilla activists. We know that didn't turn out so well. Israel did have a legitimate right to blockade the Gaza Strip to prevent more rockets, more munitions from being brought into the Gaza Strip that were being used to fire on, kill, and terrorize Israelis. Again, actions have consequences, and many remember the flotilla coming down and challenging the blockade, and there were people who were killed.

If you go back, here is an article. It is dated also May 30, 2010, which was a Sunday. But it points out—and this is an article from The Washington Times entitled, “Israel assails resolution on nuke weapons as ‘flawed,’” and it is talking about an agreement that President Obama was trying to get done, a nonproliferation agreement, and the article points out that on Friday, which was May 28, 2010:

A U.S. delegation in New York voted to endorse a consensus document ending the 2010 review conference for the Non-Proliferation Treaty that calls for a conference in 2012 to discuss a weapons of mass destruction-free zone in the Middle East.

The final document of the monthlong review conference calls on Israel to join the treaty, a move that would require Israel to disclose and then give up its undeclared nuclear arsenal.

This was viewed and discussed as being the first time in people's memory when the United States, by and through its administration—the Obama administration—had taken action that was very adverse to Israel and the international community, and particularly in the U.N. Normally we did not side with Israel's enemies.

One of the lessons that I was taught by history professors at Texas A&M is that when a nation's enemies see that nation's strongest ally pulling away, it is provocative. It often provokes action by that nation's enemies against it because they think their strongest ally is pulling away. Some saw that before the war in Korea. They thought that the United States might have North Korea beyond its “sphere of influence.” Those kinds of things, those words, these actions, these votes can be provocative.

So 2 days after the United States sides with Israel's enemies in demanding that Israel disclose its nuclear weapons, the flotilla launches to challenge the blockade. Isn't that amazing? It just happens to be right after this administration sides with Israel's enemies. Here comes a challenge to Israel's blockade that was just trying to save Israeli lives.

Well, the reason that it is important to point these things out now is, what is happening between the United States and Iran, as we leave Israel out of the equation—even though it is Israel that is considered to be the little Satan and we are considered the great Satan, and Israel is probably to be the first attacked, if there is an attack—they are certainly the most vulnerable. Yet we leave our former friend Israel out of the equation.

It brings to mind a number of things that have been happening during this

administration that have caused the vast majority of people in Israel, of Israeli citizens, to believe that this Obama administration is not concerned about Israel's best interests.

There are many who have been aware of Scripture, and it has often been a guide in our relations with Israel. It is really such an historically appropriate thing in this House of Representatives, especially if we were down the hall in the former House Chamber, now called Statuary Hall, where they used to hold church most Sundays during the 1800s. Up until the late 1800s, the largest church congregation was in the House of Representatives, and it was not considered to be violative of the Constitution because it didn't endorse a particular religion. It was considered non-denominational.

Scripture was read regularly, every week, down the hall. Thomas Jefferson had coined the phrase “separation of church and State” as being appropriate. He didn't find it offensive, that notion, and, in fact, at times would bring the Marine band to play hymns.

So it seems appropriate, when we talk about Israel, to talk about Israel's roots because in Genesis 12—and this is the King James version:

Now the Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee;

And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great, and thou shalt be a blessing;

And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee, and in thee shall all families of the Earth be blessed.

So Abram went to the land of Canaan, which later became Israel, just as God had promised in these verses. So it was no accident that just minutes after Israel became a Nation, the United States, through its President, Harry Truman, became the first nation in the world to recognize what was prophesied throughout the Old Testament about Israel returning after its absence.

□ 1945

Israel returned and Harry Truman made sure we were the first Nation that recognized them as an independent nation. The U.N. had voted unanimously. Because of the Holocaust and over 6 million Jews being killed, they wanted to ensure that another Holocaust would never happen again. And that brought about Israel being re-established in part of the land they had possessed 3,000 years before.

This is an article from The Washington Post, David Ignatius:

Is Israel preparing to attack Iran? Because it is considered a betrayal of an ally to warn an ally's enemies that that ally may take self-defensive action to prevent being attacked. And the United States and Iran, including President Obama, has said repeatedly and has promised an American-Israeli gathering here at the Convention Center that he would never allow Iran to have nuclear weapons, that it is an existential threat to Israel. It certainly is.

So we have been hearing behind the scenes for a number of years that this

administration was telling Israeli leaders, Don't you dare attack Iran without our permission. We will take care of this. We won't let them have nuclear weapons; and yet it is not the United States that is first threatened. The great Satan, the United States, in the eyes of leaders in Iran—not the Iranian people, but Iranian leaders—would get around to attacking us. But first Israel is threatened.

So there was concern, obviously, here in Washington in the Obama administration that the reported threats to Israel not to defend themselves without our permission—even though no nation should ever need permission from another to defend itself—and even President Obama said this out here at the Convention Center to an American-Israeli group. Prime Minister Netanyahu reminded me of our President's words, and I went back and looked them up. Sure enough, he said:

Israel must defend itself by itself.

Our President said that. And yet if we are not going to help Israel defend itself, which is actually defending us as well, then shouldn't we avoid jeopardizing Israel's own self-defense?

Yet here is this article dated February 2, 2012. It says:

Defense Secretary Leon Panetta has a lot on his mind these days, from cutting the defense budget to managing the drawdown of U.S. forces in Afghanistan. But his biggest worry is the growing possibility that Israel will attack Iran over the next few months.

Panetta believes there is a strong likelihood that Israel will strike Iran in April, May, or June—before Iran enters what Israeli's described as a “zone of immunity” to commence building a nuclear bomb. Very soon, the Israelis fear, the Iranians will have stored enough enriched uranium in deep underground facilities to make a weapon—and only the United States could then stop them militarily.

That is a betrayal of our ally, Israel. That is a gross betrayal of our ally, Israel. We are supposed to be on the same side; and if Israel defends itself, it is defending us as well, whether we recognize it or not.

That was a betrayal of Israel to leak what this administration believed were their plans to defend itself. If we are not going to defend ourselves, for heaven's sake, at least allow Israel to do it without putting them more in jeopardy.

By leaking that, obviously, it was this administration saying to Israel, Well, you better not go when you were thinking you were going to go because they are going to be ready because we warned your enemy for you.

So we get to May and, obviously, the window that Israel may have been considering attacking had to pass because of the leak by our own administration to Israel's enemies, through The Washington Post. An intentional leak.

This is from March 29, 2012, “Israelis Suspect Obama Media Leaks to Prevent Strike on Iran,” by Alexander Marquardt from ABC News:

Two reports today about Iran's nuclear program and the possibility of an Israeli

military strike have analysts in Israel accusing the Obama administration of leaking information to pressure Israel not to bomb Iran and for Iran to reach a compromise in upcoming nuclear talks.

That is simply outrageous.

This article says, continuing that same article:

The first report in Foreign Policy quotes anonymous American officials saying that Israel has been given access to air bases by Iran's northern neighbor Azerbaijan from which Israel could launch air strikes or at least drones and search and rescue aircraft.

The article goes on:

It seems like a big campaign to prevent Israel from attacking, analyst Yoel Guzansky at the Institute for National Security Studies told ABC News. I think the Obama administration is really worried Jerusalem will attack—and attack soon. They're trying hard to prevent it in so many ways.

The Foreign Policy report by Mark Perry quotes an intelligence officer saying, We're watching what Iran does closely. But we're now watching what Israel is doing in Azerbaijan. And we're not happy about it.

Further down:

In recent weeks the Obama administration shifted from persuasion efforts vis-a-vis decisionmakers and Israel's public opinion to a practical, targeted assassination of potential Israeli operations in Iran, Ben-Yishai writes. The campaign's aims are fully operational: to make it more difficult for Israeli decisionmakers to order the Israeli defense forces to carry out a strike, and what's even graver, to erode the IDF's capacity to launch a strike with minimal casualties.

We are putting Israel's own forces at far greater risk for casualties. Is that something an ally does to a friend?

Some of us believe that the Bible is accurate. Certainly, so many prophecies have been fulfilled. And if that is true, this administration, unless they can find a verse that accurately says that those who betray Israel will be blessed, then this country is being dug in a deeper hole by this administration and its betrayals of Israel's trust and Israel's friendship.

This is from November 3, 2013, from TheBlaze, "Fury, Scandalous: Israel Conveys Bitter Protests to Obama Admin Over Reported White House Security Leak."

This says:

The Israeli government conveyed "bitter protests" to the White House this weekend over the Obama administration's reported leak of who was behind last week's air raid on a Syrian base near the port city of Latakia. Words being used by the media and officials speaking anonymously in Israel to describe what they perceive as a breach in trust on the part of the United States include fury, scandalous, baffled, unthinkable.

This administration continues to betray our friend, our ally, Israel.

Other things that have happened in the past were the comments made by President Obama to President Sarkozy in 2012 at a G-20 summit which were belittling Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, comments in 2011 that Israel should return to its 1967 borders that would have subjected it to relentless attacks and vulnerability. They were not helpful to our friend and ally.

The Obama administration's failure to condemn Palestinians building of illegal settlements, yet constantly criticizing Israeli housing plans for East Jerusalem; the Obama administration's decision to eradicate the missile defense programs that would have helped Israel as well as the United States; leaving Prime Minister Netanyahu in 2010 on for over an hour in the White House meeting room while President Obama dined with his family and refused to take a picture with him was not a friendly gesture.

Also, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton announced the Obama administration planned to send \$147 million to the West Bank and Hamas-run Gaza; President Obama stated that all his friends in Chicago were Jewish and says he was sometimes being accused of being a Jewish "puppet"; the Obama administration leak to The Washington Post of the time window in which Israel would take out Iran's nuclear program; the Obama administration leaked to the media that Israel was going to use the Azerbaijan airspace to take out Iran's nuclear program.

We placed immense pressure on Israel not to defend itself without the United States' permission. The Obama administration has never rejected or condemned the racist, hateful teachings about Jewish people going on in Palestinian schools in the Middle East and in some Muslim schools in the United States.

President Obama traveled to Turkey, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt and apologized to them on behalf of the United States. The Obama administration's support for the Muslim Brotherhood's rise to power in Egypt as well as throughout the Middle East, though the Muslim Brotherhood had never backed away from their demand for the nonexistence of Israel, the Obama administration continues to support the Muslim Brotherhood's return to power in Egypt, when Egypt is where the Muslim Brotherhood turned violent on Morsi's arrest because of his violation of the constitution that did not provide for impeachment, after the Egyptian people turned out in the millions to demand his removal.

It was not a coup, as the Christian Pope in Egypt told me. It was not a coup. This was a people rising up and demanding removal, and yet this administration now has cut off support because Egypt does not want the group, the Muslim Brotherhood, that was killing Christians, burning churches, terrorizing the nation, we want them back in charge—this administration does.

It is an outrage.

Though the Syrian leader Assad has been ruthless in killing and abusing his people, has not been helpful to Israel to the extent the Egyptian leader Mubarak was, this administration has not done anything but put Israel in more jeopardy by its actions in Syria.

So we have not been terribly helpful to our friend Israel. And it doesn't

sound like we are actually blessing Israel. It sounds like we are cursing Israel, belittling its leaders, marginalizing its efforts to defend itself, which also enures to our benefit.

My oath of office is to this country. When I was in the Army for 4 years, my oath was to this country. My allegiance continues to this country, and I believe that being Israel's friend is helpful to this country; and that is why I so strongly support being a friend to Israel.

And even if you took the Bible completely out, you took out most anything except just looking at the Middle East and who believes in the value of life like we do here in the United States, who believes more in democratic actions like we do in the United States, then Israel should certainly be our friend.

But what this administration is doing with Iran is foolhardy. It is foolhardy. And thank God for France. They didn't wave a white flag of surrender. They said, This is a terrible deal. And thank goodness they slowed it down, because this administration thinks they just knew and everything they try will work perfectly. Hello, ObamaCare.

□ 2000

It doesn't work any better when they try to mess with our friendships and reward our enemies and hurt our friends.

So, in the few minutes that are remaining, Madam Speaker, I would like to reference back to the New York Times article by Barry James, October 21, 1994, during the Clinton administration.

The director of the International Atomic Energy Agency expressed skepticism Thursday about the U.S.-North Korean nuclear agreement, saying it could delay inspections by the agency.

Officials at the agency, some U.S. Republican Senators and politicians in South Korea criticized the accord, saying they feared Pyongyang had bought itself a further 5 years of secrecy, thus concealing whether it has reprocessed enough plutonium to build one or more nuclear weapons.

The energy agency says it needs to inspect two nuclear waste dumps to be able to answer the question. North Korea has never conceded the existence of the dumps. "It would be in the interests of all concerned that a prolonged delay be avoided," said the agency director, Hans Blix; but, he added, "We are better off" with the agreement than with none at all. "We have to worry about how much they have squirreled away," an agency official said. "Blix thinks 5 years is a long time to have to wait for our inspectors to gain access to the facilities we need to see, including the two facilities the North Koreans have never declared."

Yet, under the agreement that the Clinton administration reached, North Korea agreed to place in storage the fuel removed last spring from a 5-megawatt graphite reactor containing enough plutonium for four or five nuclear bombs. U.S. Republican Senators protested in a letter to President Bill Clinton that this reversed longstanding U.S. policy because it allowed the North Koreans to hang onto their spent fuel rods and would delay for several years the inspection of suspect sites.

The accord “shows it is always possible to get an agreement when you give enough away,” said Senator Bob Dole of Kansas . . . The deal also has been heavily criticized in South Korea. Many people there see it as a diplomatic triumph for Pyongyang, which failed to dispel doubts about its nuclear intentions.

As part of the pact, which will be signed in Geneva on Friday, the United States will head an international consortium to provide North Korea with an interim supply of fuel to overcome its chronic energy shortage and, eventually, two 1,000-megawatt light-water reactors. In exchange, North Korea will abandon its existing nuclear facilities and renounce any plans to build nuclear weapons.

Gee, doesn't that sound familiar? This administration is repeating the same mistakes of Madeleine Albright and Bill Clinton as President. They are running to Iran, which can not be trusted, which has lied repeatedly just like North Korea did.

And how did the Clinton deal work out? Yes, they took the nuclear facilities we provided them, but they didn't stand good behind their promise not to develop nuclear weapons. They developed them and we helped them.

Now this administration wants to do the same thing with Iran? We are still paying for the mistakes of the Clinton administration with North Korea's helping them get more nuclear power—and now this administration wants to do that with Iran? That is a huge mistake.

We need to help our friend Israel, to stop betraying them, to help our friends, to stop rewarding our enemies, because the consequences to this Nation will be dire if we don't turn this around.

Madam Speaker, it is my prayer—it is my hope—that this administration will turn from its stupid ways. The arrogance that existed before ObamaCare kicked in surely should have come down a notch so that they can realize maybe we are making a mistake in dealing with bloodthirsty people in Iran as well.

This country's future is at stake. That ought to be enough to make this administration slow down and realize they are about to make another huge mistake that we will pay for for generations if they don't stop. Iran will certainly not stop just as North Korea did not. They had gotten help from North Korea. They learned the lesson from North Korea. It is time this administration learned a lesson from our mistake and from the mistake of the Clinton administration and Madeleine Albright.

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

THE PRICE IS WRONG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 30 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, everyone has heard about “The Price is

Right,” but on C-SPAN tonight, we are going to play “The Price is Wrong.” Before doing so, I want to put this in perspective.

A number of years ago, we were all aghast as taxpayers—even here as Members of Congress—when we found out that in the Department of Defense we were spending \$436 on a hammer, that we spent \$7,600 on a coffee urn, and that—oh, yes—we spent \$640 on a toilet seat. Talk about flushing money down a toilet—we were doing it—but that fleecing that we thought had ended has actually continued.

Since 2010, the inspector general of the Department of Defense has found that we are spending more than \$430 million over what we should be paying for spare parts—thousands of spare parts. So we are paying much more than the fair or reasonable price for these parts. What the military should do when it needs parts is go to what is called the Defense Logistics Agency, DLA—it is sort of like the defense hardware store—but sometimes they think it is cheaper and, maybe, faster if they go to a defense contractor and ask for those parts.

These audits also showed that the certain parts we have in such volume will last us 100 years. That is like having spare parts like, let's say, horseshoes dating back to World War I, and they are sitting around the defense hardware store today—more than 100 years' worth of certain spare parts. You might think maybe this is a little complicated, but it is really not complicated. The auditors go to the Department of Defense databases, and they can tell immediately, with just a click, whether or not these spare parts are in stock and how much they will be charged for those spare parts.

So let's play our very first game of “The Price is Wrong.”

This is a ramp gate roller assembly. It is about the size of a quarter. This particular assembly sells for \$7.71 in the defense hardware store. The auditors suggested—maybe because this is, in fact, for a Chinook helicopter—that it could be even a little bit more. What did the personnel within the Department of Defense pay for this little assembly? It wasn't \$7.71. Was it perhaps \$77.10? No, it wasn't \$77.10. Was it \$771? No, it wasn't \$771. We paid for this \$7.71 part \$1,678.61.

The price is wrong, and the Department of Defense has got to clean up its act.

Let's move on to yet another game that we can play. It is called “That's Too Much.”

I am going to show you another part. This is a bearing sleeve, and you are going to tell me whether or not you think the price is too much. At the local hardware store, this would sell for \$6. Again, this is for a Chinook helicopter. The inspector general says maybe, for this sophisticated helicopter, it would cost \$10 for this part. So, what did we pay for this part? Did we pay \$86? No, we didn't pay \$86. Did

we pay \$286? No, we didn't pay \$286. We paid \$2,286 for this little part. Now, we didn't just buy one part. We bought 573 of these parts, of this little bearing sleeve, and it cost us \$1.3 million.

All right. If you haven't enjoyed playing this game so far, we have one more game to play tonight. This game is the finale. It is called the “Showcase Showdown.” This is when we compare two packages and see which one costs more.

Our first items here are two simple ramp gate roller assemblies. Now, which is more expensive—these two ramp gate roller assemblies or a trip to Paris, France, for two, including airfare and hotel for four nights? Which is more expensive? If you guessed the trip to Paris, France, you would be wrong because a trip to Paris, France, if you go on one of the local Web sites, would cost \$2,681, and we paid—or, I should say, the Army paid—\$3,357 for these two ramp gate roller assemblies.

The Pentagon is playing games with taxpayer dollars, and let me tell you that this is just the tip of the iceberg. The worst part of this game is that it is rigged. The contractors always win, and the taxpayers always lose.

The inspector general found that the Army overpaid one defense contractor \$13 million but that the Pentagon only recovered \$2.6 million. Now get this: it is discovered that one defense contractor overcharged us \$13 million for a number of parts, and then after it was exposed, they didn't even refund us what they should have. They only paid us back \$2.6 million. It included paying twice the fair and reasonable price for kits and overpaying by \$16,000 for a structural support that should have cost only \$1,300.

Now, this bearing sleeve that I just showed you that was over \$2,200, let's put it in kind of simple terms.

If we went into a local cafe and ordered the blue light special and the menu said it was \$2,200, we would walk right out, and they would be laughed out of our community—but no, that doesn't happen in the military. As for that defense contractor who overcharged us and then didn't even pay us back what they had overcharged us—get this—the Air Force has just signed on the dotted line a contract with this defense contractor to do the following: to manage the supply chain. It is almost laughable that the defense contractor who ripped us off now has another contract to manage the supply chain.

Those are all of the games we have for tonight. Thank you for playing. We will see you next time on “The Price is Wrong.”

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1499. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 278 Main Street in Chadron, Nebraska, as the "Sergeant Cory Mracek Memorial Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

S. 1512. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1335 Jefferson Road in Rochester, New York, as the "Specialist Theodore Matthew Glende Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

S. 1557. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize support for graduate medical education programs in children's hospitals; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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. 2747. An act to amend title 40, United States Code, to transfer certain functions from the Government Accountability Office to the Department of Labor relating to the processing of claims for the payment of workers who were not paid appropriate wages under certain provisions of such title.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on October 31, 2013, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 3190. To provide for the continued performance of the functions of the United States Parole Commission, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 14, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3636. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the 2013 Annual Report on the Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarship Program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3637. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergency Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pur-

suant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3638. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the 2012 annual report on the activities and operations of the Public Integrity Section, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 529; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3639. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition on behalf of workers employed at the Baker Brothers site in Toledo, Ohio, to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3640. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition on behalf of workers employed at the Feed Materials Production Center (FMPC) in Fernand, Ohio, to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3641. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Small Business Size Standards: Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting (RIN: 3245-AG43) received October 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

3642. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Small Business Size Standards: Support Activities for Mining (RIN: 3245-AG44) received October 28, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

3643. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Ballard Canyon Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2013-0001; T.D. TTB-116; Ref. Notice No. 132] (RIN: 1513-AB98) received October 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3644. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Big Valley District-Lake County and Kelsey Bench-Lake County Viticultural Areas and Modification of the Red Hills Lake County Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2013-0003; T.D. TTB-118; Ref. Notice No. 134] (RIN: 1515-AB99) received October 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3645. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Moon Mountain District Sonoma County Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2013-0002; T.D. TTB-117; Ref. Notice No. 133] (RIN: 1513-AC00) received October 30, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 3461. A bill to support early learning; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 3462. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from the definition of health insurance coverage certain medical stop-loss insurance obtained by certain plan sponsors of group health plans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and 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. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. BARBER, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 3463. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to ensure proper manpower on the United States border and to provide for reforms to rates of pay for Border Patrol agents; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LOBIONDO (for himself and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H.R. 3464. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to discharges incidental to the normal operation of certain vessels; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BACHUS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 3465. A bill to reauthorize the Second Chance Act of 2007; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 3466. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to apply the prohibition against the conversion of contributions to personal use to contributions accepted by political committees; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. JONES, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HIGGINS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 3467. A bill to enhance reciprocal market access for United States domestic producers in the negotiating process of bilateral, regional, and multilateral trade agreements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 3468. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to extend insurance coverage to amounts held in a member account on behalf of another person, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ENYART, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr.

GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. MENG, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. HONDA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. COOK, Mr. COLE, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. WATERS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 3469. A bill to amend titles 5 and 38, United States Code, to clarify the veteran status of an individual based on the attendance of the individual at a preparatory school of a service academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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. ROYCE (for himself and Mr. ENGEL):

H.R. 3470. A bill to provide for the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. CHU (for herself, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HOLT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. WELCH, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. ESTY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MENG, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. WATERS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 3471. A bill to protect a woman's right to determine whether and when to bear a child or end a pregnancy by limiting restrictions on the provision of abortion services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 3472. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13127 Broadway Street in Alden, New York, as the "Sergeant Brett E. Gornewicz Memorial Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 3473. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the qualifying therapeutic discovery project credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 3474. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of the employer mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 3475. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to provide protections for cruise vessel passengers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 3476. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the American Opportunity Tax Credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3477. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide support to university law school programs that are designed to provide legal assistance to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. BENTIVOLIO, and Mr. STOCKMAN):

H.R. 3478. A bill to protect the right of law-abiding citizens to transport knives interstate, notwithstanding a patchwork of local and State prohibitions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THORNBERRY (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. BENTIVOLIO):

H.R. 3479. A bill to provide a taxpayer bill of rights for small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. TSONGAS:

H.R. 3480. A bill to prohibit entities from using Federal funds to contribute to political campaigns or participate in lobbying activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. COLE):

H.J. Res. 102. A joint resolution providing for the appointment of Risa Lavizzo-Mourey as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. COLE):

H.J. Res. 103. A joint resolution providing for the appointment of John Fahey as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. HONDA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. MOORE, Ms. HAHN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. MENG, Ms. CHU, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H. Res. 408. A resolution expressing sincere condolences and support for assistance to the people of the Philippines and all those af-

ected by the tragic Super Typhoon Haiyan (Yolanda) of November 8, 2013; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BACHMANN (for herself, Ms. BASS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. JONES, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KLINE, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MARINO, Mr. NUNNELEE, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. TERRY, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H. Res. 409. A resolution expressing support for the goals of National Adoption Day and National Adoption Month by promoting national awareness of adoption and the children awaiting families, celebrating children and families involved in adoption, and encouraging the people of the United States to secure safety, permanency, and well-being for all children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER):

H. Res. 410. A resolution expressing support for the designation of a "Small Business Saturday" and supporting efforts to increase awareness of the value of locally owned small businesses; to the Committee on Small Business.

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. GEORGE MILLER of California:

H.R. 3461.

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. CASSIDY:

H.R. 3462.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, paragraph 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 3463.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution: 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. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 3464.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 3465.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 3466.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4 of the U.S. Constitution, which states that "Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations" regarding the "Times, Places and Manner of holding elections."

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 3467.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 3468.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution to regulate commerce.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 3469.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Because this bill affects spending by the United States, in that it alters the definition of a constitutionally-permissible class (military Veterans) that receives funds from the federal government, Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution which empowers Congress "To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common defence [sic] and general Welfare of the United States" and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, which empowers Congress to "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. ROYCE:

H.R. 3470.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. CHU:

H.R. 3471.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States of America and Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, the authority to enact this legislation rests with the Congress.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 3472.

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 Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 3473.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

16th Amendment

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 3474.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 3475.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 3476.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3477.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 3478.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 18 "The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

As it is the purpose of the government of the United States to protect and defend the natural and inalienable rights of the American citizen, it is necessary and proper for the Congress to legislate, when necessary, to ensure the ability of the citizenry to keep and bear arms and to travel with such arms while taking reasonable precautions to ensure the safety of his/her fellows and to respect state and local laws.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 3479.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imports 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 Ms. TSONGAS:

H.R. 3480.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas

H.J. Res. 102.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17, giving Congress exclusive jurisdiction over the District of Columbia. That clause was cited as the authority for the government's ability to accept the original Smithsonian donation and the creation of the Smithsonian Institution via the Act of August 10, 1846.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper clause, which provides the power to enact legislation necessary to effectuate one of the earlier enumerated powers, such as the authority granted in Clause 17 above.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.J. Res. 103.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17, giving Congress exclusive jurisdiction over the District of Columbia. That clause was cited as the authority for the government's ability to accept the original Smithsonian donation and the creation of the Smithsonian Institution via the Act of August 10, 1846.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper clause, which provides the power to enact legislation necessary to effectuate one of the earlier enumerated powers, such as the authority granted in Clause 17 above.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 129: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 274: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 292: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 351: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 411: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 455: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 494: Ms. DELBENE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 564: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 631: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 647: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 664: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 685: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 713: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. HAHN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 719: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 732: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 831: Mr. JEFFRIES and Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 858: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 861: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 920: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 940: Mr. STUTZMAN and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 961: Mr. CARNEY and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1000: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 1015: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1020: Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 1024: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 1027: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 1091: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 1098: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1105: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 1125: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 1176: Mr. COTTON.

H.R. 1179: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1199: Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 1209: Mr. JOYCE, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 1226: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1240: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1250: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1295: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1318: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 1331: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 1337: Mr. YOHO, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 1339: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 1354: Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 1453: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1528: Mr. HUDSON, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. KIND, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 1557: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1563: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 1661: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 1692: Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1726: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1767: Mr. ENYART, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SHEAPORTER, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1775: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1812: Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 1814: Mr. FARR and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

H.R. 1823: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1837: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 1845: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1851: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1861: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1869: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.

- H.R. 1914: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. BASS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
- H.R. 1950: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
- H.R. 1984: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
- H.R. 2019: Mr. WOLF.
- H.R. 2027: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
- H.R. 2028: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. DELBENE.
- H.R. 2041: Mr. WALBERG.
- H.R. 2073: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
- H.R. 2086: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
- H.R. 2093: Mr. OWENS.
- H.R. 2118: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
- H.R. 2120: Mr. WAXMAN.
- H.R. 2123: Mr. MARINO, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. AMODEI.
- H.R. 2203: Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. MCINTYRE.
- H.R. 2233: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
- H.R. 2247: Mr. BOUSTANY.
- H.R. 2263: Mr. BURGESS.
- H.R. 2315: Mr. POMPEO, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. WOLF, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. KIND.
- H.R. 2328: Mr. GOODLATTE.
- H.R. 2429: Mr. MARINO and Mr. SHUSTER.
- H.R. 2509: Ms. EDWARDS and Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD.
- H.R. 2536: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
- H.R. 2575: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
- H.R. 2697: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
- H.R. 2723: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
- H.R. 2725: Mrs. BACHMANN.
- H.R. 2780: Mr. KEATING, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
- H.R. 2783: Mr. NOLAN and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
- H.R. 2785: Mrs. BEATTY.
- H.R. 2791: Mr. SHUSTER.
- H.R. 2805: Mrs. BLACK.
- H.R. 2807: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
- H.R. 2822: Mr. ELLISON.
- H.R. 2866: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. HIGGINS.
- H.R. 2902: Mr. PETERS of California.
- H.R. 2911: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
- H.R. 2932: Mr. TERRY.
- H.R. 2941: Mr. CALVERT.
- H.R. 2955: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. LYNCH.
- H.R. 2957: Mr. JOYCE, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. HONDA, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. POLIS.
- H.R. 2967: Mr. COTTON.
- H.R. 2983: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. HOLT.
- H.R. 3017: Mr. GIBSON.
- H.R. 3022: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Ms. EDWARDS.
- H.R. 3038: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mrs. BACHMANN.
- H.R. 3111: Mr. SALMON, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. TERRY, Mr. LONG, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
- H.R. 3113: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
- H.R. 3116: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
- H.R. 3121: Mr. WOMACK, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
- H.R. 3122: Mr. KIND.
- H.R. 3137: Ms. ESHOO.
- H.R. 3154: Mr. YODER, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. WALBERG.
- H.R. 3179: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. POLIS.
- H.R. 3206: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
- H.R. 3240: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. COTTON, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. MICHAUD.
- H.R. 3292: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
- H.R. 3299: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
- H.R. 3311: Mr. JONES, Mr. PERRY, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. YOHO, Mr. ROSS, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. ROKITA.
- H.R. 3333: Mr. KING of New York.
- H.R. 3335: Mr. FLEMING, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
- H.R. 3344: Mr. HULTGREN.
- H.R. 3350: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. FORBES, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
- H.R. 3360: Mr. POCAN.
- H.R. 3361: Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. RIBBLE.
- H.R. 3367: Mr. BARBER.
- H.R. 3369: Mr. WOLF, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. TAKANO.
- H.R. 3374: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
- H.R. 3382: Mr. DEUTCH.
- H.R. 3388: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
- H.R. 3391: Mr. POCAN, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. MORAN.
- H.R. 3397: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MAFFEI, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
- H.R. 3406: Mr. LIPINSKI.
- H.R. 3408: Mr. JONES, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. BUCHANAN.
- H.R. 3416: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. LAMALFA, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. YOHO, Mr. ROSS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. MARCHANT.
- H.R. 3429: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, and Mr. MARCHANT.
- H.R. 3435: Mr. MCNERNEY.
- H.R. 3446: Mr. MEEKS and Ms. BONAMICI.
- H.R. 3448: Mr. FINCHER.
- H.J. Res. 68: Mr. DOYLE.
- H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. WILLIAMS.
- H. Con. Res. 55: Mr. MCCAUL.
- H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. KILMER.
- H. Res. 11: Mr. NOLAN.
- H. Res. 109: Mr. LEWIS.
- H. Res. 135: Mr. LEVIN.
- H. Res. 153: Mr. CHABOT.
- H. Res. 250: Mrs. BACHMANN and Mr. LAMALFA.
- H. Res. 296: Ms. FOX.
- H. Res. 301: Mr. HOLT.
- H. Res. 302: Mr. HARRIS.
- H. Res. 356: Mrs. BACHMANN and Mrs. CAPITO.
- H. Res. 360: Mr. BURGESS.
- H. Res. 365: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BARBER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. NEAL, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. JONES, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KIND, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. RUIZ.
- H. Res. 398: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. COHEN.
- H. Res. 404: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. SIREN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. VARGAS.
- H. Res. 405: Mr. LONG, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
- H. Res. 406: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 3350 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.