



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 2014

No. 62

## House of Representatives

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

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
April 29, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN J. DUNCAN, Jr. 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 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

### HONORING W. RONALD COALE

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life and legacy of my friend, W. Ronald Coale, who passed away on April 17, 2014.

Ron was a native of Stockton, California. He went to local schools, graduated from Stockton College, and acquired a teaching certificate in the field of transportation and distribution from the University of California at Berkeley. Dedicated to his country,

Ron was a veteran of the Korean war, serving in the United States Army from 1952 to 1954.

His life was dedicated to serving the community in a variety of jobs, including as a member of the Stockton Metropolitan Transit District Board of Directors; Stockton City Council, serving as vice mayor in 1985; San Joaquin County Council of Governments; California Public Utility Commission; Stockton Port District Board of Port Commissioners.

Appointed by the Stockton City Council to the Board of Port Commissioners in 1991, Ron served with distinction as the commissioner for 20 years. During his tenure on the Stockton Port Commission, Ron's leadership was apparent from the onset, and in the year 2000 he helped the Port of Stockton secure Rough and Ready Island from the United States Navy.

By acquiring Rough and Ready Island, the Port of Stockton became the third largest port in California, the largest inland port in terms of acreage in California, and the second busiest inland port on the west coast. This allowed the Port of Stockton to better serve California's expanding agriculture industry, and is essential given its proximity to major transportation hubs in the State.

Ron also served on various boards and commissions at the State and local levels in California. He was a former member of the advisory board of the YMCA of San Joaquin County, a member of the Stockton Salvation Army, and a former gubernatorial appointee to the Atascadero State Hospital Advisory Board. In these roles, Ron helped to reach our youth and help those in need.

As a veteran, Ron was a member of Karl Ross Post of the American Legion in Stockton. He was a member of my U.S. service academy nomination committee. His knowledge and expertise was invaluable to the young men and

women who are joining our Armed Forces. Ron was also a frequent visitor to my Stockton district office, and he knew my entire staff, and we appreciated him.

Ron was a 33rd Degree Scottish Rite Mason, the highest degree for a mason. He was appointed to the office of Personal Representative of the Sovereign Grand Inspector General of California for the Stockton Scottish Rite in April 1992, serving in that position until May 2003.

He was instrumental in partnering the Stockton Scottish Rite Childhood Language Disorders Center and the speech and language department of the University of the Pacific. Throughout his partnership, the Stockton Center became a flagship for all Scottish Rite Childhood Language Disorders Centers in California, providing speech therapy treatment to children throughout our community. This center now serves approximately 100 children each week free of charge.

Ron's impact on our community and lives around him will not be forgotten. Ron always brought a smile and a warm sense of humor. To know Ron was to know a dear friend. He was one of Stockton's most dedicated citizens, and we will miss him.

Ron was preceded in death by his wife of 50 years, Mary Ellen Coale. Ron is survived by his two sons, Ronald W. and Michael W., and five grandchildren: Ronald Thomas, Stephanie Lynn, Christopher Aaron, Jeffrey Michael, and Tyler Joseph Coale.

### THE NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, last week as I traveled my State, over and over again people encouraged me with a simple statement, "I pray for you."

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.

H3245

Those powerful words pack a tremendous amount of compassion and theology. It is the belief of millions of Americans that there is a God who created us, He cares for us, and He is interested in our lives. It is the belief that if we pray, a loving God hears our prayer and He responds to our needs and the needs of others.

This is the week of the National Day of Prayer. This is a time for us to be able to reflect on prayer and to remember and recognize the Americans who value prayer. I share the belief with many others that people are separated from God because of our choices to walk away from God and God's path for our lives, so people live their lives alone, even in a crowd. The Bible says, in Romans 6:23:

The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Christ Jesus, our Lord.

Simply put, what we earn for what we do wrong is separation from life, real life. God gives us the opportunity to have eternal life, life with God forever, by accepting the gift of Jesus Christ through his death and his resurrection.

It was my first real prayer. When I was 8 years old, I realized for the first time that there is a God and I did not know Him. I was separated from Him. At my home, I prayed for Jesus to forgive my sin and come into my life and take control. It is that same simple prayer that millions of others have prayed to begin a walk with God.

The Bible teaches us—and I believe—that God hears our prayer, not because of our good behavior, but because God opened the line of communication when Jesus paid for our sin on the cross, and I accepted His offer of forgiveness and a relationship.

It begs the question still: Does it matter if we pray and pray for each other? Yes is the simple answer. Prayer puts our hearts and thoughts back in line with God's design. Prayer allows us an opportunity to spread out our most painful problems before a loving God. Prayer also provides an opportunity for the God who can do anything to demonstrate His care and power in a world that thinks they do not need God.

This attitude is not new. President Lincoln in his proclamation for a National Day of Prayer on March 30, 1863, wrote this:

We have been the recipients of the choicest bounties of Heaven. We have been preserved, these many years, in peace and prosperity. We have grown in numbers, wealth, and power as no other nation has ever grown. But we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the gracious hand which preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched us and strengthened us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all these blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own. Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us. It behooves us then to humble ourselves before the offended Power, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness.

The National Day of Prayer is not a mandate to pray. It is not a congressional establishment of religion. It is two things: a congressional acknowledgment that millions of people in our Nation believe in God, and they believe that God hears our prayers and responds when we pray; and a request that those who believe in prayer should pray, and pray for our Nation and pray for our Nation's leaders.

If you are considering calling my office to complain that I mentioned prayer and God on the House floor, you are always welcome to call, but you are not going to change my mind, and you are not going to change our Nation. Each day we begin with prayer in the House of Representatives. The words of our national motto, "In God We Trust," are emblazoned on the wall right over my right shoulder. There is a prayer chapel in the Capitol set aside for Members of Congress to stop and pray before votes. We have always had prayer as a nation. That is the free exercise of religion that is protected by the Constitution.

I am well aware that some people want people of faith to be silent and never speak about God in public. They condemn my insensitivity for their lack of belief by trying to require a fellow free American to live life more like them. But I would remind them that they are not required to believe in God because they are an American, and I am not required to stop believing in God just because I represent Americans. We are both free. You can choose not to pray, and I can choose to pray for you.

For those in our Nation that pray, I humbly request that you set aside this National Day of Prayer to renew your commitment to pray for our Nation. We need God's help in our Nation right now. We are in obvious trouble and conflict. Even many Christians that I meet would rather complain than pray.

For everyone who says to me we are too far gone in debt, our culture is past the tipping point, we have lost our way forever, I tell them that I believe there is still a God in Heaven who hears our prayer, who cares about our lives. I will work, but I will also pray, and I ask you to join me.

Let's pray.

#### RENEW UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to show you and my colleagues the faces of the Americans that are hurting by refusing to renew unemployment benefits.

Just 3 days after Christmas, this House leadership left these people out in the cold and made it more difficult for them to provide for their family, to buy food, to pay their mortgages or pay their rent. It has been 4 months

since the House Republican leaders turned their backs on millions of unemployed Americans, and the situation grows more dire for these individuals and their families with each passing day.

For far too long, this Congress has described the long-term unemployed in numbers, figures, and statistics only. Well, today I hope that will begin to change and that the Speaker and other Republicans leaders will understand what is happening to real people because of their refusal to extend unemployment benefits.

I am launching something called the "Faces of the Unemployed" to show my colleagues on the other side of the aisle just who they are hurting. This poster board will be outside my office, and I will be adding people to it as they share their stories. It will force my Republican colleagues to look into their eyes as they pass them in the hallway and to understand that these individuals should not be invisible.

Mr. Speaker, I want you and all of my colleagues to look at these faces and explain to your colleagues and to America why you won't allow a vote that will help them put food on their table, pay their rent, and provide for their families.

These are real people, Mr. Speaker, who have been left behind and forgotten about by this body. It is disgraceful that, while the Republican budget spends billions of dollars abroad and protects special interest tax loopholes that encourage companies to ship American jobs overseas, this body can't provide immediate relief to the long-term unemployed who are still recovering from the Great Recession.

In the end, this debate is about more than dollars and cents. It is about the families who continue to lose unemployment benefits with each passing day that the House fails to act. It is about the more than 200,000 veterans and more than a million children who have been affected by this loss of benefits.

It is about my constituents, Michael from Riverside, Rhode Island, who is about to lose his electricity and gas because he can't pay his bills and, in his own words, has "nowhere to turn."

It is about Paula from Bristol, who has always worked since she was 15 years old and says she is "being made to feel like a thief."

It is about Lillian from North Providence, who said she would "rather be working" but can't find a job.

These stories are not unique to Rhode Island. This is happening to people in every part of our country: Nevada, Illinois, California, Kentucky, and Mississippi, to name a few. These people aren't Republicans or Democrats. They are hardworking Americans who can't find work and need our help.

It is time to put aside our differences and come together to provide immediate relief to these struggling families. In tough times, Congress has a

longstanding history of extending these benefits, as we saw during the Bush administration. I urge Speaker BOEHNER to look at the faces of these unemployed Americans and hear their stories so we can work together to solve this problem as we have in the past.

These photos and stories will be posted outside my office—and I hope many of my colleagues will do the same—to serve as a reminder that this is about the individuals and the families who are hurting every day because we have not extended this critical lifeline. I hope this will put a face on the real stories of the people who are hurting and it will cause the Speaker to bring a bill to the floor that will extend unemployment so we can answer the call and be sure that we are doing everything we can to help those most in need.

□ 1015

TRIBUTE TO MASTER CHIEF  
PETTY OFFICER GARY “DOC”  
WELT

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

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great American hero, a quiet legend in the special operations community and in military medicine, Master Chief Petty Officer Gary “Doc” Welt.

Doc Welt passed away on April 8 due to complications of ALS. He passed away in Seminole, Florida, surrounded by his family. He was only 55 years old. He dedicated his life to service—service to his country, to his family, to those in the ALS community, and service to his brotherhood of special operators.

He joined the Navy in 1976, becoming a Navy SEAL in 1980, proudly serving on SEAL Teams 2, 4, and 8. He also served instructor tours at the John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center and the Naval Special Warfare Center. After retiring in 2006 as a USSOCOM senior enlisted medical adviser, Doc continued to serve as a contract specialist, conducting counterterrorism and counter-piracy operations until 2012.

Doc is survived by his loving wife of 17 years, Brenda Ann Thompson Welt; his son, Robert; his daughters, Crystal Lynn Elliott and Sabrina Audell Ranford; his brothers, Robert Welt and Donald Wolford; as well as his four grandchildren, Lillian, Meadow, Andon, and Michael.

Mr. Speaker, two communities gathered at MacDill Air Force Base last week. One was the community of Pinellas County and the Tampa Bay area, who knew and loved Doc. The second community was the special operations community, who loved Doc. It was a fitting tribute to a great man.

Today, we honor his life, his legacy, and his service. We pledge and commit to carry on the fight that Doc fought

against ALS. We commit to not quitting until that fight is won.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to pay tribute to a great man from Seminole, Florida, who had an impact across this world.

#### NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER

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

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as cochairman of the Congressional Prayer Caucus in recognition and celebration of the annual observance of the National Day of Prayer.

Each year, we take this opportunity to pause from the hurried pace of our daily lives to reaffirm our Nation’s rich spiritual heritage and our commitment to maintaining and strengthening our great country’s religious freedom. Throughout more than 200 years of our Nation’s history, faith, prayer, and trust in God have played a vital role in strengthening the fabric of our society.

From the dawn of our country, when the first national call to prayer was issued, to that day on April 17, 1952, when President Harry Truman made the annual National Day of Prayer a permanent fixture, to this upcoming Thursday, when we will celebrate the 63rd annual National Day of Prayer in the Cannon Caucus Room right here on Capitol Hill, we have continued to turn to prayer as a guiding compass as we seek God’s guidance and wisdom and healing balm for our land. It is from these historic underpinnings that our Nation has grown and thrived.

We stand here today on the shoulders of those Americans who have boldly fought for our rights to be able to assemble, to be able to speak out, and to be able to worship freely. One of our great opportunities as Americans is to be able to come together and say we want to be able to ask God for his blessings and his help upon our Nation so we indeed can be one Nation under God, as we say in our Pledge of Allegiance, and also a Nation that honors our national motto, which is not “e pluribus unum,” as some have mistakenly thought, but which is, “In God We Trust.”

In fact, for all Members of Congress that would like, we have plaques being made and distributed that say, “In God We Trust,” just to reaffirm our national motto.

That is why I have joined with my friend and cochairman of the Congressional Prayer Caucus, Congressman RANDY FORBES of Virginia, to introduce a bipartisan resolution, H. Res. 547. I hope all of our Members listening today will join us in supporting the National Day of Prayer and urging all Americans to come together to pray and reaffirm the importance that prayer has played in our national heritage.

We hear so much today about partisanship and bickering and asking why don’t people get along. The one

thing that I share back home, Mr. Speaker, which usually surprises people, is there is one group on Capitol Hill where all those labels are put to the side, and that happens every Monday night or Tuesday night, depending on the night we go into session, right across the hall in room 219, where there is no agenda except to pray and ask God for wisdom, like Solomon of the Old Testament.

So my hope is that as many Members and your staff—you will allow your staff to join us this Thursday morning to come together as we celebrate the National Day of Prayer.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the true source of power is not found here in the Halls of Congress or in the Oval Office in the West Wing or in the chambers of the Supreme Court. The true source of power is found on our knees before the throne of grace, before almighty God.

It is in that spirit that I rise today to reaffirm this celebration of prayer in our Nation’s history for the past, the present, and, God willing, the future.

Indeed, the power of prayer knows no bounds. May we be a Nation that does stand for our motto, “In God We Trust.” Indeed, we pray, may God bless America.

#### NEED ACTION IN THE SENATE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, just a short while ago, one of my colleagues talked about the plight of folks who are unemployed—individuals who are unemployed either short term or those chronically unemployed. He actually failed to mention those who are underemployed in this Nation. It is an issue that needs to be addressed.

I am actually proud to be a part of solutions that have passed out of the House of Representatives but sit in the Senate, waiting for Senator REID to take the leadership to bring those House-passed jobs bills to the Senate floor for action—bills that would provide some immediate opportunities for individuals who are unemployed.

More than anything else, what folks who are unemployed need is a job—a good-paying job with family-sustaining wages.

Mr. Speaker, the House has passed bill after bill to help working middle class Americans get the skills they need, the jobs they desire, and adequate pay to provide for their families. In the Senate, yet another day has passed when Leader REID has chose to deny consideration of these common-sense bills and chose to deny the relief that would come for those who are unemployed.

The House has acted on more than one occasion to advance completion of the longstanding Keystone XL pipeline. This decision has again been delayed by the Obama administration.

The House recently passed the Save American Workers Act, which would restore hourly wages cut by ObamaCare's 30-hour workweek rule. This bill remains stalled in the Senate's legislative graveyard.

The House has passed bipartisan legislation that would renew the Federal Government's commitment to actively and adequately manage our Federal forests. Where we have well-managed Federal forests that are managed in a healthy way, we have healthy rural economic communities where we grow jobs. Today, that bill is gathering dust on the Senate Leader's desk, awaiting action.

Mr. Speaker, we were elected to solve problems. It is about time we got about the people's business. Hardworking Americans deserve as much.

#### INEQUALITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, when I think of most Americans, I know that one of the major components of our work ethic is that we believe in working hard. We are not standing in line for government subsidies or handouts. We simply want to be able to have an opportunity.

Last evening, I was on the floor speaking of the unfortunate circumstances of this past week, such as the mischaracterization of what affirmative action really means, which is an opportunity for all of our students to go to institutions of higher learning with a diverse student body that embodies and reflects America, responding to the decrease in numbers of African Americans since the dismantling of affirmative action at schools like the University of Michigan, Berkeley, and others.

We then follow that decision with untimely and unfortunate comments, first by an owner of a national basketball team. It baffles me when the owner indicates that he does not want to see Black people at his stadium. It amazes me because if he looks out onto the playing floor, he might see a lot of them. We find that sports is something that brings us all together, from all walks of life.

Then we have an individual that represents himself as one of the true traditions of America, a rancher—and much of that is done in Texas—who wants to suggest that African Americans would be better off picking cotton and having gardens and chickens.

The reason I raise these issues today is because we have parts of our society that reflect those injustices. We have parts of society that ignore the ills that befall those who are more impoverished than others.

Many people don't realize that even though slavery ended in the 1800s, the 20th century found itself with individuals or segments of the population being treated unequally for more than

half a century. Even when those laws changed, like with the 1964 Civil Rights Act, minds and hearts did not change. And so the inequities followed people of color: language minorities, like Hispanics, and African Americans in particular.

I have a document that reflects that inequity right in the city of Houston and the district that I represent.

Yesterday, we came out with the Children at Risk research on the level of high schools that were not functioning. They list North Forest High School, Madison High School, Jones High School, Wheatley High School, Sterling High School, Kashmere High School, and Worthing High School at the bottom of the list. Why? They are all in inner city areas. The investment in people is not there.

And so this wealth inequality is not about someone who wants to get a handout; it is to reflect what is happening.

The highest unemployment is among Latinos and African Americans, which are the red and purple bars. Because of the barriers to access to credit, the lowest number of business ownership in this country is with African Americans. It has the lowest number of business owners. When we faced the recession and mortgage collapse, the highest number of bankruptcy filings were among Latinos and African Americans.

No, they are not looking for a handout. We are looking for policies that in fact will invest in education and make sure that when we invest in people, we overcome the barriers that deal with race and racism.

When we lost all of the home equity, which was one of the greatest assets of African Americans, the decline in home equity and ownership fell upon many of us in a high number, from Asians to Whites to Latinos and African Americans. And when I say this, I speak of those who are White and equally face obstacles.

Many know that one of the major movements of Senator Robert F. Kennedy was his visit to Appalachia and other places.

So my question to my colleagues today is how we can come together to look at a way of empowering those impoverished and making sure that the educational system, regardless of your level of income, has the ability to treat you equally so that the school that you attend every day—your parents pay taxes and send you there—is not giving you the bottom rank in opportunity and that your family is not in the category with no assets or retirement, no ability to help you go to college. Highest number, 62 percent for African Americans; Latinos, 69 percent, which is partly due to the fact that many Latinos live in a "shadow society," many of them because we have not passed comprehensive immigration reform.

So, Mr. Speaker, rather than to accuse individuals and call people names and use racist categories, it is time for

us to come together and be united to lift the boats of all Americans.

□ 1030

#### TRIBUTE TO A PATRIOT

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

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute, to honor, to remember, and to celebrate the life of an outstanding American patriot whom I greatly admired, Marine General Carl E. Mundy, Jr.

It is not often, I would think, that a former sergeant in the Marine Corps Reserves becomes friends with a Four-Star General and a former Commandant of the Marine Corps, but such was my good fortune.

I met General Mundy—he served as our 30th Commandant of the Marine Corps—through my father, Ike. They lived in the same retirement community in Florida and shared the special bond that binds one generation of American marines to the next.

It is a connection that transcends grade and rank, officer and enlisted, and that my father fought in the battle for Iwo Jima, which is a sacred memory for all marines, made their friendship and their mutual respect that much deeper.

It was at my dad's encouragement that I reached out to General Mundy when I sought this office. When I met him, he was 73 years old, yet he exuded, without effort and without pretense, the dignity and the military bearing that we would expect of a Marine Commandant.

It was his humble spirit, however, that I truly found myself pondering and admiring long after our meetings and conversations had ended. Though the general always encouraged me to call him Carl, I never could. He was always, of course, General Mundy.

Always a leader, the general encouraged me in this effort to, again, serve my country, not in uniform, but through public service; and I suspect he lent his good name and reputation to help me more out of respect for my dad than for me.

Of the many endorsements I was so fortunate to receive, the general's meant the most. I believe all who favored me with their endorsement—and I think especially those who served in our United States military—will understand why the Commandant's endorsement was particularly meaningful.

Not long after General Mundy lost his wife of 56 years, Linda Sloan Mundy, the general was diagnosed with cancer. My parents passed him in the neighborhood 1 day when he was still well enough to take his afternoon walks.

Dad shared with me the account of how, when the general saw my parents coming and he recognized my father, he stopped, he came to full attention, and offered a respectful hand salute to

my dad who, again, was a World War II marine sergeant—a nice, crisp hand salute.

Now, this is the spirit of the man and the marine, the humble warrior that I knew and so deeply respected. It is good to see the young people in the House today. As I reflect upon General Mundy's life and his service, I am reminded that we are a free people because good men and women have willingly set aside differences to fight for that, which binds us together as fellow Americans.

General Mundy inspired many of us to serve, including his two sons, Brigadier General Carl Mundy III and Colonel Timothy Mundy, both of whom are on Active Duty as United States Marines.

So I join my fellow marines especially, including my father, Ike, and grateful Americans across our country, in expressing heartfelt condolences to the Mundy family.

It is with eternal gratitude and respect that I will offer a final hand salute in tribute and in memory to the 30th Commandant of the United States Marine Corps, an American patriot whom I was so fortunate to count as my friend.

General Carl E. Mundy, Jr., United States Marine Corps, mission accomplished, sir.

Semper fidelis.

#### RECOGNIZING NATIONAL AUTISM AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor National Autism Awareness Month.

Modern science has helped control or eliminate many once deadly and debilitating diseases and conditions, but our understanding of autism remains an unsolved puzzle.

More children than ever are being diagnosed with communication and behavioral disorders that lead to a diagnosis of autism. Autism now affects one in every 68 children, according to the CDC. My nephew Trey is one of them.

I have seen firsthand how autism strains families, stretches their resources, and makes life more challenging in many ways. I have also seen the amazing joy that an autistic child can bring to a family. Trey has sure brought a lot of joy to ours.

Families with autistic children do everything they can to help their kids maximize their God-given abilities, whatever they choose to be; but it is not always easy, especially in a world where many don't understand the unique challenges that autism presents.

Helping these families better navigate this treacherous world would make a huge difference for my brother and his family and millions like them, but doing so would be much more than just helpful to those families.

It would be good policy too. That is because autism imposes tremendous costs on families, many of which are shared by the schools their children attend and the many medical and developmental specialists involved in their care.

Studies have found that it can cost parents up to \$21,000 a year to care for a child with autism, more than it requires for one without. Children with autism have annual medical expenditures that exceed those without autism by up to \$6,000 a year.

The average medical cost for Medicaid-enrolled children with autism are about six times higher than for children without autism. In addition to medical costs, intensive behavioral interventions for children with autism can cost \$40,000 to \$60,000 per child, per year.

There are several steps that Congress can take right now to help ease these burdens for families. The House should pass H.R. 647, the Achieving a Better Life Experience, or ABLE, Act, which is legislation I have cosponsored, to allow for the creation of tax-exempt savings accounts for individuals with disabilities.

Congress also must reauthorize the Combating Autism Act, which expires in September. This vital legislation provides Federal support for critical autism research, services, and treatment.

Mr. Speaker, I have often said that autism is the polio of our time, and together, as a Nation, we can beat this challenging disease.

Families struggling with autism face challenges that many of us can't imagine. They neither need nor want our pity, but they deserve our help.

National Autism Awareness Month, which ends tomorrow, should serve as a call to action for us to address the urgent and long-term needs of people affected by autism and, hopefully, one day, piece together the autism puzzle, so as few children as possible are impacted by this disorder.

#### THE SECRET SCIENCE BILL

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

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, last evening, I had a couple of articles sitting on my desk and had the opportunity to read through them. I was somewhat—what's the term—oh, yeah, outraged at some of the comments in there, so that is the reason I am standing here on the floor today.

I want to walk through a concept and then try to ferret out why is the agency so terrified of this concept, something very simple. If you are going to make public policy, shouldn't it be based on data that is available to the public?

That public data, properly vetted, is used to make public policy, sort of this concept of almost the crowdsourcing of information.

So if there is a rule set made by an agency, we can all believe in it. We all know it has been properly looked at. It wasn't produced by a small silo of very smart elitists who may be ideologically set one way or another; but the data, the information that creates the rules that we all live under, belongs to all of us.

So how would you feel if you pull up a piece of paper and on that piece of paper is an article about a speech that Administrator McCarthy gave on Monday morning? And I do hope she is misquoted because we have treated her very kindly from the Science Committee and my subcommittee.

But if I came to you and read a line that McCarthy told the audience, on Monday morning, that she intends to go after a—one more time—go after a small but vocal group of critics, in light of what the IRS has done, doesn't that send chills down someone's back when you hear that an agency intends to go after its critics?

And then there is this arrogance that was, I hope, misquoted that only qualified scientists should be allowed to see, real scientists.

So you are telling me that a grad student or a leftwing group or a conservative group or just someone that has an interest in data shouldn't be allowed to see the datasets that are making public policy that literally cost trillions of dollars?

The concept of having a government that runs substantially on secret information is outrageous. So that is why I am trying to push forward on a bill—and maybe the title of the bill is a little inflammatory. It is called the Secret Science bill, a very simple concept that you make public policy with public data and that public data that we all have the right to vet and look at.

Look, the vast majority of Americans will never look at it, but shouldn't you have the right to access it?

Then there is this outlier that the agency is using that is complete obfuscation of the truth: well, there is personal data out there, and we don't know how to protect it.

Every single day, whether it be the Census Bureau, the CFPB, the Commerce Department, they collect personal data. There are standards out there where you blind data. As a matter of fact, there are actually protocols for the protocols on blinding data that we all get to use. It is done every single day.

Somehow, the EPA doesn't want to have that conversation because, somehow, they don't want you, the American public, and the academic community of all ideological stints to have the right to access it.

Mr. Speaker, Administrator McCarthy was quoted as saying:

You just can't claim the science isn't real when it doesn't align with your politics.

She is absolutely right. I am not asking for ideological data. I am just asking for data to belong to the public and

so everyone has the opportunity to study it and understand it.

Who knows, maybe that studying of that data will find better ways, smarter ways, more efficient ways to protect the environment, more rational ways; but we will never know until the EPA finally steps up and makes that data available to every American.

---

#### 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 43 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

Reverend Dr. Benny Tate, Rock Springs Church, Milner, Georgia, offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we bow our heads in Your presence. The Bible teaches us, "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity, because a House divided will not stand."

May Your servants in this body not look to parties, personalities, preferences, or press, but may they focus on principles and people. Let no personal ambition blind them to their responsibilities and accountability.

God, we call our Representatives politicians, but You call them ministers. May all the Members of this body make full proof of their ministry. I ask for Your guidance on their decisions and grace on their families.

I pray the Members of this body will seek Thy will and ways and have the spiritual courage and grace to follow it. Lift them above the claims of politics unto the dimension of a higher calling and mission.

We pray this prayer, respecting all faiths, but pray it in the name of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

Amen.

---

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

---

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MCNERNEY 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 REVEREND BENNY TATE

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Pastor Benny Tate, the senior pastor of Rock Springs Church in Milner, Georgia. Under the leadership of Dr. Tate, Rock Springs Church grew from just 60 members to its current congregation of over 6,000.

Dr. Tate began numerous ministries at Rock Springs Church, including the Rock Springs medical clinic to care for those who cannot afford medical insurance; The Potter's House, which ministers to women battling drug and alcohol abuse; Rock Springs Christian Academy, offering quality education to kids K-12; and the Impact Street Ministries, which helps the homeless by serving meals and providing clothing and housing to those in need.

James 1:27 says:

Religion that God our Father accepts as pure and faultless is this, to look after orphans and widows in their distress and to keep oneself from being polluted by the world.

Dr. Tate's work is a shining example of what Scripture tells us the role of the church should be: to care for the poor, the fatherless, and widows.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Dr. Benny Tate, pastor of Rock Springs Church, for his 25 years of outstanding leadership and service to his community.

---

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

---

#### ARKANSAS' STORM RECOVERY

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

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I ask the Members of this House and all Americans to lift up Arkansas in their prayers as we recover from the storms that devastated much of central Arkansas on Sunday evening. Fifteen people lost their lives in these storms, and many more saw their homes and neighborhoods destroyed. The communities of Mayflower and Vilonia, vibrant, thriving towns, were particularly hard-hit.

I want to thank the first responders and all those on the ground in Arkansas who continue to assist with rescue

and recovery operations. We are deeply grateful for your service.

I know my sorrow and grief for the devastation and loss of life is shared by all Arkansans and all Americans. We have a long road ahead of us, but Arkansans are a tough, hardworking people, and together we will come out stronger.

---

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO THE HARDWORKING SHIPYARD WORKERS IN GROTON, CONNECTICUT, AND NEWPORT NEWS, VIRGINIA

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, last evening the U.S. Navy and two shipyards, the electric boat shipyard in Groton, Connecticut, and Huntington Ingalls shipyard in Newport News, Virginia, entered into an \$18 billion contract to build 10 submarines over the next 5 years.

This event did not happen by itself. It was the result of exhaustive national security reviews that started under Secretary Gates, continued with the Nuclear Posture Review, and continued with the Quadrennial Defense Review. In every instance, the findings were that we needed to bolster our undersea fleet, which has declined from 100 ships at the end of the cold war to 53 today.

With rising maritime challenges in the Asia Pacific, with the decision by Vladimir Putin to recapitalize his military to the tune of \$700 billion, we must bolster our undersea fleet, which is the one area where the United States still has undisputed domination of that domain.

I want to congratulate the shipyard workers who have shown the Virginia class program is ahead of schedule and under budget, whether it was the USS *California*, the *Hawaii*, or, most recently, the *North Dakota*. Again, they have set, in my opinion, an example for Navy shipbuilding across the board and commercial shipbuilding, which the U.S. has got to step up its game and become part of.

Again, congratulations to the hardworking shipyard workers in Groton and Newport News, Virginia.

---

#### GET SERIOUS ABOUT REDUCING THE REGULATORY OVERBURDEN UPON THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, Federal agencies in Washington, D.C., are setting new records. Unfortunately, these are not records that they should be proud of. In 2013, the Federal Register contained nearly 80,000 pages of new rules and regulations imposed on American businesses. We know that the result of this is that it stifles jobs, it slows economic growth, and it hurts

opportunities for hardworking Americans.

Before coming to Congress, I was a small business owner. I saw firsthand the devastating effect of these regulations on job creation and growth. This administration will be remembered for one thing, and that is ObamaCare, which I think is the worst law written in the history of the universe. But it will also be recognized for another, and that is Dodd-Frank, which runs a close second. Both of these are emblematic of this philosophy of bigger government, a more powerful government, a less effective government.

Now is the time to get serious about reducing the regulatory overburden upon the American people.

#### RECOGNIZING THE 1ST SQUAD, 2ND PLATOON, HOTEL COMPANY OF THE 26TH MARINE REGIMENT

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 1st Squad, 2nd Platoon, Hotel Company of the 26th Marine regiment. It is with great honor that we commemorate these brave marines who risked their lives for our Nation.

On May 29, 1967, at the end of Operation Hickory and the beginning of Operation Prairie IV, the 1st Squad, under the command of Sergeant Thomas Gonzalez, recovered a spent Russian SA-2 missile inside the demilitarized zone of South Vietnam on a reconnaissance control. The command-and-control mechanism of the missile was then transported to Washington, D.C., for analysis. The intelligence derived gave the U.S. a military advantage, changing the strategy and saving many, many lives.

Today, I want to read the names of all these brave marines: U.S. Marine Thomas Gonzalez; Anthony Astuccio; Mike McCombes; Richard Light; Thomas Lehner; Ronald Blaine; Gerald Eggers; Albino Martinez; Lloyd Parker, Jr.; Charles Melton; Hector L.R. Rodriguez; and one U.S. Navy corpsman, Mel Overmeyer.

#### TRUTH IN ADVERTISING ACT

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, along with my colleagues LOIS CAPPS and TED DEUTCH, I introduced the Truth in Advertising Act, a bill that could help reduce the negative health impact of photoshopped images in advertising.

Photoshopped ads can promote unrealistic expectations of the human body, leading to tragic emotional, mental, and physical health problems. Academic evidence has already shown the connection between very thin models in advertising and body image issues,

one of the major contributing factors to eating disorders.

The Truth in Advertising Act does not impose new regulations, but simply asks the Federal Trade Commission to work with stakeholders to investigate how to confront this important public health issue while ensuring that freedom of speech is protected.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to cosponsor this bill so that we can find the best way to stop the destructive impact of photoshopping on eating disorders.

#### NATIONAL DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE AND COMMEMORATION OF THE HOLOCAUST

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, this week of April 27 is our national Days of Remembrance and commemoration of the Holocaust. In communities across the country, we set aside this time to stand in solemn solidarity with millions of Jews worldwide to pledge never again to allow such evil to exist.

In Israel, on Holocaust Remembrance Day a siren sounds for 2 minutes. Everybody stops what they are doing and stands silently in a powerful living memorial to those who were lost and a symbol rejecting the worst evil the world has ever known.

As survivors perish each year, it becomes more important to internalize the lessons of the Holocaust and recall the 6 million Jews and other innocent victims who perished in the great shame of the 20th century.

In western New York we are proud that one of our own, Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson, was the chief prosecutor for the United States at the Nuremberg trials of Nazi war criminals. His actions helped to inspire a deep commitment from our community to preserve and honor the story of the Holocaust for future generations.

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO THE WILL JAMES MIDDLE SCHOOL SCIENCE BOWL TEAM

(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 am very proud to congratulate students from Will James Middle School in Billings, Montana, the town where Mom and Dad grew up and my grandma still lives today, for winning the best car design at the National Science Bowl Middle School Electric Car Competition.

This weekend, five young Montana students traveled to the National Science Bowl in Washington, D.C., to compete against 47 other teams from around the Nation. I speak for all Montanans when I say that we are incredibly proud of their success.

Under the guidance of science teacher Patrick Kenney, this team of five

middle school students gained hands-on science and engineering experience in designing, building, and racing their model car.

As Montana's Representative and a chemical engineer from Montana State University, I am incredibly proud Montana students like Madi, Sam, Tyler, Julianne, and Alex are leading the way in science and technology.

Congratulations again to the Will James Middle School Science Bowl team.

#### BLACK APRIL

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we commemorate the 39th anniversary of the fall of Saigon and the collapse of the Republic of Vietnam. This is known in my community as Black April.

It has been my honor to join with the Vietnamese American community of Little Saigon, which is in my district, to remember this important event. Thirty-nine years ago, millions of Vietnamese were forced to leave their homeland in search of freedom. Many of them found their way to the United States, where today they comprise a strong, vibrant community that has given invaluable contributions to our Nation.

This week we remember the brave sacrifices of so many in the cause of freedom, who fought tirelessly to enable their children to live a better and brighter life. Today, we must ensure that their sacrifices were not in vain by continuing the fight for democracy and human rights in Vietnam.

□ 1215

#### EARTH DAY

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, last week was the 44th Earth Day. Since the initial Earth Day in 1970, tremendous progress has been made on cleaning our water, cleaning our air, reducing pollution, and preserving the natural beauty of this great Nation.

It is my privilege to represent one of the most beautiful places on the planet. North Carolina's High Country and the Blue Ridge Mountains are majestic. In the highlands you will find the nearly 6,000-foot high Grandfather Mountain, one of the tallest peaks in the Blue Ridge Mountains. The scenic Blue Ridge Parkway passes by the south side of Grandfather Mountain.

I feel it is my duty to help protect these treasures, and I consider myself a conservationist.

It is unfortunate, though, that the tremendous success of the environmental movement has led some self-appointed environmentalists to resort to

ever more extreme goals and behavior. Maintaining a safe, clean, and beautiful natural world for ourselves, our children, and grandchildren to enjoy is a goal we should all share.

#### HONORING LANCE CORPORAL SARA CASTROMATA

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

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of Marine Lance Corporal Sara Castromata. Lance Corporal Castromata was tragically murdered in an incident on the Marine Base at Quantico on March 21, 2013. An investigation by the military revealed that there were lapses in security on the base.

Lance Corporal Castromata joined the Marines in 2011, after graduating with honors from Liberty High School in Brentwood, California. A strong-minded individual, Ms. Castromata enlisted in the U.S. Marines to serve our great Nation. While in the Marines, she earned the National Defense Service Medal, the Global War on Terrorism Medal, and the Good Conduct Medal, all of which are a testament to her honorable service.

I appreciate the Marine Corps for investigating this crime and providing recommendations to prevent future criminal acts. While these are steps in the right direction, we must do more to ensure that this type of event doesn't happen again.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the memory of Marine Lance Corporal Sara Castromata and for additional base security.

#### RECOGNIZING USA SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING FESTIVAL AND NATIONAL SCIENCE WEEK

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the USA Science and Engineering Festival.

This past weekend, government, industry, and academia came together to energize students and teachers through hands-on experiences to showcase the opportunities of the future and the ways studying STEM subjects can be fun and rewarding for boys and girls.

It wasn't your traditional science fair. The festival is a great model of how a diverse team can partner together to further the STEM fields that are home to the future careers of our youth. Our next generation of technicians, engineers, and scientists should be exposed to opportunities that they don't realize are within their grasp—careers and jobs they hadn't even considered when imagining their futures.

I introduced a resolution last June encouraging State and local govern-

ments to recognize the last week of April as National Science Week. Getting kids excited about robotics, computers, and math can spur them to become our future leaders and innovators.

#### IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, we returned from our district work period, or spring recess, although really what it was for most of us was the opportunity to be back during Passover and the week leading up to Easter. And for those of us like myself that love celebrating our faith, we go to our synagogues and churches to hear more about the things we believe.

This time, what I heard most from religious leaders was how we were letting down the teachings of the Holy Scriptures by not doing what was commanded in Leviticus 19:

You shall treat the alien who resides with you no differently than the natives born among you.

Or, what we hear Jesus teaching in Matthew 25:

For I was hungry and you gave me food, I was thirsty and you gave me drink, I was a stranger and you welcomed me.

Let's heed what our religious leaders are pleading with us to do and pass comprehensive immigration reform.

#### REFUNDABLE CHILD TAX CREDIT ELIGIBILITY VERIFICATION RE- FORM ACT

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Refundable Child Tax Credit Eligibility Verification Reform Act.

This bill, authored by my friend and colleague, Congressman SAM JOHNSON, cracks down on fraud. It requires taxpayers who claim the additional child tax credit to provide a valid Social Security number. This is just common sense.

It has been well-documented that the government loses billions of dollars due to the rampant fraud of the additional child tax credit. The IRS inspector general puts this fraud number at an unbelievable \$4.2 billion a year.

This fraud—and failure to fix the problem—is simply unacceptable. This is why my constituents in Texas deserve to know what is being done to address this problem.

There is a clear solution. That solution is H.R. 556.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me today in cosponsoring this bill to deliver a more responsible government to Texas and to American taxpayers.

#### DETECTING BREAST CANCER EARLIER

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, today, African American women with breast cancer are 40 percent more likely to die from the disease than White women. In my hometown of Los Angeles, African American women are 70 percent more likely to die from breast cancer than White women. This is tragic and shameful.

I have heard heartbreaking stories of women who were not able to access screening until it was too late or who could not receive treatment because they did not have health insurance.

I have introduced a resolution here in Congress to recognize this alarming disparity and to raise nationwide awareness of this crisis in our health care system. My hope is that greater awareness of this issue will help to be the impetus for action and help improve the way we treat breast cancer for all women.

This is an issue of life and death, and we must do everything we can to ensure that every woman, regardless of race, has access to the quality screening and treatment she needs to fight this awful disease.

The good news is that now, under the Affordable Care Act, which my colleagues on the other side said was the worst law ever written in the history of man, lifesaving mammograms are covered for women in this country, allowing them to detect breast cancer early.

#### ASIA-PACIFIC REGION PRIORITY ACT

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

Ms. HANABUSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4495, the Asia-Pacific Region Priority Act. Introduced by Congressman FORBES of Virginia and myself, this was filed last night.

The timing of this bill is when the President left his last stop on the trip to the pivot of the Asia Pacific. Also, this is the result of 5 months of hearings, roundtables, and meetings that Congressman FORBES and I conducted.

This is truly a bipartisan effort in that it is in line with the President's commitment to my part of the world. The pivot to Asia Pacific is not just for security, but also for prosperity and economic growth, along with what is very important: relationships.

The President has said that the 21st century will be defined by Asia Pacific—whether we live in cooperation or in conflict. I believe it will be in cooperation.

I ask my colleagues to support our efforts on this truly bipartisan measure for the definition of the 21st century.

LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, extra, extra, read all about it. The Republicans have released their new agenda for the spring.

Well, let's just take a look at what their legislative priorities are for the months ahead.

Unemployment insurance extension? No.

Equal pay for equal work for women? No.

Increase in the minimum wage? No. Comprehensive immigration reform? No.

In short, their plan offers no investment in infrastructure and education, no attempt to create jobs, and no proposal to help people achieve the American Dream.

They can claim to be like Thomas Jefferson, but this plan reflects nothing that I have ever read about Thomas Jefferson.

So let's honor and value hard work by setting a real agenda—a new agenda that truly gives everyone a chance at the American Dream.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

GOLD MEDAL TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2014

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4488) to make technical corrections to two bills enabling the presentation of congressional gold medals, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4488

*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 "Gold Medal Technical Corrections Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO AN ACT THAT AUTHORIZES PRESENTATION OF A CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., AND CORETTA SCOTT KING.

Section 2 of Public Law 108-368 is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking all before "to present" and inserting the following: "(a) PRESENTATION AUTHORIZED.—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate are authorized"; and

(B) by striking "(posthumously)"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(c) SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Following the award of the gold medal in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and Coretta Scott King under subsection (a), the gold medal shall be given to the Smithsonian Institution, where it shall be available for display as appropriate and made available for research.

"(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Smithsonian Institution shall make the gold medal received under paragraph (1) available for display, particularly at the National Museum of African American History and Culture, or for loan as appropriate so that it may be displayed elsewhere, particularly at other appropriate locations associated with the lives of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and Coretta Scott King."

SEC. 3. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS TO AN ACT THAT AUTHORIZES PRESENTATION OF A CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL COLLECTIVELY TO THE MONTFORD POINT MARINES, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS.

Section 2 of Public Law 112-59 is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(c) SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Following the award of the gold medal in honor of the Montford Point Marines, United States Marine Corps under subsection (a), the gold medal shall be given to the Smithsonian Institution, where it shall be available for display as appropriate and made available for research.

"(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Smithsonian Institution shall make the gold medal received under paragraph (1) available for display, particularly at the National Museum of African American History and Culture, or for loan as appropriate so that it may be displayed elsewhere, particularly at other appropriate locations associated with the Montford Point Marines."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous material for the RECORD on H.R. 4488, which is currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4488, the Gold Medal Technical Corrections Act of 2014, introduced by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation seeks to make minor technical corrections to allow the actual awarding of two Congressional Gold Medals authorized in previous Congresses. The first medal was awarded to Martin Luther King, Jr., and Coretta Scott King. The other medal was awarded to the pioneering Montford Point Marines of World War II.

For different reasons, there are now no statutorily designated recipients of

the medals. As has often happened in the past with such medals, they will be given to the Smithsonian Institution, where they will be available for display, research, or loan, as appropriate, to sites significant to their honorees.

Importantly, in the case of both these medals, the sense of Congress is expressed that one place that would be very appropriate to display either or both of these medals is at the new National Museum of African American History and Culture, now under construction literally just down the street.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. It is a bipartisan bill. I ask for its immediate passage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of H.R. 4488. I would like to thank my colleague across the aisle for his support. I would also like to thank the Honorable JOHN LEWIS for being a sponsor of this legislation.

This is important legislation, as it does embrace two Congressional Gold Medals that have already been awarded.

As fate would have it, Mr. LEWIS was the original sponsor of the bill awarding the Congressional Gold Medal to Ms. Coretta Scott King and the Honorable Dr. Martin Luther King. Both of them are honorable people.

I would also say that Mr. LEWIS has been a champion for human rights and civil rights. It is very difficult to have him in your presence and not acknowledge all that he has done.

So, today, I am honored to support the Gold Medal Technical Corrections Act of 2014.

I am also honored to mention one other colleague, the Honorable CORRINE BROWN. She worked on the bill that accorded a Congressional Gold Medal to the Montford Point Marines of the United States Marine Corps. She was an original sponsor of this legislation.

□ 1230

These two giants have brought us this far. It will take this legislation to take us the final steps along the way.

The legislation merely indicates where these Congressional Gold Medals may be displayed. It seems to do what we could have done earlier, but we have found that it is not too late to do now.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am honored to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable JOHN LEWIS, our civil rights icon right here in the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding, and I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey for all of his work on this legislation.

I would like to thank the chair and ranking member of the Financial Services Committee and all of their staff for their strong support of the legislation.

This bill is very simple. It simply ensures that these medals are displayed at the Smithsonian's National Museum of African American History and Culture, which opens next year.

In 2004, Congress passed bipartisan legislation to grant the Congressional Gold Medal to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and Mrs. Coretta Scott King. I introduced the House bill, and my good friend, Senator CARL LEVIN, sponsored the Senate companion.

The legislation passed in the House and Senate by voice vote. Unfortunately, a couple of years later, my good friend, Coretta Scott King, passed away. She was a beautiful and strong spirit and, like her husband, a national treasure.

They were heroes, breaking down barriers, opening doors, fighting injustice across our country, and building bridges around the world. It is only fitting that this congressional tribute is on exhibit to the world in a permanent national memorial.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the bipartisan leadership and staff for all of their good and great work in support of this commonsense legislation.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am so honored to be a part of this, and I would thank, again, the Honorable JOHN LEWIS for his efforts to not only accord the Congressional Gold Medals to Dr. King and Mrs. King, but also his efforts to make sure that they are properly located, so that they can be displayed properly.

I would also want to, again, reiterate the efforts of the Honorable CORRINE BROWN, with reference to the Montford Point Marines of the United States Marine Corps. I believe this bill is one that can be embraced by all of our colleagues.

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

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

At this point, we have no other speakers. I, again, would just like to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for joining us with the sponsoring of this legislation; Mr. LEWIS, not only for legislation that is on the floor today, but for your historic work on behalf of civil rights prior to coming to Congress as well.

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have been an elected official for nearly 32 years, and one of the proudest moments I have experienced in all my years was when this House passed the bill to grant a Congressional Gold Medal to the Montford Point Marines. When the bill granting the Gold Medal passed, all of the Members of Congress honored the Marines with a standing ovation for their service, their bravery, and their dedication to preserving freedom and democracy for our nation and the world.

I was pleased to work with Marine Commandant General James F. Amos, who put his office and staff behind the Gold Medal and in only 4 months, we went from introduction to

public law, granting that Gold Medal. There were 308 cosponsors on the bill and it passed unanimously by a vote of 422–0.

When I was first elected to Congress, I requested to be a member of the Veterans Affairs Committee. And today, as the second most senior Democrat on the Committee, I believe it is my duty to continue to do everything I can to assist the members of our armed forces.

So for me, it was more than an honor to sponsor a Resolution to recognize the service and sacrifice of the Montford Point Marines, and acknowledge today's United States Marine Corps as an excellent opportunity for the advancement of people of all races, which in large part is due to the service and example of the original Montford Point Marines.

Years before Jackie Robinson, and decades before Rosa Parks and Martin Luther King, Jr., these heroes joined the Marines to defend our great nation. Fighting racism both at home and in the armed forces, as well as enemies abroad, these men persevered and protected this nation when it mattered most.

These African Americans from all States were not sent to the traditional boot camps in Parris Island, South Carolina and Sari Diego, California. Instead, African American Marines were segregated, and went through basic training at Camp Montford Point near the New River in Jacksonville, North Carolina.

We must honor these war heroes' selfless service and sacrifice. They answered our nation's call at a time when our society was deeply divided along racial lines. Because of this, many of their contributions went unrecognized and many times they were not given the respect and recognition they deserved as Marines, as Americans, and as patriots. To correct this past injustice, we honor the Montford Point Marines, and this Gold Medal will forever anchor their role in the history of our nation's great military.

I am reminded of the words of the first President of the United States, George Washington, whose words are worth repeating at this time:

The willingness with which our young people are likely to serve in any war, no matter how justified, shall be directly proportional as to how they perceive the veterans of earlier wars were treated and appreciated by their country.

Thank you all for your service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4488.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### NATIONAL PARK SERVICE 100TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 627) to provide for the issuance of coins to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 627

*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 "National Park Service 100th Anniversary Commemorative Coin Act".

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) In 1916, Congress established the National Park Service as a bureau within the Department of the Interior to administer America's great national parks and monuments as a unified National Park System.

(2) From 1916 to the present, the National Park System has grown from 37 park units with 6,000,000 acres of land in the western United States to more than 395 units with 84,000,000 acres of land in nearly all States and territories.

(3) The responsibilities of the National Park Service have grown to include—

(A) managing national historic trails and national scenic trails;

(B) administering wild and scenic rivers;

(C) recognizing America's most significant historic resources through the National Register of Historic Places and the National Historic Landmark program;

(D) providing historic preservation grants; and

(E) assisting communities in meeting their preservation, conservation, and recreation needs.

(4) The National Park Service Organic Act of 1916, which established the National Park Service, remains the preeminent law guiding the management of parks and articulating the Service's core mission, "to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations".

(5) The 100th anniversary of the National Park Service in 2016 will be an occasion to celebrate a century of American vision and achievement in identifying and preserving our Nation's special places for the benefit of everyone and the culmination of 100 years of accomplishment by the National Park Service's employees, partners, and volunteers. It will also mark the beginning of the organization's second century of service to the American people as environmental leaders and vigilant stewards of the Nation's treasured places and stories.

(6) Coins commemorating the 100th anniversary of the National Park Service will bring national and international attention to the National Park System and to the legacy Congress left in 1916 when it established a Federal agency to ensure the protection of our Nation's most treasured natural and cultural resources for all time.

(7) The proceeds from a surcharge on the sale of commemorative coins will assist the financing of the needs of the National Park Service's parks and programs, helping to ensure that our Nation's great natural and cultural resources will endure for generations to come.

#### SEC. 3. COIN SPECIFICATIONS.

(a) DENOMINATIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") shall mint and issue the following coins:

(1) \$5 GOLD COINS.—Not more than 100,000 \$5 coins, which shall—

(A) weigh 8.359 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 0.850 inches; and

(C) contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

(2) \$1 SILVER COINS.—Not more than 500,000 \$1 coins, which shall—

- (A) weigh 26.73 grams;
- (B) have a diameter of 1.500 inches; and
- (C) contain 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper.

(3) HALF DOLLAR CLAD COINS.—Not more than 750,000 half dollar coins, which shall—

- (A) weigh 11.34 grams;
- (B) have a diameter of 1.205 inches; and
- (C) be minted to the specifications for half dollar coins, contained in section 5112(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(b) LEGAL TENDER.—The coins minted under this Act shall be legal tender, as provided in section 5103 of title 31, United States Code.

(c) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of sections 5134 and 5136 of title 31, United States Code, all coins minted under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

#### SEC. 4. DESIGN OF COINS.

(a) DESIGN REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The design of the coins minted under this Act shall be emblematic of the 100th anniversary of the National Park Service.

(2) DESIGNATION AND INSCRIPTIONS.—On each coin minted under this Act there shall be—

- (A) a designation of the face value of the coin;
- (B) an inscription of the year “2016”; and
- (C) inscriptions of the words “Liberty”, “In God We Trust”, “United States of America”, and “E Pluribus Unum”.

(b) SELECTION.—The design for the coins minted under this Act shall be—

- (1) selected by the Secretary after consultation with—
  - (A) the National Park Service;
  - (B) the National Park Foundation; and
  - (C) the Commission of Fine Arts; and
- (2) reviewed by the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee.

#### SEC. 5. ISSUANCE OF COINS.

(a) QUALITY OF COINS.—Coins minted under this Act shall be issued in uncirculated and proof qualities.

(b) PERIOD FOR ISSUANCE.—The Secretary may issue coins minted under this Act only during the period beginning on January 1, 2016, and ending on December 31, 2016.

#### SEC. 6. SALE OF COINS.

(a) SALE PRICE.—The coins issued under this Act shall be sold by the Secretary at a price equal to the sum of—

- (1) the face value of the coins;
- (2) the surcharge provided in section 7(a) with respect to the coins; and
- (3) the cost of designing and issuing the coins (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping).

(b) BULK SALES.—The Secretary shall make bulk sales of the coins issued under this Act at a reasonable discount.

(c) PREPAID ORDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall accept prepaid orders for the coins minted under this Act before the issuance of such coins.

(2) DISCOUNT.—Sale prices with respect to prepaid orders under paragraph (1) shall be at a reasonable discount.

#### SEC. 7. SURCHARGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—All sales of coins minted under this Act shall include a surcharge as follows:

- (1) A surcharge of \$35 per coin for the \$5 coin.
- (2) A surcharge of \$10 per coin for the \$1 coin.
- (3) A surcharge of \$5 per coin for the half dollar coin.

(b) DISTRIBUTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to section 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code, all surcharges

which are received by the Secretary from the sale of coins issued under this Act shall be promptly paid by the Secretary to the National Park Foundation for projects and programs that help preserve and protect resources under the stewardship of the National Park Service and promote public enjoyment and appreciation of those resources.

(2) PROHIBITION ON LAND ACQUISITION.—Surcharges paid to the National Park Foundation pursuant to paragraph (1) may not be used for land acquisition.

(c) AUDITS.—The National Park Foundation shall be subject to the audit requirements of section 5134(f)(2) of title 31, United States Code, with regard to the amounts received by the Foundation under subsection (b).

(d) LIMITATIONS.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), no surcharge may be included with respect to the issuance under this Act of any coin during a calendar year if, as of the time of such issuance, the issuance of such coin would result in the number of commemorative coin programs issued during such year to exceed the annual 2 commemorative coin program issuance limitation under section 5112(m)(1) of title 31, United States Code (as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act). The Secretary of the Treasury may issue guidance to carry out this subsection.

#### SEC. 8. FINANCIAL ASSURANCES.

The Secretary shall take such actions as may be necessary to ensure that—

(1) minting and issuing coins under this Act will not result in any net cost to the United States Government; and

(2) no funds, including applicable surcharges, shall be disbursed to any recipient designated in section 7 until the total cost of designing and issuing all of the coins authorized by this Act (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping) is recovered by the United States Treasury, consistent with sections 5112(m) and 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code.

#### SEC. 9. BUDGET COMPLIANCE.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, again, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and also to submit extraneous materials for the RECORD on this bill, H.R. 627, as amended, and currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 627, the National Park Service

100th Anniversary Commemorative Coin Act, introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN).

Mr. Speaker, this legislation seeks to authorize the minting and sale in 2016 of gold, silver, and clad commemorative coins marking the centenary of the forming of the National Park Service, the great stewards of American history and the American landscape so important to all of us.

The idea of federally recognizing and preserving certain sites began in the late 19th century with the official establishment of a select group of national parks, including Yellowstone, Sequoia National Park in California, and Yosemite as well.

When Theodore Roosevelt became President in 1901, he continued this effort, speaking out on the importance of preserving the habitats of American wildlife and signing the Antiquities Act of 1906. That act allowed the President to “declare by public proclamation historic landmarks, historic and pre-historic structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest.”

About a decade later, in 1916, the National Park Service was created to place all of the sites under the care of a single independent agency.

Fast forward to today, now, the Park Service manages nearly 400 sites totaling 84 million acres. These parks cover all corners of our Nation, and almost every American State and territory is home to at least one.

People from around the globe now are attracted to our national sites because of both their beauty and also their grandeur. Every year, our parks hosts—note this—280 million visitors.

The legislation before us today has 307 cosponsors, and a companion Senate bill has 73.

The coins will be minted and sold at no cost to the taxpayer. No proceeds from the sale may be used to acquire new lands.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, honoring a great part of the Federal Government that maintains some of the most spectacular parts of American landscape and history, and I ask for its immediate passage.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill would authorize the U.S. Mint to produce gold, silver, and clad coins for resale in 2016. Proceeds from the sale of these coins will be used to help protect our national parks, so that our country's great natural and cultural resources will endure for generations to come. This bill comes at no cost to taxpayers.

National parks are not only crucial to preserve our natural, historic, and cultural treasures, but they are also economic engines to job creators. They generate tens of billions in revenue and support hundreds of thousands of jobs nationwide.

This bill will help maintain and promote many beautiful and important

parks in our country, such as Everglades National Park, which is located near the district I am proud to represent.

The Everglades region is a large, interconnected ecosystem that is globally unique because of the hundreds of species and plants and animals that live there, such as the Florida panther and the West Indian manatee.

This rare ecosystem also faces exceptional problems due to rapid development and outdated infrastructure in the area.

You may be wondering why someone from Florida's Treasure Coast is concerned with the Everglades. As my colleagues have surely heard me discuss, there are serious problems facing Florida's many waterways.

When there is heavy rainfall—also known as summer in Florida—the Army Corps, following the Lake Okeechobee release schedule, releases water from Lake Okeechobee into the St. Lucie River in the east and the Caloosahatchee River in the west. These freshwater releases are heavy in nitrogen, phosphorus, and bacteria that then plague our brackish waterways.

Last summer, the St. Lucie River contained such high levels of bacteria that local officials posted public health warnings up and down the shore, and many residents reported infections resulting from their interaction with the water. Toxic algae blooms were also found throughout the waterways.

This pollution not only forces people to avoid contact with the water, which is frequently the center of their livelihood, but also is an extreme threat to the most biodiverse estuary in the country.

Just like the broader Everglades system, several species in the Indian River Lagoon are already being listed as threatened or endangered, and these releases jeopardize these species even further.

My constituents stress to me that the health of our environment cannot be separated from the health of our economy. In Florida's 18th District, the health of the Everglades and our waterways is critical to economic strength.

I will continue to advocate to even the most conservative of my colleagues that the economic impact of Everglades restoration projects provides a 4 to 1 return on investment in both short-term and long-term economic benefits.

So important are these restoration efforts, the Florida delegation continues to come together in a bipartisan manner in support of protecting our environment and the economic role it plays in our great State of Florida.

All members of our delegation understand that, for the entire system to benefit and for the Federal Government to work most efficiently, we must aggressively continue to push to complete Everglades restoration projects that we have already started.

It is clear that water quality and management decisions that impact one

area of the Everglades system have residual impacts throughout the entire water system of central and south Florida and the Treasure Coast.

So while people who live along the Florida Bay may not immediately see the benefits of the C-44 Indian River Lagoon project in my district—and the same for residents of the Treasure Coast with the C-111 spreader canal—you cannot look at one piece of the system in a vacuum. It is intensively interconnected.

That is why I have been so passionate on Everglades restoration issues, not only in my district, but throughout the State and the watershed and why today I stand in support of this bill that will help the Park Service continue its important work of preserving this and other critical habitats.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, at this time, we are joined by the original sponsor of the legislation. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN).

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank him for his leadership, as well as Chairman HENSARLING and all the staff on the Financial Services Committee for bringing this legislation forward.

I also want to mention my partner in this effort, Congresswoman KAPTUR, for her efforts in promoting this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, President Teddy Roosevelt said:

There can be nothing in the world more beautiful than the Yosemite, the groves of the giant sequoias and redwoods, the canyon of the Colorado, the canyon of the Yellowstone, the three Tetons; and our people should see to it that they are preserved for their children and their children's children forever, with their majestic beauty all unmarred.

His leadership and tireless advocacy for conservation led to the creation of the National Park Service and System back in 1916.

Today, the National Park Service comprises over 401 different areas, covering more than 84 million acres across America, including territories like in American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. These areas include some of our most cherished monuments, battlefields, lakeshores, recreation areas, pristine rivers, and pristine falls.

Minnesota is host to five national parks who are visited by more than 650,000 visitors each and every year, contributing \$34 million to our local economy. They span the entirety of the State, from the beautiful Voyageurs National Park up on the Canadian border, to the Mississippi River and Recreation Area, running through the heart of the Twin Cities.

Americans from all States, though, and all backgrounds have enjoyed the opportunity to visit these sites. In 2016,

in just a few years, we will all come together to help celebrate the centennial, the 100th birthday of the National Park Service.

To commemorate this occasion, we have got bipartisan, bicameral legislation that will allow the Department of the Treasury to authorize the minting of a series of commemorative coins: a \$5 coin, a silver dollar, and a clad half dollar. There is no cost to the taxpayer.

Over 300 authors in the House have signed on to the bill, bipartisan support in the Senate; and all the proceeds from this commemorative coin program go to the National Park Foundation, which is responsible for preserving and protecting all these resources under the stewardship of the National Park Service, and then promoting the public enjoyment and recreation and appreciation for those resources.

□ 1245

So more than 278 million people enjoy national parks each and every year, including my wife and my family, my four daughters. We frequently have the opportunity to visit and vacation in national parks. One of the very first summer jobs that I had was working at Yellowstone, some of the best memories of my life. My brother was a park ranger for many years at Glacier National Park.

So here we have a bill that commemorates not only the anniversary of our Park Service but also makes sure we have got dedicated funds that will have no taxpayer cost, no taxpayer impact in promoting these resources.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that our national parks are truly one of our greatest natural resources and crowned jewels, and they deserve being celebrated and preserved so that future generations can enjoy that beauty and history in our country. So passing this bill is just one important step to help us honor our country's very important heritage.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues and the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from New Jersey for the spirited debate on the importance of America's national parks, including Florida's incomparable "river of grass," the Everglades.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 627, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MURPHY 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 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### RESTORING PROVEN FINANCING FOR AMERICAN EMPLOYERS ACT

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4167) to amend section 13 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, known as the Volcker Rule, to exclude certain debt securities of collateralized loan obligations from the prohibition against acquiring or retaining an ownership interest in a hedge fund or private equity fund, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4167

*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 “Restoring Proven Financing for American Employers Act”.

#### SEC. 2. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION RELATING TO COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATIONS.

Section 13(g) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1851(g)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(4) COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—

“(A) INAPPLICABILITY TO CERTAIN COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to require the divestiture, prior to July 21, 2017, of any debt securities of collateralized loan obligations, if such debt securities were issued before January 31, 2014.

“(B) OWNERSHIP INTEREST WITH RESPECT TO COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATIONS.—A banking entity shall not be considered to have an ownership interest in a collateralized loan obligation because it acquires, has acquired, or retains a debt security in such collateralized loan obligation if the debt security has no indicia of ownership other than the right of the banking entity to participate in the removal for cause, or in the selection of a replacement after removal for cause or resignation, of an investment manager or investment adviser of the collateralized loan obligation.

“(C) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph:

“(i) COLLATERALIZED LOAN OBLIGATION.—The term ‘collateralized loan obligation’ means any issuing entity of an asset-backed security, as defined in section 3(a)(77) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(77)), that is comprised primarily of commercial loans.

“(ii) REMOVAL FOR CAUSE.—An investment manager or investment adviser shall be deemed to be removed ‘for cause’ if the investment manager or investment adviser is removed as a result of—

“(I) a breach of a material term of the applicable management or advisory agreement or the agreement governing the collateralized loan obligation;

“(II) the inability of the investment manager or investment adviser to continue to perform its obligations under any such agreement;

“(III) any other action or inaction by the investment manager or investment adviser that has or could reasonably be expected to have a materially adverse effect on the

collateralized loan obligation, if the investment manager or investment adviser fails to cure or take reasonable steps to cure such effect within a reasonable time; or

“(IV) a comparable event or circumstance that threatens, or could reasonably be expected to threaten, the interests of holders of the debt securities.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARRETT. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials to the RECORD on H.R. 4167, as amended, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, at this point, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4167, which is the Restoring Proven Financing for American Employers Act. It was introduced by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), who we will be hearing from shortly. And I would also like to thank my good friend from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), the ranking member of the Capital Markets Subcommittee, for her bipartisan and commonsense work on this important issue as well.

Today we have the opportunity to correct, in a strong, bipartisan way, an egregious example of regulatory overreach. For no reason that has been coherently stated by anyone, the banking regulators responsible for implementing the Volcker Rule have included provisions in their final rule that will literally cripple the market for collateralized loan obligations, also called CLOs.

See, at the stroke of a pen, the banking regulators are going to wreak havoc on one of the largest and most important sources of financing for literally hundreds of growing companies across this country. If the CLO provisions in the Volcker Rule go forward as planned, there will be a heavy price to pay in failed companies and also lost jobs.

So why is the government doing this? Did CLOs do anything to cause the financial crisis? No, they did not. Are CLOs a menace to the stability of our financial system? No, again. Is the small proportion of securities included in some CLO structures a national crisis that requires such a heavy hand by the Federal Government? Of course not.

Thankfully, the bill we have today, introduced by my friend from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), fixes this problem of the banking regulators’ own making. First, it prevents a disastrous fire sale

of suddenly impermissible legacy CLOs. Second, it narrows the Volcker rule’s absurdly broad definition of an “ownership interest” in a CLO.

Last month, the Financial Services Committee passed this bill on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis, with all but three members of the committee voting in favor of it. The Independent Community Bankers of America and the American Bankers Association have all voiced their support as well.

I am sorry, though, that it has come to this. You know, time and time again the committee has admonished the banking regulators that the CLO provisions of Volcker were a threat to the economy and to the financial stability that they are supposed to be protecting. Time and again, however, the unwieldy banking regulators chose to do nothing. If they had corrected this problem as we have been urging them to do and which they could do, we would not be here wasting valuable legislative time saving the CLO market from our own public servants.

Now, some have suggested that the agencies don’t have the legal authority to fix the problems. It is interesting that Federal agencies always seem to have plenty of authority when it comes to doing something, but when they need to fix something that they messed up, well, suddenly they have no authority.

Perhaps the real problem is the fact that we have so many different banking regulatory agencies in the first place. If coordinating these agencies to avoid a regulatory train wreck is too difficult, then maybe we need fewer agencies.

I have spoken before about the proliferation of government regulators with authority over our financial markets. More regulators mean more wasteful duplication of functions, more regulatory confusion, more empire building, more bureaucratic rivalry, less accountability, and less problem solving.

An ever increasing number of agencies with ever increasing authority only makes our financial system more unsustainable and more arbitrary and more unstable, and it makes it all the more likely that the heavy-handed government will fall suddenly on some unlucky corner of the economy.

So it is my hope that this body can come together now and support this bipartisan piece of legislation so that we can ensure that the market for collateralized loan obligations, CLOs, is not carelessly and needlessly destroyed. While they may not have a high profile, CLOs provide a valuable function that our recovering economy cannot do without, and I urge my colleagues for that reason to support H.R. 4167.

And at this time, I will reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4167, to create jobs and prevent unintended consequences of the Volcker Rule, which I strongly support.

The bill before us represents a truly bipartisan compromise that balances the author's goal to preserve a proven financing mechanism with democratic concerns against watering down the Volcker Rule, which is designed to prevent banks from gambling on Wall Street with consumer deposits, the very type of behavior that nearly took down our financial system and gave us the Great Recession.

The truth is the Volcker Rule is not intended to capture debt. Debt is an everyday tool of plain vanilla financial institutions. No, the Volcker Rule is about equity ownership. We don't want banks owning hedge funds and private equity funds, but of course we still want banks out in the communities lending to the real economy.

I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for working together on a compromise that makes a narrow, commonsense fix to the Volcker Rule without undermining its core purpose: prohibiting risky proprietary trading by federally insured banks.

I also want to recognize Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS for the truly bipartisan way this bill came to the floor by a vote of 53-3. I am hopeful that we will see more bipartisanship from our committee on the business of the American people: comprehensive community bank regulatory relief, TRIA, reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank to help American job creators access foreign markets, and reforming Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to protect taxpayers without undermining the housing market and preserving the 30-year fixed rate mortgage for middle class families.

The bill before us would simply clarify that the right to vote to remove a CLO manager in traditional, creditor-protective circumstances, such as a material breach of contract, does not, by itself, convert a debt security into an equity security under the Volcker Rule.

It would also provide narrow relief to existing CLO securities as long as they qualify as debt under this bill. For CLOs that are not debt securities under this bill, banks will get an additional 2 years to divest, which will prevent a disruptive fire sale of these securities and cost as much as \$8 billion.

At this time, I will insert the text of a letter from the Independent Community Bankers of America into the RECORD.

INDEPENDENT COMMUNITY  
BANKERS OF AMERICA,  
Washington, DC, April 28, 2014.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: On behalf of the more than 6,500 community banks represented by ICBA, I write to express our support for the Restoring Proven Financing for American Employers Act (H.R. 4167), which

will be considered on the House floor this week. Introduced by Rep. Andy Barr, H.R. 4167 will allow community banks to retain debt securities of collateralized loan obligations (CLO) issued before January 31, 2014. The Financial Services Committee reported H.R. 4167 by a nearly unanimous vote in March.

As you may know, the final Volcker Rule implementing a provision of the Dodd-Frank Act, issued December 10, requires banks, including community banks, to divest their holdings of CLOs by July 2015. Though the compliance date was later extended, this requirement could cause a significant, immediate and permanent loss of capital for community banks that hold these securities and are still recovering from the financial crisis. H.R. 4167 would avert this damaging and unanticipated outcome by repealing the divestment requirement for CLOs issued before January 31.

ICBA urges you to support H.R. 4167. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

CAMDEN R. FINE,  
President & CEO.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Once again, I would like to thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), who also is a member of the United Solutions Caucus and is dedicated to real problem solving and saving the partisanship for another day. He worked hard on this bill and was willing to reach across the aisle for commonsense compromise. As a result of this hard work, this jobs bill is on the suspension calendar and has earned a strong bipartisan vote.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, at this time, we are now joined by the sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from Kentucky, who, as was indicated, worked in a bipartisan manner to get it out of committee, here on the floor. And I assume we are going to see a strong bipartisan vote for it on the floor as well.

At this time, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, my friend who has, himself, shown a considerable amount of leadership on this issue in making sure that American companies on Main Street and all across this country have access to reliable, affordable capital to grow their businesses and create jobs.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Florida for participating in the discussion here today in a bipartisan manner and for his support. And I also thank my colleagues both on this side and that side of the aisle for their support and for recognizing that we do need to fix this problem.

H.R. 4167, the Restoring Proven Financing for American Employers Act, is about jobs and economic growth. It is about reliable access to affordable credit to small, midcap, and emerging-growth companies, in fact, some of the most dynamic and job-producing companies in America.

As the U.S. Chamber of Commerce states in its letter of support, my legislation is necessary to "fix the adverse

impacts of the Volcker Rule upon thousands of Main Street businesses."

This legislation, as has been mentioned earlier, passed out of the Financial Services Committee on a March 14 strongly bipartisan vote of 53-3. I want to thank Congresswoman CAROLYN MALONEY of New York for her support and work in developing this commonsense legislation to provide a necessary clarification of the Volcker Rule while maintaining the original legislative intent regarding the treatment of collateralized loan obligations.

While there are several exemptions provided in the statute included in section 619 of the Dodd-Frank law, which authorizes the Volcker Rule, that legislative language states:

Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit or restrict the ability of a banking entity or nonbank financial company supervised by the Federal Reserve Board to sell or securitize loans in a manner otherwise permitted by law.

Nevertheless, despite this plain language in the statute, certain asset-backed securities originally thought to be exempt by the Volcker Rule are now subject to the covered fund definition.

So the pragmatic need to provide this defined, narrow fix is why the legislation is endorsed by the American Bankers Association, by the Kentucky Bankers Association, and by the small community banks around this country, the Independent Community Bankers of America. And it is why a small community bank in my home State of Kentucky contacted my office in January. He alerted us to the fact that failing to fix this problem could very well mean significant losses to that small community bank, possible layoffs of employees, and higher borrowing rates and fees for the customer in the local community.

So getting this issue right and fixing the problem is important to community banks. It is important to U.S. employers and businesses on Main Street. It is important to a whole lot of jobs that support families in Kentucky and around this country. And here is why: collateralized loan obligations, or CLOs, have proven to be a critical source of funding for U.S. businesses over the last 20 years.

□ 1300

Today, CLOs continue to provide over \$300 billion in financing to U.S. companies, including companies that are well-known to all of us in this Chamber—Dunkin' Donuts, American Airlines, Burger King, Toys "R" Us, Neiman Marcus, Delta Air Lines, Goodyear Tire, and even a mattress and bedding company in my hometown of Lexington, Kentucky, Tempur Sealy. Yet, this valuable form of corporate finance that supports jobs is under assault due to the regulators' implementation of the Volcker Rule, which makes it impermissible for banks to retain or invest in these assets.

According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, H.R. 4167 would "preserve

this important source of financing that supports growth and job creation throughout our economy.” CLOs have a proven track record of success, and they “performed very well before, during and since the financial crisis.”

According to the Kentucky Bankers Association, investment in CLOs is a “conservative addition to an existing and balanced investment approach” and a “thoughtful solution to the equity problem” that banks face. In fact, the default rate on CLOs in the last 20 years has been less than one-half of 1 percent.

Yet, despite this proven track record and despite this critical source of funding for growing U.S. companies and job producers in America, the Volcker Rule regulators require that banks divest of their CLO holdings. The consequences will be a fire sale in the market that will cause significant losses to banks currently holding what are known as legacy CLOs.

Looking forward, it will increase the cost of borrowing in the future for U.S. businesses looking to expand, grow, and create much-needed jobs.

These warnings may sound abstract. So let me explain how this affects a real business that employs many of my constituents in Kentucky’s Sixth Congressional District. Tempur-Pedic is a high-end mattress bedding company, and they produce, through space-age technology, very comfortable, high-end beds for the top of the market. But they knew that in order to be resilient and to be growing in the future, they needed to acquire a competitor that covered the rest of the marketplace—the value products, the midlevel products, and a lower but higher level form of mattress so that in the event of an economic downturn or competitive pressures in the marketplace, they would have a cross-section of the entire marketplace with all price points of bedding.

So Tempur-Pedic used CLO financing, where it didn’t have access to affordable corporate bond financing, as affordable corporate bond financing. They accessed CLO financing and closed this transaction where they acquired a well-known company to a lot of Americans, Sealy, and that transaction closed in March of 2013. This allowed them to expand their business and create already in just a year’s time 200 new jobs in my district.

Thanks to CLO financing, Tempur Sealy is now a more resilient company and better poised for growth in the future. And if Tempur Sealy sees an opportunity to grow even more and is in need of a commercial loan, we want to make sure that this source of affordable financing is there for them and for all U.S. companies.

H.R. 4167 is a defined, narrow fix which clarifies that the Volcker Rule should not be construed to require the divestiture of any debt securities of CLOs prior to July 21, 2017, if such CLOs were issued before January 21, 2014.

H.R. 4167 also clarifies that a bank shall not be considered to have an ownership interest in a CLO for purposes of enforcement of the Volcker Rule if such debt security has no indicia of ownership other than the right to participate in removal for cause or in the selection of a replacement investment manager or investment adviser of the CLO.

So, in sum, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a bipartisan, commonsense fix to a real world problem voiced by community banks and emerging growth companies like Tempur Sealy in my own district that will benefit these companies all around the country. So I urge a vote in support of H.R. 4167, the Restoring Proven Financing for American Employers Act.

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

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO).

Mr. CAPUANO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of those three people who voted “no.” I do not expect to win here today on the floor. And I want to be real clear: I do not oppose consolidated loan obligations. I support them. They are an important financial tool.

But that is not what this bill does. This bill allows risky CLOs. Most CLOs would be permitted pursuant to the Volcker Rule. If they only contained loans, they are okay. Any bank can own them to any degree.

So let’s not think that somehow the Volcker Rule has killed CLOs. They have simply said they have to be what they say they are, collateralized loan obligations, not collateralized loan obligations put together with all kinds of other junk. Simple. Straightforward.

There is not going to be any fire sale. The regulators have already listened to the congressional comments, of which I was one, asking for a delay to allow the existing CLOs that do not meet the regulation to be held for 2 more years. There will be no fire sale. There has been no fire sale.

As we speak, the sale of CLOs is at a historic high. The Volcker Rule has not killed the market. They are back to almost the same levels they were at in 2007 before the crash.

Let me be clear. I agree that CLOs did not, on their own, participate in the ‘08 problems and that they do have a record of success. But prior to 2008, most people would have said the same thing about collateralized debt obligations. By the way, at some point, somebody has to explain to me the difference between debt and loans, but that is a different issue.

Collateralized loan obligations are important. They are a good, thoughtful way to provide capital. By the way, most of them are used for leveraged buyouts, as the example we just heard, for leveraged buyouts. Now, you can argue whether leveraged buyouts to

the extent they happen are good or bad, but that is what they are mostly used for.

I also want to be real clear. Very, very, very few small, community banks have any CLOs. Over 70 percent of the collateralized loan obligations, both the ones that are allowed and disallowed, are owned by three banks. Over 70 percent are owned by three of the largest banks in the world. And by the way, almost all of those CLOs would be permitted to those three large banks.

So what are we solving here? We are pretending to save some great investment tool. It is not under threat. We are pretending that no problems could ever happen. Those are the same discussions we had in ‘05, ‘06, ‘07, and ‘08. All the risk that was being assumed comfortably and successfully prior to 2008 was perfectly fine. Those regulators are just killing America—until the crash happened, from which we are still recovering.

All we want to do is take a look at some of the riskier aspects of this financial aspect and simply say, whoa, it doesn’t mean everybody can’t do it. It simply means regulated banks can’t do it. Private investors could still do every one of these things. Why would regulated banks be prohibited from doing only the most risky CLOs? Because they are protected by taxpayer dollars, because they are protected by the FDIC, and because we, as a society, have said that bank stability is important to the American economy.

So let’s be clear: CLOs are not being killed. They are being limited in a very small way only to target the most risky CLOs. Banks and others have already adjusted to those limitations by reinvigorating the CLO market in a way that has been and would be allowed under the existing rule. But yet we have a problem.

We have a crisis that we have to solve. A handful of people will not be allowed to risk my mother’s investment. That is what we are crying about. Well, I have heard that before, and it didn’t turn out too well in ‘08. A little limitation is good for the American system. And, by the way, it is historically the system as it has been for a thousand years.

I just want to end with a quote by Paul Volcker himself. I presume Paul Volcker knows more about the economy and the markets than most people in Congress. But maybe not. Maybe some people are smarter than him. This is what he said about this bill:

This constant effort to get around the rule limiting banks’ investment in hedge funds on behalf of a few institutions who apparently want room to resume the financing practices that got us into trouble in the past really should end.

CLOs—straightforward and plain vanilla—are a good and important investment tool for the American economy. They should and will be allowed under the current rules. There should and will be time for people to move slowly

and thoughtfully without a fire sale out of the handful of risky investments that are there, and even those people who love those risky investments will be able to do it still, just not through a subsidized bank.

I know that I have not convinced anyone. I know that I am going to lose this vote on the floor, and I respect it. And I hope to God that my concerns are wrong and overblown. I hope that in a few years I come back and I apologize to the gentleman for my concerns, that they were overblown and unjustified. Because America will be better off if you are right. But if you are wrong, a handful of people will make a lot of money, but the rest of us will be dramatically and deeply hurt once again.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his remarks.

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AMODEI). The gentleman from New Jersey has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, and I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his contribution to the debate. It gives us an opportunity to actually analyze what exactly we are talking about here.

We are not talking about the risky assets that were contributing factors to the financial crisis. If this were junk, as the gentleman from Massachusetts describes it to be, the default rate on CLOs would have been much higher over the last 20 years. But the default rate on CLOs over the last 20 years, including during the financial crisis, was less than half of 1 percent. Not one of the nearly 4,000 notes rated AAA or AA ever defaulted in CLOs.

Part of the reason for this strong, durable performance of CLOs is because CLOs are very different from the troubled assets that fueled the financial crisis. CLOs are distinct because, number one, they are based on diverse assets, commercial loans that are well diversified across the industry. These are solid, diversified loans, and they are typically secured loans.

Secondly, there is an alignment of interest between CLO investors and the CLO managers. The managers actually have skin in the game.

Finally, third, there are significantly greater transparency features to CLOs and disclosure since the commercial loans here, the secured commercial loans, are issued by companies that report financial information on a regular basis to investors, and they are required to provide regular financial reports with the SEC.

Now, with respect to the gentleman's claim that the CLO market is doing

just great, there is a lot of misinformation about this. According to the Loan Syndication and Trading Association, U.S. banks hold an estimated \$70 billion of CLO notes, which would have to be divested if we don't make the fix by July 21, 2015, and with the Fed's change a little bit later. But even the threat of such a divestiture roiled the CLO market in December and January before Congress took action.

So due primarily to uncertainty around the Volcker Rule in January 2014, U.S. CLO issuance dropped nearly 90 percent from the prior year, drying up access to credit. The only reason why the CLO market has recovered since January is because of this bill. It is because of the legislative action, the bipartisan efforts of this body.

Finally, I just would like to conclude by responding to the gentleman's assertion that a little limitation is good for the system—a little limitation is good for the system. Well, hear what a witness at our hearing about this issue said about this little limitation:

If you have a situation where the Volcker Rule basically impedes U.S. banks and some foreign banks from investing in CLOs, you can see their appetite reduced by 80 percent. They will just not participate in the CLO market.

Ultimately, that leads to our other point, in that we can see a significant cost to financing for U.S. companies. What happens when you see a significant cost to financing or decreased credit availability for companies? That means these companies that have over 5 million employees can't build new factories, they can't build new cellular networks, they can't expand, and they can't combine and merge to bigger, more resilient companies that can compete effectively on a global basis. It ultimately would have a very destructive effect on U.S. companies.

So, Mr. Speaker, in sum, I will just bring it back to my home district. If a little limitation is good for the system, tell that to the 200 Kentuckians who now have jobs because of this innovative source and a responsible source of commercial credit in America.

□ 1315

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

I just want to take a moment to respond as well to the gentleman from Massachusetts. He indicated that he is probably not going to convince anyone who is supporting the bill. I presume I am probably not going to convince him either, as I look over there, because he is now off the floor; but if he is back in his office and tuning us in, let me just make some points where he might be convinced.

He spoke about the fire sale that will not occur now under the proposed Volcker Rule. Well, yes, it still will occur, just because you are not saying that the sale has to occur this afternoon, but it is going to occur at a set point in time, either 6 months from now, a year from now, or as they are

proposing, 2 years from now. In either case, when you set a date certain for a sale, then everyone else out there knows that this is the day that they might as well wait for; and eventually, they will have to sell, and at that point in time, they will engage in a fire sale.

In other words, by setting a date when you have to sell all of your assets or whatever you have, you are basically pushing the price down in that market.

Secondly, with regard to sales up, I guess the gentleman from Kentucky already raised that point. Sales were going down until Congress came together in a unique experience for Congress, which was a bipartisan effort, and once the rest of Main Street and Wall Street saw that Congress can actually do things together and work together in a bipartisan manner, they did what the rest of Americans will do and said: good thing. They said: let's get that market going back up again.

As the gentleman from Kentucky pointed out, that is exactly what occurred.

Thirdly, the gentleman from Massachusetts admitted that the CLO market was not the cause or any cause of the crisis that we had back in 2008, and I have not heard any testimony from anyone on any panel from either end of the spectrum that the CLOs would be a basis for the next crisis that inevitably will come.

Next, the gentleman from Massachusetts raised the point that something like 70 percent of all the CLOs out there are captured by something like three large banks or three financial institutions and made it sound as though the smaller and mid-sized banks are not really playing here.

Then you had to listen to the next thing that he said. He said that most of those CLOs held by those would already be protected by the current Volcker proposal out of the administration.

Well, that tells you right there that the legislation from the gentleman from Kentucky is not addressing or not trying to solve a problem for the three large banks. The legislation he is trying to put forward in a bipartisan manner is, in fact, doing just as he explained for the smaller banks, for the mid-sized banks, those are the ones that we are concerned about; and we want to make sure that they are not hurt through fire sales or further restrictions on them.

Finally, last—but maybe not least—is the fact that this bill will not end too big to fail. Well, we know that Dodd-Frank, unfortunately, did not end too big to fail.

Dodd-Frank did a number of things, but it did not end too big to fail, and the way to solve that is not by nitpicking around the edges on areas such as this that did not cause the crisis in the first place.

In fact, the authors and the proponents of Dodd-Frank understood that when they passed Dodd-Frank—because, look, what is the language in

Dodd-Frank when it comes to the Volcker Rule and the CLO matter that is before us today? Did they want to have this included in the rule that Volcker would eventually come out with? The answer is no.

The language specifically in 619 of Dodd-Frank—voted in favor of, by the way, by the gentleman from Massachusetts—says:

Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit or restrict the ability of a banking entity or nonbank financial company supervised by the Federal Reserve Board to sell or secure type loans in a manner otherwise permitted by law.

What does that sentence mean? That means that the sponsors of—and those like the gentleman from Massachusetts who supported Dodd-Frank—specifically put into the Dodd-Frank law the direction to the Fed and the other regulators that they should not be doing what they are doing right now. They should not be putting, as it says, limitations on this type of instrument.

So for all of those reasons, if the gentleman from Massachusetts is still watching what we are doing on the floor, perhaps we have convinced him that he should join with the majority on both sides of the House and not be part of the three or so who remain opposed to this and support the legislation, H.R. 4167.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues and the gentleman from New Jersey for their thoughtful debate on this commonsense improvement to the Volcker Rule.

I appreciate my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle always keeping the focus on preventing some of the world's largest banks from subjecting the American people to another financial crisis.

However, I believe this bill strikes the right balance to protect the American people and create jobs. It was reported by the Financial Services Committee with a strong bipartisan 53-3 vote, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4167, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4414, EXPATRIATE HEALTH COVERAGE CLARIFICATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 555 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 555

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4414) to clarify the treatment under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of health plans in which expatriates are the primary enrollees, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, 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 Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), 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. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 555 provides for the consideration to fix yet another flaw that has to be corrected in the Affordable Care Act due to the rushed process by which the bill was passed in March of 2010.

As a direct result of the hasty legislation, experts have estimated that over 1,000 Americans will lose their jobs unless Congress takes immediate action to correct and clarify the Affordable Care Act's impact on expatriate health care plans.

This bill before us today will do just that, putting Americans above partisan politics and helping yet another subset of people in our country who currently are being harmed by the President's takeover of our health care system.

The rule before us today provides for one full hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member on the Committee on Ways and Means. Further, the rule provides for the adoption of an amendment by the bill's authors, Representatives NUNES from California and CARNEY from Delaware, which addresses a number of concerns the minority expressed during debate of this legislation several weeks ago.

True to the Speaker's commitment of letting the House work its will, Republicans listened to those concerns and

crafted a bipartisan amendment to improve the legislation. In addition, the rule provides the minority the standard motion to recommit.

H.R. 4414, the Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act of 2014, addresses the problem caused by the Affordable Care Act, which could result in those Americans who live abroad for a substantial portion of the year, those individuals referred to as expatriates, that could cause them to lose their health care coverage because of the one-size-fits-all approach to our health care system, which was employed by the wizards who wrote the Affordable Care Act.

Expatriate health care providers have traditionally offered tailored, specialized insurance plans to meet the needs of Americans who spend their time overseas. These citizens simply cannot rely on a local general practitioner or neighborhood clinic because, so often, they are far away from home.

However, the Affordable Care Act does not provide an avenue by which these plans can continue to be offered. Instead, Senator REID, Kathleen Sebelius, and Barack Obama decided it was up to them to decide how Americans' health insurance plans should be structured.

The legislation before us today is a clear example of why a top-down Federal approach to health care does not work. Consumers should be in the driver's seat deciding what works best for them, what works best for themselves and their families, not someone sitting in Washington, D.C.

Because of the regulations in the Affordable Care Act, insurers have announced that they will have to shift their expatriate operations overseas in order to be in compliance with the law, and with those operations will go those jobs. All Americans know that it was shown to be an empty promise when someone said, if you like your health care plan, you can keep it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is a darn good thing the President never promised, if you like your job, you can keep it. Over a thousand jobs tied to expatriate health care operations will now be shipped overseas. Americans who rely on these health plans, which until now have worked well for them and their families, are going to have to scramble and scramble fast to find alternative coverage.

Some examples of those Americans who will potentially lose their health care coverage due to the unyielding regulations of the Affordable Care Act include businessmen and businesswomen, pilots, foreign aid workers, ship operators, and tour guides.

The President has already acknowledged that his law will hurt these Americans, announcing that the Department of Health and Human Services would, yet again, ignore the law and provide a temporary waiver from complying with the law's requirements; but this is not how you fix flawed legislation.

You involve the legislative branch. You come to Congress, and you ask that you legislate and fix the problem in the law.

Now, the White House, where there is a so-called constitutional scholar, the President seems to have only read article II of the Constitution, skipping entirely over the first and longest article, article I, where the Founders make the case that Congress is the body where laws are passed, the body where laws are written, the body where laws are amended. As a result of the President making this change unilaterally, the relief is only temporary.

The bill before us today provides the long-term security, the security that is required to give these affected Americans and their families the certainty they need to make decisions for their futures. These expatriate plans are not barebone plans that some in this body have criticized.

This is not lousy insurance. They typically are robust plans. They are comprehensive plans, which simply cater to the special needs of Americans who travel and are gone for a good portion of the year.

□ 1330

The amendment by Representatives NUNES and CARNEY, which is adopted in the rule before us, takes a thoughtful piece of legislation and improves it even further. It clarifies that any future plans offered to expatriates must still comply with the actuarial requirements in the Affordable Care Act, as well as any pre-Affordable Care Act laws, including the Employee Retirement Income and Security Act, known as ERISA, and the Public Health Service Act. Moreover, it narrowly tailors this relief to those Americans who spend more than 180 days outside the country. These were concerns that Democrats expressed during the previous debate on this legislation, and they are fully addressed in the legislation before us today.

This is a carefully crafted fix. It was necessary because the underlying law was so poorly crafted. It is needed to help Americans who are being directly harmed by the President's health care law.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I voted for the Affordable Care Act, I support the Affordable Care Act, and I believe in the Affordable Care Act. I believe every person in this country ought to have health care. I don't think that is a radical idea, but my friends on the other

side of the aisle apparently do. I think everybody in this country is entitled to good, quality health insurance. I think when they get sick they ought to know they will be taken care of and not have to worry about whether they are going to get covered or not because of pre-existing conditions or whether they are going to meet some sort of lifetime cap and be excluded from coverage.

That is what the Affordable Care Act is all about. That is what this big controversy that my friends on the other side of the aisle have decided to make on this issue is all about. So I am making sure that everybody in this country has health care. Boy, what a radical idea, what a radical idea.

I will also say that having supported the Affordable Care Act, it is not a perfect piece of legislation. I have never seen a perfect piece of legislation ever come out of Congress. Legislation, especially legislation that covers a subject as wide as this, at times will be tweaked. There will be unintended consequences that we will come and we will try to fix. That is what legislation is supposed to do: to try to fix the problems.

Democrats have said that from the beginning, that we want to make this bill work, work as well as it possibly can. We said we would be willing to work with Republicans and the administration to address the problems that have come about as a result of the implementation of this law. By no means does that mean that we should repeal the Affordable Care Act, which is something my Republican friends are obsessed with. To the contrary, we need to do everything we can to fix any challenges that this law may have to make sure that every American gets the benefit of the Affordable Care Act.

H.R. 4414, the Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act, is trying to fix one problem with the law. My friend from Delaware (Mr. CARNEY) and others are attempting to try to fix a provision in the law that causes some problems with the ways that expatriates are treated under the ACA.

This is one example of how we—Democrats and Republicans—should be able to work together. This is one example of how we—supporters and opponents of the ACA—should be able to lay those differences aside as we try to find solutions and move our country forward.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that House and Senate Democrats and Republicans have been working with the White House to come up with a solution that can pass both Houses of Congress and be signed by the President. It is also my understanding that discussions were ongoing as late as yesterday afternoon when the House majority decided to go with the version before us today instead of waiting to continue negotiations in a bipartisan, bicameral way so that we can get a bill moved expeditiously through both Houses and signed into law by the President of the United States.

I am more than a little disappointed, Mr. Speaker, because I want to work with the majority to fix this problem. I am concerned that this bill, the bill before us that we are talking about right now, creates other problems, namely excluding green card holders and nonimmigrant workers from most of the coverage protections provided by the ACA. I am disappointed that this process was closed down even though negotiations were still ongoing.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas literally took my breath away when he talked about that this represents the Speaker's pledge to let the House work its will. This issue first came up under a suspension, which was totally closed, and it is coming to the floor today under a closed rule. Those of us who have some ideas on how we might be able to make this more palatable to address some of the concerns that we have will not have that opportunity. They have closed the process down. I hardly think that that can be described as an open process or as a transparent process. This is yet another closed rule, another closed rule.

Mr. Speaker, this process was flawed and this process could have been better. There are many of us on my side of the aisle who believe that we need to fix this flaw that the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CARNEY) has brought to our attention, but we need to do it in the right way, and this is not the right way to do it.

I think what is going to happen here is—my friends on the other side of the aisle control most of the votes here so they will probably pass this bill—but what will happen then is that the Senate will then have negotiations with the White House and try to figure out how to fix this problem. They will pass it, then it will have to come back to the House again, and then we will have to deal with it separately.

I regret very much that my friends have decided to go this way. If they had waited a few more days we probably could have gotten a solution to this that could have received unanimous support. Instead, we are back at the same old-same old, where it is attack the ACA, attack the ACA, and pretend to try to fix it by addressing a legitimate concern, but adding to that a whole bunch of extraneous stuff that creates other problems.

I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and to vote "no" on the bill. Let's wait until the Senate gets it right with the White House and we can revisit this issue.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

This bill was brought to the floor under suspension of the rules prior to the Easter recess. So it has been available for consideration, for staff work to occur, for some period of time. The fact of the matter is that it is an imminent problem facing people who are working

outside of the country, and for that reason it was important to get it solved.

If the gentleman feels that more work should have been done prior to that time, perhaps they should have worked with the majority prior to it being brought up under suspension. I don't know the answer to that. But I do know where we are today is that this is a problem that needs to be fixed, and the Republican majority is seeing to it that it is fixed, bringing it to the floor under a rule. The minority will have an opportunity to amend during a motion to recommit, and I certainly look forward to a lively discussion during that time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

What we are considering right now before the full House is very clear.

One, a closed rule. What a closed rule means is that you can't offer any amendments. So some of the concerns that have been raised about the underlying bill we can't fix. For the life of me, I don't understand why, if the gentleman claims that the Republican majority is committed to an open, transparent process where the House can work its will, I don't understand why you would approve a closed rule on this.

Let's be honest about this. It is not like my friends on the other side of the aisle are doing anything else. We have had multiple repeals of the Affordable Care Act before us. We have had lots of message issues that their pollsters say poll well, but the Republican majority hasn't really done very much to help the American people in any way, shape, or form. So it is not like the time doesn't exist to maybe have a little bit more debate on an issue like this and be able to perfect this bill. This is a closed rule. This is a closed rule, this is a closed process, and this has become a closed House.

Again, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this closed rule, reject this closed process, reject the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

This, this was brought to the House floor as a closed rule in March of 2010. This coercive, partisan piece of legislation which is going to affect health care in this country for every man, woman, and child for the next three generations, this was brought under a closed rule.

We are trying to fix one very narrow problem contained within these pages. It seems to me that there has been ample discussion. A bill was debated under suspension. It did not receive the required two-thirds vote, so it is being brought back today under a rule, and the minority will have an opportunity to offer an amendment during the motion to recommit. This was a closed rule which was very damaging to the country. Today's closed rule is simply

to fix one of the many problems contained herein.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I remind the gentleman that the Speaker of the House said when the Republicans won the majority that they were going to conduct proceedings here in the most open way possible—this will be the most open and transparent House ever. And it has become the most closed House ever.

Because the gentleman brought up the Affordable Care Act, I want to make sure he understands the facts. While the bill we are talking about right now received 20 minutes of debate under suspension, let me read you the facts about the Affordable Care Act, in case my friend forgot.

The House held nearly 100 hours of hearings and 83 hours of committee markups. The House heard from 181 witnesses, both Democrats and Republicans. 239 amendments were considered in the three committees of jurisdiction, 121 of which were adopted. The bill was available for 72 hours before Members were asked to vote on it on the floor.

The process was just as open in the Senate. The Senate Finance Committee held more than 53 hearings. The Finance Committee also spent 8 days marking up the legislation, the longest markup in 22 years for the committee. The Senate Health Committee held 47 bipartisan hearings, roundtables, and walk-throughs on health care reform. The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act may have started out with a different bill number, but the fact remains hundreds of hours of hearings on the Affordable Care Act, hundreds of witnesses, hundreds of amendments considered in the committee, and countless hours of townhall meetings.

My friend on the other side of the aisle likes to say, well, there was a different bill number when we voted here on the floor, but as he knows, the process of using a different bill number is very common around here. In fact, the Republican majority has done it several times in the past 3 years. But regardless of the bill number, the work that went into forming this legislation was one of the most open processes in the history of Congress.

That is the facts on that.

But let me also make one other point. The problem my friends on the other side of the aisle have with the Affordable Care Act is not with the process. It is just they don't believe that people ought to have affordable health care in this country. They have spent countless hours on this floor trying to repeal a bill that eliminates pre-existing conditions as a way to deny people insurance.

They have been fighting against a bill that helps senior citizens get free preventive care coverage, that helps close that doughnut hole in the Medicare prescription drug bill. They are fighting against a bill that has brought

millions and millions and millions of more people into a process where they can afford health care. So they have been against this from the very beginning.

I think the American people have a very different view. Their view is that they want this bill to work. My friends on the other side of the aisle have just spent countless hours, countless days, countless weeks, countless months just trying to repeal it. It is just Johnny One Note: repeal, repeal, repeal.

This idea that everybody should have affordable health care is such a controversy in the Republican Congress, I can't quite understand why. Why is it such a bad idea that everybody in this Congress has access to good quality health care? Why is that an idea that causes such resentment on the other side of the aisle? I don't get it.

We ought to make sure that this law gets implemented properly, and we ought to do this the right way. My friends don't want to do it the right way, so we are going to have to wait for the Senate to work it out with the administration and then send it back to us. There really should be a better way to do this.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Does the gentleman have any other speakers?

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

As much as I would like to continue this lively back-and-forth, we both know each other's positions on this extremely well.

No, I have no other speakers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1345

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question.

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that would allow the House to consider the Fair Minimum Wage Act. This week, the Senate will vote to raise the minimum wage to \$10.10 an hour. Now is the time for the House to act and to honor our commitment to the middle class by giving hard-working Americans fair pay.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Again, I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who like to talk about how the Republican majority is committed to allowing the House to work its will and is committed to an open and transparent process, to vote with us on this.

We have been trying to get the minimum wage bill to the floor forever, and we can't even get it up for a vote so that every Member has an opportunity to vote up or down. This is that opportunity so that we can have that vote, a vote to help lift people out of poverty and to help give people an opportunity to live better lives.

There are millions of workers in this country who are working full time—who are working hard at minimum wage jobs—and they are still stuck in poverty. There are millions and millions of people in this country who work hard full time at minimum wage jobs, but who earn so little that they still qualify for SNAP, and they rely on that program to put food on their tables because their paychecks don't provide enough.

This is an important issue, and I hope that my colleagues will support me on this. I urge all of my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question, and I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for the consideration of a critical bill to ensure Americans who are being hurt by the Affordable Care Act can have some relief.

Americans and their families who live abroad for part of the year face losing this specialized health insurance coverage on which they have come to rely. In addition, the men and women who operate on these health care plans face having their jobs outsourced overseas in order for companies to comply with regulations from the Department of Health and Human Services.

I certainly want to thank Mr. NUNES and Mr. CARNEY for their thoughtful legislation. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 555 OFFERED BY  
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. 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. 1010) to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage. 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 Education and the Workforce. 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. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1010.

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 impli-

cations. 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. BURGESS. 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. MCGOVERN. 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, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by a 5-minute vote on adopting House Resolution 555, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 189, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 180]

YEAS—226

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

Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman

Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)

Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Williams
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
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
Schneider
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southernland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry

Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—189

Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
McGovern
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.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
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
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
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Stated for:
Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 180 I was unavoidably detained and did not finish meeting with Chancellor Phylis Wise in time to get to floor. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to have my votes recorded on the House floor on Monday, April 28, 2014 and Tuesday April 29, 2014. Severe weather in the Midwest cancelled my flight out of Minneapolis on Monday afternoon, and again delayed me out of Chicago on Tuesday morning. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of H.R. 4192 (roll No. 178) and in favor of H.R. 4120 (roll No. 179) on Monday, April 28, and against H. Res. 555 (roll No. 180) on Tuesday, April 29.

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. McGOVERN. 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 238, noes 181, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 181]

AYES—238

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishak
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly

NOES—181

Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
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.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy T.
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran

NOT VOTING—12

Brown (FL)
Campbell
Griffin (AR)
Hensarling
McCarthy (NY)

McKeon
Miller, Gary
Murphy (PA)
Richmond
Rush

NOT VOTING—16

Brown (FL)
Campbell
Clever
Davis, Rodney
Griffin (AR)
Kind

□ 1418

Messrs. CARSON of Indiana and CAS-TRO of Texas, Ms. SINEMA, Messrs. ISRAEL and CARNEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1425

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.

### EXPATRIATE HEALTH COVERAGE CLARIFICATION ACT OF 2014

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 555, I call up the bill (H.R. 4414) to clarify the treatment under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of health plans in which expatriates are the primary enrollees, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). Pursuant to House Resolution 555, the amendment printed in House Report 113-422 is considered adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 4414

*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 “Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act of 2014”.

#### SEC. 2. TREATMENT OF EXPATRIATE HEALTH PLANS UNDER ACA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the provisions of (including any amendment made by) the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) and of title I and subtitle B of title II of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152) shall not apply with respect to—

- (1) expatriate health plans;
- (2) employers with respect to any such plans for which such employers are acting as plan sponsors; or
- (3) expatriate health insurance issuers with respect to coverage offered by such issuers under such plans.

(b) MINIMUM ESSENTIAL COVERAGE AND ELIGIBLE EMPLOYER-SPONSORED PLAN.—For purposes of section 5000A(f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and any other section of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that incorporates the definition of minimum essential coverage provided under such section 5000A(f) by reference, coverage under an expatriate health plan shall be deemed to be minimum essential coverage under an eligible employer-sponsored plan as defined in paragraph (2) of such section.

(c) QUALIFIED EXPATRIATES AND DEPENDENTS NOT UNITED STATES HEALTH RISK.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 9010 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (26 U.S.C. 4001 note prec.), for calendar years after 2014, a qualified expatriate (and any dependent of such individual) enrolled in an expatriate health plan shall not be considered a United States health risk.

(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR 2014.—The fee under section 9010 of such Act for calendar year 2014 with respect to any expatriate health insurance issuer shall be the amount which bears the same ratio to the fee amount determined by the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to such issuer under such section for such year (determined without regard to this paragraph) as—

(A) the amount of premiums taken into account under such section with respect to

such issuer for such year, less the amount of premiums for expatriate health plans taken into account under such section with respect to such issuer for such year, bears to

(B) the amount of premiums taken into account under such section with respect to such issuer for such year.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) EXPATRIATE HEALTH INSURANCE ISSUER.—The term “expatriate health insurance issuer” means a health insurance issuer that issues expatriate health plans.

(2) EXPATRIATE HEALTH PLAN.—The term “expatriate health plan” means a group health plan, health insurance coverage offered in connection with a group health plan, or health insurance coverage offered to a group of individuals described in paragraph (3)(B) (which may include dependents of such individuals) that meets each of the following standards:

(A) Substantially all of the primary enrollees in such plan or coverage are qualified expatriates, with respect to such plan or coverage. In applying the previous sentence, an individual shall not be taken into account as a primary enrollee if the individual is not a national of the United States and resides in the country of which the individual is a citizen.

(B) Substantially all of the benefits provided under the plan or coverage are not excepted benefits described in section 9832(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(C) The plan or coverage provides benefits for items and services, in excess of emergency care, furnished by health care providers—

(i) in the case of individuals described in paragraph (3)(A), in the country or countries in which the individual is present in connection with the individual’s employment, and such other country or countries as the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Labor, may designate; or

(ii) in the case of individuals described in paragraph (3)(B), in the country or countries as the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Labor, may designate.

(D) In the case of an expatriate health plan that is a group health plan offered by a plan sponsor that—

(i) also offers a qualifying minimum value domestic group health plan, the plan sponsor reasonably believes that the benefits provided by the expatriate health plan are actuarially similar to, or better than, the benefits provided under a qualifying minimum value domestic group health plan offered by that plan sponsor; or

(ii) does not also offer a qualifying minimum value domestic group health plan, the plan sponsor reasonably believes that the benefits provided by the expatriate health plan are actuarially similar to, or better than, the benefits provided under a qualifying minimum value domestic group health plan.

(E) If the plan or coverage provides dependent coverage of children, the plan or coverage makes such dependent coverage available for adult children until the adult child turns 26 years of age, unless such individual is the child of a child receiving dependent coverage.

(F) The plan or coverage—

(i) is issued by an expatriate health plan issuer, or administered by an administrator, that maintains, with respect to such plan or coverage—

(I) network provider agreements with health care providers that are outside of the United States; and

(II) call centers in more than one country and accepts calls from customers in multiple languages; and

(ii) offers reimbursements for items or services under such plan or coverage in more than two currencies.

(G) The plan or coverage, and the plan sponsor or expatriate health insurance issuer with respect to such plan or coverage, satisfies the provisions of title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg et seq.), chapter 100 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and part 7 of subtitle B of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1181 et seq.), which would otherwise apply to such a plan or coverage, and sponsor or issuer, if not for the enactment of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and title I and subtitle B of title II of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

(3) QUALIFIED EXPATRIATE.—The term “qualified expatriate” means any of the following individuals:

(A) WORKERS.—An individual who is a participant in a group health plan, who is an alien residing outside the United States, a national of the United States, lawful permanent resident, or nonimmigrant for whom there is a good faith expectation by the plan sponsor of the plan that, in connection with the individual’s employment, the individual is abroad for a total of not less than 180 days during any period of 12 consecutive months.

(B) OTHER INDIVIDUALS ABROAD.—An individual, such as a student or religious missionary, who is abroad, and who is a member of a group determined appropriate by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Labor.

(4) QUALIFYING MINIMUM VALUE DOMESTIC GROUP HEALTH PLAN.—The term “qualifying minimum value domestic group health plan” means a group health plan that is offered in the United States that meets the following requirements:

(A) Substantially all of the primary enrollees in the plan are not qualified expatriates, with respect to such plan.

(B) Substantially all of the benefits provided under the plan are not excepted benefits described in section 9832(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(C) The application of section 36B(c)(2)(C)(ii) of such Code to such plan would not prevent an employee eligible for coverage under such plan from being treated as eligible for minimum essential coverage for purposes of section 36B(c)(2)(B) of such Code.

(5) ABROAD.—

(A) UNITED STATES NATIONALS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), for purposes of applying paragraph (3) to a national of the United States, the term “abroad” means outside the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

(ii) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of applying paragraph (3) to a national of the United States who resides in the United States Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, or Guam, the term “abroad” means outside of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and such territory or possession.

(B) FOREIGN CITIZENS.—For purposes of applying paragraph (3) to an individual who is not a national of the United States, the term “abroad” means outside of the country of which that individual is a citizen.

(6) UNITED STATES.—The term “United States” means the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, and Guam.

(7) MISCELLANEOUS TERMS.—

(A) GROUP HEALTH PLAN; HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE; HEALTH INSURANCE ISSUER; PLAN SPONSOR.—The terms “group health plan”, “health insurance coverage”, “health insurance issuer”, and “plan sponsor” have the meanings given those terms in section 2791 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–91), except that in applying such terms under this section the term “health insurance issuer” includes a foreign corporation which is predominantly engaged in an insurance business and which would be subject to tax under subchapter L of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 if it were a domestic corporation.

(B) FOREIGN STATE; NATIONAL OF THE UNITED STATES; NONIMMIGRANT; RESIDE; LAWFUL PERMANENT RESIDENT.—The terms “national of the United States”, and “non-immigrant” have the meaning given such terms in section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)), the term “reside” means having a residence (within the meaning of such term in such section), and the term “lawful permanent resident” means an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence (as defined in such section).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 4414.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House today comes down to one simple question: Will we allow American companies to offer expatriate plans or will we force the offshoring of these plans? Will we support employment in America or stimulate employment overseas?

Mr. CARNEY and I have worked carefully and in good faith on a bipartisan basis to craft a bill that is limited in scope while at the same time remaining true to our commitment to save American jobs.

There have been a few changes to the bill since a bipartisan majority of the House supported it a few weeks ago. We clarified that an expatriate plan must be a comprehensive health care health plan and not a mini-med or other substandard plan.

□ 1430

We tightened the definition of an expatriate. The bill says that an expatriate must be abroad for at least 6 months. This is a much tougher standard, and it will guard against potential abuse.

The bill now also requires an expatriate plan to offer reimbursements in more than two currencies. Plans meet this requirement today, but the addition of this provision protects against

the possible abuse of the expatriate exemption in the future.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill now makes explicit that the expatriate plans must continue to comply with relevant laws enacted prior to ACA, specifically ERISA and the Public Health Service Act.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a good bill. It is a bipartisan bill, and I urge the support of the House.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I shall consume.

There is no doubt about where Democrats stand. We have taken the lead to make sure there is no offshoring, and there has been a good faith effort here, up to a point. Surely, that has been true of Mr. CARNEY in all of his efforts, working with Mr. NUNES.

But the problem is that there remain some serious shortcomings in this bill, and unfortunately, we cannot try to remedy it through an amendment, so the notion there is an open process here isn't correct.

The definition of expatriate has been tightened. I think there remain some issues, at least one regarding it; but the major problem relates to the language and how it would impact, potentially, health insurance for an estimated 13 million legal permanent residents and others who are lawfully present foreign workers in the U.S.

Let me just give you examples of where the standards remain weak. For example, under this legislation, expat plans would have dispensation to be weaker than other employer plans in this country.

They could, for example, impose cost sharing on preventive benefits. They could impose annual and lifetime limits on coverage. They could impose unduly long waiting periods.

Indeed, the only ACA provision that would clearly remain in effect would be that they would have to offer coverage to young adults under 26.

So the bottom line is, unfortunately, that the legislation, in its present form, could substantially undermine health security for foreign workers, as well as American dependents who remain in this country.

Also, what it does is provide unprecedented special treatment for these plans in terms of exempting them from financing mechanisms.

Let me say further, as we found out from the Joint Tax Committee and CBO, they confirm this bill would cause some employers who would offer ACA-compliant plans under present law to offer less generous expatriate plans that are no longer subject to the ACA. This is the reason the administration issued, I think just today, a Statement of Administration Policy, and they say they do not support H.R. 4414.

The ACA gives people, it continues, greater control over their health care; and what they say is that this is not true sufficiently in this case.

It says, because of the ACA, Americans who have previously been denied

coverage due to a preexisting medical condition now have access to coverage, and that may well not continue.

So the administration concludes it remains willing to work with Congress to improve H.R. 4414 to address those issues and to maintain basic consumer protections for all workers. There are straightforward changes to the legislation, which we have shared with the Congress, that would satisfy these goals, and the Congress should pursue a solution.

Unfortunately, because of this rule, we cannot propose an amendment which would essentially implement these proposals from the administration that they have shared with the Congress. That is why I, unfortunately, have no choice but to suggest a “no” vote on the floor of this House.

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

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RENACCI), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4414, the Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act, a bill introduced by my good friend, JOHN CARNEY.

When Mr. CARNEY and I first came to Congress, we looked around in search of others who, like us, were interested in finding common ground. Mr. CARNEY and I now meet regularly for breakfast with a group of Members from both sides of the aisle.

We come together to discuss commonsense ways to solve our Nation's problems that Members on both sides of the aisle can get behind. The bill that is on the floor today is an example of this type of commonsense approach to making policy.

The purpose of the bill is to fix a problem created by the President's health care law. If we don't fix it, 1,200 jobs will be lost across the country.

Mr. CARNEY and I may not agree on everything. In fact, the President's health care law is one thing we disagree on; but we do agree this specific provision is another example of one of the law's unintended consequences.

This bill before us today will keep America competitive and save American jobs. I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this important legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CARNEY), a colleague and friend who is a sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, last week, when I was back home in my district in Delaware getting a workout at the YMCA in my hometown of Wilmington, a man came up to me as I was on the exercise bike and said: Excuse me, do you mind if I interrupt?

I said: Of course not, I work for you. He said: I wanted to see if you know about the status of H.R. 4414 because I write expatriate health insurance plans

for Cigna, and I don't want to lose my job.

Losing even one job like this in my State keeps me up at night. The prospect of losing 500 jobs is a punch to the gut. That is how many jobs we will lose in my home State of Delaware if we don't pass this bill on the floor today.

I am a strong supporter of the Affordable Care Act, so are a lot of people in my State; but no law is perfect, and in a law as important, as complicated, and as technical as the Affordable Care Act, there are bound to be a few things that needed to be fixed.

The ACA was unintentionally written in a way that subjects U.S. expatriate health insurance plans to all the provisions of the ACA, which places a unique burden on these types of plans.

Expatriate health insurance plans offer a high-end, robust coverage to people working outside their home country, giving them access to a global network of health care providers. Individuals on the plan could be foreign employees working here in America, Americans working abroad, or, say, a German working in France.

Expatriate plans ensure that these employees have worldwide access to quality health care while working outside their home country.

Several U.S. health insurance companies—Cigna, MetLife, Aetna, and United Health—offer expatriate health insurance plans. These insurance companies compete with foreign insurance companies that also sell the same kind of plan. The issue is these foreign plans don't have to comply with the ACA.

Forcing U.S. expatriate insurance plans to comply with the ACA thereby gives their foreign competitors a distinct advantage. As a result, to stay competitive, a U.S. expatriate insurer will move their business overseas, taking the jobs with them; and that is why I am here on the floor today.

The good news is that we have bipartisan legislation here today that will level the playing field. In fact, the administration has already provided temporary relief for expatriate plans from nearly every Affordable Care Act provision that has gone into effect so far. The problem is this relief is only partial and only temporary. The administration can't make this relief without this legislative fix.

Our legislation ensures that American expatriate insurance carriers are on a level playing field with their foreign competitors, so that American jobs stay here in America.

Many of you know that this is our second go-round at this legislation. Over the past few weeks, we have worked painstakingly to improve our bill, and we have.

We are confident that our original version of the bill wouldn't have negatively impacted green card holders or create loopholes in the ACA, but we have worked hard over the past few weeks to address the concerns we heard.

We heard concerns the bill would let insurance companies create low-quality

plans. Our bill now requires expat plans to meet the same value standard as any other employer-based plan under the ACA, and if the plan doesn't meet that standard, the expat can use subsidies to buy coverage on the exchange, just like any other American.

We heard concerns that the definition of an expat was too broad, that it could be taken advantage of. We changed that definition, tightened it up, and it is identical to the HHS regulations today.

We now make explicit that expat plans must follow all ERISA and Public Health Service Act requirements that were in place before the ACA.

We have been working on this issue for 3 years. The crafting of this bill has been a more collaborative bipartisan process than I think this Chamber has seen in quite a while, and I want to thank my friends and colleagues on both sides of the aisle for that effort.

This bill isn't perfect. The Affordable Care Act wasn't perfect. No bill is perfect, but if there was ever a case where the perfect was being made the enemy of the good, we are hearing it from my colleagues today.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. CARNEY. So if we don't pass this legislation today, people who have expatriate plans and the companies that offer them will continue to do so. The question is whether they will do so here in the United States and keeping those workers here or whether they will move those operations overseas.

I understand, as well as anyone, that the ACA is a political weapon in a larger political war on both sides of the aisle. All I am asking today is that we take actions so that 500 hard-working Americans in my district don't become collateral damage in that partisan political fight. Let's call a temporary truce in that battle today to protect those jobs.

Finally, I want to thank my colleague, Congressman NUNES, and the Ways and Means staff on both sides of the aisle for their hard work on this issue, and I want to thank leadership on both sides of the aisle for recognizing this is a very serious problem that needs fixing.

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support us and vote "yes" on this legislation today. Vote "yes" on H.R. 4414.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4414, the Expatriate Health Care Coverage Clarification Act.

I do want to point out that the American people do expect us to work together in a responsible manner to solve real problems, and that is what this bill we are talking about today does.

I certainly want to thank my colleagues, Representative CARNEY of

Delaware and Representative NUNES of California, for taking the initiative to craft this really important piece of legislation.

I also know it is really difficult to look at any bill dealing with the health care law without considering the broader context of the law. However, it is also difficult to look at the state of our economy today and be nonchalant about the fact that 1,200 of our fellow Americans stand to lose their jobs if we don't act and pass this legislation.

Many of those folks live in the State of Delaware. Many of them live in the State of Pennsylvania, just over the Delaware State line. So our constituents are hearing about it, just like the story you heard from Mr. CARNEY and he is stopped by his constituents. We are hearing about this at home.

So that is really what this bill introduced by Mr. CARNEY and Mr. NUNES does. It saves jobs, it is that simple, and it does so without jeopardizing anybody's health care.

No one is going to be affected by this in a negative way. The bill on the floor today simply allows American companies to continue selling insurance to people who live and work overseas, many of our neighbors and friends. That happens to them.

□ 1445

If we don't pass this bill, the business will go to foreign insurance companies who will be selling these plans and possibly getting many of these jobs. Why would we want to do that? More importantly, why would we even allow that?

So this bill represents a very narrow change to the law and saves jobs. This bill simply amends the law. It does not end the law. This is not a partisan bill. This bill is a vote to keep jobs here in America and Pennsylvania and Delaware and California and other places and would take sensible steps to fix a law that we all know needs to be fixed.

Again, I know it is difficult, but we need to focus on the trees here and look past the forest, so to speak, on this bill. We need to take action and save jobs for American workers. And most important of all, we need to demonstrate to the American people that we can work together to solve very specific problems that need to be fixed. That is what we are doing. That is why everybody, whether you are a Republican or a Democrat, should stand up and enthusiastically support this bill that will not harm anyone's health care and will save American jobs.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, this is a bill that could have been worked out. This is a bill that could have accomplished the purpose that I know that our colleague from Delaware wants to see put into place, and I applaud him

for working hard to improve the bill under very difficult circumstances.

In trying to allow the American insurance companies to sell policies to expats, we could craft a bill that is narrow, but we are not getting cooperation to get to that point. The reason we are not getting cooperation is we are told we must pass a bill right away. Well, we were told that 2 weeks ago when we had the bill under suspension, and we couldn't consider any amendments under suspension. Now we have the bill under a rule. Oh, and the rule provides for no amendments either.

There is a bill to be crafted, but this bill before us does not accomplish the goal in a way that really doesn't hurt some people's insurance coverage.

There are still two major problems with the legislation before us today. First, it does not have enough safeguards to guarantee that these expatriate plans are high quality, and the second issue is the bill creates problems for millions of other people who are legal permanent residents here in the United States and others working in this country who are currently protected by the Affordable Care Act.

On the first issue, the insurers tell us that their expatriate plans are going to be extremely generous. They say they cover people in dozens of countries around the world and they have comprehensive benefits, but we don't see any language to verify that claim. Supporters of the bill claim to guarantee the plans are as high quality as the insurers say they are. But it is one thing to say that their plans will be of high quality; it is another thing to actually require them to offer comprehensive benefits. As President Reagan used to say, "Trust, but verify."

The second issue has nothing to do with the expatriate plans and the companies that are threatening to shut down their operations here in the United States. It has to do with millions of other people who are legal permanent residents and workers on visas who currently benefit from the ACA's protections. But this bill creates a loophole that could allow these people to be sold plans here in the United States that do not meet ACA standards. That is why a lot of people looking at this legislation are saying—such as major labor unions, immigration advocacy organizations—that this bill is not one they can support, and they urge that we vote against it.

So I think we can fix both of those issues. We should have fixed both of those issues before this bill was brought up on the House floor. But as it stands, we don't know if the Senate can pass any bill, and I don't believe the President can sign this bill.

My colleague from Delaware and my other colleagues have already helped make important improvements for the bill. Changing the definition of an expatriate to someone who is outside of the country for 6 months is an important step. We should continue to make progress.

There have been productive negotiations on the legislation in recent days. We need to reach an agreement, and we should bring that compromise to the House floor; but without that compromise, I don't feel I can vote for the bill as it presently stands. There are these two glaring problems that need to be fixed; and without it, we will not know if those expatriate plans really are the high quality they claim to be, and we will not know if legal residents of the United States will be able to get the kind of high-quality plan that everybody else in the United States will have.

So I urge a "no" vote and suggest that we get back to the negotiating table.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 14 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, we have waited for 4 years. For 4 years, we have been trying to fix this problem. Four years, time is up. We have got to pass this bill and send it to the Senate so that it can be signed into law.

I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I support this bill.

There are really two issues at stake. One is preserving the integrity of the ACA, the Obama health care bill. There is huge division in this Congress as to whether that bill should have been passed. It was passed. But there is unity of purpose now that where there is an identified problem, we should fix it rather than just having the ideological battle about whether the law should have been passed in the first place. That is actually progress because, as my friend from Pennsylvania said, there is a legitimate expectation on the part of the people we represent to solve concrete, discrete problems when, in the solving of them, we are going to keep 1,200 people working. And that is the real goal of this.

Is there a way where both sides—those who agree with the health care bill and those who disagree with it—can come together with a narrow fix that allows 1,200 people—500 in Delaware and 700 in other parts of the country—to keep doing their work? And, of course, we can.

There is a second question that has come up, and that is whether this bill right now goes as far as it needs to go. Is this crafted as well as it needs to be crafted? And that is debatable. The points that the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) made were heartfelt, but there has been real progress because there has been engagement.

You have had Mr. CARNEY and Mr. NUNES working very closely with colleagues on both of their sides to deal with practical issues that have come up. You have had the White House meeting with Cigna, and both sides understood. Cigna understood that the White House had had some legitimate

concerns as proponents of the ACA; the White House understood that Cigna had real and legitimate concerns about their business and their jobs.

So the progress is reflected in this bill. There is now a debate about whether that is enough progress. So we have to make a decision: Do we wait and try to keep negotiating here or do we move it on to the Senate?

In my view, we move it on to the Senate, partly because, as Mr. NUNES said, we have been grappling with this for 3 to 4 years. Second, we have got ACA supporters—and this gives me comfort—on the Senate side, Senator CARPER and Senator COONS from Delaware, who are committed to making certain that the fix doesn't compromise the health care bill. That is important to folks like me who voted for the ACA.

So this is a practical step that we can take, working together in order to save jobs without compromising the underlying legislation.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 21 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD three letters: one from the Council for Affordable Health Coverage in support of our bill, the other from the National Association of Health Underwriters in support of our bill, and the last one from the Business Roundtable in support of our bill.

COUNCIL FOR AFFORDABLE  
HEALTH COVERAGE,  
April 29, 2014.

Hon. JOHN CARNEY,  
*Longworth House Office Building,*  
*Washington, DC.*

Hon. DEVIN NUNES,  
*Longworth House Office Building,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMEN CARNEY AND NUNES: We write to endorse H.R. 4414, the Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act of 2014. We strongly support this modification of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) because it will prevent Americans workers abroad and American companies providing health coverage internationally from being disadvantaged compared to their foreign counterparts.

Employers are not alone in their concerns about the application of the ACA to expatriates. The Department of Labor in a Frequently Asked Questions document stated, "The Departments recognize that expatriate health plans may face special challenges in complying with certain provisions of the Affordable Care Act. In particular, challenges in reconciling and coordinating the multiple regulatory regimes that apply to expatriate health plans might make it impossible or impracticable to comply with all the relevant rules at least in the near term." The Center Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight (CCIIO) concurred with the Department of Labor by posting the same document on their website.

It is clear that the ACA never envisioned the impact of the law on expatriate plans. For example, CCIIO and the Department of Labor used the following example to illustrate the impracticality of applying the ACA to expatriate plans. "For example, independent review organizations may not exist abroad, and it may be difficult for certain preventive services to be provided, or even be identified as preventive, when such services are provided outside the United States by clinical providers that use different code sets

and medical terminology to identify services.”

Because of the challenges and impracticalities associated with this aspect of the Affordable Care Act, we urge you to quickly pass this legislation to protect American workers abroad and American insurers selling insurance on the international market.

Sincerely,

Communicating for America;  
Council for Affordable Health Coverage;  
National Association of Health Underwriters;  
National Retail Federation;  
Retail Industry Leaders Association;  
Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council; and  
U.S Chamber of Commerce.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF  
HEALTH UNDERWRITERS,  
Washington, DC, April 28, 2014.

Congressman JOHN CARNEY,  
Longworth House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CARNEY: On behalf of the National Association of Health Underwriters (NAHU), representing 100,000 licensed agents and brokers who are engaged in the sale and service of health insurance and other ancillary products and serving employers and consumers around the country, I want to commend you on your efforts to pass the Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act as amended.

NAHU members work to help millions of employers of all sizes finance administer and utilize their group health benefit plans on a daily basis. Expatriate health insurance plans offer high-end, robust coverage to executives and others working outside their home country, giving them access to a global network of health care providers.

U.S. insurance companies compete with foreign insurance companies that also sell expatriate health insurance plans, but these foreign carriers are not required to comply with the Affordable Care Act (ACA). This imbalance gives foreign competitors an unfair advantage. The bill narrowly clarifies that the Affordable Care Act does not apply to expatriate health insurance plans.

Since the legislation's original introduction, it has been amended and now requires an expatriate plan to meet minimum value requirements as defined under the ACA (60 percent actuarial value). This is the same standard all other employer-provided plans must meet in order to comply with the laws employer shared responsibility provisions. Should an expatriate plan offered under this bill fail to meet minimum value requirements, an employee would be eligible to seek coverage on the exchange and could be eligible for income-based subsidies.

Further, the amended bill tightens the definition of an expatriate. It says that an expatriate must be abroad for at least six months. The previous version of the bill said that an expatriate only had to be abroad for three months, or travel outside the country 15 times in a year. This bill requires a much tougher standard that will guard against potential abuse. Finally, the amended bill explicitly states that expatriate plans must continue to comply with relevant laws enacted prior to the ACA—specifically the Employee Retirement Income Security Act and the Public Health Service Act.

We appreciate your leadership on this important issue for businesses and their employees so that the law can help all Americans get quality health insurance. We look forward to working with you and your colleagues in enacting this bipartisan legislation this year.

Best regards,

JANET TRAUTWEIN,  
Executive Vice President and CEO.

BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE,  
Washington, DC, April 28, 2014.

Hon. HARRY REID,  
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,  
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

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

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADERS: The Business Roundtable encourages you to support legislation that does not apply Affordable Care Act (ACA) requirements upon employer-sponsored health care coverage for those employees and their families who work outside of the United States. Business Roundtable is an association of chief executive officers of leading U.S. companies with \$7.4 trillion in annual revenues and more than 16 million employees.

Business Roundtable companies provide health coverage to over 40 million Americans around the globe. We consider our employees to be among our strongest competitive assets and are committed to a benefits strategy that enhances their health, well-being, and sense of security wherever they may be. We have also advocated for reforms that will improve quality and make health care more affordable and more efficient.

As companies expand operations internationally, we face challenges in a global competitive environment, one of which is the application of ACA requirements to our globally mobile employees and their families. As currently interpreted, the complex and prescriptive requirements of the ACA apply to U.S.-based expatriate plans, which means U.S.-based international plans must comply with the domestic law's requirements in all parts of the world and for all employees outside the United States covered on those plans, regardless of their citizenship and work location. Many of these requirements are difficult to implement in other countries and may not be relevant in other locations.

For example, the Summary of Benefit Coverage notification uses terminology and data that is specifically tailored to types of benefits, costs, and care offered in the United States. This form is not relevant to those who live outside the country. There are numerous examples of these types of requirements in the law that are unique to our health care system and should not be applied to benefits offered to employees who are residing outside of the United States.

Expatriate health care benefits are highly valued by our employees and ensure they can continue to benefit from an American health care option. This, in turn, assures the competitiveness of U.S. jobs in the global market. For these reasons, we urge Congress to pass narrow, common sense relief that provides certainty and clarity for multinational corporations and their ability to continue providing comprehensive health benefits for those employees outside the United States.

Sincerely,

GARY LOVEMAN,  
Chairman, Chief Executive Officer and President, Caesars Entertainment Corporation; Chair, Health and Retirement Committee, Business Roundtable.

Mr. NUNES. I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr.

BECERRA), a member of our committee and also the chair of our Caucus.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, let me say in advance that I appreciate the work that has been done by any number of Members with regard to this legislation. Many people have engaged in a good faith effort to try to find an acceptable solution that resolves issues which are legitimate and have raised a concern for a lot of us with regard to how we move forward with the Affordable Care Act and make sure that not only Americans are covered, but that our companies can continue to offer insurance coverage for those Americans that are not only affordable but have high quality.

And many of us have recognized that in the case of Americans who are out of the country for more time than they are in the country in a year, that we may have to make some exceptions for them so that the company that is offering them health insurance can offer a policy that is competitive. We don't want to price out our American companies that offer health insurance coverage simply because they are trying to meet domestic care standards for health care that are required as a result of the Affordable Care Act but that may not work as well abroad.

So you take a look at the name of this bill, the Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act of 2014. You think, okay, that is what we are trying to do. We are trying to help expatriates, Americans who work abroad more time than they are here at home. But when you take a close look at the bill, that is not what it does.

We are told by the Congressional Research Service that there are probably about 285,000 Americans who have expatriate health care coverage. This bill wouldn't impact just those 285,000 Americans. This bill impacts millions because it impacts U.S. citizens who are here in the country, not abroad for more than half of the time, and it could have an impact on every single legal immigrant who is in this country.

So I think all of us agree. We want to make sure that the Affordable Care Act and its patient protections work, and if we could tweak things to make it work better, we should. But this is not a bill for expatriates. This is a bill that goes way beyond.

So let's not fool ourselves. We have to take care of trying to deal with the narrow exception that we are looking at for expatriates, not create a giant loophole by which we can now remove the protection against discrimination for preexisting conditions that right now all Americans and legal immigrants can now know that they have.

We want to make sure that all of those people who now have protection from the plans that don't provide coverage after a certain amount of money, where all of a sudden, boom, you go bankrupt because you didn't know that your insurance company would only

cover \$50,000 of your health care costs, that protection might be gone. What we don't want is to create a giant loophole in trying to help a narrow band of Americans and companies that offer these Americans health insurance coverage.

The White House has said there is a fix here. And I know the White House has been trying to work with the proponents of this bill to come up with a fix. But as they said the last time this was up, this needs work, and it should not come up for a vote.

But what are they saying now? The administration issued this today:

The administration does not support House passage of H.R. 4414 in its current form because it would reduce consumer protections and create even more loopholes in the Tax Code.

There is a fix, but this is not it because it goes way beyond. And what we also have to do is recognize that there are other things involved.

This bill will cost the American taxpayers money. How much? We are told by the Congressional Budget Office and Joint Tax Committee, \$1.4 billion. Is it paid for? Are the \$1.4 billion that we would take away from—or have to take from other taxpayers covered so that we won't have to have other Americans pay for this? No. This bill is unpaid for.

And so for any number of reasons, we should sit down and get this resolved the right way because the White House says there is a fix. Those of us who oppose this bill say there is a fix. But to create more loopholes which allow American citizens and immigrants who are lawfully here, working hard, to all of a sudden be deprived of their protections—

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman from California an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BECERRA. To deprive American citizens who don't know about this, to deprive those immigrants who came to this country legally and are working in this country and today have the same protections to make sure they are not discriminated against for a preexisting condition, who also have a chance to get offered a plan that has those protections against that fine print we used to see in the health policies, to all of a sudden tell them that they are going to be denied that because we were trying to fix a problem for Americans who work abroad for more than a half a year, that is not what we should be doing.

There is a fix. This should not cost the taxpayers more money. And I believe we could do this pretty quickly because it is a narrow issue.

If we really want to help expats, take out the language in the bill that talks about legal immigrants who are in the country. It talks about workers who come to this country to work under worker visa categories, like in the high-tech field or in agriculture. We can do this very simply. And I just appeal to my colleagues and friends on

both sides of the aisle: Let's not open up bigger loopholes that cost the taxpayers money simply to try to fix a narrow version of this that we know we can do.

So with that, I hope that sanity will prevail before this goes too far.

□ 1500

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to my friend from Pennsylvania again, I just want to say that as someone who used to work in the fields, I would much prefer an expatriate plan over ObamaCare.

At this time, I will yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, just in response to some of the comments I heard from my colleagues from California, I think it is pretty clear, the Joint Committee on Taxation, JCT, has been quoted here, but under this bill, the Joint Committee on Taxation confirms that all plans are ACA compliant. The JCT also confirms that more U.S. employers—American employers—will offer employer-sponsored insurance as a result of this bill.

Further, the Joint Committee on Taxation confirms that the impacts of this legislation are under 1 million people, closer to 300,000 at best. That is what we are talking about here.

Let's be very clear. The Nunes amendment that was offered to this bill actually does help solve many of the problems I believe that have been raised here in the last few minutes. Mr. WAXMAN from California also raised his concerns. But I must say that if we don't move on this bill, we are not going to have to worry about any of this, because Americans working overseas as expats will be buying insurance from German insurance companies or British or some other European concern. These Americans may be working in places like Ghana, Ethiopia, or Poland. Frankly, the ACA, the health care law, really has no standing in those countries.

So, please, this is a very targeted piece of legislation. These Americans will have good, quality health care as they are working overseas in countries that really don't recognize the health care law. So it is a commonsense proposal. The JCT, the Joint Committee on Taxation, confirms that this is going to affect fewer than 300,000 people. We know that all these plans are ACA compliant, and we know that more U.S. employers are going to offer employer-sponsored health insurance as a result of passing this bill.

I say vote for the bill, do the right thing, get the bill to the Senate and ultimately to the President's desk.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, Mr. LEVIN, for the 2 minutes.

I rise today to speak in favor of H.R. 4414, the Expatriate Health Coverage

Clarification Act. I am a cosponsor of this bill because I think it provides a targeted fix to the unintended consequences of the Affordable Care Act. It is too bad, though, that we cannot work together in fixing other flaws in the ACA instead of trying to repeal it over 50 times over the last 2 years.

I think, though, this bill will save American jobs, including many in the San Joaquin Valley. There have been some concerns that this bill would negatively impact green card holders and other immigrants to our country. I think this bill does provide safeguards to ensure that that will not happen.

An expat plan, by its nature, offers robust benefits across the globe. No one should be concerned that this bill will somehow erode coverage or quality for non-Americans living here in the U.S. or for Americans living abroad, for that matter.

With more than 1,000 jobs at stake, passing this bill will signal to the American people that, yes, on occasion Congress can work together and that we do care about more than business as usual.

I am pleased to join my colleagues, Mr. CARNEY and Mr. NUNES, in standing up for this effort to protect some American jobs. But let's remind ourselves that it is a work in progress and the author knows that this legislation, I suspect, would not be signed into law in its current form. But it is a work in progress. We move it along, we work with the Senate and get the concerns addressed the administration has raised. That is what it takes working together on a bipartisan basis to get legislation done.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the bill when it comes up for a vote today.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit a letter from the American Benefits Council, a letter from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and also a letter from CHCC, Corporate Health Care Coalition.

AMERICAN BENEFITS COUNCIL,  
Washington, DC, April 8, 2014.

Re Support for H.R. 4414—Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act.

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

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND LEADER PELOSI: I write on behalf of the American Benefits Council ("Council") to express support for H.R. 4414, the Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act of 2014 ("Act"). The Act provides important clarification regarding application of the Affordable Care Act (ACA) to health coverage that is provided to globally mobile employees. These are issues of significant concern to multinational employers, their employees and families.

The Council is a public policy organization representing principally Fortune 500 companies and other organizations that assist employers of all sizes in providing employee

benefits. Collectively, our members either sponsor directly or provide services to health and retirement plans that cover more than 100 million Americans both within the United States and abroad.

Most of our member companies sponsor health coverage for a workforce that includes globally mobile employees. Council members rely on expatriate health plans to provide benefits that meet the unique needs of this employee population and their families. Multinational employers value expatriate health plans for many reasons, including the role they play in recruiting and retaining a productive globally mobile workforce by ensuring coverage of their employees' and families' health care needs while abroad.

The ACA was intended to reform the U.S. health care system. Its application to expatriate health plans and to the employer sponsors and people covered by such plans, has created compliance uncertainty with respect to the law's individual and employer mandates and certain other health plan requirements. Although some of these matters have been addressed in transition guidance issued by the agencies, the guidance is temporary and does not fully address the outstanding concerns.

H.R. 4414 provides needed statutory clarification with respect to the application of the ACA to expatriate health plans and the employers, employees and family members that rely on such plans to meet the health benefits needs of a globally mobile workforce.

We appreciate your consideration of these important issues.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. KLEIN,  
President.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Washington, DC, April 9, 2014.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation representing the interests of more than three million businesses of all sizes, sectors, and regions, as well as state and local chambers and industry associations, and dedicated to promoting, protecting, and defending America's free enterprise system, strongly supports H.R. 4414, "The Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act of 2014," to preserve the ability of our country's businesses to provide, and our citizens to obtain appropriate health care coverage as they conduct business and live overseas. This important bill protects the ability of American companies to provide and workers to obtain coverage abroad that have historically been offered and valued.

The PPACA was designed to improve access to coverage and health care services for people in the United States and to strengthen this nation's health care system. Whether it will accomplish these goals remains to be seen. However, it was certainly not intended and must not be misconstrued to disadvantage American companies either operating or employing individuals in other countries or selling products abroad. It is important to ensure that this unintended consequence does not occur. This bill would protect the coverage and opportunities of American workers, American employers, and American products abroad. Congress must pass this bill to explicitly exempt expatriate plans from the myriad of PPACA requirements.

Applying these new mandates to international plans would not only be extremely difficult and complex from an operations standpoint due to the global nature of this type of coverage but would also be bad policy. They would place American businesses

and expatriate American employees at a disadvantage in the global marketplace. Requiring American companies that operate around the globe and their foreign-based employees to buy more costly coverage would unfairly benefit foreign competitors and foreign employees. Such PPACA-compliant expatriate plans are not likely to be cost-competitive. In many instances, they may not provide global coverage and would in fact not comply with applicable local laws. Because of conflicting requirements between these new mandates and the laws of other countries, an employer may also have to purchase multiple policies with overlapping coverage or risk noncompliance with one or more nations' laws. Congress must protect the ability of American companies and their expatriates to purchase and offer appropriate and valued plans that have long been part of how our country operates in the global marketplace.

U.S. jobs are at stake. If this legislation does not get enacted, American jobs associated with writing, servicing and administering these plans will be shipped overseas.

The Chamber continues to champion health care reform that builds on and reinforces the employer-sponsored system while improving access to affordable, quality coverage. The Chamber urges you and your colleagues to support H.R. 2575, and may consider including votes on, or in relation to, this bill in our annual How They Voted scorecard.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN.

CORPORATE HEALTH CARE COALITION,  
Washington, DC, April 28, 2014.

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

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND LEADER PELOSI: The Corporate Health Care Coalition is writing to convey its support for H.R. 4414, "The Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act of 2014." CHCC is a public policy organization comprised of leading companies from varying industries that compete in the global marketplace and sponsor health plans for the benefit of eligible employees and dependents located in every state in the nation and across the globe.

CHCC members are leaders in providing high quality health benefits in an efficient and effective manner. A healthy workforce is critical to our competitiveness both domestically and globally. Expatriate health plans play a particularly vital role in recruiting and retaining a productive, globally mobile workforce, by ensuring that the health care needs of employees and their families are met while overseas.

The Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act of 2014 would provide needed clarification with respect to the Affordable Care Act's application to expatriate health plans, thereby preserving these plans as a viable means of providing health coverage to employees who reside outside of the United States. Therefore, CHCC urges Congress to pass the Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act of 2014.

Sincerely,

KATE HULL,  
Executive Director.

Mr. NUNES. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), another member of our committee.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation before us today not because I believe it is a perfect answer to a problem that needs to be fixed but in order to make sure that the process moves forward. I want to commend my colleagues who have worked tirelessly over the ensuing weeks to try to address the concerns—legitimate concerns, I view—of some of the shortcomings of the legislation before us, Mr. NUNES and my good friend, Mr. CARNEY from Delaware.

This is, I think, emblematic of how we should be addressing reform within the health care system, having the wisdom as a body to recognize what is working with health care reform and what isn't working and then try to deal with that with fixes and needed adjustments along the way.

This was an unintended consequence affecting expat health insurance plans. In my view, there are competitiveness issues from those insurance plans offering expat coverage compared to what other foreign plans are offering, but also the ability of people to be able to work and live effectively abroad.

Even the administration has admitted in their Statement of Administration Policy that there is a problem that needs to be addressed. They have identified certain shortcomings of this legislation, from consumer protections to issues affecting the Tax Code, but I am sure that as we move forward today, hopefully with bipartisan support, the Senate will have an opportunity to address many of these concerns, and we will have to continue to work with the administration with the legitimate concerns that they continue to raise.

Again, this is, I think, an approach that we should be taking as a nation right now, having the wisdom to understand what is working and also dealing with the unintended consequences of health care reform, which affects one-fifth of the entire U.S. economy. You are not going to change that overnight. If you try, you are going to introduce shocks to the system that aren't going to work for people.

I think this is an honest approach done in a bipartisan fashion with a lot of listening on both sides and a lot of vetting of issues that I think are legitimately being raised right now in order to address one of those small, unintended consequences of the health care reform.

I think, clearly, everyone recognizes more work needs to go into this legislative package in order to allay some of the concerns. The Senate, again, will have an opportunity to address and will continue to engage the administration in order to address some of the concerns that they are raising, as well. But this is a good, I think, first honest approach in order to find that solution so we don't see the detrimental job impact occurring right here in the United

States and that we do allow affordable and quality health care coverage for those workers overseas.

Again, I commend my friends, Mr. CARNEY and Mr. NUNES, for the outreach and the work that they have put into this legislation. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation as it moves forward.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Can I ask my colleague, are you ready to close?

Mr. NUNES. Yes, I am ready to close.

Mr. LEVIN. So I will do the same.

I would like to place in the RECORD a letter of opposition to this bill as presently formulated from the AFL-CIO, the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, the American Federation of Teachers, Farmworker Justice, the UAW, the National Council of La Raza, the National Education Association, the National Immigration Law Center, the Service Employees International Union, the UNITE HERE, the United Farm Workers, and the United Food and Commercial Workers International Union.

APRIL 28, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We write today regarding the Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act (H.R. 4414), scheduled for floor debate on Tuesday. Although negotiations are apparently occurring behind closed doors on a final version of the bill, it is our understanding that these discussions are unlikely to address major shortcomings of the bill. Barring substantial revisions to the bill, we urge you to oppose it.

As you know, the bill is intended to accommodate health plans providing coverage for workers that work in multiple countries, and it is reasonable to grant these plans some flexibility to pursue this role. We understand that these “expatriate” health care plans currently cover fewer than 300,000 workers. However, the current draft of the bill could impact a much wider population, resulting in a lower standard of health care coverage for 13 million lawful permanent residents (LPRs or green card holders), as well as individuals with visas for more highly skilled work and people in dozens of other nonimmigrant categories.

It is important that these workers, who live and work beside other U.S. workers, enjoy the same coverage protections provided by the Affordable Care Act (ACA). It would simply be unfair to provide them a lower level of protection, and it would exert downward pressure on the benefits offered to all other workers.

We do believe it is possible to accommodate the needs of expatriate health plans while avoiding this impact on millions of workers. First, the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) can continue its work developing regulatory approaches to easing the administrative burdens faced by these plans. Second, more work can be done on a legislative approach that appropriately reduces the burden faced by legitimate expatriate health plans, without creating a loophole that could be exploited by plans seeking to skirt the coverage standards of the ACA.

The bill has been improved in some ways since it was first considered on the House floor. U.S. citizens may only be included in the plans if they travel out of the country for more than 180 days a year, and a benchmark has been added to encourage employers to offer coverage with an actuarial value of 60 percent or higher.

It remains imperative, however, to ensure that LPRs and individuals in nonimmigrant visa categories are not exposed to a gap in ACA coverage protections. More must be done to exclude these groups from the populations covered by this bill. Additional employer reporting and enforcement provisions would help ensure that employers would not stretch the definition of expatriate employees to offer substandard coverage to workers.

We welcome the opportunity to help improve this legislation to address the concerns of the expatriate health plans without having a negative impact on workers who live and work in the U.S. It is unlikely that H.R. 4414 will be amended to meet these goals before the scheduled floor vote, however, and we urge you to vote against the bill.

Sincerely,

AFL-CIO,  
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME);  
American Federation of Teachers;  
Farmworker Justice;  
International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW);  
National Council of La Raza (NCLR);  
National Education Association (NEA);  
National Immigration Law Center;  
Service Employees International Union (SEIU);  
UNITE HERE;  
United Farm Workers;  
United Food and Commercial Workers International Union (UFCW).

Mr. LEVIN. Also, I submit for the RECORD a letter in opposition to this bill as presently formed from the National Immigration Law Center.

NATIONAL IMMIGRATION LAW CENTER,

Los Angeles, CA, April 30, 2014.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND DEMOCRATIC LEADER PELOSI: As the House of Representatives considers the Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act (H.R. 4414) again today, we urge you to oppose it. Already defeated in the House on April 9, 2014, this bill, absent key changes, will lead to an erosion of Affordable Care Act (ACA) standards and lower quality health coverage for immigrants who are unreasonably and mistakenly classified as expatriates under the legislation.

Supporters of the bill claim that the problems contained in the original bill have been adequately addressed. This is simply not true. While some positive changes have been made, the most egregious provisions remain firmly in place, including those with broad implications for low-income immigrants living and working in the U.S. These remaining problems leave the bill vulnerable to legal challenges.

H.R. 4414 would eliminate the ACA’s group plan consumer protections for “expatriate health insurance plans,” including for U.S.-regulated issuers, provided to individuals who travel “abroad.” This blanket exemption alone should be cause for concern. However, what is far more troubling is that the bill uses a broad definition for “expatriate” that includes many immigrants who live in the U.S. permanently and do not travel abroad for work. This definition extends far beyond the purported objectives of the legislation and must be fixed.

Specifically, the definition of “expatriate” in H.R. 4414 includes lawful permanent residents (LPRs or green card holders), most of whom spend the vast majority of their time in the United States. These individuals reside in the U.S., are on a path to citizenship, and have built their lives in the U.S. Simply put, they should not be defined as “expatriates” if they do not travel outside of the United States for work for extended periods.

Instead, their health insurance plans should have the same consumer protections codified by the ACA as others who live and work in the U.S. This bill would create a loophole that could lead to inferior coverage for these individuals.

H.R. 4414 would have an unintentional, disastrous impact on LPRs and other low-wage immigrant workers. We urge you to oppose the bill, and we look forward to working with members of Congress to close its loopholes and find workable solutions.

Sincerely,

MARIELENA HINCAPIÉ,  
Executive Director.

Mr. LEVIN. Finally, I submit into the RECORD the Statement of Administration Policy from the Obama administration.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY  
H.R. 4414—EXPATRIATE HEALTH COVERAGE  
CLARIFICATION ACT

(Rep. Carney, D-Delaware, and 24 cosponsors)

The Administration does not support House passage of H.R. 4414, the Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act, in its current form, because it would reduce consumer protections and create even more loopholes in the tax code.

The Affordable Care Act gives people greater control over their own health care. Since October 1, eight million have signed up for private insurance and millions more have been enrolled in Medicaid. Because of the Affordable Care Act, Americans who have previously been denied coverage due to a pre-existing medical condition now have access to coverage. Additionally, the law helps millions of Americans stay on their parents’ plans until age 26, and helps provide access to free preventive care like cancer screenings that catch illness early on.

The Administration remains willing to work with the Congress to improve H.R. 4414 to address these issues and to maintain basic consumer protections for all workers. There are straightforward changes to the legislation, which we have shared with the Congress, that would satisfy these goals, and the Congress should pursue a solution.

Mr. LEVIN. So let me close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think it is regrettable that we are here in this predicament when we don’t need to be. I think we do need to fix the expat issue, but not by unfixing health care reform for millions of people. This is more than about 300,000 people. We are talking about the health care protections and provisions applicable to 13 million people in this country who are here legally.

It has been said, and I very much respect this, it has taken 3 years to try to fix this problem, and Mr. CARNEY and others have truly been working, and Mr. NUNES, and there have been bipartisan discussions.

But here is the problem: If we are really going to continue effectively to work together when there is an outstanding issue, when there has been this aura of good faith, the majority should have let the minority place on the floor an amendment to the bill and let us debate it.

In fact, it only works against bipartisanship in this kind of circumstance to say it is essentially a closed rule. What is there to fear? The only thing to fear is that we would have discussion that

might make this a still more bipartisan bill. So instead of getting a likely minority of members on the Democratic side, we would have, I think, an overwhelming majority on both sides determined to keep jobs here, but not at a price of undoing necessary protections in terms of the health of millions and millions of Americans.

So that is where we are here and essentially so for so many of us placed in a situation where we say we must do better, we shouldn't simply leave it to the other body, we have the abilities within this House with true bipartisanship to continue working, and after 3 years, it might take another week or 2, that would be worth it in terms of trying to restore the reality of bipartisanship that really works.

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

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I will close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The need for this bill wasn't conceived by opponents of the Affordable Care Act or ObamaCare. The Obama administration and the army of regulators acknowledged there is a problem and have come to the Congress to fix it. Treasury, HHS, and Labor have all accepted the fact that expat plans should not be regulated the same way domestic plans are regulated.

After 4 years of examining this issue, as I said earlier, the administration issued limited and temporary regulatory relief for expat plans. This bill is necessary because despite the administration's limited and temporary fixes, thousands of jobs are on the chopping block. American businesses can't compete based on the promise of limited and temporary relief.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also remind my colleagues that Mr. CARNEY and I have worked on this for many years, and we have worked not only in a bipartisan way in the House of Representatives, we have also worked with our Senate counterparts where we have bipartisan support in the United States Senate.

So, the Obama administration has said they have concerns, but we don't know what the concerns are and they did not issue a veto threat. So I think that more level heads will prevail. This bill will pass today. It will go to the Senate, it will pass, and I would urge, then, President Obama to sign it into law so that we can save these jobs.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the amended version of H.R. 4414 that was brought up today is a marked improvement over the previous version of the bill that was brought up earlier this month. I again commend Representative CARNEY for proposing fixes to the Affordable Care Act. I also commend him for trying to work with House leadership and the Administration to come to an agreement on how to properly treat expatriate plans under the Affordable Care Act. Unfortunately the bill on the House floor today does not have the Administration's support. The potential of law-

ful permanent residents and other visa holders in the United States to erroneously be considered expatriates under H.R. 4414 still exists. I expect the Senate to fix this potential loophole and look forward to supporting final passage of the bill after the Senate has made targeted changes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEWART). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 555, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 627.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 268, nays 150, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 182]

YEAS—268

Aderholt	Cramer	Hartzler
Amodei	Crawford	Hastings (WA)
Bachmann	Crenshaw	Heck (NV)
Bachus	Cuellar	Herrera Beutler
Barber	Culberson	Higgins
Barletta	Daines	Himes
Barr	Davis, Rodney	Holding
Barrow (GA)	Delaney	Hudson
Barton	DelBene	Huizenga (MI)
Benishek	Denham	Hultgren
Bentivolio	Dent	Hunter
Bera (CA)	DeSantis	Hurt
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart	Issa
Bishop (NY)	Duckworth	Jenkins
Bishop (UT)	Duffy	Johnson (OH)
Black	Duncan (TN)	Johnson, Sam
Blackburn	Engel	Jolly
Boustany	Enyart	Jones
Brady (TX)	Esty	Joyce
Bridenstine	Farenthold	Kelly (PA)
Brooks (AL)	Fattah	Kilmer
Brooks (IN)	Fincher	Kind
Buchanan	Fitzpatrick	King (IA)
Bucshon	Fleischmann	King (NY)
Burgess	Fleming	Kingston
Bustos	Flores	Kinzinger (IL)
Byrne	Forbes	Kirkpatrick
Calvert	Fortenberry	Kline
Camp	Poster	Kuster
Cantor	Fox	LaMalfa
Capito	Franks (AZ)	Lamborn
Carney	Frelinghuysen	Lance
Carson (IN)	Gabbard	Lankford
Carter	Gardner	Larsen (WA)
Cassidy	Garrett	Larson (CT)
Chabot	Gerlach	Latham
Chaffetz	Gibbs	Latta
Clay	Gibson	Lipinski
Cleaver	Gingrey (GA)	LoBiondo
Coble	Gowdy	Long
Coffman	Granger	Lucas
Cole	Graves (GA)	Luetkemeyer
Collins (GA)	Graves (MO)	Lummis
Collins (NY)	Griffith (VA)	Maloney
Conaway	Grimm	Carolyn
Connolly	Guthrie	Maloney, Sean
Cook	Gutiérrez	Marchant
Cooper	Hall	Marino
Costa	Hanabusa	Matheson
Cotton	Hanna	McAllister
Courtney	Harper	McCarthy (CA)

McCarthy (NY)	Pompeo	Sinema
McCaul	Posey	Sires
McClintock	Price (GA)	Smith (MO)
McHenry	Quigley	Smith (NE)
McIntyre	Rahall	Smith (NJ)
McKinley	Reed	Smith (TX)
McMorris	Reichert	Southerland
Rodgers	Renacci	Stewart
Meadows	Ribble	Stivers
Meehan	Rice (SC)	Stockman
Messer	Rigell	Stutzman
Mica	Roby	Terry
Miller (FL)	Rogers (AL)	Thompson (CA)
Miller (MI)	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (PA)
Moran	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
Mullin	Rohrabacher	Tiberi
Mulvaney	Rokita	Tipton
Murphy (FL)	Rooney	Turner
Neal	Ros-Lehtinen	Upton
Neugebauer	Roskam	Valadao
Noem	Ross	Vargas
Nugent	Rothfus	Wagner
Nunes	Royce	Walberg
Nunnelee	Runyan	Walden
Olson	Ruppersberger	Walorski
Owens	Ryan (WI)	Weber (TX)
Palazzo	Scalise	Webster (FL)
Paulsen	Schneider	Welch
Pearce	Schock	Wenstrup
Perlmutter	Schraeder	Westmoreland
Perry	Schweikert	Williams
Peters (CA)	Scott, Austin	Wilson (SC)
Peters (MI)	Scott, David	Wittman
Peterson	Sensenbrenner	Wolf
Petri	Sessions	Womack
Pittenger	Sewell (AL)	Woodall
Pitts	Shimkus	Yoder
Poe (TX)	Shuster	Young (AK)
Polis	Simpson	Young (IN)

NAYS—150

Amash	Green, Gene	Napolitano
Bass	Grijalva	Negrete McLeod
Beatty	Hahn	Nolan
Becerra	Harris	O'Rourke
Bishop (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Pallone
Blumenauer	Heck (WA)	Pascrell
Bonamici	Hensarling	Pastor (AZ)
Brady (PA)	Hinojosa	Payne
Bralley (IA)	Holt	Pelosi
Broun (GA)	Honda	Pingree (ME)
Brownley (CA)	Horsford	Pocan
Butterfield	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Capps	Huelskamp	Rangel
Capuano	Huffman	Roe (TN)
Cárdenas	Israel	Royal-Allard
Cartwright	Jackson Lee	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Rush
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Chu	Johnson, E. B.	Salmon
Ciilline	Jordan	Sánchez, Linda
Clark (MA)	Kaptur	T.
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Sanchez, Loretta
Clyburn	Kelly (IL)	Sanford
Cohen	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Conyers	Kildee	Schakowsky
Crowley	Labrador	Schiff
Cummings	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Davis (CA)	Lee (CA)	Serrano
Davis, Danny	Levin	Shea-Porter
DeFazio	Loeback	Sherman
DeGette	Lofgren	Slaughter
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)
DesJarlais	Lowey	Speier
Deutch	Lujan Grisham	Swalwell (CA)
Dingell	(NM)	Takano
Doggett	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (MS)
Doyle	(NM)	Tierney
Duncan (SC)	Lynch	Titus
Edwards	Maffei	Tonko
Ellison	Massie	Tsongas
Ellmers	Matsui	Van Hollen
Eshoo	McCollum	Veasey
Frankel (FL)	McDermott	Vela
Fudge	McGovern	Velázquez
Gallego	McNerney	Visclosky
Garamendi	Meeke	Walz
Garcia	Meng	Waters
Gohmert	Michaud	Waxman
Gosar	Miller, George	Wilson (FL)
Grayson	Moore	Yarmuth
Green, Al	Nadler	Yoho

NOT VOTING—13

Brown (FL)	Lewis	Schwartz
Campbell	McKeon	Wasserman
Farr	Miller, Gary	Schultz
Goodlatte	Murphy (PA)	Whitfield
Griffin (AR)	Richmond	

□ 1543

Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Messrs. YOHO, MASSIE, SANFORD, and AMASH changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. KUSTER, Messrs. MORAN and SCHOCK changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 182, I would have voted "nay" had the Speaker allowed me to vote at the well. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE 100TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 627) to provide for the issuance of coins to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 13, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 183]

YEAS—403

- Aderholt, Amodei, Bachmann, Bachus, Barber, Barletta, Barr, Barrow (GA), Barton, Beatty, Becerra, Benishek, Bera (CA), Bilirakis, Bishop (GA), Bishop (NY), Bishop (UT), Black, Blackburn, Blumenauer, Bonamici, Boustany, Brady (PA), Braley (IA), Bridenstine, Brooks (AL), Brooks (IN), Brownley (CA), Buchanan, Bueshon, Burgess, Bustos, Butterfield, Byrne, Calvert, Camp, Cantor, Capito, Capps, Capuano, Cárdenas, Carney, Carson (IN), Carter, Cartwright, Cassidy, Castor (FL), Castro (TX), Chabot, Chaffetz, Chu, Cicilline, Clark (MA), Clarke (NY), Clay, Cleaver, Clyburn, Coble, Coffman, Cohen, Cole, Collins (GA), Collins (NY), Conaway, Connolly, Conyers, Cook, Cooper, Costa, Cotton, Courtney, Cramer, Crawford, Crenshaw, Byrne, Cuellar, Culberson, Cummings, Daines, Davis (CA), Davis, Danny, Davis, Rodney, DeFazio, DeGette, Delaney, DeLauro, DelBene, Denham, Dent, DeSantis, DesJarlais, Deutch, Diaz-Balart, Dingell, Doggett, Doyle, Duckworth, Duffy, Duncan (TN), Edwards, Ellison, Ellmers, Engel, Enyart, Eshoo, Esty, Farenthold, Farr, Fattah, Fincher, Fitzpatrick, Fleischmann, Fleming, Flores, Forbes, Fortenberry, Foster, Foy, Frankel (FL), Franks (AZ), Frelinghuysen, Fudge, Gabbard, Amash, Bentivolio, Gallego, Garamendi, Garcia, Gardner, Garrett, Gerlach, Gibbs, Gibson, Gingrey (GA), Gohmert, Gowdy, Granger, Graves (GA), Graves (MO), Grayson, Green, Al, Green, Gene, Griffith (VA), Grijalva, Grimm, Guthrie, Gutiérrez, Hahn, Hall, Hanabusa, Hanna, Harper, Harris, Hartzler, Hastings (FL), Hastings (WA), Heck (NV), Heck (WA), Hensarling, Herrera Beutler, Higgins, Himes, Hinojosa, Holding, Holt, Honda, Horsford, Hoyer, Hudson, Huelskamp, Huffman, Huizenga (MI), Hultgren, Hunter, Hurt, Israel, Issa, Jackson Lee, Jeffries, Jenkins, Johnson (GA), Johnson (OH), Johnson, E. B., Johnson, Sam, Jolly, Jordan, Joyce, Kaptur, Keating, Kelly (IL), Kelly (PA), Kennedy, Kildee, Kilmer, Kind, King (IA), King (NY), Kingston, Kinzinger (IL), Kirkpatrick, Kline, Kuster, Labrador, LaMalfa, Lamborn, Lance, Langevin, Lankford, Larsen (WA), Larson (CT), Latham, Latta, Lee (CA), Levin, Lipinski, Flores, LoBiondo, Loeb, Lofgren, Long, Lowenthal, Amash, Bentivolio, Lowey, Lucas, Luetkemeyer, Lujan Grisham (NM), Luján, Ben Ray (NM), Lummis, Lynch, Maffei, Maloney, Carolyn, Maloney, Sean, Marchant, Marino, Matheson, Matsui, McAllister, McCarthey (CA), McCarthey (NY), McCaul, McClintock, McCollum, McDermott, McGovern, McHenry, McIntyre, McKinley, McMorris, Rodgers, McNeerney, Meadows, Meehan, Meeks, Meng, Messer, Mica, Michaud, Miller (FL), Miller (MI), Miller, George, Moore, Mullin, Mulvaney, Murphy (FL), Nadler, Napolitano, Nuland, Negrete McLeod, Neugebauer, Noem, Nolan, Nugent, Nunes, Nunnalee, O'Rourke, Olson, Owens, Palazzo, Pallone, Pascrell, Pastor (AZ), Paulsen, Payne, Pearce, Pelosi, Perlmutter, Perry, Peters (CA), Peters (MI), Peterson, Pingree (ME), Pittenger, Pitts, Pocan, Polis, Pompeo, Posey, Price (GA), Price (NC), Quigley, Rahn, Rangel, Reed, Reichert, Renacci, Ribble, Rice (SC), Rigell, Roby, Roe (TN), Rogers (AL), Rogers (KY), Rogers (MI), Rohrabacher, Brady (TX), Broun (GA), Duncan (SC), Gosar, Jones, Massie, Poe (TX), Salmon, Weber (TX), Yoho, Young (AK), Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—15

- Bass, Brown (FL), Campbell, Goodlatte, Griffin (AR), Lewis, McKeon, Miller, Gary, Moran, Murphy (PA), Petri, Richmond, Schwartz, Sessions, Wasserman, Schultz

□ 1553

Mr. WEBER of Texas changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2429

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove Congressman DAVID PRICE of North Carolina as a cosponsor from H.R. 2429. His name was inadvertently added.

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

There was no objection.

HONORING FORMER U.S. REPRESENTATIVE MICK STATON

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

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise here with my fellow Members from West Virginia to honor former U.S. Representative Mick Staton, who passed away on April 14, 2014.

Mick was a lifelong West Virginian who devoted himself to a life of service to our great State, including representing the Third District of West Virginia. Mick's public service began with 8 years in the National Guard, and his passion for serving others and his dedication to Republican principles inspired him to make a run for Congress.

A successful businessman, Congressman Staton also served as a Presidential elector for West Virginia. Then, just last month, he was named as one of only five emeritus members of the West Virginia Republican Party.

More evident than Mick's tremendous dedication to West Virginia was his devotion to his family. He and his wife, Lynn, shared a true partnership in life, giving them faith and support to persevere through his difficult health challenges.

As a friend of Mick's for 30 years, I will miss his bright smile, quick wit, and warm companionship. I offer my deep condolences to Lynn, their two children, and their extended family.

HONORING FORMER U.S. REPRESENTATIVE MICK STATON

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

NAYS—13

- Amash, Brady (TX), Broun (GA), Duncan (SC), Gosar

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I, like my colleagues from West Virginia, Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. MCKINLEY, remember Mick Staton as a dedicated public servant, a son of West Virginia.

I enjoyed serving in this body with Mick. He always knew where he stood on a given issue. While he and I were members of different political parties, on principle, we often agreed. He shared the most basic value of true West Virginians, loyalty—loyalty to his faith, to his family, to his friends, to his Nation, and to our State.

Mick's word was his bond. Of course, he was a loyal Republican, and as a copper-riveted, rock-ribbed Republican through and through, Mick was always my friend. There is a good lesson in that for our Members today. Our friendship continued to grow after his distinguished service ended in this body.

Mr. Speaker, Mick Staton's service to our State of West Virginia never ended, nor did his efforts to bring people together to get things accomplished for West Virginians.

He worked hard for that, and his devotion flowed as naturally as a pristine mountain stream. This courteous, cordial fellow—with what could best be described as an award-winning, ever-present smile—had a good way with people. It is no secret to anyone who knew him that all of that warm personality—that sincere charm—stemmed from a good heart.

Mick always made a point of delivering a birthday card to me, personally, sometimes in my congressional office. This May, as my birthday approaches, that good heart will be sorely missed. My thoughts and prayers remain with Lynn—his wife—and with his family.

□ 1600

#### MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING PIONEER AND LIFELONG MOUNTAINEER DAVID "MICK" STATON

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

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 14, we lost a friend in West Virginia. Mick Staton and I had known each other for some time. I considered him a true friend, someone who had a passion for West Virginia.

He was a trailblazer for numbers of us, all through West Virginia, in trying different techniques, campaign styles, and work ethic. He made a difference for numbers of his conservatives in West Virginia. He was elected to the House of Representatives on behalf of the Second District.

He brought with him a background of work with the National Guard for 8 years. His role here in the House meant a lot to him, and after he left, whenever I would run into him, Mr. Speaker, he would always ask: What about

something new? What is happening? Because he cared passionately about our country and the State of West Virginia.

Afterwards, after leaving office, he served as the chief political adviser for the United States Chamber of Commerce. He continued his mission to try to get the message across of how we can be a better Nation, stronger, more vibrant, because he cared very much.

As you heard, he has left behind his wife, Lynn, and two adult kids: David "Mick" Staton, Jr., and his daughter, Cynthia.

Mr. Speaker, again, we have lost a friend. I would ask that we have just a moment of silence on behalf of the family.

#### APPROVING THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

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

Mr. BARROW of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, almost 2 weeks ago, the administration announced yet another delay in approving the Keystone XL pipeline. I think they have it all wrong. Further delays in constructing this pipeline means that the U.S. will miss out on tens of thousands of jobs and continue to depend on foreign oil from hostile countries.

The Keystone XL pipeline will bring in 840,000 barrels of oil a day from our friend and neighbor, Canada. That can essentially replace the 900,000 barrels we have to get every day from Venezuela, one country we cannot count on. Add to that the roughly 20,000 jobs that will be created and the findings that the pipeline will have no net negative environmental impacts, you can see why there is broad, bipartisan support for the Keystone XL pipeline.

Mr. Speaker, this oil will be extracted, refined, and used by someone. The only question is who will get the jobs and who will be the first in line to use it. America needs the Keystone XL pipeline now, and I urge the administration to end the holdup.

#### NATIONAL DNA DAY

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, April is National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month. April 25 was National DNA Day. It commemorates the discovery of DNA's double helix and subsequent scientific advancements.

DNA has revolutionized public safety in the criminal justice system. Since its inception in 1994, the national DNA database system has solved more than 200,000 previously unsolved crimes. It provides closure to victims of violent crimes. It assists prosecutors in taking violent offenders off the streets and has

helped clear more than 300 wrongfully convicted.

Katie Sepich was a 22-year-old New Mexico State University graduate student. In August of 2003, she was brutally raped, strangled to death, burned, and abandoned at a dumpsite. Katie was a fighter with full DNA profiles under her nails. Through DNA, we were able to find her attacker.

Katie's Law was signed into law last year, helping States with DNA collection. The discoveries and advancements of DNA have done wonders for our society. Closure has transformed our justice system.

#### THE NATIONAL CONSTITUTION COMPETITION

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, last night it was my honor to be in the audience as Lincoln High School from Portland, Oregon, won the national Constitution competition. This is a terrific program. The We the People competition has been going on since 1987. It has involved almost 28 million youngsters, nearly 100,000 coaches and teachers, where young people do a deep dive into constitutional underpinnings. I will tell you, these students were no different.

I am pleased that this is the third year in a row that Portland, Oregon, has won: Lincoln 2 years ago, Grant High School, Lincoln again this year.

These are outstanding young men and women. It has been my privilege to have had an opportunity to work with them during their preparation. I am continually impressed with their insight and their commitment.

There is a lot of concern about the state of civic education in the United States today, and rightly so. But these young trailblazers are showing the ability of young people to master the subject, make a commitment, and they are sowing the seeds for productive careers for years to come.

I hope some day this Congress will see fit to once again support this civic education program, which we had done until 2 years ago. It is time to reconsider and see if we can be a partner as well.

#### CALLING UPON THE BELARUSIAN OFFICIALS FOR THE IMMEDIATE AND UNCONDITIONAL RELEASE OF ALL POLITICAL PRISONERS

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, every individual has a right to live in a free society. This May, the Ice Hockey World Championship 2014 will take place in Minsk, Belarus, challenging the Belarusian Government to demonstrate that it lives up to the core principles of good sportsmanship and fair play.

This global sports competition promotes integrity and emphasizes the fair application of rules and regulations. It is thus fitting that Belarus should do the same and show its citizens and the international community that it can play by the rules.

I then call upon the Belarusian officials for the immediate and unconditional release of all political prisoners, including Ales Bialiatski, Mikalai Statkevich, and Eduard Lobau, whom Amnesty International regards as prisoners of conscience, imprisoned solely for the peaceful exercise of their human rights.

#### ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES AFFECTING OUR REGION

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the challenges facing our coastal communities.

Last week, I was honored to help organize a conference in my district that brought increased attention to the economic, social, and environmental priorities of tribal communities.

With Interior Secretary Sally Jewell, tribal representatives, and other Federal agency officials and stakeholders, we were able to make significant progress in recognizing the need for active and sustained engagement on economic environmental issues affecting our region.

Secretary Jewell rightly pointed out that we have a moral obligation to act in the face of rising sea levels, ocean acidification, and severe weather patterns caused by climate change. In my district alone, three tribes are currently in the process of relocation due to the threats of floods.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to act. Let's help regions identify their infrastructure needs and work cooperatively to help ensure that we are protecting coastal communities and their heritage sites, maintaining livelihoods, and living up to our treaty and trust obligations.

Let's also work to develop new, cleaner energy sources, cut carbon emissions, and lead a global effort to tackle the real threat of climate change.

#### REAUTHORIZE THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank that begins this discussion.

I yield to the gentleman and my friend and a passionate advocate on behalf of the Export-Import Bank, Congressman CÁRDENAS from the 29th District of California.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, we need to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. It is very rare that you will see, quite frankly, any government on the planet that actually has a program that they support, that actually puts money back to the taxpayers rather than costing the taxpayers.

I say that is rare anywhere in the world. It certainly is rare here. This Export-Import Bank in the United States is in fact that kind of organization. For example, last year the bank supported 205,000 American jobs. I did not say "exported jobs." I said "supported 205,000 American jobs." That is what those loans did for American companies.

In addition to that, it should be noted that the loans that are being given are actually filling the gap that private banks will not or choose not to support; but our American companies need that kind of support, especially when they are competing in our global economy. The Export-Import Bank is exactly that mechanism that should exist.

What I would like to ask all Americans is to go ahead and go online and start tweeting Export-Import Bank and find out what your Congressman or Congresswoman thinks about the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

If you care about jobs, if you care about the person who lives next to you or down the street and they are unemployed, the Export-Import Bank is an answer to solving some of the problems in our economy in this country. Yes, there are too many Americans out of work, but not reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank will just contribute even more to companies in the United States not being able to compete, but also possibly closing their doors.

In addition to that, I would like to point out that every developed country in the world actually has their version of an Export-Import Bank. And some of those countries like China and India are actually tenfold, maybe 100 times the support that we are giving to our domestic companies here they are giving to their companies so they can compete or perhaps overcompete around the world.

I think it is important for all of us as Americans to understand that there is something good about the Export-Import Bank, and that is that it exists for creating American jobs. That is exactly what it is doing. If you are concerned about the American tax dollar, you would support the reauthorization

of the Export-Import Bank because all it does is create more jobs and more taxes in the coffers, and it doesn't take away anything from the taxes of the American public.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the 18th Congressional District of Florida, Congressman PATRICK MURPHY, another passionate advocate on behalf of reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington for his advocacy and passion for this critical issue for our country and for American jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out on the urgent need for Congress to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, boosting job growth at home and the export of American-made products abroad.

Coming from the private sector, one of the first things I did after being elected was embark on a jobs tour, which included over 70 meetings, roundtables, and company visits within the first year. I have taken ideas and suggestions from all of these conversations and have put them into a plan to grow jobs in the Palm Beach-Treasure Coast district that I am so proud to represent.

This plan consists of commonsense, pro-growth policies that allow new businesses to gain a solid foothold in a tough economy and for existing businesses to expand and prosper. One of the major focuses of this plan is on how the government can provide stability and certainty and resources to keep jobs at home by investing in our manufacturing sector and promoting exports of American-made goods abroad. Reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank with greater lending authority is one pillar for how we can do this.

As my voting record shows, I have strong feelings about government overspending. As a former small business owner myself, I know that government does not create jobs. But government does have the responsibility to create an environment conducive to job growth, and that is exactly what the Ex-Im does at zero cost to taxpayers.

It is an unfortunate reality that the United States buys much more than it sells. In 2013 alone, we imported over \$400 billion, about 25 percent of GDP, more than we exported. We need to reverse this trend by boosting U.S. manufacturing and exports.

Now, the world knows we have the best equipment and the most highly trained workforce, and our products are sought after around the world for their high quality and skilled workmanship.

We must better leverage these strengths and provide greater opportunity to export goods made in America. One of the best ways to do this is by reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank before its current charter expires on September 30.

Just a few months ago, we celebrated the 80th anniversary of the Ex-Im Bank

and its commitment to boosting the sales of U.S. products overseas. Ex-Im supported over 200,000 American jobs in 2013 alone and generated over \$1 billion in revenue in 2012. With my district being home to a growing manufacturing sector and its proximity to several major ports, export sales are a major economic issue for our community, contributing tens of millions of dollars to our local economy every year.

The Ex-Im Bank is especially beneficial to small businesses, which are the backbone of our economy, creating two-thirds out of all new jobs nationwide.

□ 1615

More than 85 percent of Ex-Im's transactions benefit U.S. small- and medium-sized businesses, helping these entrepreneurs compete globally.

In my district, the majority of exporters are also small businesses. I recently met with one such business during my jobs tour, Locus Traxx Worldwide. They were recognized with an Export Achievement Award by the U.S. Department of Commerce for their successful entry into the international marketplace.

I also must commend our local Export Assistance Center for the great work they do with local businesses such as Locus Traxx, helping them utilize the Ex-Im Bank to promote the selling of goods made in America to buyers overseas.

You see, the Export-Import Bank makes a real difference to our economy at the local, State, and national level. It is a highly effective and completely self-sustaining mechanism that businesses of all sizes use to finance exports.

Even in times of intense partisanship, we should all be able to agree on the value the Ex-Im Bank provides to our economy. It would be shortsighted and detrimental to our economic recovery to allow its charter to expire.

We must work together to build a brighter future for our Nation, strengthen our workforce, grow our economy, and reduce our deficit. To do that, we must come together to continue to support successful programs like the Ex-Im Bank that help small businesses prosper, support American jobs, and boost our exports.

Now, we can have our differences, but at the end of the day we have to do what is in the best interest of America. And to do that, we have to work together. It shouldn't matter who gets the credit, as long as America and Americans succeed.

For 80 years, the Ex-Im Bank has been making sure that we succeed. I strongly urge my colleagues to join in calling for the commonsense reauthorization of the Ex-Im Bank so that we may continue to support American businesses' access to global markets and increase our Nation's international competitiveness.

I want to thank the gentleman from Washington for his leadership.

Mr. HECK of Washington. When someone in America builds a better mousetrap or improves upon the design of an existing product, the world takes notice. Companies, governments, and industries in countries from South Africa to Turkey and in between are potential customers for well-crafted, American-made products.

But in the modern-day globalized economy, credit is necessary for complex transactions. Buyers and sellers need assurance that the deals are legitimate. Without that, they are forced to imitate products, violate intellectual property rights and standards, and American companies lose out on market share.

For 80 years, our economy has expanded and grown beyond our borders and into the developed and developing world, in part because of the Export-Import Bank of the United States. Today, with U.S. trade deficits growing as exports fall, we need now more than ever to be able to support increases in exports.

Exports accelerate our economic growth, and the Export-Import Bank is a key part in encouraging just that activity. Increased exports translate into more jobs in America. Studies have shown that export-related jobs pay, on average, 15 to 18 percent more than the overall average. They are better-paying jobs.

Finally, with 95 percent of the potential customers of U.S. goods and services living outside our borders, exporting provides vast potential for American businesses, large and small.

Ninety-five percent of the world lives outside our borders, and the rest of the world is growing a middle class. So think of it this way. If we want to keep and grow our middle class, we better be selling into the rest of the world's growing middle class.

This is not, and has never been, about picking winners and losers. The Export-Import Bank simply serves to bridge the gap between those who want American goods and services and Americans that have goods and services to sell. It is about leveling the playing field so that small operators have access to a global market of customers equal to that of large corporations.

For example, the Bank's export credit insurance policy provides payment coverage for commercial risks such as buyer default and political risk from war or unrest. The insurance also ensures that businesses no longer have to forego sales because they cannot match the credit terms offered by global competitors. This is what we are talking about when we say it levels the playing field.

There is no other private lender currently offering what the Export-Import Bank provides American businesses. For example, 89 percent of the bank's transactions directly benefit U.S. small businesses. That doesn't even include the small businesses that make up the supply chain of the larger companies

whose goods are purchased from foreign entities.

If you want more information on this, the very best place to get it is at the Export-Import Bank's own Web site, [www.exim.gov](http://www.exim.gov). Look up the businesses in your area that have benefited from the Export-Import Bank.

As was mentioned earlier, lo and behold, we actually even make money off the Export-Import Bank. Last year alone, over a billion dollars transferred to the U.S. Treasury off the profits of the Export-Import Bank. As a matter of fact, in the 80 years of its existence, quite literally not one red penny of American taxpayer dollars has ever been used in support of the Ex-Im. Not one red penny. It lowers the deficit and does not use taxpayer dollars.

As I mentioned, it is small companies. Take a company like Pexco, which is located in the 10th Congressional District in Fife, Washington. They produce traffic control products you see on the road when repairs are being made, like traffic cones, raised curbs, reflective signs, and barricades indicating where the road is blocked off. They are used all over the world.

In fact, just recently, a distributor from Denmark purchased \$125,000 worth of Pexco products, which was financed by the Export-Import Bank. No commercial bank would have touched that transaction. But it guaranteed the products would reach Denmark. They were done reliably because of the Export-Import Bank.

In fact, in this individual company's instance, which is not atypical of their sales—and they are a small company of 200 employees—over half is sold internationally. Ten percent of total sales are financed by the Export-Import Bank.

So what is the result? The residents of Fife, Washington, are put to work producing their popular products in traffic safety all over the world.

I mentioned it was FDR that actually created the Export-Import Bank 80 years ago, and although it was actually initiated and created by a Democratic administration, the support of it has always been strongly bipartisan.

Republican Presidents such as Dwight Eisenhower, Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush, and George W. Bush supported the mission of the Ex-Im Bank, as did Bill Clinton. All these Presidents were staunch supporters of capitalism and the Ex-Im Bank.

Listen to what President Reagan said when he signed the reauthorization, which was a bill that was reauthorized almost unanimously, in 1986:

This sends an important signal to both our exporting community and foreign suppliers that American exporters will continue to be able to compete vigorously for business throughout the world.

Perhaps an even more conservative voice, former Vice President Cheney, said in 1997:

Some of my fellow conservatives on the Hill may have a philosophical problem with the fact that the bank is a government agency, but if they consider the success of its

lending programs, it would be difficult for them to object on budgetary grounds.

For every dollar put into Ex-Im, Cheney said, “there’s been a \$20 return to the U.S. economy.”

And again, the same speech, Vice President Cheney said:

Ex-Im Bank is remarkably effective at helping create jobs, opportunities for trade, stable democracies, and vibrant economies throughout the world. The Bank has made a tremendous contribution as a rapid response, service-oriented agency designed to meet the export financing needs of American businesses.

Indeed, the Bank has been reauthorized a number of times throughout its history—almost always unanimously, until of late—each time making it more effective for the economic climate of the time.

So let’s have a conversation about how to make it better. Let’s have a conversation on how to get the word out to businesses that they have yet to tap into their potential global markets. Let’s talk about how to get our economy running and get ahead of our global competitors.

Let’s remember, as Congressman CÁRDENAS alluded to, every single developed entity in the world has an Ex-Im Bank-like entity, and if we do not reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank, it is the equivalent of and tantamount to unilateral disarmament in a global economy—one in which global trade has increased fivefold just since 1980.

What is the Export-Import Bank about? It is about jobs, jobs, jobs. Yes, 200,000 last year, but over a million in the last 4 years.

Every month we spend debating the merits of the Export-Import Bank instead of encouraging companies to explore the world market, the economy loses billions of dollars in potential export opportunities. The jobs, especially in manufacturing, stagnate. People remain unemployed when they want to work.

As a member of the House Financial Services Committee, I am encouraging, I am urging, I am beseeching, I am pleading with the chair to hold hearings as soon as possible on reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. We have been waiting 15 months for something to happen. And it is time to move forward.

Let us be clear-eyed and cold-blooded about what the cost is of not doing anything. At a recent roundtable of businesses who had been involved with the Export-Import Bank there was a gentleman present from a company in California. I believe his name was Steve Wilburn and the company was named FirmGreen.

Literally, in the course of the conversation he raise his hand and he said, I just lost a multimillion-dollar order of sales, and I am told the reason I lost it is that our competitor manufacturer, which was in another country, persuaded the purchaser that the cloud hanging over reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank may mean it will

not be there when you need it. We lost millions in sales because Congress dithered.

Ladies and gentlemen, at the end of the day, this is the most straightforward imaginable proposition. This is about shoring up, strengthening, supporting the manufacturing sector of the American economy and creating good-paying jobs.

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

#### CURRENT EVENTS AFFECTING AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to my dear friend, Dr. VIRGINIA FOXX.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you, Congressman GOHMERT, my classmate and friend. I appreciate very much you yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, last week, I had the opportunity to visit a remarkable public school in Kernersville, North Carolina. In addition to preparing students academically for college, the North Carolina Leadership Academy is publicly committed to giving their 400 students “the opportunity to develop true leadership qualities and become creative thinkers and problem-solvers while retaining a sense of responsibility for their families, their community, and their country.”

NCLA has an ambitious mission, and they are executing it so well that last year this charter school had over 700 applicants for 95 openings. The wait list has over 600 names, and is growing.

□ 1630

It was a privilege to spend time with the remarkable students and faculty of NCLA. I was truly impressed by their commitment to scholarship, by the leadership skills of the students, and by the remarkable academic progress that was on display.

All NCLA students in grades 7–12 participate in Civil Air Patrol, a program established by Congress in 1946 that uses military-style uniforms, customs, courtesies, ceremonies, and drill in order to improve student leadership skills, fitness, and character. This program is working.

NCLA places a strong emphasis on family involvement; and the level of commitment demonstrated by parents, families, and the Piedmont community at large was impressive.

Community engagement is a key to success of any school, and the community’s support for NCLA is a good reminder that decisions about the education of our youth should remain local.

I have been a strong supporter of charter schools for my entire legislative career. In the North Carolina

State Senate, I supported charters as one of the best hopes to genuinely reform our school system.

In Congress, those of us who support charter schools should express that support by ensuring that Federal policy encourages States to adopt expansive charter laws.

Further, we need to ensure that Washington does not put up bureaucratic roadblocks that would keep State, city, and county governments from experimenting with new ideas and establishing effective charter school programs.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot say enough about how impressed I was to spend time with the educators of the North Carolina Leadership Academy, individuals who seek daily to impress upon the students the values encapsulated in the school motto of “Scholarship, Leadership, Citizenship.”

I expect many good things from the remarkable young scholar leaders currently being educated by this wonderful school. The community will reap the benefits of having this school in its midst for years to come.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate so much my colleague from North Carolina. Having been a president of a university, she knows all about education.

It is certainly one of the areas where we are failing American youth these days, and you would have thought that, if the Federal Government were the answer to everybody’s problems, then when President Carter started the Department of Education, everything would have gotten instantly better; but over 35 years later, it turns out the Federal Government is not the answer to better education.

I have talked with enough high school students who also say the Federal Government is not the answer to their food problems. I have met with cafeteria workers and leaders who say that kids are not eating the food. They are required to choose from lists of foods to put on the plates that they had heretofore not heard of before that students don’t want, don’t like.

The football players were saying last fall: How in the world can we go to football practice and all we get is this piddly little bit of meat and other stuff we can’t eat?

So obviously, education, food has not been helped, certainly not according to my constituents in east Texas, the vast majority; and education itself does not seem to have made all that great or remarkable progress since the Carter administration started the Department of Education and Congress began putting strings on virtually everything they did in the way of educational support.

The 10th Amendment had some real meaning and was really visionary. It was the last of those first 10 Bill of Rights and, in essence, said everything that is not specifically enumerated as a power of the Federal Government is reserved to the States and the people; that is because the genius of our

Founders collectively was the best answers are found locally, not by bureaucrats in Washington, D.C.

I was shocked to go online years ago and see that one of my school districts was bragging that, gee, about half of their employees were actually teachers. I was shocked. I would have thought that, if we really cared about education, the big bulk of employees would be teachers.

So I did further investigation and found out that before the national Department of Education was created under Jimmy Carter, there was between 70 and 80 percent of the Texas educational employees who were teachers.

Naturally, when Washington gets involved, there are more requirements for the State agency—education agency in each State; then with more State education accountability and requirements to Washington, there became more bureaucrats there, which meant there had to be more bureaucrats in the local school districts.

If we want to ever get back to having the best education that we can get for our dollar, we need to get back to observing the 10th Amendment. The best educational accountability comes not from some bureaucrat on his buttocks here in Washington, but from those who are there locally that see what is happening in the school.

We have done enough damage. One of the disagreements I had with former President George W. Bush, who I like and admire—I think it unfortunate that people do not appreciate either his intelligence or his very, very clever wit.

Unlike Mr. Gore, who seemed to have trouble being able to make good enough grades to stay in graduate programs, former President Bush didn't have any problem getting through and getting an MBA from Harvard; though obviously, Harvard is not what it used to be when it would embrace and allow debate from all sectors. Now, it is the liberal sector, or they don't really appreciate you.

So, anyway, No Child Left Behind was a big mistake. When Governor George W. Bush pushed accountability at the State level, he was acting within the bounds of the Constitution.

I had hopes that this administration would actually keep the promise that they would dismantle No Child Left Behind. It has been eased, but not nearly what should have happened.

It turns out that the administration has been so busy with other aspects that, apparently, it has not had the time to devote to dismantling No Child Left Behind, as they might have hoped.

We have this story from today, April 29, 2014, Washington, D.C., from Judicial Watch, "Benghazi Documents Point to White House on Misleading Talking Points."

The article says that—as a release from Judicial Watch, that they announced today that, on April 18, 2014, it obtained 41 new Benghazi-related State Department documents.

They include a newly declassified email showing then-White House Deputy Strategic Communications adviser Ben Rhodes and other Obama administration public relation officials attempting to orchestrate a campaign to reinforce President Obama and to portray the Benghazi consulate terrorist attack as being "rooted in an Internet video and not a failure of policy."

Other documents show that State Department officials initially described the incident as an attack, a possible kidnap attempt.

The documents were released Friday as a result of a June 21, 2013, Freedom of Information Act lawsuit filed against the Department of State to gain access to documents about the controversial talking points used by then-U.N. Ambassador Susan Rice for a series of appearances on television—Sunday news programs—on September 16, 2012.

Judicial Watch had been seeking these documents since October 18, 2012. The Rhodes email was sent on Friday, September 14, at 8:09 p.m., with the subject line, "Re: Prep call with Susan: Saturday at 4 p.m. ET."

The documents show that the prep was for Ambassador Rice's Sunday news show appearances to discuss the Benghazi attack. The documents list as a goal, "to underscore that these protests are rooted in an Internet video and not a broader failure of policy."

I might insert parenthetically here that, actually, this must be taken in context in 2012 because there was an election only weeks following this incident, and the big campaign line that Osama bin Laden is dead, GM is alive, al Qaeda is on the run, didn't look nearly as tantalizing if it turns out al Qaeda—al Qaeda may be on the run, but if they are, they are running toward American interests and killing an American Ambassador and other State Department personnel.

This article goes on to say:

Rhodes returns to the "Internet video" scenario later in the email, the first point in a section labeled "Top-lines."

And here is the quote:

We have made our views on this video crystal clear. The United States Government had nothing to do with it. We reject its message and its contents. We find it disgusting and reprehensible, but there is absolutely no justification at all for responding to this movie with violence, and we are working to make sure that people around the globe hear that message.

Mr. Speaker, it also should be noted here that it was not only sending Susan Rice out to mislead the American people before the election into believing that this was not a failure of policy by the Obama administration, which it clearly was, but actually, it was all about a video.

To perpetuate this misleading, some might argue, fraudulent presentation of anything but facts included producing a commercial with Secretary of State Hillary Clinton saying the United States had nothing to do with

that video, repeatedly making the point to add cover to their cover story that it was not a failure of policy by the Obama administration that caused and failed to suppress the attack at Benghazi, but it was some video by some lone person out in California who must be stopped.

They spent tens of thousands of dollars running this commercial in foreign countries to help give cover to what were the true facts, the true facts being that this was nothing about a video; it was all about a planned concerted attack, which it turns out may have even utilized weapons that the United States provided to these rebels over many of our objections on this House floor, and with the President saying he really didn't need congressional support because he had Islamic countries and France wanting us to get in there and provide weapons and air cover to the al Qaeda-backed rebels.

□ 1645

We knew there was al Qaeda involved. As we said on the floor back during those days, we just don't know how extensive it is. We think we ought to wait until we know how extensive the al Qaeda involvement is. But this administration wouldn't have that. They moved ahead. They furnished weapons. And it could very well turn out that there were people in our party that said, okay, all right, if that is what you want to do, but it certainly wasn't this congressional body that did that.

The President got his will. They furnished weapons to rebels that included al Qaeda. This administration refused to provide the security that was requested by more than one person, but including Chris Stevens, himself. It refused to provide it.

How bad would that look right before the election: A mere matter of weeks before early voting started, and it turns out that not only did they not provide security as requested, when it was requested, heck, they may have even provided the weapons to the rebels who killed our Ambassador. It was the first time an Ambassador had been killed since the Jimmy Carter administration, and here it was happening again.

This administration knew exactly what would happen when America finds out that an administration is toothless, is ineffectual, and has actually brought assistance to radical Islamists becoming in charge of a country. Because, after all, it was the Carter administration that did as this administration did with Mubarak and Qadhafi in saying they have got to go, pushed an ally out. It was not a very nice one by any stretch, but an ally.

And then President Carter welcomed the Ayatollah Khomeini as a man of peace. So then for the first time in what was a long period, a radical Islamist got control of a major country. That opened the door to many thousands and thousands and thousands of Americans being killed in the

decades ahead. That kind of ineffectual foreign policy that Jimmy Carter had saw the results at Benghazi.

But this article goes on to point out that:

Among the top administration PR personnel who received the Rhodes memo were White House Press Secretary Jay Carney, Deputy Press Secretary Joshua Earnest, then-White House Communications Director Dan Pfeiffer, then-White House Deputy Communications Director Jennifer Palmieri, then-National Security Council Director of Communications Erin Pelton, Special Assistant to the Press Secretary Howli Ledbetter, and then-White House Senior Advisor and political strategist David Plouffe.

The Rhodes communications strategy email also instructs recipients to portray Obama as “steady and statesmanlike” throughout the crisis. Another of the “goals” of the PR offensive, Rhodes says, is “to reinforce the President and Administration’s strength and steadiness in dealing with difficult challenges.” He later includes as a PR “top-line” talking point:

“I think that people have come to trust that President Obama provides leadership that is steady and statesmanlike. There are always going to be challenges that emerge around the world, and time and again, he has shown that we can meet them.”

The documents Judicial Watch obtained also include a September 12, 2012, email from former deputy spokesman at U.S. Mission to the United Nations Payton Knopf to Susan Rice, noting that at a press briefing earlier that day, State Department spokesperson Victoria Nuland explicitly stated that the attack on the consulate had been well planned.

The email sent by Knopf to Rice at 5:42 p.m. said:

“Responding to a question about whether it was an organized terror attack, Toria said that she couldn’t speak to the identity of the perpetrators but that it was clearly a complex attack.”

In the days following the Knopf email, Rice appeared on ABC, CBS, NBC, FOX News, and CNN still claiming the assaults occurred “spontaneously” in response to the “hateful video.”

And it is worth noting, there were people that used those words, “steady” and “statesmanlike.” And certainly this would have appeared to be a real problem for the administration that someone speaking soon after the attack and the murder, the assassination of Chris Stevens and three American patriots, Ms. Nuland, not knowing that she was supposed to use talking points and mislead the American public and the world, spoke the truth because she hadn’t gotten the email, the talking points to mislead Americans and the world. So she spoke the truth.

It was very clear, as it was to those in Libya, that this was a complicated attack. It was well planned, well coordinated, and it had nothing to do with the video.

This article goes on:

On Sunday, September 16, Rice told CBS’s “Face the Nation”:

“But based on the best information we have to date, what our assessment is as of the present is, in fact, what began spontaneously in Benghazi as a reaction to what had transpired some hours earlier in Cairo where, of course, as you know, there was a violent protest outside of our Embassy sparked by this hateful video.”

The Judicial Watch documents confirm that CIA talking points that were prepared for Congress and may have been used by Rice on “Face the Nation” and four additional Sunday talk shows on September 16 had been heavily edited by then-CIA Deputy Director Mike Morell. According to one email:

“The first draft apparently seemed unsuitable because they seemed to encourage the reader to infer incorrectly that the CIA had warned about a specific attack on our Embassy. On the SVTS, Morell noted that these points were not good and he had taken a heavy hand to editing them. He noted that he would be happy to work with then deputy chief of staff to Hillary Clinton, Jake Sullivan, and Rhodes to develop appropriate talking points.”

The documents obtained by Judicial Watch also contain numerous emails sent during the assault on the Benghazi diplomatic facility. The contemporaneous and dramatic emails describe the assault as an “attack.”

Just as State Department number two person in Libya said Chris Stevens described it: We are under attack. There was nothing about a video. The American people were duped right before the election, as was the intent.

Back to the article:

September 11, 2012, 6:41 p.m., Senior Adviser Eric Pelofsky to Susan Rice:

“As reported, the Benghazi compound came under attack and it took a bit of time for the ‘annex’ colleagues and Libyan February 17 brigade to secure it. One of our colleagues was killed—IMO Sean Smith. Ambassador Chris Stevens, who was visiting Benghazi this week is missing. U.S. and Libyan colleagues are looking for him.”

Further down, it notes how much material is blacked out in so many of the emails. Judicial Watch President Tom Fitton said: “Now we know the Obama White House’s chief concern about the Benghazi attack was making sure that President Obama looked good.” “And these documents undermine the Obama administration’s narrative that it thought the Benghazi attack had something to do with protests or an Internet video. Given the explosive material in these documents, it is no surprise that we had to go to Federal court to pry them loose from the Obama State Department.”

Well, that has led to this printing that I did of another Judicial Watch FOIA request. This is an article from here in D.C.:

Judicial Watch announced today that on March 25, 2014, it filed a Freedom of Information Act lawsuit against the Federal Bureau of Investigation seeking agency records related to the awarding of the Louis E. Peters Award in 2011 to Mohamed Elbiary, a member of the Department of Homeland Security Advisory Council. Elbiary is alleged to have close ties to radical Islamist organizations, including the Muslim Brotherhood.

And I will insert parenthetically here that, actually, when a Muslim Brother, Morsi, was President of Egypt, a periodical there was bragging about six top Obama officials who were Muslim Brothers, and one of them was Mr. Elbiary from Texas.

This points out here:

Judicial Watch seeks the following documents in its June 24, 2013, FOIA request:

Any and all records regarding, concerning, or related to the awarding of the Louis E.

Peters Memorial Award to Mr. Mohamed Elbiary on September 8, 2011.

Further down, it says:

Elbiary, who in his role as Homeland Security adviser has regular access to classified information, most recently came under fire in November 2013 for tweeting out the message that America is an “Islamic country with an Islamically compliant constitution.” In its December 2013 “Special Report: U.S. Government Purges of Law Enforcement Training Material Deemed ‘Offensive’ to Muslims,” Judicial Watch identified Elbiary as one of nearly a half dozen “Islamist influence operators” within the Obama administration “seeking to advance an ideological agenda completely at odds with our constitutional system.”

Of course, that was December of 2013 when actually it was December of 2012 when the Egyptian Muslim Brother-controlled government had a periodical that talked about, a year before this, the six Muslim Brothers who had such powerful influence and roles in this administration.

This goes on to talk about Mr. Elbiary and his role in the Homeland Security Department. Personally, I had an opportunity to question Janet Napolitano as Secretary of Homeland Security more than once about Mr. Elbiary.

And actually, on the night before one of our hearings, I had talked to the head of the Texas Department of Public Safety, Steve McCraw, a great man, a great patriot, a former FBI agent. He understands what is going on in this country. And he was alerted that Mr. Elbiary had downloaded two documents from a classified database that Mr. Elbiary only got access to because Janet Napolitano, to the best we can find out, just unilaterally gave him a security clearance so he could go into these Web sites. And he did it from his own computer, and he did it at his home. They could tell all of this by the intelligence they were able to gather, and it was clear he had downloaded two documents.

What was in an article and published was that the article writer said that he had talked to someone in the national media who said that Elbiary had shopped those two documents to this national media source, and they didn’t accept it. They were concerned about accepting classified documents and printing them, and so they didn’t.

□ 1700

The next day at our hearing I brought this up to Secretary Napolitano. She said she didn’t know what I was talking about, basically, and she would look into it. What she didn’t know is that I knew when she made those false statements that her chief of staff the night before, her chief of staff had talked to Steve McCraw and had told him, look, I know you are concerned—basically that is what he said:

I know you are concerned, but I have given a full briefing of what happened to the Secretary herself. She knows what is going on. She is fully briefed on the matter.

So either Secretary Napolitano lied to me and the Congress in our hearing

under penalty of perjury, or her chief of staff just completely made up that he had just briefed the Secretary on this troubling security breach.

I would like to think that if the Secretary, as here, had unilaterally put what Egypt considered a member of the Muslim Brotherhood into our very tight inner circle and given him a secret security clearance without going through the normal vetting that is supposed to be required, and if that person that she unilaterally got that position had breached the protocol and downloaded documents from a classified setting, that somebody, for Heaven's sake, would have alerted the Secretary of Homeland Security. But she sat right there and told me that, no, she didn't know anything about it.

The next time I asked her about it, however, she said she had looked into it and there was nothing to it. Unfortunately for her, and unfortunately for our country and its own security, no one had bothered to properly look into the matter because the reporter who published the article that he had talked to, a national media source, said Elibiary tried to get him to publish the classified documents. Nobody called that reporter. Nobody talked to that reporter. He probably wouldn't have disclosed his source, but nobody bothered to even talk to the reporter that knew Mr. Elibiary had shopped those documents.

If homeland security could be so poorly run at the highest level, over its own security, is the rest of America really very safe? The FBI in 2011 gave their highest civilian award, or one of the highest awards, to this same person who was a featured speaker at the tribute to the Ayatollah Khomeini. In fact, the tribute was entitled, "A Tribute to the Great Islamic Visionary, Ayatollah Khomeini." Well, there were no cameras allowed in that big tribute, so we don't know exactly what Mr. Elibiary had to say in tribute to this great Islamic visionary, the Ayatollah Khomeini, who was responsible for kick-starting this radical Islamic effort against the Great Satan, the United States, from their way of thinking.

So he is entitled to the FBI's great tribute to civilians? It kind of gives you a little insight, Mr. Speaker, into how in the world the FBI, after the United States got two heads-ups from a foreign government that was not necessarily our friend, that Mr. Tsarnaev had been radicalized. They talked to Tsarnaev. The best we could get from the hearings that we had when we questioned Director Mueller, the FBI Director at the time—apparently they talked to Mr. Tsarnaev, and he didn't confess to them that he had become radical. They talked to his mother, and she didn't confess that he had become radical. And when I said that you didn't even go out to the Muslim temples there in Boston where the Tsarnaevs attended to ask questions—you can ask questions if you had proper training. Oh, yes, that is right, be-

cause CAIR and ISNA were identified by a United States District Court, that was upheld by the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, that CAIR and ISNA are front organizations for the Muslim Brotherhood. Yes. CAIR and ISNA, they regularly complain. They give instructions. They give insights to this administration. And CAIR, particularly, had complained about things that radical Islamists might find offensive in the FBI training material, so they were purged.

A couple of us went through these documents that were purged, but we were told the setting and the information was classified so I can't go into it. But, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you it was shocking that some of that stuff was purged. Some of it was stupid. It didn't have to be there. But when, as one of our intelligence officers told me, we blind ourselves to our ability to see our enemy, then when you go investigate someone that you have been given a heads up is radicalized and is a threat to kill Americans, you don't know what to ask. Because if you knew what to ask, you would go to the mosque and say, who knew Tsarnaev? Have you ever heard him talk about "Qutb's Milestones," that publication he wrote, you know, the one that Osama bin Laden said helped to radicalize him?

If you know about radical Islam, you would know the questions to ask. But our FBI, our intelligence, they are not allowed to get that information anymore because it might offend a radical Islamist. Thank God for the moderate Muslims around the world who do not want radical Islamists in charge of their country. And our friends that originally helped to defeat the Taliban, the Northern Alliance in Afghanistan, are in trouble because we have abandoned them, and this administration now won't have anything to do with them. They fought the Taliban. They defeated the Taliban, and the last great fight consisted of Northern Alliance leader, General Dostum, a legend, riding with about 2,000 Northern Alliance tribesmen on horseback. Dostum said they had to go on horseback because they knew soldiers on foot would never make it up the hill, that mountain, to get to the Taliban stronghold. Their only chance to get through the rocket-propelled grenades and the bullets was to ride on horseback. And they knew many of them wouldn't make it, but they really believed enough of them would that they could defeat the Taliban. That is the kind of courage—and, yeah, they fight the Taliban the way the Taliban fights. They are pretty tough folks. But they are the enemy of our enemy, the Taliban.

So this administration doesn't really want to have anything to do with the Northern Alliance that were our allies. Instead, they keep wanting to cut some kind of a deal with the Taliban. And all the Northern Alliance said was, Look, you know, you helped force this constitution upon Afghanistan that centralizes the government when we are

really more tribal, we are more regional. But you gave us a government where the president gets to appoint every governor, every mayor, every police chief, most of the higher level teachers, a slate of many of the legislators that has some powers of the purse. All they ask is let us elect our own governors, mayors, and pick our own police chiefs, and that way the Taliban just can't knock off the president or co-op the president and take back over Afghanistan, which is what is about to happen the way this administration has so poorly handled our foreign policy.

They said that if you could at least push through an amendment that let us elect our governors, mayors, and get our own police chiefs, then we could be regionally strong. So maybe the Taliban gets one region, but the rest of us could rise up and put him out of business again.

Mr. Speaker, why wouldn't that be a good strategy? We don't even need Americans to carry that out. We don't need Americans sitting and hoping, as John Kerry once said about Vietnam, that they are not the last one to die leaving Afghanistan. I have been to too many funerals of people who gave the last full measure for this country in Afghanistan. We owe it to them not to let it fall immediately back into Taliban hands, and we could prevent that without any more American blood being shed.

We prop up financially the Afghan Government to the point that if we put enough pressure on—and I know this administration always puts pressure on the wrong people. Instead of the Palestinian terrorists, we put pressure on Israel to keep giving away their security and safety. In Afghanistan, we pressure the people of Afghanistan to give up their security and safety because we want to cut a deal with the Taliban. The thing to do is to empower the enemy of our enemy, and they will keep our enemies at bay. That is what needs to be done in Afghanistan.

That is why it is so important lest anyone is attempted to ask the question about Benghazi, what difference, at this point, does it make how our four Americans were killed? Well, it makes a difference because if we had learned the specific breakdowns and causes during the Clinton years of two Embassies being attacked and Americans dying, then perhaps we would have been better prepared at Benghazi. But since we didn't learn the lesson under the Clinton administration because people in that administration apparently were wondering what difference does it make how or why these people died and let's just move on, and so Americans died in the future. If we are going to stop that in the future from here, we need to know at this point what happened in Benghazi.

Now, not only is this administration continuing to thwart efforts to get to the bottom of what happened at Benghazi, it also sends our Secretary of State to insult the Israelis yet again.

This time, as this article from the Daily Beast, 4/27, points out:

The Secretary of State, that is John Kerry, said that if Israel doesn't make peace soon, it could become 'an apartheid state,' like the old South Africa. Jewish leaders are fuming over the comparison.

If there is no two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict soon, Israel risks becoming 'an apartheid state,' Secretary of State John Kerry told a room of influential world leaders in a closed-door meeting Friday.

Senior American officials have rarely, if ever, used the term 'apartheid' in reference to Israel, and President Obama has previously rejected the idea that the word should apply to the Jewish state. Kerry's use of the loaded term is already rankling Jewish leaders in America—and it could attract unwanted attention in Israel, as well.

It wasn't the only controversial comment on the Middle East that Kerry made during his remarks to the Trilateral Commission, a recording of which was obtained by The Daily Beast. Kerry also repeated his warning that a failure of Middle East peace talks could lead to a resumption of Palestinian violence against Israeli citizens. He suggested that a change in either the Israeli or Palestinian leadership could make achieving a peace deal more feasible. He lashed out against Israeli settlement building. And Kerry said that both Israeli and Palestinian leaders share blame for the current impasse in the talks.

Yeah, let's figure that out, Mr. Speaker. Israel and Palestinians share the blame for the breakdown of Palestinian peace talks because Israel says you just have to recognize we have a right to exist as a Jewish state so we don't suffer another Holocaust.

□ 1715

And the Palestinians say: you are the little Satan, America is the great Satan, we intend to wipe you off the map. At no time will we be willing to recognize your right to exist. So no, we are not going to agree to allow you to exist, so the only agreement we will enter is if you agree that we have to still plan on wiping you off the map.

And this is the kind of agreement that Kerry thinks should be made.

According to the 1998 Rome Statute, the crime of apartheid is defined as:

Inhuman acts committed in the context of an institutionalized regime of systematic oppression and domination by one racial group over any other racial group or groups and committed with the intention of maintaining that regime. The term is most often used in reference to the system of racial segregation and oppression that governed South Africa from 1948 until 1994.

So let's see, in Israel, Palestinians get the best jobs anywhere between their Palestinian area and Israeli area, and they are allowed to hold those jobs, make the money, and go back into the Palestinian area; and let's see, why does Israel want to protect itself? Oh, yes, before they put up a fence, it made it too easy for Palestinian suicide bombers to just walk into a school yard, walk into an area where innocent children, women, and men are occupying or having a good time and blow them up.

Finally, as a matter of their own self-security, they said: no, we are going to

have to have fences, so you can't just walk in and blow up innocent people.

How have the Palestinians taken to that? Well, they have taken to it by continuing to have, in their textbooks, references to Jewish people as rats or vermin and other such references.

They elicit hatred from the little schoolchildren against Jews. They name holidays and landmarks and monuments and streets after people who have been able to kill innocent people in Israel.

You know, that is one thing about the United States, we don't normally name holidays and streets and landmarks and monuments for people who kill innocent other people. We name holidays and streets for people like Martin Luther King, Jr., an ordained Christian minister who said, by his life, you don't use violence to kill innocent people.

Those are the kind of people we respect here in America. Those are the kind of people we name holidays and streets for, but not in Palestine. Oh, no. Oh, no. And this Secretary of State blames Israel. He does say there is some blame to share, but as the Prime Minister of Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu, said standing at that podium right there:

If the Palestinians lay down their weapons, there will be peace; if the Israelis lay down their weapons, there will be no Israel.

After World War II, when it was learned the extent of the Holocaust, of killing 6 million or so Jewish people simply because of their race, simply because of who they were, the world reacted so strongly and appropriately, they said: we can't allow this to happen again, we need to create the nation of Israel where Jews can go and be protected in a Jewish state, the only Jewish country in the world.

Amazingly, people that had no concept of what the Bible were actually carried out prophecies from the Old Testament, to the letter, by what they did. Maybe there is something to that Old Testament and its prophecies.

For those in this administration, perhaps they are hoping that is not the case because this Secretary of State has, in essence, cursed Israel more than once and that Old Testament that prophesied Israel would be reborn, as it has been exactly, it says those who curse Israel will be cursed and those who bless Israel will be blessed.

You only have to go back a year before or just last year, November 13, 2013. Here is another article about our Secretary of State from Haifa, Israel:

America's Ambassador to Israel has been in damage-control mode after his boss, Secretary of State John Kerry, wondered rhetorically if Jewish opposition to peace negotiations with Palestinians was driven by a desire for a third intifada. Intifada is an Arabic word for uprising and was the term given to intensified Israeli-Palestinian violence from 1987–1993 and from 2000–2005.

Our Secretary of State is saying out loud in a foreign country that, gee, he is wondering if the Israelis want an

intifada again in which hundreds and hundreds of Israeli citizens will be senselessly killed again.

You know, there was a reason—and I was talking to one of my Democratic colleagues yesterday about Secretary Kerry's remarks. There was a reason the majority of the United States said: you know what, we are concerned about some aspect of John Kerry. We don't want him to be the spokesman around the world for the United States of America. So it could be credited to President Obama, we will give him another chance. We will let him speak for America, I will appoint him Secretary of State.

And he has shown yet again, you know what, there really was a reason that the American people did not want him to be the international spokesman for America. It is time, I believe, he came home and ceased being Secretary of State.

Here is an article from yesterday by Ben Shapiro. He is a Jew. He is brilliant. He is a friend. He wrote yesterday an article titled, "The Anti-Semitism of the Obama administration." He talks about Kerry's comment about the apartheid state. Ben says in his article:

This is pure anti-Semitism. Blaming Israel for its incapacity to make peace with people whose stated goal is to murder Jews cannot be construed as anything other than Jew hatred. Likening the Jewish state to South Africa, despite the fact that there are well over a million Arab citizens with full voting rights and despite the fact that the Palestinian territories are completely Judenrein, is more of the same.

Upon tape of his remarks hitting the press, Kerry immediately backtracked, stating, "I will not allow my commitment to Israel to be questioned by anyone, particularly for partisan, political purposes." He then disclaimed that he ever said Israel was an apartheid state and said, "If I could rewind the tape, I would have chosen a different word to describe my firm belief that the only way in the long term to have a Jewish state and two nations and two people is through a two-state solution."

Sadly, Kerry is simply not believable at this point. The Obama administration has demonstrated a consistent pattern of anti-Semitic rhetoric—even aside from their practical undermining of any Israeli attempt to stop the Iranian nuclear program with repeated national security leaks. It peppers the top ranks of the Obama White House.

And then the article goes on to point out some of the leaks that were done to hurt Israel.

But Secretary Kerry should be encouraged. Here is an article, "Far Left J-Street Defends Kerry's Apartheid Accusations Against Israel," posted by Jim Hoft on Tuesday, April 29:

J-Street calls itself the organization that "gives political voice to mainstream American Jews and other supporters of Israel," but it is far from a pro-Israel group. In 2010, it was revealed that radical far left billionaire George Soros donated \$245,000 to the leftist organization in 2008 and another \$500,000 in subsequent years.

Cofounder Daniel Levy was caught on tape telling an audience that the creation of Israel was "an act that was wrong."

Wow.

Yesterday, this far left anti-Israel group defended John Kerry. Pro-Israel groups

blasted J-Street today after the far left Jewish group supported John Kerry's apartheid accusation against Israel. The Zionist Organization of America responded to J-Street's comments: J-Street has again demonstrated that it is an extremist group, hostile to Israel, by supporting Secretary of State John Kerry's "apartheid" accusation against Israel.

This is the administration that condemns, cajoles our friend Israel, supports and coddles terrorists, radical Islamists in Afghanistan and Palestine, that went rushing into Libya when many of us were saying: look, this isn't a good idea. We know al Qaeda is supporting the rebels. Let's wait and see how much of these rebels are al Qaeda.

But he helped them anyway, and now, we find out, here is an article from today from *The Blaze* titled, "The Massive Amount of Weapons Meant for Libyan Rebels That Actually Ended Up in Terrorists' Hands."

It is a good article from Sara Carter. The trouble is these weapons were actually intended for the terrorists because we knew—we had information there were al Qaeda terrorists that were part of the rebels against Qadhafi.

I know I just have a couple more minutes, but let me mention, as some of the leadership in the Senate and even some on the Republican side here in the House is being encouraged and encouraging others, let's have some kind of legal status, amnesty-type bill for certain people.

Or how about in the NDAA that we are going to take up, why don't we put in there, if you are in this country illegally and you are willing to go into the service, then we will claim you are legal?

Recent veterans are struggling to find jobs, and information indicates our military members are being released from the military right and left because of the dramatic cuts to the military, far more than should ever have been allowed by this body, and they are having trouble finding jobs.

The unemployment rate for our veterans ought to be much lower than for anybody, and it is much higher than for the American population, and this administration now and some of our own leadership wants to encourage people illegally here to go take those jobs away from those being bounced out of the military and let them compete and bring down the level of wages for the middle class in America. It should not be allowed.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1730

#### RECOGNITION OF THE 63RD ANNUAL OBSERVANCE OF THE NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to follow a gentleman like Mr.

GOHMERT here. My subject matter for this minute is about the National Day of Prayer. I would like to add to his comments: we should also pray for Israel.

Recognition of the 63rd Annual Observance of the National Day of Prayer will be this Thursday, May 1.

Our Nation has a rich prayerful heritage, a heritage that began with many of our first settlers to the New World and strengthened through the first national call to prayer invoked by the Second Continental Congress in 1775.

As reflected in the writings and speeches of our forefathers, prayer has had a profound influence not only on the lives of these great leaders, but also on the content of the Declaration of Independence and other founding documents.

In his farewell address, President George Washington warned about the consequences that will descend on a Nation that excludes religion from the public arena. He declared the "indispensable" importance of religion, and proclaimed that: "Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle."

Today, prayer remains very important in our daily lives, not only to our society, but to each of us individually as well. It calls to mind our actions and helps support us in our daily tasks.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join with me to continue this tradition of prayer and ensure that God remains involved in the affairs of leaders of this great Nation.

#### ISRAEL'S MODERN HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRAMER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to discuss the comments made recently by Secretary Kerry regarding Israel and apartheid.

I am not going to be one of the many people that are probably calling for Secretary Kerry's resignation in that regard. I too work in the arena of public policy, and I understand that sometimes you make mistakes in the things you say, you say things that you didn't necessarily intend to say.

I think it is very instructive to talk about it for just a few moments here. I want to remind everybody that Israel first fought a War of Independence in 1948 and 1949, and then fought again in 1967 in the Six Day War and then again in 1973 with the Yom Kippur War.

During these periods of time, they were attacked, unilaterally attacked by their neighbors. Some people say: Well, we need to go back to those pre-1967 borders. I ask anybody who was attacked, who has been in a fight where somebody sucker-punched them, who was the aggressor, why is it incumbent upon Israel to return the spoils of the

war? Folks attacked them, they fought the war, and they won, and they want to secure their population. Because of that, some people think that somehow Israel is the oppressor. They reacted to an act of aggression.

I just want to also read statements from President Obama from 2008 regarding the usage of the term "apartheid":

There's no doubt that Israel and the Palestinians have tough issues to work out to get to the goal of two states living side by side in peace and security, but injecting a term like apartheid into the discussion doesn't advance that goal. It's emotionally loaded, historically inaccurate, and it's not what I believe.

That is not what Americans believe either.

I think for me and what I want to tell anybody that is watching and anybody that is listening is, this should be proof positive; finally, the evidence of what many conservatives and many people who support Israel have been saying for the last 6 years. Finally, what we are seeing is—if this isn't proof, I don't know what is—the thoughts and the feeling and the mindset and what is in the heart of this administration regarding Israel. This is what they believe. This is who they are.

If you support Israel as the only ally, the only true ally for America in that part of the world, if that is who you support, then you must recognize this for what this is, Mr. Speaker. It is an abandoning. It is not only an abandoning of our ally, our great ally and our true friend, but is a castigation of who they are.

When we think about what apartheid is, Israel doesn't represent any of that. It is an open democracy that lets people live freely and participate within the confines of their security situation, and as the representative before me discussed, rockets being rained down upon them, homicide bombers coming into their children's school and blowing up their children, blowing up their buses on a busy street or a cafe where people are just trying to have a meal. That is their daily life. And we are supposed to castigate them for defending their nation, for their leaders defending their nation against that, and that is somehow apartheid?

The physical, racial, financial, I mean the spiritual and emotional oppression for the sake of race, that is apartheid. That is not what Israel is doing. That is not what Israel is about. That is not what Israel has done. Israel has tried to live peaceably in that region of the world among its neighbors. It has fought to exist. It fights every day to exist.

For the Secretary of State to use that term in describing who Israel is, what they are as a people, what they are as a government, it is not only reprehensible, it in my mind truly defines, it very clearly illustrates what this administration believes. So if you are a supporter of Israel, if you are a supporter of the only ally, the true ally of

the United States in that region of the world, it is time for you to take stock. If you have been a supporter of this administration, it is time for you to take stock in that support. Is it justified? Is it realistic? Is it what you really believe? Because if you believe what this administration believes, then you believe that the only answer is for Israel to continue to give, to give of itself to its neighbors who hate it, who are continually trying to destroy it, who refuse after all these years—1947—after all these years, continue to refuse as a matter of just negotiation to acknowledge Israel's right to exist as a state.

How much longer will it take, Mr. Speaker? How many more years until these other organizations—you know, the taxpayers, the United States taxpayers, fund the Palestinian Authority and their effort to pay stipends to prisoners who blow up Israelis, who blow them up. It is seen as their job. It is like a paycheck. If you go to prison, you get paid for doing it, and the more heinous it is, the more you get paid.

Yet, somehow Israel is supposed to turn the other cheek yet again and give of itself to people that blow it up. Even after they give, let's face it, after they give, because they have offered to give time and time and time again, we all know, Mr. Speaker, it is not going to be enough. Because the people that call Jews and Israel descendants of apes and dogs and pigs, they are not going to stop thinking that just because Israel agrees to whatever concession they demand. They won't stop until there is no Israel. That is their goal. That has been their stated goal, and it hasn't changed.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to again highlight to anybody that has supported this administration because of their support for Israel, see what it is, look it in the face. It has shown itself finally for what it truly is. It is not support of Israel, it is support of a political agenda that makes Israel continue to bleed, and it is unacceptable for the United States of America to turn its back on this longstanding ally.

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

**REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4486, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4487, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015**

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-426) on the resolution (H. Res. 557) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4486) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4487) making ap-

propriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

**PATENT TRANSPARENCY ACT**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to warn the American people that fundamental changes are being proposed in our legal system here in Washington that could have a dramatic impact on their freedom, a dramatic impact on the prosperity of this country, and a dramatic impact on the security of our country.

These changes that I am talking about are not so apparent to the average person because they deal with a very complicated issue of technology and technology ownership. I have been in Congress for about 25 years—actually 26 years at the end of this year. During that time period, there has been an ongoing fight that has not been recognized by many American people.

It is the fight to maintain a very strong patent system in our country. It has been ongoing because major players around the world, especially multinational corporations, have not been supportive of the idea that the American people have a right to own their own creations. In fact, our Founding Fathers felt that this was so important that we have the patent rights and copyrights for the average American person that they wrote it into our Constitution. I just happen to have a copy of the Constitution here.

Article I, section 8 says one of the powers of Congress is “to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.” This is what our Founding Fathers wrote into the Constitution. This is the body of the Constitution. This is before the Declaration of Independence.

Our Founding Fathers were so much in favor of this concept where people would own what they created, and that would spur the creativity and the genius of people and that would uplift all of humankind, they were so much engaged in that concept they wrote it into our Constitution and put it on par thus above the Bill of Rights in terms of speech, religion, and other rights.

People like Benjamin Franklin, who is one of our great Founding Fathers, a technologist at heart, knew this is the way we would be the shining light of the world where ordinary people would be able to live well. Jefferson—go to Monticello and see—he himself was an inventor. Yes, he was the first administrator of the U.S. Patent Office.

The intellectual property rights that our people have enjoyed over the years

have been one of America's greatest assets. They have provided ordinary people throughout the world a chance to live decent lives, have jobs in which they can own homes, have jobs that will create wealth. It wasn't because our American people work harder. People work hard all over the world. All over the world you have people struggling and working so hard, but they don't have freedom and they don't have technology. It is the freedom to create technology and the utilization of that technology by ordinary people that expands the creation of wealth so that ordinary people can live well.

Tonight, I would like to alert the American people: one of the fundamental elements laid down by our Founding Fathers that would help us create this wonderful country of freedom and prosperity for ordinary people, it is now being threatened, it is being threatened by a concerted attack by large, huge corporations, multinational corporations, who do not have loyalty to the American people at their heart.

Let me note that today, after fighting this fight for 26 years, the first fight that we were in dealt with, they were going to put an amendment on the gap implementation legislation, which is a treaty laying down the rules for trade around the world. The provisions they were going to put in would have reversed the basic tenets of our patent system.

That is, number one, they were going to say that if you apply for a patent, after 18 months, whether or not that patent is issued to you, it is going to be published for the whole world to see. That is what they were trying to foist on us. I called it the Steal American Technologies Act.

Today, if you apply for a patent, that is top secret. In fact, if somebody in the Patent Office leaks that information they can be put in jail for a felony. But they wanted to change that because the rest of the world—Europe and Japan—has that system and they want to globalize our rights, especially our patent rights.

□ 1745

They said they were going to eliminate it so that, after 18 months, they would just publish it. We fought that back—MARCY KAPTUR, who is a Democrat, and I. On both sides of the aisle, we had people fighting this, and we beat the big guys.

Unfortunately, over the years, we have had three or four of these fights. Sometimes, we have lost; and sometimes, we have won. Once again, we are talking about people who have come to the floor to reform the patent system. They always use the word “reform” when, in reality, they are trying to destroy the fundamentals of a strong American patent system.

The last patent reform bill was the America Invents Act, which just went into effect last year. The patent lawyers and courts and innovators are still

trying to figure out what the implications are of the changes that we made in the last Congress. However, we have to recognize that that bill itself was the most sweeping in changes to the American patent system in the history of our country.

Now, even before we see how that is going to impact America and the American people, they are trying to shove another one through. It actually has gone through the House. Even before we are able to judge the effects of the last Congress' America Invents Act, another bill—that is H.R. 3309, the Innovation Act—was rammed through the House last December.

Its companion bill, S. 1720, the Patent Transparency and Improvements Act—all of these sound so good, don't they—right now is being considered in the United States Senate.

Prudence and good judgment suggest that Congress should move forward slowly and see how at least the last bill that we put in place is working. If it is phase one, let's wait for phase two, to see how phase one is working. Perhaps we should take time to see if there are unintended consequences.

By the way, there are unintended consequences, but I am here to say to the American people today that there are intended consequences to these changes. The intended consequences are to diminish the patent protection that has been afforded the American people since the founding of our country—to diminish your rights to own the technologies you have developed. It is a great threat to our people.

This onslaught has been under the guise of being pro-patent and pro-inventor. They use those words over and over again when, in reality, this is cynical, and it is being proposed by huge corporations—multinational corporations—that despise the little guy because he is demanding to be paid when his technology discoveries are being used.

Instead, of course, what we have is a globalist effort to neuter the patent rights of the American people, the patent rights that we have had—the strongest patent system since our Constitution was written. In the whole world, we have the strongest patent system. This antipatent juggernaut has been organized and financed by megacompanies, by mega-multinational companies.

The public and, yes, my colleagues haven't had time to fully understand the implications of this power play that has been ongoing, especially the power play that we see now on the part of the electronic industry giants like Google; yet a vote approaches in the Senate which could take us down a road which will be hostile to American innovation, a road from which we will never return.

The vote in the Senate should be and must be postponed. The American people need to speak to their Senators and let them know that they expect the Senate patent bill to be postponed—

maybe, perhaps, until next year—while we get a chance to look and see what is in this bill and what impact it will have on the American people.

Right now, as I say, some huge corporate interests are on the verge of being given power—that is what this bill would do—to steal the creative genius and innovation of American technology entrepreneurs and inventors.

What will this do to the United States? This may help those big companies for a little while, but in the long run, it will undercut the well-being, the standard of living, the prosperity that we have for average Americans here.

How could this be? How could this be happening? Why would we give up our freedom and undercut our competitiveness?

The big boys have set out to scare us into giving up our freedom. They have set out to create some horrible threat—the sound of which is very sinister—that will let us put restrictions on the ownership of intellectual property, which we know is America's greatest asset, yet we are going to go along with it because there is some threat to that.

Twenty-five years ago, they called it the submarine patent. Oh, how horrible that was going to be, in that it was going to undercut our competitiveness. Of course, it proved to be nothing, zero.

Today, the patent battle is supposedly aimed at patent trolls. This sinister sounding classification refers to scam artists who are using patent infringement claims to extort money from innocent small business men and small business owners. Yes, some of that happens in our country.

Throughout our economy, you will find lawyers who are threatening lawsuits that are not substantive, but that are aimed at forcing victims to pay and face exorbitant legal fees in order to get them off their backs.

Of course, that is a frivolous lawsuit. It is throughout our system, and it is something that, unfortunately, the average businessman in America and businesswoman in America has to put up with.

Frivolous lawsuits have plagued every portion of our society. Every businessman, doctor, lawyer—you name it—throughout our society is affected by frivolous lawsuits, but this only focuses on, supposedly, frivolous lawsuits by inventors.

How come they are being singled out? How come they have to make sure that we have to change the rules of the game, so there won't be frivolous lawsuits by inventors, as compared to all of the other frivolous lawsuits?

That is because this legislation that is going through Congress treats all inventors as if they are scam artists. You see, there aren't any legitimate lawsuits by these guys against inventors. Every one of them is a scam artist.

In order to get those scam artists, they have got to eliminate or dramatically reduce the ability of small inven-

tors to protect their inventions. This bill, of course, is a reversal of the frivolous lawsuit scam.

Interestingly enough, what we have here are large corporate interests that want to steal the inventions and inventiveness of our little guys by making it too expensive and complicated for them to protect their rights through our judicial process.

Of course, they are not going to tell you that is their goal, but that is what it is. They are trying to shackle the little guy, so he can't protect his own rights. In the legislation making its way through Congress, the terms "patent troll" and "patent assertion entity" and "non-practicing entity" are all lumped together.

This is the evil. This is, obviously, a semblance of a wrongdoing by someone and is certainly not a legitimate property right for these people to be bringing these suits. That is what we are being told.

The legislation, however, doesn't limit just frivolous lawsuits. In fact, it doesn't limit frivolous lawsuits at all. It limits lawsuits by every inventor. It weakens the position of every inventor in relationship to a large corporation that is involved with arrogantly trying to steal that inventor's patent rights without paying the little guy.

It is the little guy who created these things, and this law that we are putting through in the name of getting the patent troll basically cuts the ground out from the people who we have most to be grateful for, the inventors of this country, who have come up with the technology that has created the wealth and the freedom that we have here and the security that we have here.

This battle is the ultimate David versus Goliath, and I am sorry to say that the Congress of the United States seems to be on the side of Goliath. After all of these years of fighting this battle, MARCY KAPTUR and I—Democrats and Republicans on both sides of the aisle—now find with this legislation on behalf of one huge, mammoth company—the "Goliath Google gang" we can call them—that they have greased the skids.

With the power play, of course, we have to recognize they have greased the skids. They have gotten a lot of them. They have gone way down the road on this, but they are not unstoppable, and it is not irreversible yet, but if the Senate passes the bill, that is probably the point of no return.

However, we do have a chance. They have overplayed their hand, and that is often what happens when companies become too arrogant. In this case, the universities, which are not helpless and without supporters as compared to the small inventors—the little guys in their garages or the small inventors—have been put at risk by this legislation.

Science and research departments of educational institutions create new things all the time. They have patents that they apply for and get all the time

because they are involved almost on a full-time basis of pushing back the boundaries and the understanding of knowledge that would help us create new technologies.

They deserve to reap the rewards from these discoveries. They deserve to have the benefit of patents. Our Founding Fathers knew this would be a great source of wealth for institutions that invested in creating new ideas.

Yes, they have many patents that are not practiced, which means the universities just develop the new technology, but they don't practice it. They don't try to commercialize it. Guess what? That makes them patent trolls, by the definition of the legislation. According to the patent legislation, they are patent trolls. Our universities become patent trolls.

In fact, if this legislation passes in the Senate and if it is enacted into law, much of the value of the patents held by America's universities will evaporate. It will be the most damaging hit ever taken by university-based science in the history of our country.

Google, however, will be doing just fine. Our universities may take a big hit, but Google will be doing fine, along with these other multinational corporations.

If this becomes law, small businesses will be forced to sue in order to defend their patents, and they will find that the process is more costly, more risky, less certain.

Investors will stop investing in small companies, by the way. They will stop investing and trying if someone comes to them with a good idea, and they will require a greater return for their investments if someone is trying to help an innovator or a technologist develop his or her idea.

Their risks will be increased, so that any investor will demand more of a return. This will destroy the small and independent inventors, but these big companies don't care. What they care about is taking anything they can get their hands on and using it without paying the inventor.

In the past, we have had an effort by the corporations to eliminate what you call triple damages. Triple damages are if someone comes to them and says—or if one is informed or if it can be proven that one is aware that they are using patented technology and not paying a royalty to the inventor of that technology, they can be sued for triple damages.

They tried to take this away. The reason the corporations wanted to take it away was that you could never get a lawyer to work for you on contingency if you were only going to get your equal damages paid for, but if you have got triple damages, a lawyer could be called in to help defend the little guy against the big guy. They tried their best to get this taken out.

Now, why are they doing that? Why is a big corporation doing that? They are doing it because they don't want to pay that little guy. What has happened

is that because they couldn't get the triple damages taken out—that is something that MARCY KAPTUR and I defeated—they have found a way around it.

Before, when a company was developing a new type of video screen or electronic device, if there were a new chip or something that needed to be included, there would be a patent search to go and see if they were stepping on somebody's toes. That was part of what they did. That was part of the process.

It was a costly part, but it made sure that everybody's rights were protected. They didn't go forward in building something without notifying the patent owner and working out a deal with him or her.

That is not the way it is anymore. These big corporations that we are talking about instruct their engineers and their scientists: don't do a patent search because, if you don't do a patent search, they can't prove that we knew that this was invented by somebody else; thus, we don't have triple damages.

This is as cynical as it gets, but yet we have Members of the House who come to the floor and defend these corporate scavengers, who defend these big guys who are trying to step on little Americans. They defend them because—guess what—these are powerful players; and, yes, Google has given enormous amounts of money politically over the years in order to make sure people listen to them.

I am not saying people are bought by them, but they have laid the foundation, and now, Congress is listening to them. That is why that bill passed.

□ 1800

The American people have to counter that. We counter that by making sure our voice is heard, by making sure that the voice of the little guy is heard, by making sure that the people who believe in the Constitution of the United States, that their voices are heard over some mega-multinational corporation board members who are out wining and dining people.

We can turn this around. America has proven that freedom works if the American people are willing to work at it. But we have had the fundamentals working for us. We have had a patent system and a Constitution working for us.

So what we need to do, and if indeed there is a problem with trolls, let's admit to these corporations, yes, there are some frivolous lawsuits in your area of the economy. Just like in all the other areas of the economy, there are frivolous lawsuits by people who shouldn't be filing them, who are trying just to get paid off because the cost of the litigation will be so high.

Okay. We admit that to them. Let's say, Let's fix that problem. Let's go and just fix the problem of frivolous lawsuits, and let's make sure that if there is a frivolous lawsuit, it is easier for people to counteract a frivolous

lawsuit in the technology. If they want to do it just for technology people, fine. It hurts everybody, but we should do it for everybody. But fine, if they have got the ear of the Congress now, let's work and change that law, the laws that will then make it easier to counteract the frivolous lawsuits by these sinister people, the trolls that are aimed at putting pressure on when it really isn't legitimate. We can do that.

The legislation that has passed here last year and the legislation in the Senate does just the opposite. It only focuses on all inventors, on regular people who are doing things and creating things themselves, not trolls.

What it is is the old theory of how we are going to make America under different countries better. This is way back when our country was being founded we had to decide: Are we going have a system in which the government can control everybody in order to prevent the bad people from doing things or are we going to give everybody freedom and then really punish the bad people?

This legislation that we have now before us and what has just passed the House and is now lingering in the Senate is an attempt to supposedly control the bad people in our country by controlling all of us, by making rules that will take away the rights of every inventor. No. No, that is not what you do. That is inconsistent with American tradition, inconsistent with our Constitution, inconsistent with what our Founding Fathers had in mind.

Let's go down and say: What specifically, if you have frivolous lawsuits coming at large electronic corporations, how can we handle that without undermining the rights of those inventors who are coming up with the apps and the new creations, the three-dimensional printers and the wonderful things that we are on the verge of today?

That is not going to happen unless the American people rise up. That is not going to happen unless the voice of these giants, these Goliaths of the industrial world, Google and the rest of them who are now rampaging and stepping on the rights of individual American inventors, unless we speak up, unless our voice is heard at least as loud as theirs, we are going to lose our freedom. We are going to lose our edge.

It has been the American technology and our inventiveness over the years that has made us a secure country. It is the technology that we have developed for our Nation's defense. You take away the patent rights of our American people, we will neuter that and we will be vulnerable, you take away the patent protections that we have had for our inventors that have come up with newer ways to compete.

How can American workers compete with a world filled with cheap labor? I will tell you how we can do it. We can make sure they have the best technology and the newest ideas and are

the greatest innovators, because they can outcompete people who are working just with their muscles and their sweat. We can do that, but that is not the direction our government is going in. That is not the direction our multinational corporations want us to go in.

Let me alert you, we have a bill in the Senate. If it passes the Senate, it will totally undermine the little guys, the independent inventors. It will undermine the universities. It will undermine everybody but the big multinational electronics corporations. That needs to be thwarted.

Something else is happening. Something again is being snuck through, just like they tried to sneak through 25 years ago in the gap implementation legislation. The gap is, again, a trade treaty we are getting into to try to do this where we would publish all of America's patent applications even before they were issued to our inventors. They tried that.

The other thing they tried to do was what? Was if someone applies for a patent, that at that moment the clock starts ticking and 20 years later they have no more patent protection. Of course, until their patent is issued, they have no patent protection anyway. Quite often patents take 5 to 10 years. Plus, they are cutting in half the time the inventor has for patent protection. They are trying to push that through. We stopped that.

Well, guess what? We now have several trade treaties that people are negotiating for this Congress. Look real close at what is happening. These big multinational corporations, from what I understand, are trying to put provisions into those trade treaties that will change the fundamental law of intellectual property rights here in this country.

Beware. Be aware and beware of what will happen if that comes about. You put this into a treaty. It snuck through. They tried to do that in gap, and it took a Herculean effort on the part of a few of us to try to stop that 20 years ago.

With that said, I would like to put into the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, at this point a list of those things that would be very detrimental to the small inventor that are provisions of the bill that is now in the Senate.

PATENT TRANSPARENCY PROVISIONS

It would create a new requirement that a patent holder must, once filing a claim for infringement, provide information about all parties with an interest in the patent to the patent office, the court, and the accused infringer.

This means the elimination of privacy in business dealings. The little guy is totally exposed as his friends and suppliers will be as well. The patent holder will be forced to provide a list of potential "bank accounts to raid" to the accused infringers.

In addition, once this requirement has been invoked, the patent holder must maintain a current record of the information on file at the patent office or forfeit their rights. That means a patent holder gains a new bureaucratic reporting requirement, dramatically increasing the vulnerability of

the small inventor and investors. This just because they reported an infringement of their intellectual property rights.

In addition, the patent holder gains a new bureaucratic fee by being forced to pay recordkeeping fees to maintain their current record at the patent office.

These are minor inconveniences to multinational corporations, but will be of killer significant burden on the little guy.

CUSTOMER STAY PROVISIONS

The Patent Transparency Act also enables large multi-national corporations to create nested "shell companies" which have few assets, but can infringe on patents while the inventor is unable to sue their "customers" who are free to continue infringing the patent while the first court case moves through the system. This process could keep an infringing process in place for a decade or more while an inventor, if he has the resources, tries to stop it.

SMALL BUSINESS EDUCATION, OUTREACH, AND INFORMATION ACCESS PROVISIONS

The Patent Transparency Act authorizes the patent office Director to create a "patent troll" database, and to create a strategy program to teach small businesses how to defend themselves from "patent trolls."

So we will be encouraging the Director of the patent office to create an "enemies list" and a strategy guide for infringers to undermine patent rights.

The ultimate results of this legislation will be: increased patent infringement, reduced legal remedies for those being infringed, reduced investments in small business, and irreparable damage to our research universities, our inventors, our entrepreneurs, our economy, and our nation.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, so I would suggest that the American people read this and take a look at what the impact of these changes that they are proposing will be. They are going to claim it is a patent troll and there is a monitor behind the curtain, but who that person is behind the curtain is the inventor, the person who is coming up with the invention, the Edisons, the Teslas, and the other people who have improved our standard of living. The people who have come up—even this bill would have a serious impact on the development of new medicines and new health care technologies. These people need to be protected in their creation and encouraged, not controlled and not have their rights for ownership of what they created be trimmed.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of him assisting with the emergency response to the tornadoes in Arkansas.

Mr. RICHMOND (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for April 28 and today on account of attending to family matters.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,  
Washington, DC, April 29, 2014.

AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS, AND OTHER BUDGETARY LEVELS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2015 BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. RYAN OF WISCONSIN. Mr. Speaker, section 115 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, Public Law 113-67, requires the chairs of the House and Senate Budget Committees to submit for printing in the Congressional Record committee allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels for fiscal year 2015.

Pursuant to section 115 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record: (1) an allocation for fiscal year 2015 for the House Committee on Appropriations, (2) allocations for fiscal years 2015 and 2015 through 2024 for committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, (3) aggregate spending levels for fiscal year 2015, and (4) aggregate revenue levels for fiscal years 2015 and 2015 through 2024.

In the case of allocations for committees other than the Committee on Appropriations and for the revenue aggregates, the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 provides that the levels shall be consistent with the Congressional Budget Office's most recent baseline, adjusted to account for any legislation enacted since the date the most recent baseline was issued. In other words, in these instances, the new allocations and levels are set equal to the most recent baseline.

The committee allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels included in this submission are set pursuant to the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013. The provisions of H. Con. Res. 25 (113th Congress), as deemed in force by section 113 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, Public Law 113-67, remain in force to the extent its budgetary levels are not superseded by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 or subsequent action of the House of Representatives.

Associated tables are attached. These committee allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels are made for the purposes of enforcing titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and other budgetary enforcement provisions.

If there are any questions on these committee allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels please contact Paul Restuccia, Chief Counsel of the Budget Committee, at 202-226-7270.

Sincerely,  
PAUL D. RYAN OF WISCONSIN,  
Chairman, House Budget Committee.

FISCAL YEAR 2015 BUDGET TOTALS

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year 2015	Fiscal years 2015–2024
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority .....	3,025,306	n.a.
Outlays .....	3,025,032	n.a.
Revenues .....	2,533,388	31,202,135

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2016 through 2024 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year 2015
Base Discretionary Action:	
BA .....	1,013,628
OT .....	1,141,432
Global War on Terrorism:	
BA .....	85,357

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO THE HOUSE  
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—Continued  
[in millions of dollars]

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO THE HOUSE  
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—Continued  
[in millions of dollars]

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO THE HOUSE  
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—Continued  
[in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 2015		Fiscal year 2015		Fiscal year 2015
OT .....	39,981	OT .....	1,181,413	OT .....	861,637
Total Discretionary:		Current Law Mandatory:			
BA .....	1,098,985	BA .....	868,410		

SPENDING AUTHORITY FOR HOUSE AUTHORIZING COMMITTEES  
[On-budget amounts in millions of dollars]

	2015	2015–2024
<b>Agriculture:</b>		
May 2013 Baseline:		
BA .....	8,077	541,347
OT .....	8,223	536,794
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation:		
BA .....	0	0
OT .....	0	0
Total:		
BA .....	8,077	541,347
OT .....	8,223	536,794
<b>Armed Services:</b>		
May 2013 Baseline:		
BA .....	150,603	1,756,626
OT .....	150,416	1,754,958
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation:		
BA .....	0	0
OT .....	0	0
Total:		
BA .....	150,603	1,756,626
OT .....	150,416	1,754,958
<b>Financial Services:</b>		
May 2013 Baseline:		
BA .....	14,978	111,205
OT .....	5,407	–52,927
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation:		
BA .....	0	0
OT .....	0	0
Total:		
BA .....	14,978	111,205
OT .....	5,407	–52,927
<b>Education &amp; Workforce:</b>		
May 2013 Baseline:		
BA .....	–6,792	–148
OT .....	–7,187	4,922
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation:		
BA .....	0	0
OT .....	0	0
Total:		
BA .....	–6,792	–148
OT .....	–7,187	4,922
<b>Energy &amp; Commerce:</b>		
May 2013 Baseline:		
BA .....	408,088	5,163,671
OT .....	401,580	5,162,032
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation:		
BA .....	0	0
OT .....	0	0
Total:		
BA .....	408,088	5,163,671
OT .....	401,580	5,162,032
<b>Foreign Affairs:</b>		
May 2013 Baseline:		
BA .....	27,208	235,490
OT .....	26,621	231,546
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation:		
BA .....	0	0
OT .....	0	0
Total:		
BA .....	27,208	235,490
OT .....	26,621	231,546
<b>Oversight &amp; Government Reform:</b>		
May 2013 Baseline:		
BA .....	109,275	1,286,261
OT .....	106,571	1,256,418
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation:		
BA .....	0	0
OT .....	0	0
Total:		
BA .....	109,275	1,286,261
OT .....	106,571	1,256,418
<b>Homeland Security:</b>		
May 2013 Baseline:		
BA .....	1,913	23,584
OT .....	1,887	23,767
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation:		
BA .....	0	0
OT .....	0	0
Total:		
BA .....	1,913	23,584
OT .....	1,887	23,767
<b>House Administration:</b>		
May 2013 Baseline:		
BA .....	40	361
OT .....	8	104
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation:		
BA .....	0	0
OT .....	0	0
Total:		
BA .....	40	361
OT .....	8	104
<b>Natural Resources:</b>		
May 2013 Baseline:		
BA .....	5,755	61,218
OT .....	6,829	66,125
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation:		
BA .....	0	0
OT .....	0	0

SPENDING AUTHORITY FOR HOUSE AUTHORIZING COMMITTEES—Continued

(On-budget amounts in millions of dollars)

	2015	2015–2024
Total:		
BA .....	5,755	61,218
OT .....	6,829	66,125
Judiciary:		
May 2013 Baseline:		
BA .....	19,237	104,848
OT .....	10,931	109,421
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation:		
BA .....	0	0
OT .....	0	0
Total:		
BA .....	19,237	104,848
OT .....	10,931	109,421
Transportation & Infrastructure:		
May 2013 Baseline:		
BA .....	71,391	722,343
OT .....	17,102	187,125
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation:		
BA .....	0	0
OT .....	0	0
Total:		
BA .....	71,391	722,343
OT .....	17,102	187,125
Science, Space & Technology:		
May 2013 Baseline:		
BA .....	100	1,016
OT .....	100	1,016
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation:		
BA .....	0	0
OT .....	0	0
Total:		
BA .....	100	1,016
OT .....	100	1,016
Small Business:		
May 2013 Baseline:		
BA .....	0	0
OT .....	0	0
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation:		
BA .....	0	0
OT .....	0	0
Total:		
BA .....	0	0
OT .....	0	0
Veterans Affairs:		
May 2013 Baseline:		
BA .....	2,304	89,850
OT .....	2,491	91,043
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation:		
BA .....	0	0
OT .....	0	0
Total:		
BA .....	2,304	89,850
OT .....	2,491	91,043
Ways & Means:		
May 2013 Baseline:		
BA .....	987,320	15,009,326
OT .....	985,919	15,007,958
Adjustment for Enacted Legislation:		
BA .....	0	0
OT .....	0	0
Total:		
BA .....	987,320	15,009,326
OT .....	985,919	15,007,958

ACCOUNTS IDENTIFIED FOR ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

[BUDGET AUTHORITY]

ACCOUNTS IDENTIFIED FOR ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

(SUBJECT TO A GENERAL LIMIT OF \$28,781,000,000)

- Employment and Training Administration
- Education for the Disadvantaged
- School Improvement Programs
- Special Education
- Career, Technical and Adult Education
- Tenant-based Rental Assistance
- Project-based Rental Assistance

VETERANS ACCOUNTS IDENTIFIED FOR ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

(SUBJECT TO A SEPARATE LIMIT OF \$58,662,202,000)

- VA Medical Services
- VA Medical Support and Compliance
- VA Medical Facilities

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 30, 2014, 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:

5459. A letter from the FSA Regulatory Review Group Director, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Supplemental Agricultural Disaster Assistance Programs, Payment Limitations, and Payment Eligibility (RIN: 0560-AI21) received April 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5460. A letter from the Deputy Director, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicaid Program; Preliminary Disproportionate Share Hospital Allotments (DSH) for Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 and the Preliminary Institutions for Mental Diseases Disproportionate Share Hospital Limits for FY 2014 [CMS-2389-N] received April 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5461. A letter from the Environmental Protection Agency, Director, Regulatory Management Division, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Colorado; Prevention of Significant Deterioration; Greenhouse Gas Tailoring Rule Revisions [EPA-R08-OAR-2013-0801; FRL-9907-58-Region

8] received April 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5462. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Idaho Amalgamated Sugar Company Nampa BART Alternative [EPA-R10-OAR-2012-0581; A-1-FRL-9909-37-Region 10] received April 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5463. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plan Revisions; Revisions to the Air Pollution Control Rules; North Dakota [EPA-R08-OAR-2012-0761; FRL-9909-86-Region 8] received April 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5464. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Technical Amendments to Inadvertent Errors in Air Quality Designations for Fine Particles, Ozone, Lead, Nitrogen Dioxide and Sulfur Dioxide [EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0802; FRL-9909-24-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS15) received April 23, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5465. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's "Major" final rule — Control of Air Pollution From Motor Vehicles; Tier 3 Motor Vehicle Emission and Fuel Standards [EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0135; FRL 9906-86-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AQ86) received April 23, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5466. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-006, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5467. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-022, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5468. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-180, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5469. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-029, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5470. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-036, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5471. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-193, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5472. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-190, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5473. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-035, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5474. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-009, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5475. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-008, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5476. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-002, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5477. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-173, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5478. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-018, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5479. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to Section 2225(c) of the Foreign Affairs and Restructuring Act of 1998; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5480. A letter from the Chief Administrative Officer, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period January 1, 2014 through March 31, 2014 as compiled by the Chief Administrative Officer, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a Public Law 88-454; (H. Doc. No. 113-104); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

5481. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update for Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2014-27] received April 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5482. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Application of the Windsor Decision and Rev. Rul. 2013-07 to Qualified Retirement Plans [Notice 2014-19] received April 11, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5483. A letter from the Deputy Director, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Medicare Program; Extension of the Payment Adjustment for Low-Volume Hospitals and the Medicare-Dependent Hospital (MDH) Program Under the Hospital Inpatient Prospective Payment Systems (IPPS) for Acute Care Hospitals for Fiscal Year 2014 [CMS-1599-IFC2] (RIN: 0938-AR12) received April 22, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KLINE: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 10. A bill to amend the charter school program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; with an amendment (Rept. 113-423). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KLINE: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 4366. A bill to strengthen the Federal education research system to make research and evaluations more timely and relevant to State and local needs in order to increase student achievement; with an amendment (Rept. 113-424). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky: Committee on Appropriations. Report on the Interim Sub-allocation of Budget Allocations for Fiscal Year 2015 (Rept. 113-425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 557. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4486) making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending in September 30, 2015, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4487) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes (Rept. 113-426). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. CROWLEY (for himself and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 4507. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to require a State with an increase in the number of fatalities or serious injuries of pedestrians or users of non-motorized forms of transportation to include strategies to address the increase in the State's subsequent State strategic highway safety plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DAINES:

H.R. 4508. A bill to amend the East Bench Irrigation District Water Contract Extension Act to permit the Secretary of the Interior to extend the contract for certain water services; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 4509. A bill to require training for teachers in social and emotional learning programming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York):

H.R. 4510. A bill to clarify the application of certain leverage and risk-based requirements under the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. BASS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. LOEBACK):

H.R. 4511. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to establish requirements for the treatment of a private education loan upon the death or bankruptcy of a cosigner of the loan; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 4512. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a maximum rate of Federal, State, and local tax imposed on taxpayers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 4513. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to prohibit private educational lenders from requiring accelerated repayment of private education loans upon the death or disability of a cosigner of the loan; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 4514. A bill to amend the Dale Long Public Safety Officers' Benefits Improvements Act of 2012 to change the retroactive application of the Act to cover injuries sustained by rescue squad or ambulance crew members on or after December 1, 2007, rather than June 1, 2009; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNERNEY:

H.R. 4515. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants to eligible local educational agencies to encourage female students to pursue studies and careers in science, mathematics, engineering, and technology; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 4516. A bill to expedite and oversee the implementation of the women in service implementation plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 4517. A bill to authorize the provision of health care for certain individuals exposed to environmental hazards at Atsugi Naval Air Facility, to establish an advisory board to examine exposures to environmental hazards at such Air Facility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 4518. A bill to protect the constitutional rights of parents and children; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 4519. A bill to prohibit the United States from funding projects that discriminate against Israeli organizations that operate beyond the 1949 armistice lines; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 4520. A bill to require passenger aircraft to transmit GPS location data; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. HONDA, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BARBER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H. Res. 556. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 2014 as Mental Health Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

H. Res. 558. A resolution prohibiting the use of the Members' Representational Allowance for the payment of the costs of first-class airline accommodations; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H. Res. 559. A resolution expressing support for designation of April 30, 2014, as "Día de los Niños: Celebrating Young Americans"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

### 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. CROWLEY:

H.R. 4507.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8, Clause 7: "The Congress shall have Power [. . .] to establish Post Offices and post Roads."

By Mr. DAINES:

H.R. 4508.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 4509.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

H.R. 4510.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 4511.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 4512.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution which reads: "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 4513.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 4514.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

1) Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (General Welfare Clause)—The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

2) Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause)—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 the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 4515.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 4516.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers."

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 4517.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under:

U.S. Const. art. 1, §1;

U.S. Const. art. 1, §8, cl. 12;

U.S. Const. art. 1, §8, cl. 13;

U.S. Const. art. 1, §8, cl. 14; and

U.S. Const. art. 1, §8, cl. 18.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 4518.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

"The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all Powers vested by this

Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 4519.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

"To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 4520.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

"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."

### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 10: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 164: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 198: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 279: Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. NUNNELEE.

H.R. 303: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 460: Ms. MATSUI, Ms. BASS, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 485: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 543: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 630: Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 640: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 690: Mr. STOCKMAN and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 715: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 792: Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 809: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 831: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 855: Mr. CLAY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 863: Ms. PINGREE of Maine and Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 920: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 921: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 958: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 962: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1015: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1020: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 1098: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1125: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1127: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1130: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1136: Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 1139: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1141: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1148: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1199: Mr. BECERRA and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1217: Mrs. ELLMERS and Mr. HORSFORD.

H.R. 1249: Mr. COTTON, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 1286: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1317: Mr. TAKANO and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 1339: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1466: Mr. WALZ.

- H.R. 1523: Mr. MASSIE.  
H.R. 1527: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 1528: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. JOLLY, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.  
H.R. 1563: Mr. DEUTCH.  
H.R. 1591: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.  
H.R. 1652: Mr. HORSFORD.  
H.R. 1699: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. DOGGETT.  
H.R. 1717: Mr. WALBERG.  
H.R. 1728: Mr. ELLISON.  
H.R. 1732: Ms. KUSTER.  
H.R. 1750: Mr. HOLDING, Mr. LATTA, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. LAMBORN.  
H.R. 1761: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. MICHAUD.  
H.R. 1795: Ms. MATSUI.  
H.R. 1830: Mr. HONDA and Mr. SMITH of Washington.  
H.R. 1843: Ms. CLARKE of New York.  
H.R. 1852: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. RUIZ.  
H.R. 1915: Mr. POCAN and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.  
H.R. 1918: Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BARBER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. CRAWFORD.  
H.R. 1921: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. LOWENTHAL.  
H.R. 1998: Mr. PALLONE.  
H.R. 2012: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.  
H.R. 2118: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.  
H.R. 2146: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MCINTYRE, Ms. ESTY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. WALZ, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. POCAN.  
H.R. 2156: Ms. DUCKWORTH.  
H.R. 2178: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MORAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. WALZ, and Ms. FUDGE.  
H.R. 2179: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. SCHIFF.  
H.R. 2183: Mr. MCGOVERN.  
H.R. 2203: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. McALLISTER, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.  
H.R. 2249: Mr. JOLLY.  
H.R. 2328: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.  
H.R. 2333: Ms. SINEMA.  
H.R. 2338: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.  
H.R. 2452: Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. HONDA.  
H.R. 2502: Mr. PASCRELL.  
H.R. 2536: Mr. CHABOT, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.  
H.R. 2548: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. COOK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.  
H.R. 2553: Mr. HUFFMAN.  
H.R. 2676: Mr. OWENS.  
H.R. 2697: Mr. TAKANO.  
H.R. 2744: Ms. KUSTER.  
H.R. 2847: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. ENGEL.  
H.R. 2852: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
H.R. 2888: Mr. DENT.  
H.R. 2932: Mr. VALADAO, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. BASS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. HOYER.  
H.R. 2957: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. RAHALL.  
H.R. 2989: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.  
H.R. 3086: Mr. WHITFIELD, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. TERRY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. HORSFORD, and Mr. SHIMKUS.  
H.R. 3113: Mr. TAKANO.  
H.R. 3116: Mr. RIBBLE.  
H.R. 3135: Mr. PETERS of California.  
H.R. 3306: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. GUTHRIE.  
H.R. 3322: Mr. HONDA.  
H.R. 3344: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. LATTA.
- H.R. 3384: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Mr. GARAMENDI.  
H.R. 3387: Ms. KUSTER.  
H.R. 3391: Mr. JONES.  
H.R. 3395: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.  
H.R. 3423: Mr. MCDERMOTT.  
H.R. 3449: Mr. HECK of Washington.  
H.R. 3485: Mr. WILLIAMS.  
H.R. 3489: Mrs. NOEM.  
H.R. 3508: Mr. LATTA.  
H.R. 3530: Mr. CULBERSON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. PALAZZO, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. KLINE.  
H.R. 3543: Mr. HIGGINS.  
H.R. 3610: Ms. KUSTER and Mr. VARGAS.  
H.R. 3635: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.  
H.R. 3658: Mr. ROSS.  
H.R. 3690: Mr. POCAN and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.  
H.R. 3710: Mr. MCGOVERN.  
H.R. 3712: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.  
H.R. 3717: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. DOYLE.  
H.R. 3722: Mrs. BLACK.  
H.R. 3726: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.  
H.R. 3728: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MARINO, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. COOK, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. PEARCE, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. BENTIVOLIO.  
H.R. 3740: Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. TIERNEY.  
H.R. 3747: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
H.R. 3774: Mr. HUFFMAN.  
H.R. 3833: Mr. CAPUANO.  
H.R. 3852: Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
H.R. 3877: Mr. DEUTCH and Ms. DUCKWORTH.  
H.R. 3905: Ms. KUSTER.  
H.R. 3929: Mr. FOSTER.  
H.R. 3963: Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. LEWIS.  
H.R. 3991: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. PETERSON.  
H.R. 4006: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.  
H.R. 4028: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.  
H.R. 4031: Mr. LATTA, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. LANCE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.  
H.R. 4058: Mr. LATTA, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. TIBERI.  
H.R. 4059: Ms. CHU.  
H.R. 4060: Mr. ADERHOLT.  
H.R. 4069: Mr. LATTA.  
H.R. 4080: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.  
H.R. 4084: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. ELLISON.  
H.R. 4122: Mr. ELLISON.  
H.R. 4157: Mr. LATHAM.  
H.R. 4166: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. HAHN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. BARBER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. VELA, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. NUNES, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. COSTA, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. CHU, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. LATTA, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. COOK, Mr. MORAN, Mr. KIND, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. WATERS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. TERRY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HOLT, Ms. BASS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WOLF, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mrs. BUSTOS.  
H.R. 4169: Mr. MORAN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.  
H.R. 4172: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. REED.  
H.R. 4183: Ms. TSONGAS.  
H.R. 4217: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. SMITH of Texas.  
H.R. 4225: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. PALAZZO, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. JOYCE.  
H.R. 4227: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
H.R. 4234: Mrs. BLACK.  
H.R. 4250: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. DENT, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mrs. NOEM.  
H.R. 4285: Mr. HONDA.  
H.R. 4299: Mr. LATTA.  
H.R. 4307: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.  
H.R. 4308: Mr. BENTIVOLIO.  
H.R. 4315: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.  
H.R. 4317: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.  
H.R. 4318: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.  
H.R. 4320: Mr. STIVERS.  
H.R. 4321: Mr. STIVERS.  
H.R. 4333: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.  
H.R. 4342: Mr. JOLLY and Mr. MEADOWS.  
H.R. 4351: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. LOBIONDO.  
H.R. 4365: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. BOUSTANY.  
H.R. 4366: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. MESSER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.R. 4370: Mr. RUNYAN.  
H.R. 4378: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 4383: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.  
H.R. 4385: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. DEFAZIO.  
H.R. 4386: Mr. MCHENRY.  
H.R. 4387: Mr. MULVANNEY and Mr. BACHUS.  
H.R. 4395: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. RUSH.  
H.R. 4425: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. HULTGREN.  
H.R. 4427: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 4430: Mr. MASSIE, Mr. JONES, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. HANNA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. PETERSON.  
H.R. 4438: Mr. HONDA, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. KIND.  
H.R. 4446: Mr. MARINO.  
H.R. 4450: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. LANGEVIN.  
H.R. 4453: Mr. REED.  
H.R. 4454: Mr. REED.  
H.R. 4457: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.  
H.R. 4462: Ms. KAPTUR and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.  
H.R. 4465: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 4489: Mrs. HARTZLER.  
 H.R. 4490: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SIRES, Mr. McCAUL, and Mr. POE of Texas.  
 H.J. Res. 20: Mr. POCAN.  
 H.J. Res. 41: Mr. SANFORD.  
 H.J. Res. 110: Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.  
 H. Con. Res. 95: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
 H. Res. 112: Mr. PETRI.  
 H. Res. 147: Mr. NEAL.  
 H. Res. 227: Mr. PERLMUTTER.  
 H. Res. 281: Mr. COOK.  
 H. Res. 411: Mr. MILLER of Florida.  
 H. Res. 418: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.  
 H. Res. 440: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. WALZ.  
 H. Res. 456: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. MORAN.  
 H. Res. 480: Ms. CLARKE of New York.  
 H. Res. 518: Mr. PETERSON.  
 H. Res. 519: Mr. ENYART.  
 H. Res. 520: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DEUTCH, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.  
 H. Res. 540: Mr. TAKANO.

### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 2429: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

### AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 4486

OFFERED BY: MR. TAKANO

AMENDMENT No. 2: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:  
 SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act for the All-Volunteer Force Educational Assistance Program under chapter 30 of title 38, United States Code, or the Post 9/11 Educational Assistance Program under chapter 33 of such title may be used for recruiting or marketing activities.

H.R. 4486

OFFERED BY: MR. TAKANO

AMENDMENT No. 3: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:  
 SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act for

the All-Volunteer Force Educational Assistance Program under chapter 30 of title 38, United States Code, or the Post 9/11 Educational Assistance Program under chapter 33 of such title may be used for career education programs at proprietary institutions unless the successful completion of the curriculum fully qualifies a student—

(1) to take an examination required for entry into an occupation or profession, including satisfying all State-mandated programmatic and specialized accreditation requirements; and

(2) to be certified or licensed or to meet other academically-related pre-conditions of employment in the State in which the institution is located.

H.R. 4486

OFFERED BY: MR. TURNER

AMENDMENT No. 4: Page 4, line 19, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(reduced by \$20,000,000)(increased by \$20,000,000)”.

Page 5, line 3, insert after the dollar amount the following: “(increased by \$20,000,000)”.

H.R. 4486

OFFERED BY: MR. MORAN

AMENDMENT No. 5: Page 60, beginning on line 10, strike section 411.