



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 15, 2014

No. 110

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 15, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROBERT PITTEMBERG 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.

SPECIAL IMMIGRANT VISA PROGRAM

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, I joined several of my colleagues and hundreds of people in the Congressional Auditorium to watch a gripping new film, "The Interpreters," by VICE News, about the American failure to protect Afghans who helped our soldiers as guides, interpreters, and drivers. Their lives are now at risk as a result of their brave service and our failure to act.

For almost a decade, I have been battling to have the United States honor these obligations by effectively implementing the Special Immigrant Visas program authorized by Congress. For a while, we were battling the bureaucracy itself, which issued an embarrassing total of 32 visas for all of 2012 to help save these poor souls trapped in a bureaucratic hell.

Since the beginning of the year, this bureaucratic logjam has broken and we have been able to raise it to an average of 400 a month. With that progress has come troubling news.

Congress set the cap on these visas artificially low—only 3,000 for the entire fiscal year. These visas are effectively gone now. They are used up. It is not theoretical. We have 6,000 Afghan applicants in the pipeline right now and more who are looking for relief and safety.

Recently, Secretary Kerry, in a powerful opinion piece in the LA Times, noted this challenge and called on Congress to act and raise the cap. With each day that passes, as is so vividly illustrated by VICE Media's gripping documentary, these are people whose lives and those of their families are left to the tender mercies of the Taliban seeking revenge and setting as an example.

One case just caught my eye. The plight of Mohammad is typical. His father was murdered and his toddler brother was abducted, all because of his special service to the United States. Without a Special Immigrant Visa, he was next on the list to be kidnapped, tortured, and perhaps beheaded.

As Secretary Kerry pointed out, "the way a country winds down a war in a faraway place and stands by those who risk their own safety to help us in the fight sends a powerful message to the world that is not soon forgotten." Secretary Kerry said:

And as the withdrawal proceeds, the United States is in danger of sending the

wrong message to the interpreters and others who put their lives on the line to help our troops and diplomats do their jobs.

That is why this is so urgent.

Remember how we brought the Iraqi Special Immigrant Visa back to life last October in the middle of impossible circumstances during the government shutdown? There was bipartisan support, thanks to Leader CANTOR, Leader HOYER, Chairman GOODLATTE, TULSI GABBARD, ADAM KINZINGER, and others. A number of bipartisan leaders sprung to action. We need that same bipartisan spirit of support and urgency for the Afghan visa program. As soon as possible, Congress must authorize at least 1,000 additional visas for this fiscal year to get us through these next critical months.

It is the moral obligation of every Member of Congress not to just cosponsor H.R. 4594, the bipartisan Afghan Allies Protection Act, which I have introduced with my friend and colleague ADAM KINZINGER and Senators MCCAIN and SHAHEEN in the Senate, but we should demand action before we adjourn.

As Congressman KINZINGER pointed out, it doesn't matter where you stood on the Iraq war—I thought it was a tragic mistake, and I still do—but what matters now is where we stand in keeping our commitments. Innocent lives are at stake. American honor is on the line. Our future actions could be compromised if people don't trust us.

It is our duty to save the lives of those who risked so much to help us when we needed them. They need us to cosponsor H.R. 4594 to protect innocent lives and American honor.

FOREIGN POLICY

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

□ 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.

H6219

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am on the floor today because I believe that Congress must put an end to the waste of American lives and taxpayer dollars overseas.

Recently, President Obama requested \$500 million to train and arm Syrian rebels. In his editorial, "Congress Can Stop Obama's Ramp Up to War," Pat Buchanan made an excellent point, saying:

Before Congress takes up his proposal, both Houses should demand that Obama explain exactly where he gets the constitutional authority to plunge us into what the President himself calls "somebody else's civil war."

Buchanan goes on to comment:

Syria has not attacked us. Syria does not threaten us. Why are we joining a jihad to overthrow the Syrian Government?

Mr. Speaker, Iraq is another country in which America has again become involved to the detriment of our best interests.

A former commandant of the Marine Corps, who has been my adviser for the past 6 years, stated in a recent email to me, "We should not put boots on the ground." He went on to say that the situation in Iraq is "a Middle East issue that needs a Middle East solution," not more American troops.

Unfortunately, there are currently 750 American boots on the ground in Iraq, with authorization from the President for up to 770 in the future.

As our involvement in Iraq escalates, I am reminded of another important point made by Pat Buchanan:

It is astonishing that Republicans who threaten to impeach Obama for usurping authority at home remain silent as he prepares to usurp the war powers—to march us into Syria and back into Iraq.

Last August, Americans rose as one to tell Congress to deny Obama any authority to attack Syria. Are Republicans now prepared to sit mute as Obama takes us into two new Middle East wars on his own authority?

Mr. Speaker, Marine Lieutenant General Greg Newbold wrote an insightful editorial for *Time* in April 2006, titled, "Why Iraq Was a Mistake." From 2000 until 2002, General Newbold was director of operations for the Joint Chiefs of Staff and describes himself as "a witness and therefore a party to the actions that led us to the invasion of Iraq—an unnecessary war."

In closing, I would like to quote a paragraph from General Newbold's editorial regarding the distortion of intelligence that drew America into the Iraq war in the first place:

In 1971, the rock group The Who released the antiwar war anthem, titled, "Won't Get Fooled Again." To us, its lyrics evoked a feeling that we must never again stand by quietly while those ignorant of and casual about war lead us into another one and then mismanage the conduct of it.

Never again, we thought, would our military's senior leaders remain silent as American troops were marched off to an ill-considered engagement. It's 35 years later, and the judgment is in: The Who had it wrong. We have been fooled again.

Those are sad, sad words. We have been fooled again.

Mr. Speaker, we in Congress have the responsibility, based on the Constitution, to never get fooled again, but too many times we do not uphold our constitutional rights. I believe the words of Pat Buchanan and Greg Newbold articulate the many reasons that no President should bypass Congress and the Constitution to send our military into combat.

Mr. Speaker, before closing, I have a photograph from the Greensboro News-Record. Here we go again in setting up our men and women in uniform that possibly could get killed in a foreign country. Mr. Speaker, this is a group of Army soldiers bringing a flag-draped coffin off of a plane.

Please, God, don't let us forget that those in uniform are our children, and we must protect them by meeting our constitutional responsibility.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform, please bless the families of our men and women in uniform, and please, God, continue to bless America.

FOOD INSECURITY

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of summer food security programs for America's children because, unlike Congress, hunger doesn't take a summer vacation.

Today, in the United States, food insecurity is persistent and rampant. We are one of the richest and most powerful Nations in the world, yet one in five households with children experience food insecurity each year.

Any American suffering from hunger is cause for concern, but it is especially troubling to think that so many American children lying in bed at night are struggling to sleep because they are hungry.

Thankfully, most children in America who aren't able to get adequate sustenance at home are provided meals for free or at a reduced rate during the school year. In fact, 21 million children nationwide rely on free or reduced-price meals during the school year, and 825,000 of those children are from my State of Illinois.

But while we have worked hard to ensure our children are fed during the school year, we often overlook the fact that many of these same children lack access to these meals during the summer months. Of the many children who receive free or reduced-price lunches during the school year, only 14 percent currently access meals during the summer. This is why the USDA's Summer Food Service Program is so important.

As Members of Congress, it is imperative that we support and promote these programs so families who need help during the summer months can take advantage of them.

Recently, I had the opportunity to visit a Summer Food Service Program

in my district with the Greater Chicago Food Depository and No Kid Hungry Illinois. I was able to see firsthand how the program is benefiting children in Illinois and across the country. These programs are working and making a positive difference for our local families.

Take, for example, the story of Maria and her husband from Chicago Heights. Maria works part-time at a laundromat while her husband works full-time in a lumberyard. These two hardworking Americans are doing all they can to provide for their children. But times are still tough and food is more and more expensive. To help pick up the slack, Maria and her children visit the Lunch Bus.

The Lunch Bus is a great program that not only provides lunch for low-income children during the summer, but also provides a safe place for those children to play and meet other kids. There are families all over America like Maria's family that work hard every day to provide for their children; but oftentimes, despite their hard work, difficult circumstances cause them to come just short.

We in this Congress have a responsibility to stand up for these hardworking families and to ensure no child in America goes to bed hungry. That is why I am a proud cosponsor of the bipartisan Summer Meals Act, which will expand the USDA summer nutrition program to help more children across this country access quality meals during the summer months.

Rather than slashing these funds, we need to focus on positive steps we can take to end hunger across the country. The best way we can reduce the amount of Federal Government spending on food nutrition programs is by supporting legislation that creates jobs and helps families earn a living wage.

Moving forward, it is incumbent on all of us to promote summer food nutrition programs and to ensure that the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act, which expires next year, is reauthorized at sufficient levels.

□ 1015

As I said, Mr. Speaker, hunger does not take a summer break, and neither should we when it comes to taking care of America's children.

I will do all I can to make sure these children have access to nutritious meals all year round, and I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

STRATEGIC ENERGY POLICY—UTILIZING NATURAL GAS AT HOME AND ABROAD

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in a dramatic shift from just a short time ago, the United States is reducing its dependence on

foreign sources of energy. It has the opportunity to become a major force in the international energy market. It is being made possible through the development of our domestic energy resources, namely the expansion of unconventional resources, such as shale gas and oil.

Through remarkable innovations, the U.S. has been able to access oil and gas from shale formations that were previously inaccessible or uneconomical to produce. As a result, we have quickly moved from energy dependence and a weaker footing to energy abundance and strategic leverage both domestically and abroad.

At a time when the economy has not recovered at an acceptable pace, gas production in particular areas, such as the Marcellus shale in Pennsylvania, have provided a key source of economic relief and job creation. As a result of the Marcellus, Pennsylvanians and Americans across the country are benefiting from lower heating costs, businesses are able to produce goods more efficiently, and manufacturers are looking to relocate to the United States to create products, support economic expansion, and grow jobs that were previously headed overseas.

But, Mr. Speaker, if we are to sustain the same level of growth and expansion, policymakers must make smart choices for the future so that we support rather than hinder this opportunity. To start, we must continue to expand gas utilization domestically.

The Marcellus shale, for example, has changed where, in the United States, gas is transported and utilized and how it is transported from region to region. This reconfiguration requires new infrastructure, including pipelines for transmission and transport and new processing facilities, and this all requires long-term planning and investment.

Additionally, because the domestic production of natural gas is far surpassing U.S. demand, most economists agree that a modest expansion of natural gas exports would serve to stabilize domestic prices and supply, which is critical to sustaining the rapid growth in the industry that we have witnessed. Furthermore, each gas export terminal is a multibillion-dollar investment that creates construction jobs in addition to the more permanent positions within the natural gas value chain. That means jobs for steelworkers, turbine manufacturers, pipefitters, and others, which will help communities across the country.

Given the situation in Ukraine and events in the Middle East, we are reminded that our energy resources can also provide significant geopolitical benefits. Exporting even a small amount of these plentiful resources overseas to our allies will strengthen not only our domestic economy but our national security. President Obama, Secretary of State Kerry, and leaders of the European Union have clearly stated that additional global supplies

of natural gas will benefit Europe and our strategic partners. For this reason, I am proud to say the House recently passed H.R. 6, the Domestic Prosperity and Global Freedom Act. This bipartisan bill would streamline the permitting process for natural gas exports.

In February 2014, the United States Department of Commerce reported that our national trade deficit for 2013 improved by \$63.1 billion in comparison to 2012. However, despite this improvement, figures for the month of April are now showing that imports are increasing and that exports are decreasing, and as a result, the trade deficit is now at a 2-year high. With the U.S. Department of Commerce having acknowledged that increased petroleum exports are a key factor that can contribute to a lower trade deficit, it makes perfect sense to allow additional LNG exports in order to further reduce the trade deficit. In addition to its economic and international benefits, natural gas has helped to significantly lower our carbon emissions, which decreased by 3.8 percent last year in the United States, down to 1994 levels, according to government data.

The United States needs a smart energy policy that enables the citizens to continue receiving the benefits of abundant, low-cost energy, but also one that utilizes these resources as a tool of strategic leverage to improve our environment and shape international events to the benefit of America and its allies.

Mr. Speaker, we have made a smart and strategic decision in the House with the passage of H.R. 6. Let's continue to advance similar policies to further leverage the many benefits of our domestic energy resources. Let's do it for the good of the American people and our Nation's strategic competitiveness in the world.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Export-Import Bank, the official export credit agency of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, it is so frustrating to see this normally bipartisan effort to support the American economy get hijacked. I would bet, Mr. Speaker, that this bill could pass on suspension, that two-thirds of this House would be willing to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank, if we were to put it to a vote on this floor—but no. Instead, we are forced, once again, to yield to a minority of the majority—the Tea Party—which demands the decapitation of an economic development and jobs creator giant—the United States of America's Export-Import Bank.

Why is this? Is it because the Bank doesn't work? No. It is an example of how government effectively could partner with the private sector. The Bank puts U.S. exporters on equal footing

when foreign competitors have foreign export aid, and it bridges the gaps in the private market.

The reality is that, in the global marketplace, our competitors are aggressively using their export banks. Milwaukee, Wisconsin, which is my district, is still very much a manufacturing economy—the second in the Nation relying on this sector. Every day, workers in Milwaukee compete against foreign workers with extensive and aggressive foreign export credit agency backing.

Today, the United States Export-Import Bank supports an estimated 205,000 export-related jobs in the United States. My fellow Republican Wisconsin colleagues—Representative RYAN and Representative SENSENBRENNER—not long ago urged Bank financing because “all steps should be taken to reinvigorate the economy and bring jobs to the United States.” With higher than average unemployment in Milwaukee, the need for the Bank has not changed. Not only does the Bank support jobs, but it makes a profit from its operation and pays funds back to the U.S. taxpayers—\$5 billion since 1990.

Opponents don't acknowledge that. Instead, they call for gimmick accounting, or, as my CPA and tax attorney colleague Representative BRAD SHERMAN calls it, “fairytale value” accounting. Further, opponents claim that the Bank exclusively helps big corporations, yet 90 percent of the Bank's activities help small business, and that number is on the rise. Just ask Apple Steel Rule Die in Milwaukee, a company you have never heard of because it is not a big company. In fact, new reports from The Brookings Institution show that the failure to reauthorize the Bank hurts small and medium-sized businesses the most.

I hear Delta testify against the Ex-Im Bank, and then, hypocritically, turn around and use foreign export credit agencies for their fleet. By the way, Delta would qualify to use more foreign export credit to buy foreign-made Airbus aircraft if Congress does not reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. For real, colleagues, do any of us believe that Delta will turn down foreign support to buy an Airbus plane or a plane from the Chinese? Come on now. I have got a bridge to sell you.

Opponents also say the Bank only supports 2 percent of exports. Exactly. The Bank's mission is limited. It does not compete when private financing is available. The Export-Import Bank's fees are higher than U.S. commercial bank fees. It is not in competition. It works in concert with banks here in the United States. This is further proof that the Bank is working. However, that 2 percent still supports a lot of economic activity in Milwaukee. When I am back in my district, unions and businesses—large and small—are hand in hand, saying reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

We use the rhetoric of jobs an awful lot around here in Congress. Now is the time to take a powerful stand for U.S. jobs and U.S. workers. Actions speak louder than words. I urge my colleagues to support the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

COMMEMORATING THE MEMORY AND HEROIC SACRIFICE OF STATEN ISLAND FIREMAN LIEUTENANT GORDON "MATT" AMBELAS

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

Mr. GRIMM. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart but also with a swelling of pride that I rise before this House today to honor the memory and the heroic sacrifice of one of the FDNY's bravest—Lieutenant Gordon "Matt" Ambelas.

Lieutenant Ambelas, a veteran Staten Island fireman with 14 years of distinguished service, tragically gave his life this past Fourth of July weekend. He was attempting to rescue victims trapped in a horrific blaze in Brooklyn.

Lieutenant Ambelas leaves behind a devoted wife and two beautiful girls. He is New York's first firefighter to fall in the line of duty since 2012. While a family and a community mourn the excruciating loss of one of their finest native sons—one of their most dedicated protectors—Lieutenant Ambelas is a testament to the uncommon courage and sacrifice at the very core of the entire FDNY family and to the harrowing dangers they face in keeping America's greatest city safe every day.

Lieutenant Ambelas died after searching the 19th floor of a burning Brooklyn housing complex, determined to leave no innocent victim behind, as the flames spread rapidly from floor to floor. Undaunted by the danger that would have melted the courage of most any man, Matt faced it, undeterred, head on.

So I join all of my constituents in Brooklyn, on Staten Island, and all New Yorkers in acknowledging the immense debt of gratitude we all owe to Matt and his brothers in the FDNY, who put our safety above their own day in and day out.

While standing among those honoring Lieutenant Ambelas at his funeral on Staten Island last week, I was humbled by the incredible valor of Matt's actions. We watched as Matt's brothers in uniform, especially the Beach Boys of Ladder 81 on Staten Island and the Hooper Street Gang of Ladder 119 in Brooklyn, paid their final respects to the fallen hero. Seeing firsthand the mixture of strength and despair on their faces, I saw Matt's wife, Nanette, and their beautiful daughters, Giovanna and Gabriella. This was a very stark reminder that not only do we owe an enormous debt of gratitude to fallen heroes like Matt but also to the loving families that bear the immeasurable sacrifice right along with them.

When our Nation was viciously attacked on 9/11, 343 FDNY firefighters gave their lives. Since then, 18 more, including Matt, have fallen in the line of duty. Each loss, while a weight on our hearts, adds yet another angel to that storied brotherhood of heroes. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in the remembrance and commemoration of a true American hero in every sense of the word.

May God bless Lieutenant Ambelas. May He bring comfort to his young family. May He protect all of our brave FDNY firefighters, and may the noble sacrifice enshrined in Matt's memory never be forgotten.

To you, Nanette, please know that you, Gia, and Gabby are in my thoughts, in my prayers, and my heart is broken for your enormous loss.

□ 1030

PAWS FOR CELEBRATION

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

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Harry Truman famously said that if you want a friend in Washington, get a dog, and I can tell you that many of our Nation's animal shelters and rescue groups would be more than happy to introduce you to a new friend.

Between 5 and 7 million companion animals enter animal shelters nationwide every year, and the hardworking individuals at these shelters and rescues try to make sure that each of these animals makes its way to a forever home.

I have been so fortunate that my entire life I have had rescue dogs as part of my family. As a girl, it was Scotty Daisy. As a newlywed, my husband and I adopted Samantha and Walter, and as a family, with my three sons, we welcomed Bison into our family.

I want to honor the hard work of volunteers and staff at animal shelters and rescue groups across the Nation, and I encourage my colleagues to join me today at this year's Paws for Celebration event on Capitol Hill.

This event, sponsored by the ASPCA and hosted by the Congressional Animal Protection Caucus, will feature adoptable dogs and cats from shelters and rescues from around the Washington, D.C., area.

It will be a great opportunity for Members of Congress to take a moment and thank the shelter and rescue community for their hard work and dedication to our Nation's homeless pets.

Who knows? You might even find that friend in Washington you have been looking for.

HAMAS AGGRESSION FORCES ISRAEL TO DEFEND ITSELF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, 400 rocket attacks from Gaza in the past 3 weeks—Israel has made several attempts to defuse the issue and the situation.

This is how Hamas responded: "We will not agree to quiet in exchange for quiet. If Israel does not agree to our demands, I expect we will continue this battle."

Can you imagine that? Demands from Hamas that Israel not respond to rocket attacks. That is the only way you will get quiet for quiet between Israel and Hamas.

Now, we all know where this recent exchange started. On June 12, the abduction and subsequent murder of three Israeli teenagers, suspected by Hamas members, inflamed the situation, and then it was pushed over the edge by a murder of a Palestinian boy by Jewish extremists, Mr. Speaker.

There is a difference between how both sides act. From the Israeli Prime Minister, "I unequivocally condemn the murder of a Palestinian youth in Jerusalem. Murder, riots, incitement, vigilantism—they have no place in our democracy."

Israel quickly tracked down and arrested the teens' suspected murderers—tracked them down and arrested them and is prosecuting them.

What is the response from Hamas? What is the like response? In response, they launched nearly 400 rockets at Israel since June 14. For a month, this has been going on—into their population centers, not into military targets, Mr. Speaker, but population centers.

Now, last week, I attended a briefing with Israeli Ambassador Ron Dermer to discuss the ongoing operation in Gaza, and one of the things I found interesting was all the members that were there from Israel had on their phones an application which sounded an air raid siren every time one sounded in Israel. We could scarcely get through the briefing because they were just continually going off all around the room.

I imagined myself in my hometown, hunkered down in my basement against a rocket attack. No civilization should live this way.

Interestingly enough, we viewed surveillance video of Hamas members using their own people as human shields. The Israelis actually send a warning shot—this is the building we are going to hit, this is where you are making rockets, and we are going to attack it next.

You would think that people would run from the building, knowing it is going to be blown up, but what does Hamas do? They send people, Mr. Speaker, to the building.

I would remind everybody the responsibility for civilian casualties, when those civilians are used as human shields, lies with the party that deliberately places them at risk, namely, Hamas.

Understand, they are placing their launch sites and their factories next to mosques, next to churches, next to hospitals, next to schools. The plan is—their intent is to make sure that, when Israel responds, responds to an attack, that there are maximum casualties of civilians, so that Americans will think that the Israelis are bad, that the narrative is that Israelis are using an unmeasured response—response.

Remember, it is a response, Mr. Speaker. No other country faces daily rocket attacks against its civilians, nor would any, nor should any other nation tolerate such violence, and we strongly condemn the continued rocket fire into Israel and the deliberate targeting, again, Mr. Speaker, of citizens.

Now, this can all end. President Mahmoud Abbas can renounce the Hamas-backed unity government. How are we ever going to get to peace when their unity government is unified with terrorists, Mr. Speaker?

Since the beginning of July, the Palestinian terrorists have fired hundreds of missiles and projectiles at the population centers in Israel and, just recently, rejected the cease-fire negotiated by Egypt.

What is it that they want? Well, we know what they want. They want Israel obliterated from the map, Mr. Speaker.

For our administration, who has at times been with Israel—but not enough times—I would urge them, instead of calling on restraint for Israel, asking Israel to restrain—they are responding, Mr. Speaker, to attacks on their civilian population.

Instead of asking them to restrain, demand the PA denounce, renounce Hamas and start supporting Israel and give them the necessary resources to meet this threat.

CHILDREN AROUND THE WORLD

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about children and to talk about children around the world, here at home, and I guess what is most on many Americans' minds because of the visuals that they have seen, unaccompanied children coming into my State, the State of Texas.

I was down at the border some weeks ago, maybe just 2 weeks ago, and I looked at the reality of what many people see on television, and what I looked at was impoverished, frightened children, 12 years and under, children with diapers, children who were frightened and without their parents.

In addition, I saw the lovingness of volunteers from Catholic Charities to save the children, to many residents in the border community reaching out and helping.

Now, we are about to engage in a debate based upon the President's recommendation of what they need to humanely treat these children. Frankly, I

believe that many in America have gotten the wrong information through various excerpts and commentaries that have been made by people who are uninformed.

I am very glad in Houston, on this past weekend, we had over 80 religious leaders from all denominations, communities, people who drove into Houston from counties way beyond Houston, all standing up and acknowledging their commitment to the humane treatment of children. They were from diverse backgrounds. They were ethnically diverse and racially diverse, as I said, religiously diverse.

Ministers like Dr. Terrance Grant Malone and Dr. Freddie Haynes, Dr. John Ogletree, Dr. D.Z. Cofield, pastors from Faith Temple, I believe, in Polk County—if I have it correct—and individuals from the United Methodist Church, Catholic Charities, Episcopal Church, people who are in the midst of Ramadan from the Islamic Muslim faith, all ready to help these children—that is the America that all of us know.

That is the America that the Statue of Liberty stands in the harbor of New York and has said, over the years, to bring me your forlorn.

That is the same America who can stand alongside of Jordan, who is taking thousands and thousands of Syrians; or Turkey, that is taking thousands upon thousands of Syrians—not the America who listens to the fears and wrong information about disease.

These children are medically checked, but if you will check the documents, you will find that, in spite of the poverty, El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala immunizes at least 90 to 95 percent of their children; but yet we doublecheck, and we immunize again.

So I think it is important to understand that this law that has, in actuality, been at the center point of my friends on the other side of the aisle wanting to change, with the introduction now of the humane law, is a law that should stay in place and that we should give children of any country, contiguous or noncontiguous, at least due process rights because these are children who in actuality have fled violence or human trafficking or sex trafficking and they are sometimes unable to articulate that in a short period of time.

They need counsel, and they need courts that understand. To rush through the decision, to have a court make a decision in 72 hours is absolutely absurd and impossible.

To only increase immigration judges by 40, I have introduced H.R. 4940 that increases immigration judges by 70. At this point, immigration judges have 1,660 per court versus a district court that has less than 500 cases, and they are overwhelmed. There is no way that you can process these children presently, and the expedited proceedings are not going to work.

Where is our claim to due process for these children? I look forward to work-

ing deliberatively, having these children in the process that they are in. By the way, they are in a deportation process. They are not just here to stay.

Putting them in a humane condition, debunking the myth of disease, and having these children go and find that these children will appear in court by having lawyers and enforcing the border with the border security bill, H.R. 1417, that this House and this House leadership refuses to put on the floor of the House, which passed over almost 2 years ago.

If you want border security, pass the border security bill that we have written.

Finally, Mr. Speaker I want to care about American children. The violence must stop. I want to work with those who are being shot by guns across America. Let's stop the gun violence.

We need a Marshall Plan for the children who are being shot by guns in our country. Care for children all over the world.

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 42 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 Steve Walker, Fairview Village Church, Eagleville, Pennsylvania, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, I pray for each Member of this body to be mindful of Your will. You have blessed us with great freedoms and given the Members of this House great responsibility. With this responsibility comes even greater challenges.

Therefore, I ask, Lord, bless our Representatives. May every man and woman have the courage to speak their mind, the stamina to stay the course, and the determination to stand their ground, for conviction is not bendable. Progress is not made when men are not bound on principle.

Lord, I ask that this body be not just a group of representatives but, rather, a collection of free men and free women with a desire to guide a free Nation.

May they be strong in faith, abounding in wisdom, and righteous in nature. Lord, grant the home of each Member peace.

I pray in the name of my Lord and Savior Christ Jesus.

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 (Ms. HAHN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. HAHN 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.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). This is the day for the call of the Private Calendar.

The Clerk will call the bill on the calendar.

CORINA DE CHALUP TURCINOVIC

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 306) for the relief of Corina de Chalup Turcinovic.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 306

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

SECTION 1. PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR CORINA DE CHALUP TURCINOVIC.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b) of section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Corina de Chalup Turcinovic shall be eligible for issuance of an immigrant visa or for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence upon filing an application for issuance of an immigrant visa under section 204 of such Act or for adjustment of status to lawful permanent resident.

(b) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—If Corina de Chalup Turcinovic enters the United States before the filing deadline specified in subsection (c), she shall be considered to have entered and remained lawfully and shall, if otherwise eligible, be eligible for adjustment of status under section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) DEADLINE FOR APPLICATION AND PAYMENT OF FEES.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall apply only if the application for issuance of an immigrant visa or the application for adjustment of status is filed with appropriate fees within 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) REDUCTION OF IMMIGRANT VISA NUMBER.—Upon the granting of an immigrant visa or permanent residence to Corina de Chalup Turcinovic, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to reduce by 1, during the current or next following fiscal year, the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act or, if applicable, the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under section 202(e) of such Act.

(e) DENIAL OF PREFERENTIAL IMMIGRATION TREATMENT FOR CERTAIN RELATIVES.—The natural parents, brothers, and sisters of Corina de Chalup Turcinovic shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

WELCOMING REVEREND STEVE WALKER

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GERLACH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Pastor Steve Walker, the Family Ministry pastor for the Fairview Village Church in Eagleville, Pennsylvania, which serves thousands of area residents in southeastern Pennsylvania.

A native of the State of Washington, Pastor Walker received his undergraduate degree from the University of Washington and then proudly served in the United States military.

In 1991, Pastor Walker began working full time in the ministry, and since then, has served as a children's pastor in Tacoma, Washington; as an associate pastor in Topeka, Kansas; and as the lead pastor in Carson City, Nevada—all before starting his current position in Eagleville.

On a more personal note, Pastor Walker and his wife of over 30 years, Shari, have raised two terrific daughters, Ashley and Stephanie. Pastor Walker also demonstrated tremendous courage and unshakable faith as he battled cancer in 2003. He has since conquered the disease and has emerged from that battle with a renewed passion for serving the church, his congregants, and the community.

It is therefore my privilege to welcome Pastor Walker, his wife, Shari, and daughter Stephanie to the House of Representatives today and to thank him for serving as our guest chaplain.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

THE BANDITS OF HAMAS KEEP ON SHOOTING

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the Hamas terrorists in Gaza keep shooting their rockets into Israel.

Israel has used defensive weapons to intercept some. However, Iranian-backed Hamas keeps on reloading its six-shooters and firing into civilian areas.

The Israeli Government is shooting back and is headed to Gaza to stop the bandits.

Our government wants a cease-fire. Cease-fires in the past have just given Hamas time to obtain more ammo rockets from Iran. Also, Hamas shields its command centers underneath schools and hospitals in Gaza. So it cowers behind women, children, the elderly, and the sick.

Hamas wants Israel annihilated.

Israel is following the first natural right of a nation—it is protecting its people. Now it has taken the fight to the terrorists, as it has a right and an obligation to do.

The United States should be helping Israel eliminate this terrorist group instead of criticizing Israel for protecting its citizens from murder. The only way to stop this war against Israel is for Hamas to be defeated.

And that's just the way it is.

NO DEVOLUTION

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, you have heard the term "reinvent the wheel." We have some people around here who want to un-invent the wheel. The Tea Party—"small government at any cost"—radicals have what they think is a brilliant new idea. It is called "devolution."

We will devolve the duty, the obligation, and the funding of the national transportation system to the 50 States. Oh, what a great idea. Well, no. Actually, we tried it in the last century. It failed pretty miserably. Here it is: 1956. This is the brand spanking new Kansas Turnpike. Oklahoma said they would build—oh, they ran out of money, so Oklahoma didn't build their section. Kansas did. For 3 years, cars crashed through the barrier at the end of this and landed in Emil Schweitzer's farm field. That is devolution. They want to go back to that.

Dwight David Eisenhower said, no, that is not acceptable. He passed a bill for a national transportation system, funded by a user fee, and the highway got completed.

Now we want to go back to that era? We want to compete with the world by spending less on transportation, by having less Federal coordination, and by passing a pathetic Band-Aid bill today with pretend money that will limp us through the next 9 months?

No. We need a substantial investment in our national transportation system—putting millions of people back to work, making us first class again, and competing with the rest of the world. No devolution.

IRS WITH OBAMACARE DESTROYS JOBS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, the American people know the IRS cannot be trusted.

The IRS has been corrupted by this administration, undermining the integrity of its longtime employees. Former IRS employee Lois Lerner arrogantly refuses to answer questions, and now the IRS is claiming to have lost hard drives containing emails that could lead to revealing the truth.

House Republicans know that if the IRS implements ObamaCare the American people's security will be placed at risk. The House will vote on a bill that reforms the Internal Revenue Service, keeps them in check, and restores accountability. This piece of legislation prohibits the IRS from targeting people based on their political beliefs, and it restricts the agency from enforcing ObamaCare.

The President's broken promises have already caused pain for hard-working American families, destroying jobs. We must do all that we can to prevent future injustices.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

INVEST IN AMERICAN WORKERS AND NATION-BUILDING AT HOME

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Madam Speaker, today, the House will consider legislation to prevent the highway trust fund from going broke. This action is critical, as a broke highway trust fund will result in no highway trust fund and will further result in the loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs this construction season. Unfortunately, the measures under consideration in the House and Senate are weak, temporary fixes.

To effectively address America's crumbling infrastructure, the American Society of Civil Engineers estimates the need for \$3.6 trillion by 2020. Historically, this type of bold investment has created jobs and transformed the American economy. When the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act was signed into law, only 7 percent of the funds dealt with infrastructure projects. These projects accounted for nearly two-thirds of jobs created under the Act.

Congress is failing the American people by not making the investments we need to stay globally competitive. Let's invest in American workers and American manufacturers and make a real commitment to nation-building right here at home.

CHINA TIBET VISAS

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, for over five decades now, the Chinese Communist Party has ruled Tibet harshly and has treated the Tibetan people with great disdain.

The current regime says that Tibet is open to all visitors, but the truth is that actual access is highly restricted and is subject to arbitrary closures. It is difficult for tourists to access the region, and it is almost impossible for journalists and diplomats to get in to report on conditions.

When Chinese officials get visas to the U.S., they are not kept out of certain States or cities. They are free to travel our Nation, as are Chinese tourists and reporters. It is time that the Chinese Government lives up to its word and allows access to Tibet, not only for Americans, but for the many religious pilgrims from nations around the world.

I am a proud cosponsor of Congressman MCGOVERN's bill, H.R. 4851, the Reciprocal Access to Tibet Act of 2014. The bill restricts access to America for those Chinese Government officials who are responsible for blocking travel to Tibet. This is a matter of basic fairness and is critical to ensuring that human rights are protected in Tibet.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Speaker, unless Congress acts, on September 30 the Export-Import Bank will go out of existence. This is a government program that has been around for 80 years—since Franklin Roosevelt—helping businesses export products and create jobs in America.

Last week, Congressman JOHN LARSON and I joined the largest Chamber of Commerce in the State of Connecticut, along with three small exporting businesses, pleading with Speaker BOEHNER to please bring up a bill to extend the life of the Export-Import Bank, which has happened routinely on a bipartisan basis over the last 80 years.

Madam Speaker, I want to make two points. Number one, this program does not cost the taxpayers money. Last year it returned \$1 billion to the Treasury. Secondly, our largest competition—China and Germany—are doubling the sizes of their export-import programs because they understand that that is a way to grow their economies and to take away jobs and customers from our country, from America.

Please, Mr. Speaker, listen to the 850 business groups all across the country, led by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Bring up the Export-Import Bank reauthorization for a vote, and let's get this economy growing again.

MICHAEL T. McCULLOCH

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

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Michael T. McCulloch, a social studies teacher at R.J. Reynolds High School in Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

Every year, a teacher from North Carolina's Fifth District spends a week accompanying me as I go about my legislative duties. The Teacher in Congress program includes attending committee hearings and floor debates, as well as researching at the Library of Congress and with House staff, learning how this institution works.

Mr. McCulloch has taught for 19 years and hopes to use this experience to learn about the inner workings of our legislative branch and how our country's governmental structure was formed.

I commend Mr. McCulloch for his commitment to teaching the next generation about the revolutionary ideas on which our Nation was founded. It has been a pleasure to get to know him, and I hope this week proves fruitful for him and his students.

□ 1215

INDIA'S SANITATION CRISIS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, recent news has been filled with stories about the impact of India's sanitation crisis, like the NPR story about the horrific murder and rape of two young girls that could have been prevented if they didn't need to sneak out into the night to relieve themselves, leaving them vulnerable to attack.

Today, The New York Times has a heartbreaking piece directly linking the root cause of India's malnutrition crisis to the lack of adequate sanitation.

Many of the 162 million children under the age of five who are malnourished are suffering less from a lack of enough food and more from poor sanitation, and sadly, even those children who are lucky enough to survive are left with mental and physical deficits that will haunt them their entire lives.

This crisis that leaves women vulnerable, needlessly ends lives early, and undermines economic growth has solutions. I would strongly urge my colleagues to join me and Judge POE in sponsoring the Water for the World Act to make American efforts more effective, preventing the needless loss of a child's life every minute and the threat to young women and girls.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ALFRED SETTLE DOCKERY, III

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

Mr. HOLDING. Madam Speaker, I rise today in memory of Alfred Settle Dockery, III, who passed away in Raleigh last week. Settle was a kind-hearted man who was passionate about improving his community.

Settle grew up in Rockingham, North Carolina, and graduated from the College of Design at NC State University. He was a member of the 1967 football team, the highest ranked team in school history, at number three in the Nation. Settle scored a touchdown in the first NC State win at Carter-Finley Stadium.

After college, Settle began his career as a landscape architect, eventually moving to real estate development. He was a member of the original Raleigh Greenway Commission and a member of the Raleigh Hall of Fame Board of Directors.

He was a well-known man who took pride in his work and wanted to make Raleigh a better place to live. Settle was a loving father, husband, and grandfather, and he will be deeply missed by all that knew him.

FREEDOM RIDERS

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Madam Speaker, this summer, we celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Civil Rights Act. Passage of this law was the culmination of years of courageous work by a diverse group of men and women who banded together to fight against racism and inequality.

One group, the Freedom Riders, deserves our sincere applause. Starting with a handful of participants, they grew into a national movement, traversing the South, challenging segregation laws.

These brave young souls included many courageous students. Notable among them was our colleague, the Honorable JOHN LEWIS, as well as many brothers of Phi Beta Sigma fraternity, of which he is a member.

As we honor the 50th anniversary of Freedom Summer, as well as Phi Beta Sigma's centennial anniversary, we are reminded that the voices and actions of a few youth today can and will build a better future for all of us tomorrow.

I thank the Freedom Riders for the America they have made better for all of us.

SECURE OUR BORDERS NOW

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Madam Speaker, I was recently contacted by a constituent of mine, Lois Doyle. She shared with me the tragic passing of her daughter, Amanda, at the hands of a drunk driver. Words cannot fully express my sympathy for her family and her loved ones.

This is a tragedy that could have and should have been prevented. No driver

should have ever got behind the wheel after drinking, but this drunk driver was in Texas illegally. He should not have been in the country. He should not have been driving.

To make things even worse, the illegal driver was released on bail and has fled the country and will never stand trial. This tragedy would have been avoided had our border been secure. This was a preventable and avoidable tragedy.

Mr. President, please secure our borders now.

INCREASED VIOLENCE AGAINST ISRAEL

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

Ms. HAHN. Madam Speaker, I have been horrified, as many have, to see the increased violence in Israel against Israel. The bombings in Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, and the specific targeting of the Ben Gurion Airport are unbelievable to me, and my heart goes out to the millions of people who are suffering on both sides. This senseless violence has to stop.

Hamas has been using human shields to protect its terrorist infrastructure, and despite claims to the contrary, Hamas does not have Palestinian interests at heart.

The United States stands with the Israeli people and has invested in the Iron Dome missile defense system that has worked to save the lives of thousands of men, women, and children all over the country.

Thousands of rockets from Gaza were fired at Israel. Thank God the Iron Dome intercepted at least 90 percent of the rockets that would have fallen on schools, on homes, on synagogues, on mosques.

Frightened parents are sending their children away from home to safety amid these attacks.

I believe that Israel has, of course, the right to defend herself and her people from these senseless terrorist attacks.

Israel agreed to a recent call for cease-fire. Hamas did not. I hope we have a cease-fire, but until then, Israel has the right to defend herself and her people.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DIVISION OF THE REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS

(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. Madam Speaker, I rise today because Sunday, July 20, marks the 40th anniversary of the division of the Republic of Cyprus.

I fully support the reunification of Cyprus, and it is encouraging that the Government of Cyprus remains fully committed to the U.N.-sponsored proc-

ess to reach an enduring settlement that would reunify Cyprus based on a bizonal, bicommunal federation in accordance with relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions.

The occupation of Cyprus has led to thousands of Greek Cypriots being denied their fundamental right to return to their homes, freedom of worship continues to be severely restricted, and access to religious sites blocked.

Cyprus is an important ally of the United States, and its newest discovery of offshore gas reserves in the Eastern Mediterranean will strengthen cooperation with the United States and with our ally, Israel, and offer an alternative source of energy supply to Europe.

As a strategic partner of the United States, Madam Speaker, Cyprus can help us promote security and stability in this volatile region.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN ROBERT ROE

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today with the sad news that former Congressman Robert Roe passed away today at the age of 90.

A native of Passaic County, New Jersey, Bob served in the Army during the Second World War. He was elected to represent the Eighth District in 1969. Some of our longer-tenured colleagues will remember Bob for his noted ability to reach across the aisle.

During his time in Congress, he rose to the chairmanship of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. He also chaired the Committee on Public Works and Transportation from 1991 until his retirement in 1993.

A true public servant, he wasn't in it for power. When he became chairman of Public Works, he lasted only one term, in part because he exhausted himself writing the greatest highway bill in the history of the country.

However, that highway bill, through it, he achieved changes to the transportation policy to focus on connecting different modes. His favorite term was "intermodal transportation," redefining how we invest in our infrastructure with this emphasis on safety and planning.

It is ironic that today, this day, we are going to vote on a transportation bill, the day he went to his Maker.

Bob is truly a legend in our era. He left big shoes to fill for all of his successors in Congress, myself included.

The building I am in, in Paterson, New Jersey, was named after him, the Robert A. Roe Federal Office Building, a fitting tribute to a great American.

My family loved him. We offer condolences to his entire family and all 35 nieces and nephews.

COMMEMORATING THE 240TH ANNIVERSARY OF BLACKWATER BAPTIST CHURCH

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

Mr. RIGELL. Madam Speaker, last month, my wife, Teri, and I had the pleasure of attending a joint church service which brought together Blackwater Baptist Church and New Oak Grove Baptist Church. That occurred in Virginia's Second Congressional District, which I have the privilege to serve.

The two churches were celebrating the 240th anniversary of Blackwater Baptist, and what a service and celebration it was.

What was particularly enjoyable and noteworthy is that one has a largely White congregation, the other a largely African American congregation, and that is relevant, and, indeed, it is central to my point because Blackwater Baptist Church, which stood at the American Civil War, once had a slave balcony in its sanctuary.

Now, the pastors of the two churches, Greg Hammer and Tyrone Johnson, they are remarkable men. They bring their two congregations together once a year for a joint church service. They are close friends, and they talk often about their Christian faith, which binds them together.

They also have the courage to talk about race, to celebrate the progress that we have made, and to take on responsibly the challenges that remain in our country.

Madam Speaker, this is what we need more of in America, and I commend them both and their congregations.

SMART GUNS

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise once again to highlight the harmful, hypocritical influence of the gun lobby in America.

Just last week, The New York Times columnist, Joe Nocera, relayed the story of Andy Raymond, a Maryland gun dealer who faced death threats and hate mail from pro-gun radicals, all for trying to sell a gun that could save lives, the smart gun.

Smart gun technology is a breakthrough, one that could prevent thousands of accidental deaths and keep criminals from using stolen guns, yet intimidation and threats keep these products from the market while the gun lobby stands idle.

Last month, Senator MARKEY and I called on the NRA to denounce these so-called activists and their threats. They are all that stands between consumers and safer gun technology, and we cannot allow harassment and threats to continue while 45 Americans

are shot, on average, in a gun accident every single day in America.

Smart guns can stop this.

AMERICANS WANT LOWER LEVELS OF IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, a new Gallup poll has found that, by a 2 to 1 margin, Americans want to decrease immigration levels, not increase them. The recent survey shows that 41 percent of Americans support a decrease in immigration. Just 22 percent want it to go up.

Only a minority, approximately one-quarter of Independents and Democrats expressed a desire to increase immigration, and a Rasmussen poll found that people earning under \$30,000 support a reduction in immigration by a 3 to 1 margin.

When is the President going to listen to the American people? They know that when a country has lost control of its borders, it has lost control of its future.

EXTENSION OF MAP-21

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

Ms. TITUS. Madam Speaker, later today, the House will move forward on an extension of the current transportation authorization, MAP-21. This will ensure that Federal funding is available to meet our infrastructure needs through spring of next year.

For some 700,000 construction workers, including roughly 6,000 in Nevada, this is welcome news. Nonetheless, this short-term fix is only a Band-Aid on a sore that continues to fester.

For businesses, State departments of transportation, local governments, and transit authorities, this kind of unpredictability, which has gotten fairly common in Congress, hurts our economy and the ability for the public and private sectors to plan to meet our Nation's needs.

The clock is ticking, but there is still time to avoid a manufactured crisis again next year. If we work together, put all funding options on the table, and consult with stakeholders, we can get serious about building needed infrastructure, creating jobs, and investing in our future.

□ 1230

REMEMBERING RAYMOND P. MONGILLO, SR.

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Madam Speaker, Raymond P. Mongillo, Sr., was a Middletown Township, Bucks County busi-

nessman. He was a public servant and a United States Army veteran of the Korean war. He passed away on July 8, 4 days after his 82nd birthday. He had dedicated and devoted many years in service to his community, to veterans organizations, and to his church.

Ray was a leader in the effort to preserve Middletown Township's quality of life and served for 24 years on the Middletown Board of Supervisors. He was very instrumental in saving Styer's farm and orchard from future development. Aiming for the best outlook, he said:

The main thing is preserving it. We'd like to keep it going in its present form, as a farm store with pumpkins and hayrides.

And so it is, and it stands as a monument to Ray's hard work.

He leaves behind his wife of 61 years, Margaret, five children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, nieces, nephews, and many friends—and he has left a space that will be very hard to fill.

THE MARKETPLACE FAIRNESS ACT

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

Mr. WELCH. Madam Speaker, as we debate the bipartisan H.R. 3086, the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act, I would like to draw your attention to another important bipartisan effort, the Marketplace Fairness Act.

Over a year ago, the Senate passed that act with strong bipartisan support from 69 Senators. As you know, essentially what it says is that we will treat retailers the same, whether they are brick-and-mortar retailers in our downtown or Internet retailers, and if the State has passed a sales tax, then it would apply to all transactions.

This is important. When I talk to Vermont's small business owners, they tell me stories about the incredible unlevel playing field that they face. Folks come in, browse, shop, and then go online to buy. The difference is the sales tax avoidance.

These brick-and-mortar businesses are absolutely essential to the vitality of so many communities in Vermont and in so many communities in your State. This is hurting our small businesses, which make up about 60 percent of our State's private sector workforce.

Madam Speaker, I urge us to act on the Marketplace Fairness Act.

OBAMACARE HAS GOT TO GO

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, the people of Virginia's Sixth District are hardworking, busy running small businesses, teaching, raising families, earning a living, and trying to make ends meet. It is Congress' duty to make

their lives as uncomplicated by government as possible. Time and time again, however, we have seen ObamaCare doing the very opposite.

Across my district, hourly employees are seeing cutbacks in their workweeks. Multiple employers are weighing the costs of offering health coverage to their employees. I have received countless complaints from folks whose insurance was canceled or whose premiums increased.

It is offensive that the White House dismisses these experiences as “anecdotal.” The people in my district do not consider their lives, their businesses, and their health care to be anecdotal. Delays and exemptions have proven that this law is flawed and unworkable.

ObamaCare has got to go and be replaced by patient-centered health care reform.

SUPPORT FOR UNDERAGE ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS

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

Mr. McNERNEY. Madam Speaker, the current surge of children seeking entrance to the United States and the protection of our laws is a humanitarian challenge that we cannot ignore. The reasons for this surge are complex, ranging from a misunderstanding of the 2008 law signed by President Bush to discourage human trafficking to the consequences of our drug wars.

Our focus should be the interests of the children. Any person in this country is assured due process and the protection of our laws. Shortcutting these protections would be a tragedy and a crime. Each case must be decided on an individual basis, taking the child's best interest into account. Sending children back to be likely victims of murder or other crimes would be morally unacceptable and would cause new waves of refugees.

As in the aftermath of World War II when the United States helped rebuild Europe, taking the moral and humanitarian road will benefit us in the long run, whether this means finding homes for these children in the United States or helping their countries of origin develop the infrastructure to receive them back. This will create safe, friendly, and stable neighbors.

I urge Americans to support the humanitarian road that will benefit the children and our country.

IRAQ

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, for a decade, the United States, the international community, and the Iraqi people sacrificed immeasurably in support of the Iraqi people and their future.

Generations of Americans and Iraqis bear the indelible marks of this conflict. Unfortunately, the gains wrought at such cost are now jeopardized by the shortsightedness and malfeasance of Iraq's political leaders.

To survive, Iraq needs a government that is inclusive and representative. And if we are to support Iraq militarily or in any other way, our Nation must know that we are supporting such a government, a condition that I do not believe the Maliki regime meets.

Moreover, if the U.S. is to assist Iraq beyond current efforts, the President must seek a new Authorization for the Use of Military Force from Congress. I believe that authorization and that debate is absolutely essential, and I am concerned about the slippery slope we are going down.

We must not become further embroiled in another Iraq conflict without both a thorough debate and a legitimate partner in the Iraqi Government.

OUR FAILING INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, Republicans talk a lot about the need for the Federal Government to provide businesses with certainty so they can plan for the future. I agree with them. So why do they continue to block a long-range plan to fix our crumbling roads and bridges?

Across the country, one of every nine bridges is structurally deficient, and the American Society of Civil Engineers recently gave our national infrastructure a grade of D-plus. In my district alone, 129 bridges have been deemed functionally obsolete, and 65 are structurally deficient. Every American who drives a car, rides a train, or crosses a bridge knows we need to act.

Our national infrastructure was once the envy of the world. In a lot of communities today, it is an embarrassment. A strong, long-term investment in infrastructure provides States, cities, and businesses the certainty they need for the future. It will keep Americans safe and help commerce move more efficiently, and it will put tens of thousands of workers back on the job.

Madam Speaker, we should take this opportunity to create jobs and certainty for a change and enact a multiyear transportation bill.

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 the motion 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.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

PERMANENT INTERNET TAX FREEDOM ACT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3086) to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3086

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 “Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act”.

SEC. 2. PERMANENT MORATORIUM ON INTERNET ACCESS TAXES AND MULTIPLE AND DISCRIMINATORY TAXES ON ELECTRONIC COMMERCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1101(a) of the Internet Tax Freedom Act (47 U.S.C. 151 note) is amended by striking “during the period beginning November 1, 2003, and ending November 1, 2014”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxes imposed after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 3086, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

The clock is ticking down on a key law that protects Internet freedom. On November 1, 2014, a temporary moratorium on State taxation of Internet access will expire.

In 1998, Congress temporarily banned State and local governments from newly taxing Internet access or placing multiple or discriminatory taxes on Internet commerce. With minor modifications, this ban was extended three times with enormous bipartisan support. The most recent extension passed in 2007.

If the moratorium is not renewed, the potential tax burden on consumers will be substantial. The average tax rate on communications services in 2007 was 13.5 percent, more than twice the average rate on all other goods and services. To make matters worse, this tax is regressive. Low-income households pay 10 times as much in communications taxes as high-income households as a share of income.

The Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act converts the moratorium into a permanent ban on which consumers, innovators, and investors can permanently rely by simply striking the 2014

end date. This legislation prevents a surprise tax hike on Americans' critical services this fall. It also maintains unfettered access to one of the most unique gateways to knowledge and engines of self-improvement in all of human history.

This is not an exaggeration. During the 2007 renewal of the moratorium, the Judiciary Committee heard testimony that more than 75 percent of the remarkable productivity growth that increased jobs and income between 1995 and 2007 was due to investments in telecommunications networks technology and the information transported across them.

Everyone in Silicon Valley knows Max Levchin's story. He came to America from the Soviet Union at age 16. His family had \$300 in its pocket, and he learned English by watching an old TV set he hauled out of a dumpster and repaired. Ten years later, he sold PayPal, the well known Internet payments platform he cofounded, for \$1.5 billion.

That is the greatness of the Internet. It is a liberating technology that is a vast meritocracy. It does not care how you look or where you come from. It offers opportunity to anyone willing to invest time and effort. That is precisely why Congress has worked acidulously for 16 years to keep Internet access tax-free. Now we must act again once and for all.

The Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act has 228 cosponsors. The Judiciary Committee reported it favorably by a vote of 30-4. Nevertheless, small pockets of resistance remain. They argue that the Internet is no longer a fledgling technology in need of protection. But it is precisely the ubiquity of the Internet that counsels for a permanent extension. It has become an indispensable gateway to scientific, educational, and economic opportunities. It is the platform that turned Max Levchin from an impoverished immigrant into a billionaire. The case for permanent tax-free access to this gateway technology is stronger today than it ever has been.

Opponents also claim that this legislation will lower State revenues. Seven States currently enjoy an exemption from the moratorium. This legislation lets these grandfather clauses expire. But these grandfathered States had no reasonable expectation of maintaining their special status. The original moratorium included a grandfather clause to give States that were then taxing Internet access some time to transition to other sources of revenue. Some discontinued taxing Internet access in support of a national broadband policy. For those that still haven't, it has been 16 years, time enough to change their tax codes. If the revenue grandfathered States now reap is truly essential, it should be straightforward for the State to recoup it through a different form of taxation.

It is important to note that the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act does

not address the issue of State taxes on remote sales made over the Internet. It merely prevents Internet access taxes and unfair multiple or discriminatory taxes on e-commerce, whether inside the taxing State or without.

I would like to specifically thank Mr. CHABOT, Ms. ESHOO, Subcommittee Chairman BACHUS, and Subcommittee Ranking Member COHEN for their work on and support of this legislation.

This bipartisan legislation is about giving every American unfettered access to the Internet, which is the modern gateway to the American Dream. I urge all of my colleagues to support it. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ladies and gentlemen, the Internet Tax Freedom Act, enacted in 1998, established a temporary moratorium on multiple and discriminatory taxation of the Internet as well as new taxes on Internet access. This moratorium is due to expire on November 1 of this year.

□ 1245

Since 1998, Congress has extended the moratorium on three occasions. Unfortunately, however, H.R. 3086, the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act, responds to the impending expiration of the moratorium by making it permanent and ending the act's grandfather protections for States that impose such taxes prior to the act's enactment date.

The approach taken in H.R. 3086 is problematic for a number of reasons. First, Congress, instead of supporting this seriously flawed legislation, should really be focusing on meaningful ways to help State and local governments, taxpayers, and local retailers. The House can do that by addressing the remote sales tax issue.

In addition to extending the expiring moratorium on a temporary basis, the House should take up and send to the Senate legislation such as the Marketplace Fairness Act, which was mentioned earlier today on the floor of the House by the distinguished gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH). That bill incentivizes remote sellers to collect and remit sales taxes as well as require States to simplify several procedures that would benefit retailers. Such legislation would enable States and local governments to collect the over \$23 billion in estimated uncollected sales tax each year.

The measure would also help level the playing field for local retailers—who must collect sales taxes—when they compete with out-of-State businesses that do not collect these taxes. Retail competitors should be able to compete fairly with their Internet counterparts at least with respect to sales tax policy. The House should do its part and adjust the remote sales tax disparity before the end of this Congress.

In addition, this legislation will severely impact the immediate revenues

for the grandfather-protected States and all States progressively in the long term. The Congressional Budget Office, for example, estimates that this bill will cost certain States "several hundred million dollars annually" in lost revenues.

Indeed, the Federation of Tax Administrators estimates that the bill will cause the grandfather-protected States to lose at least \$500 million in lost revenue annually. These States include Texas, which would lose \$350 million a year in revenue; Wisconsin, which would lose about \$127 million per year; Ohio, which would lose about \$65 million per year; and South Dakota, which would lose about \$13 million per year.

Further, this bill would become effective during the mid-cycle for the grandfather-protected States. Because these States have to balance their State budgets, they will need to cut spending or raise taxes to balance their budgets.

Should this become law, State and local governments will have to choose whether they will cut essential government services—such as educating our children, maintaining needed transportation infrastructure, and providing essential public health and safety services—or shift the tax burden onto other taxpayers through increased property, income, and/or sales taxes.

Meanwhile, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities estimates that the permanent moratorium will deny the non-grandfathered States almost \$6.5 billion in potential State and local sales tax revenues each year in perpetuity. H.R. 3086 will burden taxpayers and services while excluding an entire industry from paying their fair share of taxes.

Finally, the bill ignores the fundamental nature of the Internet. The original moratorium was intentionally made temporary to ensure that Congress, industry, and State and local governments would be able to monitor the issue and make adjustments where necessary to accommodate new technologies and market realities.

The act was intended as a temporary measure to assist and nurture the fledgling Internet that back in 1998 was still in its commercial infancy. Yet this bill is oblivious to the significantly changed environment of today's Internet.

The bill's supporters continue to believe that the Internet still is in need of extraordinary protection in the form of exemption from all State taxation. But the Internet of 2014 is not the same as its 1998 predecessor. Today's Internet is considerably different in terms of both the types of accessibility and the accompanying technology.

The Internet then was accessed primarily a slow, unreliable dial-up service. But now technology has provided many types of methods to access the Internet, and we can anticipate that

the Internet and its attendant technology will continue to evolve. By permanently extending the tax moratorium, however, Congress severely limits its ability to revisit it and to make any necessary adjustments.

Simply put, a permanent moratorium is unwise, and so I urge my colleagues to think about this carefully and oppose H.R. 3086.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for his leadership on this bill.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3086, a bill that would make permanent the Internet Tax Freedom Act, which was passed a number of years ago, around the time when I came to Congress the first time.

The Internet is an essential part of our everyday lives. Americans use it to run small businesses, to do research, apply for jobs, listen to music, communicate with friends and family, check the weather and traffic, and a whole bunch of things. It is really a part of virtually all Americans' lives nowadays.

Madam Speaker, since 1998, Congress has made sure that access to the Internet remains tax-free. Unfortunately, this protection expires in November, as has been mentioned, at which point taxes will go up on every American who wants to get online.

Now is the time to make this policy of having access to the Internet free of taxes permanent. Now is the time to protect Internet access.

Madam Speaker, the Internet is an essential component of our economy. It drives innovation, job creation, and has resulted in a higher standard of living for virtually every American. The bill before us today provides certainty to Americans by making the current law of the land permanent and protecting access to the Internet from new taxes.

Madam Speaker, there is common ground in this Chamber today. We all agree that the Internet is an essential part of our lives and an incredibly powerful tool for communication, education, and job creation. Let's not make accessing the Internet more costly and more difficult.

Madam Speaker, the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act protects all Americans' access to the Internet from new taxes, and I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN, a senior member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, after nearly two decades, it does make sense to make this moratorium permanent. The moratorium is one of the

reasons for the huge growth in the digital economy. The Internet wouldn't be what it is today without affordable Internet access. And, by the way, this tax relief is not to companies. It is to individuals who access the Internet.

Madam Speaker, I applaud the Judiciary Committee for ensuring that the moratorium is made permanent before it expires. But the work on discriminatory taxes is not done. Wireless access to the Internet is still vulnerable to discriminatory taxation. The average tax is 17.2 percent—it goes as high as 25 percent in some States—and a disproportionate number of low-income Americans access the Internet only through wireless devices.

We have the Wireless Tax Fairness Act that I introduced. It has 220 cosponsors. So, in addition to voting for this moratorium on Internet taxation, I would encourage my colleagues to ask for a vote on the Wireless Tax Fairness Act that, after all, is sponsored by a majority of this House.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) for their leadership on this issue.

Now I would like to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON) for his statement and thank him for his leadership on this issue as well.

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3086, the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act. I believe that this permanent extension is necessary to ensure the Internet remains accessible for all Americans.

Madam Speaker, the Internet economy is growing and changing every day, and this pro-growth legislation will support the vibrant online marketplace of goods and ideas by preventing State and local tax policies from creating barriers to access.

Americans use the Internet every day to communicate, to work, and to get an education. They shouldn't have to pay an unnecessary and unfair tax to do so.

Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for his work on this important bipartisan bill. I urge all my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure now to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California, Ms. JUDY CHU, a distinguished member of the House Judiciary Committee.

Ms. CHU. Madam Speaker, I rise to speak in opposition to H.R. 3086 in its current form.

As a former member of the Board of Equalization, which is California's elected statewide tax board, and as a member of the Judiciary Committee, I support a temporary—not a permanent—extension of the current moratorium.

Madam Speaker, when the Internet was in its infancy, Congress rightfully put the moratorium in place to outlaw any burdensome tax regulations on Internet access. The Internet has

grown tremendously since then, and it will undoubtedly evolve over time. As it evolves, Congress should be called upon to revisit these issues. But I believe that a permanent moratorium would make reexamination of technology and market realities very difficult in the future.

A permanent moratorium would impede a State or local government's ability to make taxing decisions that are right for them. This is the message I have heard from States, counties, and cities. Take, for example, the city of Pasadena, which is the largest city in my district. Pasadena does not have any plans to impose taxes and fees on Internet access. However, it has concerns with a permanent extension that could shut the doors years down the line.

In fact, Madam Speaker, the National League of Cities, the League of California Cities, and the California State Association of Counties all oppose this bill. They are opposing it because they see a dramatic decline of sales tax revenue due to the increase in online sales that are not taxed, and that is why I also support the Marketplace Fairness Act. It would require large businesses to collect online sales tax.

I can tell you that this makes a dramatic difference in whether local government has the funds to fill the potholes and clean the streets. Since enacting its remote sellers sales tax law, my home State of California brought in \$260 million in its first year of collection. This is an improvement, but the potential for future growth is even greater, with a little over \$1 billion of use taxes still to be collected from remote sales in California alone.

□ 1300

With this act, we can stop the closing of businesses on Main Street and have a fighting chance to keep the jobs that they provide our communities. Keeping the Internet tax moratorium temporary helps in this fight. A short-term moratorium strikes the right balance between respecting the rights of local taxing authority and the ability for the Internet to grow.

Congress must reserve the flexibility to examine the Internet Tax Freedom Act from time to time. That is why I urge a "no" vote on this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), a member of the Judiciary Committee and a leader on technology issues.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 3086, the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act, because I support ensuring that Internet access remains free from predatory taxes imposed by State and local governments looking to fill their coffers at the expense of their residents.

I think we just saw why this bill is needed because there are two different

philosophies. Especially for those who support this legislation, this is an area where we want to continue to have the Internet free, especially as the gentlelady from California (Ms. LOFGREN) said, that this goes to the user, and I think that is one thing that we need to understand here.

This legislation ensures that no person is discouraged from accessing the Internet and experiencing its transformative power. The Internet is a tool for democracy and education. It is an outlet for free expression and the megaphone for those who were previously ignored. It connects individuals and is a means for creative entrepreneurship.

The Internet allows for all boundaries to be transcended—cultural religious, geographical, and lingual. Our economy, the expressions of our freedom, and our role as a beacon of hope and democracy are all enhanced by free and open access to the Internet.

I want to applaud the work of the chairman in ensuring this Congress is doing everything in its power to promote an open Internet that can be accessed without predatory taxes and fees.

Again, this is about the people that we represent, moms and dads who have the dream of a better America where they are making it for their kids and not being imposed upon by government simply looking to fill their coffers at the expense of citizens.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the Judiciary Committee and my friend for yielding this time to me.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support today of this legislation, the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act. This is a bill that has been stated before that will permanently eliminate any barriers created by the taxation of Internet access.

The current tax moratorium is going to expire shortly on November 1, which would then open the doors to taxation on Internet access. I think it is very important to make this very clear. This really protects consumers because the taxation would fall to them and their access to the Internet.

This issue should not be confused with the issue of sales taxes collected by jurisdictions and the discrepancies between Main Street and what is purchased on the Internet. That is not what this issue is about. This is clearly, I think, a consumer issue.

Now, whether for communication, commerce, business, education, research, the Internet is an integral part of the everyday lives of the American people and around the world as well, so we need to encourage its usage. We need to protect that usage, and I think we need to do everything we can to ensure that the access to the Internet is universal.

This legislation has widespread support in the House. It has been my

pleasure to work with Chairman GOODLATTE as the Democratic lead on this effort. It has 228 bipartisan cosponsors in the House—I think that is the most eloquent statement about it—and there are 51 bipartisan cosponsors in the Senate. It has strong support of the communications, Internet, and e-commerce communities.

I think this is an affordability issue. It is a consumer issue. It is sensible. It is bipartisan, and I believe that it deserves the full support of the House.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) for her leadership on this issue.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, I am here to speak in strong support of Internet tax freedom. I am a believer in the power of the Internet. It means a lot for America. It means a lot for the world.

Because of our commitment to keeping Internet access largely unencumbered by taxes and government control, we have created something really cool—a dynamic market for goods and services and, most importantly, a marketplace for ideas.

Our rights to freedom of speech and freedom of association have grown as the Web opens new outlets for expression in advocacy. Whether it is a group of citizens organizing to petition the government for a redress of their grievances or somebody looking for the love of their life on an Internet dating site, the Internet is there, but we cannot get comfortable.

We cannot forget that the power to tax—and might I add the power to overregulate—is the power to destroy. That is why I am up here supporting the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act, and I thank Chairman GOODLATTE and our numerous cosponsors on both sides of the aisle. This is good for America and good for the world.

Please join me in voting “yea.”

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

Mr. BARTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia, the full committee chairman, and I would like to enter into a little bit of a colloquy.

I am an original cosponsor. I certainly want to prevent taxation of the Internet, but as you know, I represent one of the 36 districts in Texas, and in my district, my largest city is the city of Arlington, and they currently collect approximately \$1 million a year in revenue from connection fees to the Internet in their city limits, and under this bill, that would be prohibited.

I had been led to believe that we were going to have the same grandfather provision that we have had for the last

16 years. Apparently, that is not the case.

Could the chairman enlighten me why we are not grandfathering existing local collection fees, and what might be done in conjunction with the other body if and when this goes to conference?

I yield to the chairman.

Mr. GOODLATTE. First of all, I thank the gentleman for his question, and I and others have been clear that we think these grandfather clauses should expire. When they first were adopted 16 years ago, it was with the intention that they be phased out. Of course, they have had 16 years, and we would like to have them do that.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

Our goal is to have a clean, permanent moratorium signed into law as promptly as possible. If the gentleman from Texas can engineer a phaseout consistent with that goal, I am certainly willing to work with him in that objective.

Mr. BARTON. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BARTON. If the gentleman will allow me to be part of the process and inform me at such a time that it would be possible to offer an amendment or to work with you and the other body, I would certainly be more than willing to do that.

Mr. GOODLATTE. As this measure is considered in the Senate and then in conference between the House and Senate, we would look forward to working with you.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, let me thank the ranking member and the chairman of the full committee. We seek opportunities on the Judiciary Committee to compromise and work together. This legislation would have been an excellent opportunity to be able to work together.

I appreciate the position of my chairman, but I know that Mr. CONYERS and myself worked on a compromise that I think and hope that, as we ultimately watch this bill make its way through the process, that we will be able to draw upon the Conyers-Jackson Lee compromise that makes this Internet Tax Freedom Act extended for a certain period of time.

We understand that there are frustrations on all sides. This bill would make permanent the Internet Tax Freedom Act, which imposes a moratorium on taxing Internet services, but as written would delete the existing grandfather clause which has been in place since the original passage of the bill in 1998 that allowed a number of States with unique circumstances, at the State and

local level, to impose tax on Internet access services.

Now, we can suggest that the present bill is a laissez-faire bill. Let me say that there is another principle of states' rights, and I have often heard it from my friends on the other side of the aisle. When it is for good, we should look at it as a reasoned answer to the uniqueness of the 50 States.

The Conyers-Jackson Lee amendment preserves the grandfather clause, so that Texas and other States could raise this very valuable revenue, but more importantly, it retains the moratorium for 4 years for us to be able to address this question in a fair manner. We offered this in the full committee, and there are many who support this compromise beyond the States that would be impacted.

A letter that I have received from the director of Citizens for Tax Justice writes in opposition to making permanent the Federal law—and I will include the letter for the RECORD—by banning State and local governments from subjecting Internet access to the same taxes they impose on other goods and services.

This letter goes on to say that it was decided that this infant industry needed special protection from taxes. Now, we are beyond that, but we are harming States.

I just want to use, as an example, the State of Texas will lose \$280 million; cities will lose \$51 million; transit, \$18 million; special districts, \$4 million; a total of \$358 million. When we are putting more burdens on States, we need to not remove an opportunity where they can raise revenue innocently and in good conscience.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Why are we barring our States from doing their good due diligence, providing resources—needed resources—for schools and infrastructure and health care?

So I am well aware of the arguments on the other side, but listen to our arguments. We are not stopping the taxation issue; we are putting a moratorium for 4 years, so that we can reassess it.

I ask my colleagues to consider that as they consider this legislation. I rise in opposition to this legislation.

Madam Speaker, the bill would make permanent the Internet Tax Freedom Act, which imposes a moratorium on taxing Internet services, but, as written, would delete the existing grandfather clause that has been in place since the original passage of the bill in 1998 that has allowed Texas at the state and local level to impose tax on Internet access services.

At the markup in the Judiciary Committee, Ranking Member CONYERS and I offered an amendment to extend the moratorium and the grandfather protections for four years. Unfortunately it failed on a primarily party line vote in the Committee.

Now, the authors of this bill would deem to tell Texas what it can do or not do regarding

its tax policy. At the heart of the notion of federalism is the right of states to legislate matters within their own jurisdiction.

The lines of authority between states and the federal government are, to a significant extent, defined by the United States Constitution and relevant case law.

The Constitution does, however, provide certain specific limitations on that power. In this instance, states would be prohibited from taxing Internet access.

H.R. 3086 would make the moratorium permanent but it would not extend the grandfather protections on which seven states, including Texas, still rely on.

The Conyers-Jackson Lee amendment preserved this “grandfather clause” so that Texas could continue to raise this very valuable revenue.

And the Conyers-Jackson Lee amendment retained the moratorium on taxation for four years instead of making it permanent.

Unfortunately, for Texas, this legislation would delete the existing grandfather clause that has been in place since the original passage of the bill in 1998 that has allowed Texas at the state and local level to impose tax on Internet access services.

The original intent of ITFA in 1998 was to encourage development of the Internet, which at the time was a new technology. The Internet is no longer an infantile industry.

Madam Speaker, as a practical matter this justification is no longer applicable given the substantial advancements in technology that have occurred since 1998.

Bundling non-Internet based services with Internet services creates a loophole for industry to avoid taxes altogether.

Again, the Conyers-Jackson Lee amendment would have preserved this “grandfather clause” so that the state can continue to raise this very valuable revenue. As written the bill raises significant federalism concerns and essentially tells Texas what to do—nobody messes with Texas.

I urge my colleagues to vote for fairness and judicial economy by opposing this legislation in its current form.

H.R. 3086: EFFECT ON TEXAS

State: \$280 million
City: 51 million
Transit: 18 million
County: 5 million
Special districts: 4 million
Total: \$358 million (per year)

JULY 14, 2014.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON LEE: Citizens for Tax Justice writes in opposition to making permanent the federal law banning state and local governments from subjecting Internet access to the same taxes that they impose on other goods and services. This ban was first enacted with the “Internet Tax Freedom Act” (ITFA) in 1998 and extended several times since then.

Both the “Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act” (H.R. 3086) and “Internet Tax Freedom Forever Act” (S. 1431) would make this ban permanent, thereby forever treating the Internet differently from other goods and services by barring state and local governments from deciding for themselves whether or not to tax it.

In 1998 Congress decided that the internet was an “infant industry” needing special protection from the taxes that state and

local governments impose on other goods and services. Today, the infant of 1998 has the keys to the American economy, yet lawmakers are still coddling it by proposing to make the tax ban permanent.

Congress should allow the ban to expire as scheduled on November 1.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. MCINTYRE,
Director, Citizens for Tax Justice.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES, NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES, U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS, INTERNATIONAL CITY/COUNTY MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION, GOVERNMENT FINANCE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS OFFICERS AND ADVISORS,

June 17, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON LEE: On behalf of local governments across the nation, our organizations want to express our opposition to H.R. 3086, the “Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act (ITFA).” Instead, as the expiration date for the current moratorium on taxing Internet access approaches, and Congress considers changes to ITFA, our organizations recommend a shorter-term extension of ITFA, as a sensible solution that respects state and local taxing authority. In addition, any extension must maintain both the long-standing grandfather provisions that preserve existing state and local revenues, as well as certain general business taxes that were not intended to be part of the moratorium.

Over the next several years, most of the services known as telecommunications and cable services will transition to broadband. As a result, the scope of the services that ITFA shields from state and local taxation will greatly expand, even if ITFA's language remains unchanged. In light of this substantial expansion and the need to protect the fiscal strength of state and local governments, we encourage you to support a temporary extension of ITFA, rather than making it permanent, as H.R. 3086 would do. That would allow time to assess more fully (1) the transition from telecommunications and cable services to ITFA-protected broadband services; (2) its impact on state and local governments' tax bases and revenues; and (3) its impact on the relative tax obligations of industry sectors to which ITFA does not apply. A temporary extension of ITFA ensures that Congress has the opportunity to revisit the moratorium to correct any unintended consequences.

For these reasons, our organizations urge you to support a fair, short-term extension of the Internet tax moratorium. We look forward to assisting you and your staff in these efforts.

Sincerely,

MATTHEW D. CHASE,
Executive Director,
National Association
of Counties.

CLARENCE E. ANTHONY,
Executive Director,
National League of
Cities.

TOM COCHRAN,
Executive Director,
U.S. Conference of
Mayors.

ROBERT J. O'NEILL,
Executive Director,
International City/
County Management
Association.

JEFFREY L. ESSER,
Executive Director,
Government Finance
Officers Association.

STEPHEN TRAYLOR,
Executive Director,
National Association
of Telecommuni-
cations Officers and
Advisors.

[From the Hill, July 14, 2014]

CONGRESS POISED TO SLAM STATES ON
INTERNET ACCESS CHARGES
(By Michael Mazerov)

The House is slated to vote this week on a bill to permanently bar states from applying their normal sales taxes to the monthly charges that households and businesses pay companies like Comcast or Verizon Wireless for Internet access—potentially costing states roughly \$7 billion a year in potential revenue.

For starters, the bill would strip Hawaii, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Texas, and Wisconsin of at least \$500 million in annual state and local revenue from their existing taxes on these charges.

Beyond costing states the \$7 billion a year in potential revenue to support education, healthcare, roads, and other services, the bill would violate an understanding between Congress and the states dating back to the 1998 Internet Tax Freedom Act (ITFA): that any ban on applying sales taxes to Internet access charges would be temporary and not apply to existing access taxes.

Enacted when Internet commerce was still in its infancy, ITFA sought to balance Congress' desire to encourage development of the Internet against states' and localities' need to finance essential services. Thus, it imposed only a temporary "moratorium" on new taxes on Internet access and protected existing taxes through a "grandfather" clause.

Congressional extensions of ITFA in 2001, 2004, and 2007 maintained those two key features. This latest ITFA legislation, though, eliminates both—the first time Congress has seriously considered doing so.

Every state would feel the impact. The seven states with taxes would start losing revenues this year, forcing some to cut services or raise other taxes to keep their budgets balanced. The remaining states would continue to lose as much as \$6.5 billion in potential revenue each year from their inability to tax Internet access charges.

The forgone revenue would likely grow substantially over time as more people sign up for Internet access and current subscribers trade up to faster, more expensive, service.

The House bill would have other, unintended effects. Eliminating the grandfather, for example, would put at risk numerous other state and local taxes that Internet access providers pay on the things they buy in order to provide Internet service, such as fiber-optic cable, or gasoline for their vehicles. Almost all of these taxes existed before 1998, so the grandfather protects them from legal challenge. But if Congress eliminates the clause, Internet access providers could challenge these taxes in court as indirect taxes on access service and therefore voided by ITFA.

The bill's proponents argue that banning taxes on Internet access charges is necessary to close the "digital divide" between low- and high-income households. Keeping monthly Internet access as inexpensive as possible by exempting it from roughly \$2-\$4 in taxes will encourage low-income people to subscribe and service providers to extend broadband service to low-income neighborhoods, they claim.

But there's scant evidence to support this argument. Studies haven't found a significant difference, in either the share of house-

holds with broadband or the availability of broadband service, between states that tax access and those that don't. And numerous studies find that Internet access costs are a smaller cause of the "digital divide" than unfamiliarity with computers and the Internet and a belief that the Internet is irrelevant to the person's life.

In fact, a permanent ITFA would likely impede the goal of getting more people online—especially low-income people who don't have Internet at home. Many people first use the Internet in public schools, libraries, and community centers, all of which rely on state and local tax revenue. The less state and local revenue that such institutions receive, the less they could provide Internet service.

Some in Congress argue that states and localities should accept a permanent ITFA as part of a deal that would also include enactment of the Marketplace Fairness Act, which would empower states to require large Internet merchants to charge sales tax on all taxable sales. Any extension of the moratorium, however, must include the grandfather clause. Eliminating that clause would threaten to invalidate many existing taxes on Internet access providers, as noted earlier.

Congress' proper course would be to end, not extend, the ban on state and local taxation of Internet access. The Internet is no longer an infant industry needing protection from taxes that apply to other services for which Internet access is a close substitute. Cable television service is widely taxed, for example, but if someone decides to pay Verizon \$50 a month so that they can stream Netflix to their TV, ITFA bans the taxation of the access charge. This unequal treatment doesn't make sense.

Even if Congress wants to renew ITFA, surely the terms should be no more favorable than in 1998—a temporary exemption for taxes on access service, with pre-1998 taxes still grandfathered—and must include the Marketplace Fairness Act, which the Senate has passed with broad bipartisan support.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ), who has been a steadfast proponent of Internet tax freedom.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for bringing this piece of legislation forward, and I appreciate the bipartisan manner in which it is done.

The Internet is working. It is working. It is one of the great things about our economy. It is one of the great things that is happening in this country. It is creating jobs, and it is creating excitement with the younger generation. It is providing for innovation. We are leading the world in what we are doing.

Access is not necessarily available to everybody. We have people from inner cities to Indian reservations to rural communities to those who are just seeking to try to be part of this community and have access and get information and be informed and be educated and allowed to engage in commerce.

Since 1998, this has been the position of the United States of America, and if you look at the Internet, it truly is interstate commerce. We can be standing side by side, right next to each other, and you can send a tweet or a

Facebook message or an email, whatever sort of electronic communication, and it literally can zoom around the country—hopefully through Utah—and then back to the person standing right next to you.

□ 1315

But in order for all that to work, the magic of the Internet and all that to work, it needs to be unimpeded. It needs to keep those costs as low as possible to ensure the maximum amount of access so those in our communities who are still trying to get in there, from our seniors, the rural communities, again, to our inner cities.

The wisdom that happened in 1998 has been reaffirmed multiple times. Only two people in the history of this piece of legislation have ever voted against this piece of legislation. The majority of the House of Representatives are cosponsors on this piece of legislation that is before us today. So, I urge its passage.

There are some other pieces of legislation that I would like the body to look at. I think we do have to deal with the remote sales tax issues. I think there are transactions that happen remotely. I would like to see parity in that—another topic for another day, but something that needs to be addressed sooner rather than later.

The issue before us today is are we going to allow the freedom for Internet access to happen at the lowest cost possible without the government coming in and thinking, oh, this is another bucket of funds that we can just tax on. The consequence is we would have less people involved and engaged. Companies are going to take care of this, but individuals who are trying to access the Internet, we need to keep those costs as low as possible.

Think about your telephone bill. We don't want that to be lit up. You know how that is lit up with all these different taxes. We don't want the Internet to be lit up like a Christmas tree with all these different taxes. It is interstate commerce. It is the purview, I think, of the United States Congress. That is why this bill is so needed. That is why I proudly joined as a cosponsor and why I urge its passage today.

And again, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE and Members on both sides of this body for bringing this bill forward. I urge its passage.

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

I want to conclude by pointing out that we might be going in the wrong direction with this misguided legislation. It will devastate State revenues, especially those States currently protected by the grandfather clause, and force State governments to eliminate essential governmental programs and services and burden taxpayers.

Furthermore, 11 national organizations are concerned with the fiscal impact on our State and local governments: the National Governors Association, the National Association of

Counties, the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and 15 other labor organizations: the AFL-CIO, AFSCME, the American Federation of Teachers, the UAW, SEIU. Fifteen national labor organizations and 11 national, local, and State government organizations all join with us who are urging my colleagues to reject this seriously flawed legislation.

Please join us in making sure that we, the people, prevail on this measure in the House of Representatives.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LIST OF OPPONENTS OF H.R. 3086

There is a long list of opponents of this bill. These opponents are concerned with the fiscal impact on our state and local governments. Opponents include such state and local groups as—the National Governors Association, the National Association of Counties, the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the Federation of Tax Administrators, the League of California Cities, the California State Association of Counties, the International City/County Management Association, the Government Finance Officers Association, the National Association of Telecommunications Officers and Advisors, and the Multistate Tax Commission.

Also opposing this bill are labor groups such as—the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO), the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), the American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE), the Communication Workers of America (CWA), the Department for Professional Employees (DPE), the International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF), the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers (IFPTE), the International Union of Police Associations (IUPA), the National Education Association (NEA), the Services Employees Union International (SEIU), the United Auto Workers (UAW), and the United Food and Commercial Workers International Union (UFCW).

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

Madam Speaker, passing the permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act would increase access all across America for millions of Americans, especially lower-income Americans, increase growth and increase opportunity, increase jobs in this country.

Now is the time to act. A permanent ban on taxation of Internet access is crucial for protecting the future of our digital economy. If the ban on Internet access taxes is not renewed by November 1, the potential tax burden on Americans will be substantial. It is estimated that Internet access tax rates could be more than twice the average rate of all other goods and services. Low-income households could pay ten times as much as high-income households as a share of income.

The last thing that Americans need is another bill on their doorsteps. A tax on Internet access would burden millions of Americans who rely on the Internet to conduct business, communicate, educate, and live.

Over the past 14 years, Congress has extended ban after ban on States tax-

ing Internet access. The measures have been met with enormous bipartisan support. Only five “no” votes were cast in the history of these renewals in the House and the Senate.

As price rises, demand falls. If the ban lapses, State telecommunications taxes could take effect, and those rates are already too high. Former White House Chief Economist Austan Goolsbee estimated that a tax that increased the price of Internet access by 1 percent would reduce demand for Internet access by 2.75 percent.

The permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act merely prevents Internet access taxes and unfair multiple and discriminatory taxes on e-commerce. It does not tackle the issue of Internet sales taxes.

Madam Speaker, this is a great issue for the Congress to move forward on in a bipartisan fashion that will help to create jobs and economic growth and foster continued greater access of the Internet. After all, isn't that what we want? We want every American to have opportunity to access this in the most affordable way so that they can have the educational opportunities, the employment opportunities, the recreational opportunities, the social opportunities that are created by the Internet.

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

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, several weeks ago, I joined my colleagues on the House Judiciary Committee in supporting the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act when it was reported out of committee by a vote of 30 to 4.

It is clear that there is broad bipartisan agreement that we should not allow the current moratorium on Internet access taxes to expire. While I joined my colleagues in moving this legislation forward to provide clarity and certainty in this area, I also have serious concerns that Congress has failed to resolve another critical issue related to state taxation and the Internet: e-fairness and the current exemption for state and local sales tax collection for online purchases.

Since the Internet Tax Freedom Act first passed in 1998, Congress has made far too little progress in developing a coherent policy that addresses the intersection of state taxation and the Internet. Aside from extending this tax moratorium three times since it first passed, Congress has yet to pass legislation like the Marketplace Fairness Act or similar legislation that would allow states to tax e-commerce sales at the same rate as sales from brick-and-mortar stores. Instead we have seen states attempting to set a patchwork of policies that simply doesn't work. A federal solution is needed from Congress.

In the meantime, adoption of the Internet has exploded since ITFA first passed in 1998, and today, 75 percent of American households subscribe to broadband Internet services, and hundreds of billions of dollars worth of commerce is done over the Internet annually. The Census Bureau recently announced that total e-commerce sales for 2013 were estimated to have increased nearly 17 percent (16.9 percent) from 2012, totaling \$263 billion in 2013.

Given the importance of the Internet to consumers and to economic growth, it is Congress's responsibility to determine a federal approach to e-fairness, and I am disappointed that we are simply looking at this bill in isolation without regard to the other issues related to Internet and taxation.

While I support an extension of the current moratorium on Internet access taxes, I believe we cannot move this legislation forward while also continuing to allow the Internet to serve as a sales tax loophole. The issue of e-fairness is a related issue that we must commit to tackling, and I know there is bipartisan support for doing so.

This is a critical jobs issue that I continue to hear about from small businesses in my district.

It is the role of Congress to ensure that our nation's tax policies and regulation don't unfairly burden one business model over the other. Yet, brick and mortar businesses can't fairly compete right now because states do not have the ability to efficiently collect the taxes owed from online purchases. Only Congress can fix this and I believe we must continue to move forward on legislation like the Marketplace Fairness Act.

I hope that House Leadership does not consider our work on Internet tax policy complete after voting today on the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act and I look forward to continuing to work with members on both sides of the aisle to work to find a solution to move forward on both ITFA and e-fairness legislation like the Marketplace Fairness Act before the end of this year.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3086, the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act (ITFA). I want to commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for bringing this legislation to the floor today.

H.R. 3086 which permanently extends the moratorium on Internet access taxes and prohibits discriminatory taxation of internet commerce has 228 bi-partisan cosponsors. Originally passed in 1998 and extended three times since with broad bi-partisan support. H.R. 3086 encourages the flow of commerce and information over the internet and improves our nation's ability to compete in the global economy.

The original intent of this law was to protect and nurture what once was a fledgling industry. Today, access to the internet has become the engine of our 21st century global economy. The internet is one the primary drivers of U.S. economic growth innovation and productivity and it is indispensable for finding jobs and accessing education and health care resources. Permanently extending the ITFA protects citizens from a fee to access this indispensable tool while continuing to encourage the growth of a key driver for American global competitiveness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3086.

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.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5021, HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2014

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 669 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 669

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5021) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, modified by the amendments 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 among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and 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 Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), my friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of the resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying bill. House Resolution 669 provides a closed rule, as is customary for bills that are reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, for H.R. 5021, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014.

On July 10, the Ways and Means Committee marked up H.R. 5021. The committee ordered the bill favorably reported by voice vote.

The bill is simple. It extends our transportation programs and our reforms enacted by MAP-21, and it pays for the extension without raising taxes on hardworking American taxpayers.

This extension is crucial. Prior to the expiration of MAP-21 later this fall, the highway trust fund is expected to encounter a funding shortfall. The Secretary of Transportation has warned that, as early as August, payments from the trust fund to the States will begin to be delayed.

Let's be clear: this bill is just an interim remedy for our current situation. It is not a solution to our transportation funding problem.

As a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I can testify to the work that Chairman SHUSTER and the committee are doing to provide a multiyear authorization bill. It is a deliberative, thoughtful process. The underlying bill advances that process.

The underlying bill proposes policies that have previously received bipartisan support. Further, these policies have previously also been embraced by the Senate.

The bill extends the surface transportation programs and funding through May 2015. It provides stability and certainty for States. It continues our investments in infrastructure. It staves off job losses at the height of the construction season. And it allows the process to move forward toward a long-term solution.

Some have suggested or proposed a short-term patch for just a few months. There are some who would like to see this just provide enough time to get through the election. A short-term extension would guarantee a crisis. Even worse, that manufactured crisis is easily avoidable.

Central Floridians are still trying to dig their way out of years of economic downturn. We are focusing on improving our families' financial situation, and certainly we don't need a downturn in construction—and especially infrastructure construction in the State of Florida and in my particular area, central Florida.

A short-term extension is, at best, feeble and, at worst, irresponsible. Washington should not do less when it can do better. Washington should not add to the list of crises of its own doing by passing a short-term patch when a longer-term answer is within reach.

The task at hand remains avoiding the expiration of the existing transportation authorization. The existing authorization is actually a good bill.

MAP-21 included significant reforms to cut out Federal red tape and bureaucracy. It streamlined the project delivery process. It reformed and consolidated programs. It improved safety. It ended the process of earmarks in transportation bills.

MAP-21 set deadlines for slow-moving projects. It set a new NEPA funding threshold and expedited projects that were destroyed by disaster.

MAP-21 consolidated more than 100 programs by nearly two-thirds. It eliminated dozens of ineffective programs and provided more resources and flexibility to States. It also

incentivized States to seek partners in the private sector to finance and operate infrastructure projects.

Further, MAP-21 passed the House by a strong bipartisan vote of 373-52, including the support of the gentleman from Colorado. It passed the Senate by an equally strong bipartisan vote of 74-19. The White House issued a statement that said they were pleased with the bill.

While we continue with a process that will lead to a multiyear authorization bill, there is no reason why we should not support an extension of MAP-21. Extending MAP-21 through next summer is simply an extension of another year of good transportation policy.

Once again, I rise in support of this rule and the potential this extension holds for producing a thoughtful process that results in a quality long-term authorization bill.

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

□ 1330

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, today, we are considering the rule for H.R. 5021, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014. While this bill provides an extension of Federal highway programs, frankly, our Nation deserves a long-term solution to support our transportation infrastructure needs that will allow for a more effective and efficient use of resources through public-private partnerships and long-term contracts. In effect, by engaging in short-term legislating, we are actually raising the cost of infrastructure projects across the country, making it less efficient rather than more than efficient.

Unfortunately, this bill is a closed rule, which I do not support. It limits debate. It doesn't allow Democrats or Republicans to come up with ideas for amendments to improve the bill. That should be what this legislative body is all about.

I have friends on both sides of the aisle who have ideas to make this more efficient, to save taxpayers money, and to get more infrastructure bang for their buck, ideas like a national infrastructure bank, a bipartisan bill by my colleague, Mr. DELANEY, that would allow for lower-cost financing with locally driven infrastructure projects, at no taxpayer cost.

None of us are even allowed to discuss for not 10 minutes, not 1 minute, not a single moment, any amendments under this closed rule, and I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote "no" on this closed rule.

In 2012, Congress passed the Moving Ahead for Progress program that my colleague, Mr. WEBSTER, mentioned, which reauthorized Federal surface transportation programs and maintained the solvency of the highway

trust fund through the end of September 2014.

That seemed like a little ways off at the time, but here we are in July of 2014, fast approaching insolvency of the trust fund in September of 2014. How inconvenient to members of the Republican Party that this might occur before an election. Suddenly, there is an impetus to do something about it, to actually address the issue or at least to kick the can down the road a few months until, conveniently, after the election when we actually have a national discussion about how to meet our infrastructure needs and to pay for them.

This bill is simply a very short-term highway trust fund patch. It only extends the highway programs through May 31, 2015, and transfers \$10.8 billion to the highway trust fund.

As Transportation Secretary Foxx said, without a patch, tens of thousands of critical projects and 700,000 jobs will be jeopardized. In fact, States are already preparing to delay or halt ongoing projects if the funding runs out in September. My home State of Colorado alone has nearly 50 active construction projects that could be at risk if we don't pass some kind of patch.

But this approach is just another kick the can down the road approach, to have a national discussion about infrastructure, to encourage efficiency of our Federal dollars rather than forcing contractors to bid out higher amounts because of uncertainty about whether their contracts will be long-term or short-term.

There are several easy ways that we could pay for a long-term transportation fix. The simplest would be immigration reform. H.R. 15 would generate over \$200 billion in the first 10 years and close to a trillion over 20 years that could be used to invest in infrastructure across our country.

Others have talked about using some kind of user fee. Traditionally, the gas tax has been used as a proxy for people who use our highways.

I am very disappointed that not only are we not considering any long-term solutions to reauthorizing MAP-21, but we are not even allowed to improve this current bill before us, not just to make it longer term, but to offer simple, efficient ideas to make it work better and get more bang for our buck.

Our Nation relies on Congress to pass measures that ensure that our roadways, bridges, and transit systems are the best in the world. This bill falls short on that account. The American Society of Civil Engineers has given our country's infrastructure a D-plus grade on its 2013 report. In this increasingly competitive global economy, a D-plus is not enough to get us by as a nation to create jobs and grow our economy.

My home State of Colorado has increasing transportation needs, as do many other States. In the wake of floods last September, rockslides, land-

slides, and mudslides caused damage to roadways and bridges in Colorado. Five hundred miles of roadway were affected at the peak of the flood and 120 bridges were damaged, resulting in over \$500 million of additional repairs to our already beleaguered transportation infrastructure. While the Colorado Department of Transportation did an excellent job completing short-term fixes to get traffic moving, there remain many long-term projects along our canyons and roadways where we need permanent repairs to our roads. There simply isn't enough of an investment in this highway infrastructure bill to address our infrastructure needs.

Again, we don't necessarily need to spend more money. We can simply pass the Partnership to Build America Act—if it were allowed to be introduced as an amendment under this bill, I would be happy to—a bipartisan bill by Representative DELANEY with 70 sponsors from both sides of the aisle that would essentially help finance locally driven projects to the tune of \$750 billion at a low interest rate by allowing U.S. multinational companies who have tax-deferred profits overseas to bring back their earnings to the United States, where they can invest them in growing employment and infrastructure here. It is a win-win scenario. Yet under this closed amendment process, we are not even allowed to bring up this bill.

This measure falls short on a number of accounts. Its short-term nature makes the growing importance of public-private partnerships more difficult. And yet if we could simply amend this bill and improve it or make it longer term, we could finally have a discussion about our national infrastructure.

The House majority continues to have a closed process where bills are constructed and not allowed to be improved upon by Republicans or Democrats here in the House. I know that we can do better, and I encourage my colleagues to oppose this rule, bring down this rule so we can have an open process regarding transportation funding.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I think it is important to note that the authorization is not ending next month. It is just the funds are running out. We have got to extend the funds. The authorization continues on through the end of the year.

That authorization was a good bill, as I explained in my opening remarks. MAP-21 was an excellent piece of legislation that consolidated a lot of programs, allowed States more flexibility, and gave them a pathway to create many of the infrastructure projects we need. This is just the money. And then we go a little bit further so we are not creating a crisis right before we adjourn.

So I think, in the end, this is a very good piece of legislation. It puts forth

what is needed. We need money to finish the authorization we already have. That is what this does.

The administration policy from the Executive Office of the President's Office of Management and Budget says this: "With surface transportation funding running out"—he is only talking about the funding. He knows that the policy still is in place—"and hundreds of thousands of jobs at risk later this summer, the administration supports House passage of H.R. 5021 . . . This legislation would provide for continuity of funding for the highway trust fund during the height of the summer construction season and keep Americans at work repairing the Nation's crumbling roads, bridges, and transit systems."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, the hallmark of a great country is a great infrastructure.

In its infancy, this country built interstate canals that helped commerce and life become strong and our economy vigorous. In the height of the Civil War, President Abraham Lincoln met with Justin Morrill, then a Senator from the State of Vermont, and conceived the ambition of an intercontinental railroad. In the 1950s, President Dwight D. Eisenhower said that we needed an interstate highway system.

This temporary bill, where our only responsibility is to make sure we can preserve what we have by having the funds necessary to repair roads and bridges is an abdication of our responsibility. Congress can do better, and America needs better. Our bridges and our roads are falling apart. I recently visited two projects in Vermont that are in desperate need of repair, but this bill provides temporary funding for 8 months. Not only that, instead of basing it on user fees, which have always been the way we funded infrastructure projects that we all benefit by, it raids pension funds. It essentially creates a pothole in future pensions to fill potholes in our highways.

Some folks are saying that we need time in order to put together a long-term bill. Madam Speaker, we have had time. What we need is a decision. There are options out there. As the gentleman from Colorado said, we are not lacking options; what we are lacking is will. This has traditionally been an area of common agreement between Republicans and Democrats where, yes, it is always difficult to figure out what that revenue source is, but that difficulty is not an excuse for Congress to fail to do its job and give this highway trust fund a sustainable and long-term revenue source so that folks in Montpelier and folks in Austin, Texas, can put together those plans to repair our roads and bridges, put America back to work, and get this economy going.

I urge us to defeat this rule and to defeat this bill and for Congress finally to do its job.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to discuss the future of our transportation system in this country.

Back at home in Sussex, Bergen, and Warren Counties in the Fifth District of New Jersey, they are only asking the same thing that people across America are, and that is to have a safe and efficient transportation system of roads and bridges.

The highway trust fund is bankrupt. Our past highway bills have been filled with excessive Federal regulation and pork-laden projects, meaning that the maintenance of our roads and bridges has not been getting done. So we are here today because we don't have the money now to fix them.

Going forward, we have two clear choices. Either we can continue down the same path, the current path, passing a bill to bail out the trust fund to the tune of some \$50 billion, or we can find a better way.

Personally, I get tired every year going and speaking to the Secretary of Transportation—it doesn't matter which party—and asking him: Can you tell me what exactly the needs are on Route 17 in Bergen County or Route 519 in Sussex or Warren County? I ask that question, and again and again they will say: Where's Route 17? Where's Route 519? Where's Route 519?

We are here saying we cannot continue to allow Washington, who doesn't know our needs and doesn't know our roads, to tell us how to run things. The solution to our current quagmire is to return the power back to the people who know better, back to the States, States, counties, and local officials are the ones that use these roads. They are in the best position to decide how to use these transportation dollars.

There is not one single Federal official here in Washington, elected or otherwise, who knows the needs of my community or your community with specific detail as well as the people who actually live there, who actually drive on those roads, and who actually have to maintain those roads.

So it is about time, after all these years, that we re-empower the States, re-empower the counties, re-empower the local officials, the people who live and use these roads, to make the transportation decisions, instead of people here in Washington who have no clue what the needs are, who have no idea what the problems are, who have no idea as to actually provide, what I said at the very beginning, what the people in my counties of the Fifth District want as a safe and efficient transportation system.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. I thank Mr. POLIS for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule for H.R. 5021. This closed rule prevents an opportunity for us to address the larger issues related to passing a long-term surface transportation reauthorization, and that is what Mr. POLIS and Mr. WELCH are talking about. I agree.

The constituents that I represent in North Carolina feel that it is critical to extend the highway trust fund. This bill is only one piece of what must be done to strengthen our Nation's infrastructure and economy.

The need to pass surface transportation reauthorization funding is extremely critical. MAP-21 expires at the beginning of October. At the same time, each day brings us closer to a highway trust fund shortfall and risks putting major transportation projects on hold and stalling our economy.

□ 1345

The North Carolina DOT has indicated that the highway trust fund insolvency would jeopardize 108 projects and 20,000 jobs across my State.

Eastern North Carolina remains one of the poorest districts in the country despite the economic resurgence many other areas of the country have seen. Strengthening infrastructure helps encourage economic development, increase commerce and improve tourism. We cannot afford to halt construction, growth, and progress. We must find a way to provide consistent and robust transportation funding. We need a fix to the reauthorization act.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this closed rule so that we can have a larger conversation about the long-term surface transportation reauthorization.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a leader on transportation issues.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you, Mr. POLIS.

I listened carefully to what you said, and you are right—this closed rule is a disservice. My respected friend from Florida, I think, is just wrong.

Madam Speaker, this is not a solution, and it is not a deliberate, thoughtful process. We have not had a single hearing on transportation finance in the Ways and Means Committee all year. We didn't have one the year before that. We haven't had a hearing in the 43 months that Republicans have been in charge. This is a perfectly predictable problem that was created by the halfhearted bill that they passed last Congress. We knew this was coming for months. Now we are here.

With all due respect, I, too, am disappointed that we have a rule that does not make in order broad discussion and amendment. We have been unable in this Congress to deal meaningfully with the looming transportation crisis. The gentleman is on the Transpor-

tation Committee. He doesn't have a bill. We are almost through this Congress, and we don't have a bill. America is falling apart. America is falling behind. We have failed to give America's communities the resources and a robust 6-year reauthorization plan.

We have done it before under the chairmanship of Bud Shuster and Ranking Member Jim Oberstar, and I was happy to have played a small role. That bill made a difference.

If we fail to come to grips with the funding level and, instead, in approving this rule and the underlying bill, this Congress is giving itself a ticket out of town to adjourn and pass it on to not just the next Congress but to the Congress after that. Make no mistake. In May 2015, you are not going to be in any different a place. It is going to be May 2017.

Congress has legitimate policy differences. I appreciate my friend from New Jersey. Some people think that the Federal Government should get out of the partnership that we have had and reduce or eliminate the Federal gas tax. They are willing to give up on the successful partnership and let each State decide what to do, when it wants to do it, or what it is able or not able to do. They would abandon all sense of a national vision and the ability to shape transportation policies. That is rejected by the mayors, rejected by county commissioners, rejected by State transportation officials. They want that partnership.

Frankly, there are some people who feel the gas tax ought to be adjusted to deal with inflation and increased fuel economy as well as the demands of a growing Nation with an aging infrastructure. Some people are comfortable with the Republican budget, which will have no new projects for 15 months and will doom us to a 30 percent reduction over the next 10 years. Those are legitimate policy differences, but we are not dealing with them here on the floor. We are shrugging our shoulders, passing them on to the next Congress and, frankly, to the Congress after that.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I agree with the people who build and maintain and use our transportation infrastructure. We should address this infrastructure question head on. American infrastructure used to be the best in the world and a point of pride, bringing Americans together. It is now a source of embarrassment and deep concern as we fall further and further behind global leaders.

We ought to reject this rule. We ought to allow full debate and, by all means, resolve the funding question now so we can go forward. America deserves no less.

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

I just want to make sure we remind everybody that there were 373 Members

who voted for that halfhearted bill, including the gentleman who spoke against that bill but who voted for it just 2 years ago. Why? Because it was good policy. It set forth some policy moving forward in that MAP-21 allowed for more flexibility for the local communities to determine what they needed. It took 100 projects and silos and so forth and reduced them down by a major amount. It gave that flexibility to the States.

As for my State, we have the largest transportation program this year that we have ever had—\$10 billion—which is \$2 billion more than it was the year before. Why? Because this program and this project and this bill and the reauthorization worked, and all we are doing is extending that good policy. The policy already extends all the way through the end of the year. We are funding it. That is the real need, to finish funding it, and then we extend it another 5 months.

To me, it is a great piece of legislation that can be improved. It gives us the time as we come along and begin working on the reauthorization bill that we are getting ready to propose at some point in time in the future. The staff is already working, and the Members are giving ideas. I have met with the staff, and have given them some ideas that I thought would work, and that is happening right now.

This does not preclude us from continuing on. We don't have to have, really, even within the current timeframe, a new reauthorization bill until the end of the year. However, we do need funding. That is what this bill does. It provides the funding necessary to complete what, I think, was a very good piece of public policy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire if the gentleman yielded back?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman reserved.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, our country's roads and highways are a vital asset to our economic competitiveness. Strengthening our transportation infrastructure will, of course, make our roads and transit systems safer, but it also will support commerce, create jobs, and strengthen our Nation's economy.

In my home State of Rhode Island, 20 percent of our bridges are in poor condition. Without any changes, 40 percent of the State's bridges will be structurally deficient by 2024, and, according to a report released yesterday by the White House, if Congress fails to act, over 3,500 jobs in Rhode Island will be jeopardized. This should not be allowed to happen, and Congress has a responsibility to provide the funding for these important transportation projects.

The highway trust fund is a critical resource that supports the building and

repairing of our roads, highways and bridges, and hundreds of thousands of jobs all across our country. Although I support acting quickly to replenish the highway trust fund, I am very disappointed that this bill is being brought up under a closed rule, ensuring that we cannot consider alternative and more robust funding mechanisms.

Although the Highway and Transportation Funding Act presents a solution that will extend surface transportation authorization until next May and ensure the highway trust fund does not become insolvent next month, a short-term solution is not enough. We have to find a long-term solution to this issue that secures real investments in rebuilding America. Due to the nature of construction projects, of course, States, localities, and contractors need long-term financing to allow for the proper planning of infrastructure projects. The uncertainty has already put important transportation projects at risk, so this governing by crisis must end.

Earlier this month, I welcomed Transportation Secretary Anthony Foxx to Rhode Island, and we discussed the urgent need to replenish the highway trust fund to help maintain Rhode Island's transportation infrastructure system and the absolute necessity of a long-term and sustainable funding model. We met with local, State, and Federal leaders and stakeholders to hear their concerns and to discuss a path forward.

This closed rule does not allow us to offer any solution to this problem. I urge my colleagues to reject this closed rule so that we can address this serious issue in a real way.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, if—or should I say when—we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will bring up legislation that will prevent employers from denying common birth control coverage to women, and it will fix the damage that has been done by the recent Hobby Lobby Supreme Court decision. Now more than ever, it is critical to protect everyone's right to health services, including that of basic contraception.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Madam Speaker, in January of this year, I joined over 90 of my House colleagues in filing an amicus brief with the Supreme Court in advance of the arguments in *Hobby Lobby v. Sebelius*.

The free exercise of religion is one of our country's foundational principles and greatest strengths, but so too is the fundamental commitment to equality and fairness—the core idea that the rights and privileges of one American never snuff out the rights and privileges of one's neighbor's.

We are disappointed in the Court's ruling that closely held corporations can now place themselves between patients and doctors. We are disappointed that it is yet another blow to women's health. We are disappointed in yet another threat to the economic security of women and families, and we are disappointed that, for the first time, our Supreme Court gave a religious exemption to a generally applicable law to a for-profit corporation.

For-profit corporations do not exist to advance the interests of individuals with a shared religious faith, and in fact, they are prohibited by law from hiring, firing, or structuring their memberships on the basis of religion.

I am proud to stand with Representatives SLAUGHTER, DEGETTE, and NADLER in offering legislation to keep private medical decisions between patients and their doctors, and I look forward to the day that our laws acknowledge that corporations are not people and that the constitutional rights of an individual are what this country is formed to enshrine and protect.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I just want to remind the audience or anyone listening that we are talking about a rule that is dealing with transportation funding and about extending it so that we can continue the jobs necessary and finish the projects that have been started in States and so that we can start new ones. That is what we are talking about here and not necessarily about the issue that was just presented.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, with due respect to my colleague from Florida, the gentleman is incorrect.

We have stated it and will offer the language on the previous question. So, as long as we can have the votes to defeat the previous question, we will be able to bring to the floor under the procedures of this body a bill that will ensure that women have access to contraception as part of basic health care. That is under the rules of this House—by defeating the previous question now being discussed and that I will offer—and we will be able to move forward on ensuring that women have access to comprehensive birth control.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Thank you, Mr. POLIS.

Madam Speaker, I rise, like my colleague Mr. KENNEDY, to urge a “no” vote on the previous question so that we can discuss a matter that is very urgent to the women of this country.

The most blessed moment of my life was the birth of my son, Ben. His life has brought me great joy as well as great responsibilities. The decision to bring Ben into the world was a private decision, made by his father and me. We didn't call our Congressman, and we didn't call my employer.

Now it appears, with the Hobby Lobby case, that the Supreme Court of the United States seems to think that

life begins at incorporation. I vehemently disagree. Employers belong in the workplace and not in the doctor's office or in our bedrooms. That is why I am a proud cosponsor of the not my boss' business act, which will ban a corporation from using its owner's religious belief to deny health care coverage for contraception. No one should lose access to birth control because her company doesn't approve of it. A woman's family planning decision is not her boss' decision, and it is none of her boss' business.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a leader on the issue.

□ 1400

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank the gentleman from Colorado and, as well, the manager of this rule.

I too rise to be able to push for voting "no" on the previous question, dealing with making sure that we fix the taking away of women's rights as it relates to choice and pass the it is not my boss's business legislation that gets us back right-side up, taking care of women and their rights, in particular, as it relates to their own body and their family choices as well, to make sure that they have the right to take care of their own family.

Let me also say that I would wish and had hoped that the present underlying bill, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act, was truly a bill that committed to the American people that we believe in the investment of infrastructure in creating jobs.

This is not what this bill is. This is a temporary fix, saying to the American cities and transit centers, our transit facilities, and buses and highways and freeways, that you are only a side thought here in the United States Congress. We will give you a small amount of money, transferring \$9.8 billion from the general fund and \$1 billion from the leaking underground storage tank trust fund, just to give you a temporary fix. We are going to put a finger in the dam.

We are not going to have a concerted, concentrated, responsible assessment of America's transportation needs so that we can fund it. We are not going to ask Houston metro what monies they need. We are not going to ask Texas what monies they need. We are not going to ask New York or California.

I would simply say we have got to get away from the I don't believe in government crowd and work with the people who understand that government has a role. The Federal Government has a role. It is a rescue facility. It is an SOS. It helps people in need, when the States are in need, and it helps to build infrastructure.

The highway system that President Eisenhower, a Republican, created—

which we have been recognized for—here, we are nickel-and-diming, so I hope that we will get down to the table, work with those of us who are concerned.

Finally, vote "no" on the previous question because it is not your boss's business. If you want to have family planning, it is certainly not your boss's business.

Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security, I rise in to speak on the rule and in support of the underlying bill, H.R. 5021, the "Highway and Transportation Funding Act," which reauthorizes federal-aid highway and transit programs for eight months—through May 31, 2015—by transferring \$10.8 billion from in other federal funds to the Highway Trust Fund to cover projected trust fund shortfalls over that time.

Instead of this temporary extension, I would have strongly preferred that we were debating a comprehensive, fair, equitable, and long-term transportation reauthorization bill the nation desperately needs. We have had two years to do so.

Democrats want such a bill as does the President. But apparently our friends across the aisle do not since they have spent the last two years wasting time on advocating policies wanted by no one except for the right-wing extremists of the Tea Party.

But I support this emergency but temporary measure because as the Department of Transportation has reported, if we do not act now highway trust fund balances by the beginning of August will reach dangerously low levels and result in a reduction of payments to states by an average of 28 percent.

Many states have already begun to cancel or delay planned construction projects, threatening 700,000 thousands of jobs, including 106,100 jobs in my home state of Texas.

The funds to be transferred are \$9.8 billion from the General Fund and \$1 billion from the Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) Trust Fund. The cost of the transfer from the general fund of the Treasury is offset through an extension of customs fees and "pension smoothing," which is a euphemism for allowing some large corporations to underfund their pension systems.

Madam Speaker, the Highway Trust Fund was created in 1956 during the Eisenhower Administration to help finance construction of the Interstate Highway System, which modernized the nation's transportation infrastructure and was instrumental in making the United States the world's dominant economic power for two generations. Our national leaders then understood that investing in our roads and bridges strengthened our economy, created millions of good-paying jobs, and improved the quality of life for all Americans.

It is currently composed of two accounts that fund federal-aid highway and transit projects built by states. Federal funding from the trust fund accounts for a major portion of state transportation spending.

The Highway Trust Fund is financed by gasoline and diesel taxes, which until the last decade produced a steady increase in revenues sufficient to accommodate increased levels of spending on highway and transit projects.

However, those tax rates—18.4 cents/gallon federal tax on gasoline and a 24.4 cents/gallon tax on diesel fuel—have remained unchanged since 1993 and were not indexed to

inflation so the value of those revenues has eroded over the years, and, combined with the fact that vehicles have been getting increasingly better mileage, the revenues deposited into the Highway Trust Fund beginning last decade have not kept pace with highway and transit spending from the trust fund.

Consequently, since 2008, Congress has periodically had to transfer at the 11th hour general Treasury revenues into the trust fund to pay for authorized highway and transit spending levels and avoid a funding shortfall. The total amount to date is \$54 billion.

Obviously, this is practice is economically inefficient and injects uncertainty in the highway construction plans, projects, and schedules of state and local transportation agencies, not to mention the anxiety it causes to workers and businesses who economic livelihood is dependent on those projects.

Madam Speaker, the last transportation authorized by Congress for 4 years or more, SAFETEA-LU, expired on September 30, 2009, at the end of FY 2009. Because Congress and the Administration could not agree to a new reauthorization, it was necessary to resort to stop-gap temporary extensions on no less than eight occasions spanning a period of 910 days before Congress finally enacted the "Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act" (MAP-21 Act) on July 6, 2012, which reauthorized highway and transportation programs through Fiscal Year 2014, a little more than two years, or until September 30, 2014.

MAP-21 was intended as a short-term measure to give Congress and the Administration breathing room to reach agreement on a long-term reauthorization bill.

Yet, as Mr. LEVIN, the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, has pointed out, since gaining the majority in 2010, his Republican colleagues have failed to take any action to sustain the Highway Trust Fund over the long-term and shore up vital infrastructure projects and has not held even a single hearing on financing options for the Highway Trust Fund.

Instead, House Republicans have wasted the nation's time voting to repeal the Affordable Care Act more than 50 times, waging a War on Women, voting to hold the Attorney General in contempt, pursuing partisan investigations into Benghazi, the IRS, and the Fast and Furious scandal originating in the Bush Administration.

Instead of doing their job, their big new idea is to sue the President for doing his job.

Madam Speaker, enough is enough. It is long past time for this Congress, and especially the House majority, to focus on the real problems and challenges facing the American people.

And one of the biggest of those challenges is ensuring that American has a transportation policy and the infrastructure needed to compete and win in the global economy of the 21st Century.

To that we have to do extend the reauthorization of current transportation programs and to authorize the transfer of the funds to the Highway Trust Fund needed to fund authorized construction projects and keep 700,000 workers, including 106,100 in Texas on the job.

But that is only a start and just a part of our job. The real work that needs to be done in the remaining days of this Congress is to reach an agreement on a long-term highway

and transportation bill that is fair, equitable, fiscally responsible, creates jobs and leads to sustained economic growth.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the Supreme Court's Hobby Lobby decision took direct aim at women's rights by giving employers a legal right to make personal health decisions for their employees.

This devastating ruling opened the door to a wide range of discrimination and denial of basic health care services for women. Now, all closely held corporations, which represent 90 percent of American businesses, can legally impose their own religious beliefs on female employees.

That is why I am proud to be a co-sponsor of the not my boss' business act, which would undo this damage and prevent for-profit companies from using the religious beliefs of the owner as an excuse to discriminate against women and limit their individual health care rights and choices.

Ninety-nine percent of American women will make the decision to use contraceptives at some point in their lives. What rights do corporations have to deny them this choice?

The Hobby Lobby decision is a significant step backwards for women's health and equality, so I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question, so that we can bring up and consider this important legislation and move bosses out of the bedroom and back into the boardroom.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I would like to inquire if the gentleman from Florida has any remaining speakers.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. No, Madam Speaker, we don't.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, this Congress seems committed to kicking the can down the road, avoiding discussions of real solutions, failing to solicit ideas from Members of both sides of the aisle to move our country forward, and just stumbling along.

I think we can do better as a Nation, and we need to do better with regard to our Nation's infrastructure.

Yes, this bill funds the highway trust fund until next May. That is important; but what happens after May 2015? Is that the magic month where we finally agree that we need to take long-term action to address our Nation's crumbling roads and bridges?

This Congress continues to manage self-imposed crisis to self-imposed crisis. That is no way to run a company. It is certainly no way to run a country.

As long as we kick the can down the road, we are reducing the certainty that developers and contractors need to plan for the future and increasing costs for taxpayers for supporting our existing infrastructure.

We are undercutting opportunities for public-private partnerships because of the lack of stability or even knowing when or if or in what form the highway trust fund will be funded in the future.

If we don't act to provide stability to the highway trust fund, we are not only putting our economy at risk, but the safety and well-being of all those who send us here as their representatives. It is not only a competitiveness issue. It is a safety issue for the American people.

Madam 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. When we defeat the previous question, we can send our colleagues back to work with regard to infrastructure and a long-term solution and address an issue that my constituents have been writing me about and that American women and men across the country have been crying out for.

Contraception was a tremendous leap forward for women and for the American people. It empowers women to make the reproductive choices that make sense for them and their families. It reduces the number of abortions. It helps ensure that children are planned and well-raised, yet the recent Supreme Court decision throws into jeopardy the availability of contraception as a basic part of comprehensive health care.

By defeating the previous question, we can bring to the floor a simple bill that I strongly support that would remedy that and ensure that women have access to contraceptive choices as part of their basic health care and prevent us returning to the pre-contraception era.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

This rule provides for ample and open debate. It advances a bill that originally passed the House 373-52, one of the most bipartisan votes we have had since I have been here.

The underlying bill extends good public policy. That policy was supported, like I said, by 373 Members of the House, 74 in the Senate, and signed by the President.

While we must look forward to the passage of another multiyear transportation authorization, there is no reason we should not pass the extension. Cer-

tainty means "the state of being free from doubt or reservation; confident; sure."

Extending our transportation programs until next summer provides our States with certainty. It also ensures that our highway trust fund does not become insolvent at the end of this month.

This extension will keep our transportation construction workers on the job. It will keep our transit systems functioning at full capacity. It will continue our investments in our economy. It will do all these things, without raising taxes on the American people.

Most importantly, it advances the process of a multiyear transportation bill. I look forward to working with Chairman SHUSTER and other members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure as we focus on producing a long-term bill that strengthens our transportation programs.

The passage of this extension gives us the opportunity to work together and produce a solution that continues to deliver an unmatched transportation system for the American people. It is our responsibility to make sure that that happens.

This bill is the last chance to fulfill our responsibility to the American people and to provide our States with certainty before the highway trust fund reaches insolvency.

I urge all Members of this House to vote for the rule, vote for the bill, keep our transportation systems operating, and let us work together for a long-term solution.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 669 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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. 5051) to ensure that employers cannot interfere in their employees' birth control and other health care decisions. 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 among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. 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. 5051.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alter-

native views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Madam Speaker, 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. POLIS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 192, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 407]

YEAS—228

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

Southerland Upton
 Stewart Valadao
 Stivers Wagner
 Stockman Walberg
 Stutzman Walden
 Terry Walorski
 Thompson (PA) Weber (TX)
 Thornberry Webster (FL)
 Tiberi Wenstrup
 Tipton Westmoreland
 Turner Whitfield

Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Wolf
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IN)

NAYS—192

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

NOT VOTING—12

Byrne DesJarlais Miller, Gary
 Campbell Hanabusa Nunnelee
 Cantor Kingston Roskam
 Carney Lewis Williams

□ 1440

Ms. DEGETTE, Messrs. BRADY of Pennsylvania, O'ROURKE, PAYNE, NOLAN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. POMPEO, MULLIN, JOHN-SON of Ohio, and PETERSON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). 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. POLIS. 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 231, noes 186, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 408]

AYES—231

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

Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf

Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho

Young (AK)
Young (IN)

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 661 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5016.

Will the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) kindly take the chair.

□ 1449

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5016) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, with Mr. BISHOP of Utah (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Monday, July 14, 2014, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 152, line 15.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

An amendment by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

An amendment by Mr. ROSKAM of Illinois.

An amendment by Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

An amendment by Ms. WATERS of California.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 161, noes 258, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 409]

AYES—161

Amash	Beatty	Bonamici
Barber	Becerra	Brady (PA)
Barletta	Bera (CA)	Broun (GA)
Barrow (GA)	Bishop (GA)	Brown (FL)
Bass	Blumenauer	Brownley (CA)

NOES—186

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

NOT VOTING—15

Black	Chu	Kingston
Byrne	DesJarlais	Lewis
Campbell	Garrett	Miller, Gary
Cantor	Gohmert	Nunnelee
Carney	Hanabusa	Williams

□ 1447

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.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dingell
Doyle
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson
Green, Gene
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez

Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebuck
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney,
Caroly
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Miller, George
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Nolan
O'Rourke

NOES—258

Aderholt
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barr
Barton
Benishke
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Capuano
Carter
Cassidy
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clark (MA)
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson

Owens
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Pelosi
Peters (CA)
Pingree (ME)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sinema
Sires
Payne
Smith (WA)
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Neal
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Byrne
Campbell
Cantor
Carney
Chu
DesJarlais
Hanabusa
Kingston
Lewis
Miller, Gary

NOT VOTING—13

Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
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
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schneider
Schock
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1453

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROSKAM

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the ayes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 338, noes 80,
not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 410]

AYES—338

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barber
Bartletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Benishke
Bentivolio
Bera (CA)
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan

Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Cleave
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doyle
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Esty
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Griffin (AR)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)

Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Horsford
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Lankford
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebuck
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maffei
Maloney,
Caroly
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem

Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Waters

Weber (TX)	Wilson (FL)	Woodall	DeLauro	Kind	Pocan	Noem	Rooney	Stutzman
Webster (FL)	Wilson (SC)	Yoder	DeBene	Kirkpatrick	Poe (TX)	Nolan	Ros-Lehtinen	Terry
Wenstrup	Wittman	Yoho	Deutch	Kuster	Polis	Nugent	Roskam	Thompson (PA)
Westmoreland	Wolf	Young (AK)	Dingell	Langevin	Price (NC)	Nunes	Ross	Thornberry
Whitfield	Womack	Young (IN)	Doggett	Larsen (WA)	Quigley	Olson	Rothfus	Tiberi
			Doyle	Larson (CT)	Rangel	Palazzo	Roybal-Allard	Tipton
	NOES—80		Duckworth	Lee (CA)	Richmond	Paulsen	Royce	Tsongas
Beatty	Hoyer	Richmond	Edwards	Levin	Ruiz	Pearce	Runyan	Turner
Blumenauer	Huffman	Roybal-Allard	Engel	Lipinski	Ruppersberger	Perry	Ryan (OH)	Upton
Bonamici	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez, Linda	Enyart	Loebsack	Rush	Peterson	Ryan (WI)	Valadao
Braley (IA)	Johnson, E. B.	T.	Esty	Lofgren	Sanchez, Loretta	Petri	Salmon	Visclosky
Brooks (AL)	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta	Farr	Lowenthal	Sarbanes	Pittenger	Sanford	Wagner
Butterfield	Kildee	Sarbanes	Fattah	Lowe	Schakowsky	Pitts	Schock	Walberg
Capuano	Kind	Schakowsky	Foster	Lujan Grisham	Schiff	Pompeo	Schrader	Walden
Carson (IN)	Kirkpatrick	Schneider	Frankel (FL)	(NM)	Schneider	Posey	Schweikert	Walorski
Clark (MA)	Larsen (WA)	Schrader	Fudge	Luján, Ben Ray	Schwartz	Price (GA)	Scott (VA)	Weber (TX)
Clay	Lee (CA)	Schwartz	Gabbard	(NM)	Scott, David	Rahall	Scott, Austin	Webster (FL)
Connolly	Levin	Scott (VA)	Garamendi	Lynch	Sewell (AL)	Reed	Sensenbrenner	Weststrub
Conyers	Long	Scott, David	Garcia	Maffei	Shea-Porter	Reichert	Serrano	Westmoreland
Cummings	Lynch	Sherman	Grayson	Maloney,	Sherman	Renacci	Sessions	Whitfield
Davis (CA)	Matheson	Sires	Green, Al	Carolyn	Sinema	Ribble	Shimkus	Wilson (SC)
Davis, Danny	McGovern	Smith (WA)	Green, Gene	Maloney, Sean	Sires	Rice (SC)	Shuster	Wittman
DeLauro	Michaud	Speier	Grijalva	Matsui	Slaughter	Rigell	Simpson	Wolf
Doggett	Miller, George	Speier	Gutiérrez	McDermott	Smith (WA)	Roby	Smith (MO)	Womack
Edwards	Moore	Tierney	Hahn	McGovern	Speier	Roe (TN)	Smith (NE)	Woodall
Ellison	Moran	Tonko	Hastings (FL)	McNerney	Swalwell (CA)	Rogers (AL)	Smith (NJ)	Yoder
Eshoo	Nadler	Van Hollen	Heck (WA)	Meeks	Takano	Rogers (KY)	Smith (TX)	Yoho
Farr	Neal	Veasey	Higgins	Meng	Thompson (CA)	Rogers (MI)	Southerland	Young (AK)
Fattah	O'Rourke	Velázquez	Himes	Michaud	Thompson (MS)	Stewart	Stewart	Young (IN)
Fudge	Pallone	Wasserman	Hinojosa	Miller, George	Tierney	Rokita	Stockman	
Grayson	Pascrell	Schultz	Holt	Moore	Titus			
Green, Al	Perlmutter	Waxman	Honda	Murphy (FL)	Tonko			
Green, Gene	Pingree (ME)	Welch	Horsford	Nadler	Van Hollen	Brady (TX)	Hanabusa	Sánchez, Linda
Gutiérrez	Pocan	Yarmuth	Hoyer	Napolitano	Vargas	Byrne	Kingston	T.
Honda	Price (NC)		Huffman	Neal	Veasey	Campbell	Lewis	Scalise
			Israel	Negrete McLeod	Vela	Cantor	Miller, Gary	Stivers
			Jackson Lee	O'Rourke	Velázquez	Carney	Nunnelee	Williams
			Jeffries	Pascrell	Walz	Chu	Owens	
			Johnson (GA)	Pastor (AZ)	Wasserman	DesJarlais	Pallone	
			Kaptur	Payne	Schultz			
			Keating	Pelosi	Waters			
			Kelly (IL)	Perlmutter	Waxman			
			Kennedy	Peters (CA)	Welch			
			Kildee	Peters (MI)	Wilson (FL)			
			Kilmer	Pingree (ME)	Yarmuth			

NOT VOTING—18

Brady (TX)	Hanabusa	Sánchez, Linda
Byrne	Kingston	T.
Campbell	Lewis	Scalise
Cantor	Miller, Gary	Stivers
Carney	Nunnelee	Williams
Chu	Owens	
DesJarlais	Pallone	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1500

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentlewoman from California (Ms.
WATERS) on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the noes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 184, noes 235,
not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 412]

AYES—184

Byrne	DesJarlais	Miller, Gary	Aderholt	Duffy	Jenkins
Campbell	Garamendi	Nunnelee	Amash	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (OH)
Cantor	Hanabusa	Royce	Amodei	Duncan (TN)	Johnson, E. B.
Carney	Kingston	Williams	Bachmann	Ellison	Johnson, Sam
Chu	Lewis		Bachus	Ellmers	Jolly
			Barletta	Eshoo	Jones
			Barr	Farenthold	Jordan
			Barrow (GA)	Fincher	Joyce
			Barton	Fitzpatrick	Kelly (PA)
			Becerra	Fleischmann	King (IA)
			Benishek	Fleming	King (NY)
			Bentivolio	Flores	Kinzinger (IL)
			Bilirakis	Forbes	Kline
			Bishop (UT)	Fortenberry	Labrador
			Black	Fox	LaMalfa
			Blackburn	Franks (AZ)	Lamborn
			Boustany	Frelinghuysen	Lance
			Bridenstine	Gallego	Lankford
			Brooks (AL)	Gardner	Latham
			Brooks (IN)	Garrett	Latta
			Broun (GA)	Gerlach	LoBiondo
			Buchanan	Gibbs	Long
			Bucshon	Gibson	Lucas
			Burgess	Gingrey (GA)	Luetkemeyer
			Calvert	Gohmert	Lummis
			Capito	Goodlatte	Marchant
			Carter	Gosar	Marino
			Cassidy	Gowdy	Massie
			Chabot	Granger	Matheson
			Chaffetz	Graves (GA)	McAllister
			Clawson (FL)	Graves (MO)	McCarthy (CA)
			Clay	Griffin (AR)	McCarthy (NY)
			Coble	Griffith (VA)	McCaul
			Coffman	Grimm	McClintock
			Cole	Guthrie	McCollum
			Collins (GA)	Hall	McHenry
			Collins (NY)	Hanna	McIntyre
			Conaway	Harper	McKeon
			Cook	Harris	McKinley
			Cooper	Hartzler	McMorris
			Cotton	Hastings (WA)	Rodgers
			Cramer	Heck (NV)	Meadows
			Crawford	Hensarling	Meehan
			Crenshaw	Herrera Beutler	Messer
			Cuellar	Holding	Mica
			Cummings	Hudson	Miller (FL)
			Daines	Huelskamp	Miller (MI)
			Davis, Rodney	Huizenga (MI)	Moran
			Davis, Danny	Hultgren	Mullin
			DeFazio	Hunter	Mulvaney
			DeGette	Hurt	Murphy (PA)
			DeLauro	Issa	Neugebauer
			Delaney		
Barber	Butterfield	Cohen			
Bass	Capps	Connolly			
Beatty	Capuano	Conyers			
Bera (CA)	Cárdenas	Costa			
Bishop (GA)	Carson (IN)	Courtney			
Bishop (NY)	Cartwright	Crowley			
Blumenauer	Castor (FL)	Cuellar			
Bonamici	Castro (TX)	Cummings			
Brady (PA)	Cicilline	Davis (CA)			
Braley (IA)	Clark (MA)	Davis, Danny			
Brown (FL)	Clarke (NY)	DeFazio			
Brownley (CA)	Cleaver	DeGette			
Bustos	Clyburn	Delaney			
			Bachus	Carson (IN)	Davis, Danny
			Barber	Cartwright	DeFazio
			Bass	Castor (FL)	DeGette
			Beatty	Castro (TX)	Delaney
			Becerra	Cicilline	DeLauro
			Bera (CA)	Clark (MA)	DeBene
			Bishop (GA)	Clarke (NY)	Deutch
			Bishop (NY)	Clay	Dingell
			Blumenauer	Cleaver	Doggett
			Bonamici	Clyburn	Doyle
			Brady (PA)	Cohen	Duckworth
			Braley (IA)	Connolly	Edwards
			Brown (FL)	Conyers	Ellison
			Brownley (CA)	Cooper	Engel
			Bustos	Courtney	Enyart
			Butterfield	Crowley	Esty
			Capps	Cuellar	Fattah
			Capuano	Cummings	Foster
			Cárdenas	Davis (CA)	Frankel (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Byrne	DesJarlais	Miller, Gary
Campbell	Garamendi	Nunnelee
Cantor	Hanabusa	Royce
Carney	Kingston	Williams
Chu	Lewis	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1457

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois
changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms.
MOORE) on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the noes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 170, noes 244,
not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 411]

AYES—170

Barber	Butterfield	Cohen
Bass	Capps	Connolly
Beatty	Capuano	Conyers
Bera (CA)	Cárdenas	Costa
Bishop (GA)	Carson (IN)	Courtney
Bishop (NY)	Cartwright	Crowley
Blumenauer	Castor (FL)	Cuellar
Bonamici	Castro (TX)	Cummings
Brady (PA)	Cicilline	Davis (CA)
Braley (IA)	Clark (MA)	Davis, Danny
Brown (FL)	Clarke (NY)	DeFazio
Brownley (CA)	Cleaver	DeGette
Bustos	Clyburn	Delaney

Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsock
Lofgren
Lowenthal

Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Polis
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
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry

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

NOT VOTING—13

Byrne
Campbell
Cantor
Carney
Chu
DesJarlais
Eshoo
Hanabusa
Kingston
Miller, Gary
Nunnelee
Sinema
Williams

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1503

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) having assumed the chair, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5016) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE CONSIDERED AS FIRST SPONSOR OF H.R. 1810

Mr. CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the first sponsor of H.R. 1810, a bill originally introduced by Representative Radel of Florida, for the purposes of adding cosponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?
There was no objection.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE FORMER LIBERIAN REGIME OF CHARLES TAYLOR—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113-135)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message

from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the former Liberian regime of Charles Taylor declared in Executive Order 13348 of July 22, 2004, is to continue in effect beyond July 22, 2014.

Although Liberia has made significant advances to promote democracy, and the Special Court for Sierra Leone convicted Charles Taylor for war crimes and crimes against humanity, the actions and policies of former Liberian President Charles Taylor and other persons, in particular their unlawful depletion of Liberian resources and their removal from Liberia and secreting of Liberian funds and property, still challenge Liberia's efforts to strengthen its democracy and the orderly development of its political, administrative, and economic institutions. These actions and policies continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to the former Liberian regime of Charles Taylor.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 15, 2014.

HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2014

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 5021.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?
There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 669, I call up the bill (H.R. 5021) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 669, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, modified

NOES—235

Aderholt
Amash
Amodi
Bachmann
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Farr
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)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Maffei
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Negrete McLeod
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce

by the amendments printed in House Report 113-521, are adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 5021

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM EXTENSION

Subtitle A—Federal-Aid Highways

Sec. 1001. Extension of Federal-aid highway programs.

Sec. 1002. Administrative expenses.

Subtitle B—Extension of Highway Safety Programs

Sec. 1101. Extension of National Highway Traffic Safety Administration highway safety programs.

Sec. 1102. Extension of Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration programs.

Sec. 1103. Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act.

Subtitle C—Public Transportation Programs

Sec. 1201. Formula grants for rural areas.

Sec. 1202. Apportionment of appropriations for formula grants.

Sec. 1203. Authorizations for public transportation.

Sec. 1204. Bus and bus facilities formula grants.

Subtitle D—Hazardous Materials

Sec. 1301. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE II—REVENUE PROVISIONS

Sec. 2001. Extension of Highway Trust Fund expenditure authority.

Sec. 2002. Funding of Highway Trust Fund.

Sec. 2003. Funding stabilization.

Sec. 2004. Extension of Customs user fees.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the existing Highway Trust Fund system is unsustainable and unable to meet our Nation’s 21st century transportation needs;

(2) MAP-21 included important reforms that must be built upon in the next reauthorization bill to increase the efficient and effective utilization of Federal funding;

(3) these reforms should include the elimination of duplicative Federal regulations and increase the authority and responsibility of the States to safely and efficiently build, operate, and fund transportation systems that best serve the needs of their citizens, including the ability of each State to implement innovative solutions, while also maintaining the appropriate Federal role in transportation; and

(4) Congress should enact and the President should sign a surface transportation reauthorization and reform bill prior to the expiration of this Act.

TITLE I—SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM EXTENSION

Subtitle A—Federal-Aid Highways

SEC. 1001. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAMS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in this subtitle, requirements, authorities, conditions, eligibilities, limitations, and other provisions authorized under divisions A and E of MAP-21 (Public Law 112-141), the SAFETEA-LU Technical Corrections Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-244), titles I, V, and VI

of SAFETEA-LU (Public Law 109-59), titles I and V of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (Public Law 105-178), the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995 (104-59), titles I and VI of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-240), and title 23, United States Code (excluding chapter 4 of that title), which would otherwise expire on or cease to apply after September 30, 2014, are incorporated by reference and shall continue in effect until May 31, 2015.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—

(1) **HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.**—Except as provided in section 1002, there is authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015, a sum equal to ²⁴³/₃₆₅ of the total amount authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund for programs, projects, and activities for fiscal year 2014 under divisions A and E of MAP-21 (Public Law 112-141) and title 23, United States Code (excluding chapter 4 of that title).

(2) **GENERAL FUND.**—Section 1123(h)(1) of MAP-21 (23 U.S.C. 202 note) is amended by inserting “and \$19,972,603 out of the general fund of the Treasury to carry out the program for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015” before the period at the end.

(c) **USE OF FUNDS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise expressly provided in this subtitle, funds authorized to be appropriated under subsection (b)(1) for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015, shall be distributed, administered, limited, and made available for obligation in the same manner and at the same levels as ²⁴³/₃₆₅ of the amounts of funds authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for fiscal year 2014 to carry out programs, projects, activities, eligibilities, and requirements under MAP-21 (Public Law 112-141), the SAFETEA-LU Technical Corrections Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-244), SAFETEA-LU (Public Law 109-59), titles I and V of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (Public Law 105-178), the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995 (104-59), titles I and VI of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-240), and title 23, United States Code (excluding chapter 4 of that title).

(2) **CONTRACT AUTHORITY.**—Funds authorized to be appropriated out of the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) under this section shall be—

(A) available for obligation and shall be administered in the same manner as if such funds were apportioned under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code; and

(B) subject to section 1102 of MAP-21 (23 U.S.C. 104 note), as amended by this subsection.

(3) **OBLIGATION CEILING.**—Section 1102 of MAP-21 (23 U.S.C. 104 note) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (1);

(ii) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting “; and”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) \$26,800,569,863 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015.”;

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (10) by striking “2011” and inserting “2012”; and

(ii) in paragraph (12) by inserting “, and for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015, only in an amount equal to \$639,000,000, less any reductions that would have otherwise been required for that

year by section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a), then multiplied by ²⁴³/₃₆₅ for that period” after “those fiscal years”;

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting “and for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015” after “2014”;

(ii) by striking paragraph (1)(A) and inserting the following:

“(A) amounts provided for administrative expenses and programs; and”;

(iii) in paragraph (2) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by inserting “or, for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending May 31, 2015, that is equal to ²⁴³/₃₆₅ of such unobligated balance” after “unobligated balance of amounts”;

(iv) in paragraph (5) by striking “section 204” and inserting “sections 202 and 204”; and

(v) by inserting “or period” after “the fiscal year” each place it appears;

(D) in subsection (d) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “2014” and inserting “2015”;

(E) in subsection (f)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by inserting “and for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015” after “2014”; and

(II) by inserting “or period” after “the fiscal year” each place it appears; and

(ii) in paragraph (3) by striking “section 133(c)” and inserting “section 133(b)”.

SEC. 1002. ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any other law, there is authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account), from amounts provided under section 1001, for administrative expenses of the Federal-aid highway program \$292,931,507 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015.

(b) **CONTRACT AUTHORITY.**—Funds authorized to be appropriated by this section shall be—

(1) available for obligation, and shall be administered, in the same manner as if such funds were apportioned under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, except that such funds shall remain available until expended; and

(2) subject to the limitation on obligations for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015, specified in section 1102 of MAP-21 (23 U.S.C. 104 note), as amended by this subtitle.

Subtitle B—Extension of Highway Safety Programs

SEC. 1101. EXTENSION OF NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.

(a) **EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS.**—

(1) **HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.**—Section 31101(a)(1) of MAP-21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) \$156,452,055 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015.”.

(2) **HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.**—Section 31101(a)(2) of MAP-21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) \$75,563,014 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015.”.

(3) NATIONAL PRIORITY SAFETY PROGRAMS.—Section 31101(a)(3) of MAP–21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) \$181,084,932 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015.”.

(4) NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER.—Section 31101(a)(4) of MAP–21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) \$3,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015.”.

(5) HIGH VISIBILITY ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM.—

(A) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 31101(a)(5) of MAP–21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A) by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (B) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) \$19,306,849 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015.”.

(B) LAW ENFORCEMENT CAMPAIGNS.—Section 2009(a) of SAFETEA–LU (23 U.S.C. 402 note) is amended—

(i) in the first sentence by inserting “and in the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015” after “fiscal years 2013 and 2014”; and

(ii) in the second sentence by inserting “and in the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” after “fiscal years 2013 and 2014”.

(6) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 31101(a)(6) of MAP–21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) \$16,976,712 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015.”.

(b) COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.—Section 403(f)(1) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by inserting “ending before October 1, 2014, and \$1,664,384 of the total amount available for apportionment to the States for highway safety programs under section 402(c) in the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” after “each fiscal year”.

(c) APPLICABILITY OF TITLE 23.—Section 31101(c) of MAP–21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended by inserting “and for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” after “fiscal years 2013 and 2014”.

SEC. 1102. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS.

(a) MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY GRANTS.—Section 31104(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (8);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (9) and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(10) \$145,134,247 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015.”.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 31104(i)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (H);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (I) and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(J) \$172,430,137 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015.”.

(c) GRANT PROGRAMS.—

(1) COMMERCIAL DRIVER’S LICENSE PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT GRANTS.—Section 4101(c)(1) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and \$19,972,603 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015”.

(2) BORDER ENFORCEMENT GRANTS.—Section 4101(c)(2) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and \$21,304,110 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015”.

(3) PERFORMANCE AND REGISTRATION INFORMATION SYSTEM MANAGEMENT GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 4101(c)(3) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and \$3,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015”.

(4) COMMERCIAL VEHICLE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND NETWORKS DEPLOYMENT PROGRAM.—Section 4101(c)(4) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and \$16,643,836 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015”.

(5) SAFETY DATA IMPROVEMENT GRANTS.—Section 4101(c)(5) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and \$1,997,260 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015”.

(d) HIGH-PRIORITY ACTIVITIES.—Section 31104(k)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting “and up to \$9,986,301 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” after “2014”.

(e) NEW ENTRANT AUDITS.—Section 31144(g)(5)(B) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting “and up to \$21,304,110 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” after “per fiscal year”.

(f) OUTREACH AND EDUCATION.—Section 4127(e) of SAFETEA–LU (119 Stat. 1741) is amended by inserting “and \$2,663,014 to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” after “2014”.

(g) GRANT PROGRAM FOR COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATORS.—Section 4134(c) of SAFETEA–LU (49 U.S.C. 31301 note) is amended by inserting “and \$665,753 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” after “2014”.

SEC. 1103. DINGELL-JOHNSON SPORT FISH RESTORATION ACT.

Section 4 of the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting “and for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015” after “2014”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(A) by striking “for each” and all that follows before “the Secretary of the Interior” and inserting “for each fiscal year ending before October 1, 2014, and for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015.”.

Subtitle C—Public Transportation Programs

SEC. 1201. FORMULA GRANTS FOR RURAL AREAS.

Section 5311(c)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) by inserting “for each fiscal year ending before October 1, 2014, and \$3,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” before “shall be distributed”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B) by inserting “for each fiscal year ending before October 1, 2014, and \$16,643,836 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” before “shall be apportioned”.

SEC. 1202. APPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FORMULA GRANTS.

Section 5336(h)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting “for each fiscal year ending before October 1, 2014, and \$19,972,603 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” before “shall be set aside”.

SEC. 1203. AUTHORIZATIONS FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION.

(a) FORMULA GRANTS.—Section 5338(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking “and \$8,595,000,000 for fiscal year 2014” and inserting “, \$8,595,000,000 for fiscal year 2014, and \$5,722,150,685 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking “and \$128,800,000 for fiscal year 2014” and inserting “, \$128,800,000 for fiscal year 2014, and \$85,749,041 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015”;

(B) in subparagraph (B) by inserting “and \$6,657,534 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” after “2014”;

(C) in subparagraph (C) by striking “and \$4,458,650,000 for fiscal year 2014” and inserting “, \$4,458,650,000 for fiscal year 2014, and \$2,968,361,507 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015”;

(D) in subparagraph (D) by striking “and \$258,300,000 for fiscal year 2014” and inserting “, \$258,300,000 for fiscal year 2014, and \$171,964,110 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015”;

(E) in subparagraph (E)—

(i) by striking “and \$607,800,000 for fiscal year 2014” and inserting “, \$607,800,000 for fiscal year 2014, and \$404,644,932 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015”;

(ii) by striking “and \$30,000,000 for fiscal year 2014” and inserting “, \$30,000,000 for fiscal year 2014, and \$19,972,603 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015”;

(iii) by striking “and \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2014” and inserting “, \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2014, and \$13,315,068 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015”;

(F) in subparagraph (F) by inserting “and \$1,997,260 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” after “2014”;

(G) in subparagraph (G) by inserting “and \$3,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” after “2014”;

(H) in subparagraph (H) by inserting “and \$2,563,151 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” after “2014”;

(I) in subparagraph (I) by striking “and \$2,165,900,000 for fiscal year 2014” and inserting “, \$2,165,900,000 for fiscal year 2014, and \$1,441,955,342 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015”;

(J) in subparagraph (J) by striking “and \$427,800,000 for fiscal year 2014” and inserting “, \$427,800,000 for fiscal year 2014, and \$284,809,315 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015”;

(K) in subparagraph (K) by striking “and \$525,900,000 for fiscal year 2014” and inserting “, \$525,900,000 for fiscal year 2014, and \$350,119,726 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015”.

(b) RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT DEMONSTRATION AND DEPLOYMENT PROJECTS.—Section

5338(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$70,000,000 for fiscal year 2014” and inserting “, \$70,000,000 for fiscal year 2014, and \$46,602,740 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015”.

(c) TRANSIT COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROGRAM.—Section 5338(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$7,000,000 for fiscal year 2014” and inserting “, \$7,000,000 for fiscal year 2014, and \$4,660,274 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015”.

(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT.—Section 5338(d) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$7,000,000 for fiscal year 2014” and inserting “, \$7,000,000 for fiscal year 2014, and \$4,660,274 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015”.

(e) HUMAN RESOURCES AND TRAINING.—Section 5338(e) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2014” and inserting “, \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2014, and \$3,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015”.

(f) CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS.—Section 5338(g) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$1,907,000,000 for fiscal year 2014” and inserting “, \$1,907,000,000 for fiscal year 2014, and \$1,269,591,781 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015”.

(g) ADMINISTRATION.—Section 5338(h) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking “and \$104,000,000 for fiscal year 2014” and inserting “, \$104,000,000 for fiscal year 2014, and \$69,238,356 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015”;

(2) in paragraph (2) by inserting “for each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and not less than \$3,328,767 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” before “shall be available”; and

(3) in paragraph (3) by inserting “for each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and not less than \$665,753 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” before “shall be available”.

SEC. 1204. BUS AND BUS FACILITIES FORMULA GRANTS.

Section 5339(d)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “for each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014 and \$43,606,849 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” after “\$65,500,000”;

(2) by inserting “for each such fiscal year and \$832,192 for such period” after “\$1,250,000”; and

(3) by inserting “for each such fiscal year and \$332,877 for such period” after “\$500,000”.

Subtitle D—Hazardous Materials

SEC. 1301. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5128(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) \$28,468,948 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015.”.

(b) HAZARDOUS MATERIALS EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND.—Section 5128(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (5) as subparagraphs (A) through (E), respectively, and by adjusting the margins accordingly;

(2) by striking “From the” and inserting the following:

“(1) FISCAL YEARS 2013 AND 2014.—From the”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) FISCAL YEAR 2015.—From the Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness Fund established under section 5116(i), the Secretary may expend for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015—

“(A) \$125,162 to carry out section 5115;

“(B) \$14,513,425 to carry out subsections (a) and (b) of section 5116, of which not less than \$9,087,534 shall be available to carry out section 5116(b);

“(C) \$99,863 to carry out section 5116(f);

“(D) \$416,096 to publish and distribute the Emergency Response Guidebook under section 5116(i)(3); and

“(E) \$665,753 to carry out section 5116(j).”.

(c) HAZARDOUS MATERIALS TRAINING GRANTS.—Section 5128(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting “and \$2,663,014 for the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015,” after “2014”.

TITLE II—REVENUE PROVISIONS

SEC. 2001. EXTENSION OF HIGHWAY TRUST FUND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.

(a) HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—Section 9503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “October 1, 2014” in subsections (b)(6)(B), (c)(1), and (e)(3) and inserting “June 1, 2015”, and

(2) by striking “MAP-21” in subsections (c)(1) and (e)(3) and inserting “Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014”.

(b) SPORT FISH RESTORATION AND BOATING TRUST FUND.—Section 9504 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “MAP-21” each place it appears in subsection (b)(2) and inserting “Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014”, and

(2) by striking “October 1, 2014” in subsection (d)(2) and inserting “June 1, 2015”.

(c) LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND.—Paragraph (2) of section 9508(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “October 1, 2014” and inserting “June 1, 2015”.

SEC. 2002. FUNDING OF HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (f) of section 9503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (7) and by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraphs:

“(5) ADDITIONAL SUMS.—Out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, there is hereby appropriated—

“(A) \$7,765,000,000 to the Highway Account (as defined in subsection (e)(5)(B)) in the Highway Trust Fund; and

“(B) \$2,000,000,000 to the Mass Transit Account in the Highway Trust Fund.

“(6) ADDITIONAL INCREASE IN FUND BALANCE.—There is hereby transferred to the Highway Account (as defined in subsection (e)(5)(B)) in the Highway Trust Fund amounts appropriated from the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund under section 9508(c)(3).”.

(b) APPROPRIATION FROM LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 9508 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) ADDITIONAL TRANSFER TO HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—Out of amounts in the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund there is hereby appropriated \$1,000,000,000 to be transferred under section 9503(f)(6) to the Highway Account (as defined in section 9503(e)(5)(B)) in the Highway Trust Fund.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 9508(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraphs (2) and (3)”.

SEC. 2003. FUNDING STABILIZATION.

(a) FUNDING STABILIZATION UNDER THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—The table in subclause (II) of section 430(h)(2)(C)(iv) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“If the calendar year is:	The applicable minimum percentage is:	The applicable maximum percentage is:
2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, or 2017	90%	110%
2018	85%	115%
2019	80%	120%
2020	75%	125%
After 2020	70%	130%”.

(b) FUNDING STABILIZATION UNDER EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The table in subclause (II) of section 303(h)(2)(C)(iv) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29

U.S.C. 1083(h)(2)(C)(iv)) is amended to read as follows:

“If the calendar year is:	The applicable minimum percentage is:	The applicable maximum percentage is:
2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, or 2017	90%	110%
2018	85%	115%
2019	80%	120%
2020	75%	125%
After 2020	70%	130%”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 101(f)(2)(D) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 1021(f)(2)(D)) is amended—

(i) in clause (i) by inserting “and the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of

2014” after “MAP-21” both places it appears, and

(ii) in clause (ii) by striking “2015” and inserting “2020”.

(B) STATEMENTS.—The Secretary of Labor shall modify the statements required under

subclauses (I) and (II) of section 101(f)(2)(D)(i) of such Act to conform to the amendments made by this section.

(c) STABILIZATION NOT TO APPLY FOR PURPOSES OF CERTAIN ACCELERATED BENEFIT DISTRIBUTION RULES.—

(1) INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—The second sentence of paragraph (2) of section 436(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “of such plan” and inserting “of such plan (determined by not taking into account any adjustment of segment rates under section 430(h)(2)(C)(iv))”.

(2) EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.—The second sentence of subparagraph (B) of section 206(g)(3) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1056(g)(3)(B)) is amended by striking “of such plan” and inserting “of such plan (determined by not taking into account any adjustment of segment rates under section 303(h)(2)(C)(iv))”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the amendments made by this subsection shall apply to plan years beginning after December 31, 2014.

(B) COLLECTIVELY BARGAINED PLANS.—In the case of a plan maintained pursuant to 1 or more collective bargaining agreements, the amendments made by this subsection shall apply to plan years beginning after December 31, 2015.

(4) PROVISIONS RELATING TO PLAN AMENDMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If this paragraph applies to any amendment to any plan or annuity contract, such plan or contract shall be treated as being operated in accordance with the terms of the plan during the period described in subparagraph (B)(ii).

(B) AMENDMENTS TO WHICH PARAGRAPH APPLIES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—This paragraph shall apply to any amendment to any plan or annuity contract which is made—

(I) pursuant to the amendments made by this subsection, or pursuant to any regulation issued by the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary of Labor under any provision as so amended, and

(II) on or before the last day of the first plan year beginning on or after January 1, 2016, or such later date as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

(ii) CONDITIONS.—This subsection shall not apply to any amendment unless, during the period—

(I) beginning on the date that the amendments made by this subsection or the regulation described in clause (i)(I) takes effect (or in the case of a plan or contract amendment not required by such amendments or such regulation, the effective date specified by the plan), and

(II) ending on the date described in clause (i)(II) (or, if earlier, the date the plan or contract amendment is adopted),

the plan or contract is operated as if such plan or contract amendment were in effect, and such plan or contract amendment applies retroactively for such period.

(C) ANTI-CUTBACK RELIEF.—A plan shall not be treated as failing to meet the requirements of section 204(g) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1054(g)) and section 411(d)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 solely by reason of a plan amendment to which this paragraph applies.

(d) MODIFICATION OF FUNDING TARGET DETERMINATION PERIODS.—

(1) INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—Clause (i) of section 430(h)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “the first day of the plan year” and inserting “the valuation date for the plan year”.

(2) EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974.—Clause (i) of section 303(h)(2)(B) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1083(h)(2)(B)(i)) is amended by striking “the first day of the plan year” and inserting “the valuation date for the plan year”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (d) shall apply with respect to plan years beginning after December 31, 2012.

(2) ELECTIONS.—A plan sponsor may elect not to have the amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (d) apply to any plan year beginning before January 1, 2014, either (as specified in the election)—

(A) for all purposes for which such amendments apply, or

(B) solely for purposes of determining the adjusted funding target attainment percentage under sections 436 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and 206(g) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1054(g)) for such plan year.

A plan shall not be treated as failing to meet the requirements of section 204(g) of such Act and section 411(d)(6) of such Code solely by reason of an election under this paragraph.

SEC. 2004. EXTENSION OF CUSTOMS USER FEES.

Section 13031(j)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “September 30, 2023” and inserting “September 30, 2024”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking “September 30, 2023” and inserting “September 30, 2024”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

H.R. 5021, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014, extends Federal surface transportation programs and ensures the solvency of the highway trust fund through May 2015. H.R. 5021 is a clean extension of the surface transportation programs and continues the MAP-21 reforms.

We have an immediate, critical need to address the solvency of the trust fund and extend the current surface transportation law. This bill does that in a responsible way, with policies that have all previously received strong bipartisan and bicameral support. If Congress fails to act, thousands of transportation projects and hundreds of thousands of jobs across the country will be at risk. This legislation provides much-needed certainty and stability for the States.

This bill in no way precludes Congress from continuing to work on addressing a long-term funding solution and a long-term reauthorization bill, which remains a top priority for the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. However, this legislation is the responsible solution at this time, ensures that we don't play politics with these programs, and enables us to

continue making improvements to our surface transportation system.

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

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, July 14, 2014.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to H.R. 5021, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014. Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Education and the Workforce with regard to H.R. 5021 on those matters within the committee's jurisdiction.

In the interest of expediting the House's consideration of H.R. 5021, the Committee on Education and the Workforce will forgo further consideration of this bill. However, I do so only with the understanding this procedural route will not be construed to prejudice my committee's jurisdictional interest and prerogatives on this bill, or any other similar legislation, and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my committee in the future.

I respectfully request your support for the appointment of outside conferees from the Committee on Education and the Workforce should this bill or a similar bill be considered in a conference with the Senate. I also request you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

JOHN KLINE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, July 15, 2014

Hon. JOHN KLINE,
Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 5021, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014. I appreciate your willingness to support expediting the consideration of this legislation on the House floor.

I acknowledge that by forgoing action on this legislation, the Committee on Education and the Workforce is not waiving any of its jurisdiction and will not be prejudiced with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and I will include our letters on H.R. 5021 in the Congressional Record during consideration of this measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

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

Mr. Speaker, passage of this bill today is absolutely necessary to keep our surface transportation programs up and running. In less than a month, the highway trust fund will go belly up and force-feed our States rationed payments for their transportation and infrastructure investments. This would starve our national economy, put States in a desperate situation, and

cost jobs. Congress must act now to avert this unnecessary crisis.

The bill under consideration today will help States get through the remainder of the construction season. It will also provide time for Congress to come together and pass a longer-term surface transportation law so that we don't find ourselves in this crisis mode again.

But this needs to happen sooner rather than later because this bill leaves our highway, transit, and safety programs on autopilot. While the driverless car may be the wave of the future, it is no way to run our transportation programs, and I know the chairman has driven those cars on autopilot.

Passing extension after extension only brings us more of the same, and our States have already said that the status quo isn't meeting their needs.

A long-term, robust surface transportation bill is the only way we are going to address our greatest infrastructure challenges. It is the only way we will be able to build on what works and reform what isn't. It is one of the few sure-fire ways to boost our economy, create jobs, and help us compete with our global rivals.

"Starving the beast" simply doesn't work when it comes to transportation and infrastructure policy. We need greater investment in our roads and bridges. We need an increased focus on moving freight across our borders and overseas.

We should grow regional collaborations to build significant projects, and we must bring every possible transportation job back to the U.S. to be done by American workers.

It is worth noting that this debate is about far more than accounting, dollar signs, and trust funds. It is about the men and women who work in these industries and have to face needless uncertainty about their futures. It is about those that rely on public transit systems. And it is about the driving public who must endure aging infrastructure and the car repair bills and safety concerns that come with it.

I am going to vote for this bill today not because it is the best solution, but because it does avert an immediate crisis and keeps the ball rolling forward.

I thank the members of the Ways and Means Committee for their work on this bill, and I look forward to working with our chairman, Mr. SHUSTER, to bring forward a robust, long-term surface transportation bill to vote on in the near future.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1515

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), chairman of the Subcommittee on Highways and Transit.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, the debate we are having today is not really about the future of the highway trust fund. Unfortunately, today is about doing what Congress does too often—kicking

the can down the road, avoiding one crisis while setting up another.

I recognize that more time is often needed to craft a more robust bipartisan solution, the result of which is often well worth the delay, but, Mr. Speaker, we must come to our senses. We must realize that another short-term patch is not really what our State governments are calling for; this is not really what the American Trucking Association or the Chamber of Commerce is calling for; and this is not what the American people sent us here to accomplish.

For close to 50 years, the highway trust fund was self-sustaining. Those who used the roads paid for the roads. But we have been stalled in the 20th century. The fuel tax, which traditionally paid for highway improvements, hasn't been changed since 1993, while construction costs have grown more expensive, cars have become more fuel efficient or run on alternative fuels, and infrastructure needs have continued to rise.

In the Highways and Transit Subcommittee, we have had hearing after hearing where State transportation officials, mayors, Governors, truckers, transit operators, economists, and experts in transportation policy have testified with unwavering support for a long-term, fully funded surface transportation bill. That should be our goal.

But at the end of the day, we can't let the quest for the perfect stand in the way of the good or the acceptable. In this case, we have an obligation to keep our highway projects going, our transportation moving, and our economy growing. Since this is the only option we have today, this is what we will do.

We need to stop the patches and budget gimmicks and come up with a viable, real solution on how we fund the trust fund. History shows that it is hard to do before an election. Perhaps it will be easy to do after that.

So I ask my colleagues to consider this question: Which is the more responsible path, more budget gimmicks or raising revenue to actually pay for needed spending?

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), ranking member of the Highways and Transit Subcommittee.

Ms. NORTON. I thank my good friend from West Virginia for yielding, and I thank both the chairman and the ranking member for their hard work on this bill. I know that they both wanted a long-term bill and that they have worked for a long-term bill.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that we have a bipartisan, bicameral bill, but I think that for all concerned, it expresses bipartisan disappointment. We had 2 years to do a bill since MAP-21, and all we have been able to produce is an 8-month stopgap fix.

At the same time, the States and the localities we represent are probably grateful for small favors today. The ad-

ministration had already announced rationing because of the insolvency of the trust fund as of August 1, with only what little money would come in to replenish the trust fund for each State.

We were staring at both an insolvent trust fund and a loss of the construction season at the same time. That would have been an economic catastrophe, with the loss of hundreds of thousands of jobs. We must use this moment to face that we cannot rebuild our bridges, roads, and transit systems on pension-smoothing stopgap extensions.

The State backlog of projects will be left untouched by this bill. Because we have produced a climate of uncertainty, States won't dare start up the real work that needs to be done on their roads, bridges, and transit because they are getting a patchwork bill. Patchwork bills yield patched-up roads and bridges and deteriorating transit.

At the very least, we owe it to the country to revisit this bill as soon as possible and as early as October. The delay in MAP-21 got us today's stopgap measure. Congress needs a spur under its saddle to avoid another delay.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD), from a State in which a referendum arose that increased the user fee to fund the highway system.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his work on H.R. 5021, which I rise in support of this afternoon, which provides greater certainty and sufficient funding for infrastructure projects across the Nation. Without an immediate solution for the highway trust fund, our State highway departments are left wondering if there will be adequate funding to continue any infrastructure improvement.

In March of this year, the Arkansas Highway and Transportation Department warned that, without congressional action to remedy the highway trust fund shortfall, continuing with highway and infrastructure contracts that were scheduled for April letting would have threatened the ability to pay contractors. As a result, 10 vital projects totaling over \$60 million were either put on hold or forced to find alternative methods of temporary financing.

My colleagues have described similar scenarios in their own States, meaning that across the Nation new infrastructure projects have already ground to a halt, threatening general contractors, their employees, suppliers, and putting at risk the jobs that are both directly and indirectly supported by these projects.

I think most lawmakers can agree that ensuring that we have a reliable and modern infrastructure on land, water, rail, and air is critical. With the Senate announcing last week an agreement with Chairman CAMP and House leaders to enact a short-term funding

solution, we can now turn our attention back to a multiyear transportation bill that will provide long-term assurance to States for financing infrastructure improvements.

In moving forward with a long-term bill, we can spend time with stakeholders and constituents—the ultimate users of the infrastructure—and allow them to weigh in on what is being considered. As we return our focus to long-term legislation, we must also examine how to reform the highway trust fund so that taxpayers will know how their dollars are being spent. With costs increasing and funds at a premium, we owe our constituents a more transparent system that demonstrates effective use of their money on infrastructure improvement.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting H.R. 5021, and I look forward to working on a long-term, comprehensive transportation bill to ensure our Nation's future growth. We can't continue to beat the drum to attract businesses, add jobs, and improve the economy if we are not willing to use our authority to invest in our Nation's infrastructure.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, allow me to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL and Subcommittee Chair PETRI and Ranking Member ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

I rise today in support of H.R. 5021, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act for 2014.

In particular, the bill before the House this afternoon would do two things: first, it would provide a total of \$35.3 billion for highway, public transit, and surface transportation programs; secondly, it would extend surface transportation programs authorized under MAP-21 through May 31, 2015.

I support this bill because it takes almost 60,000 construction jobs in Texas out of harm's way, and it ensures that over 3,500 active highway and transit projects in Texas will not be slowed or stopped by the highway trust fund's shortfall.

However, my support for this bill is reluctant, as I believe we have missed another opportunity to craft a long-term highway program yet again. While I am pleased that we have come together to address the impending highway crisis, we are also kicking the can down the road again.

Today, 65 percent of our Nation's roads are rated at less than good condition, and 25 percent of our bridges require significant repair. In Texas alone, we have over 300,000 miles of public roads, 8 percent of which are in poor condition.

The measure before us today all but ensures that we will be having this exact same debate again sometime in the next Congress; rather, what we

need to do is adopt a long-term plan that will provide certainty, increase transit investments, and keep workers in our construction industries on the job. When we return from the August recess, I urge my colleagues to work together and begin crafting a long-term surface transportation bill. We have seen again and again legislating by crisis is not effective.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

As our roads erode and our transit systems decay, we owe our constituents no less than acting in their best interest and enacting a long-term bill as soon as possible.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA), one of the committee's true experts on infrastructure, a mayor of a small city, and a construction business owner.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation that will keep our highway trust fund solvent until we agree on a long-term solution.

If we fail to act, the money to fund surface transportation projects will soon run dry. That could result in the stoppage of more than 7,000 projects. We would lose countless jobs across the country, and in my home State of Pennsylvania as well.

I have always supported a highway bill of a least 5 years or more, but in the absence of one, I support this proposal to give us time to work out a longer-term funding solution. We need a plan that will meet our transportation needs while also providing contractors and builders the guidance they need to invest in equipment and employees.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this important piece of legislation.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN), a very valued member of our Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL for bringing this before us today.

This short-term highway trust fund fix is crucial for keeping our highway and transit systems solvent, and I intend to vote for it. Letting the highway trust fund become insolvent would be irresponsible and cut 700,000 jobs and increase congestion. But once our work is done here today, we do need a long-term, creative solution to fund our much-needed transportation projects in this country.

Over 64 percent of the roads in Los Angeles are in utter disrepair, costing each resident driver nearly \$832 a year. My own dad, who was a county supervisor in Los Angeles for 40 years, used to offer people a dollar for every pot-

hole they could find in his district. If he made that offer today, he would go broke.

To fill this funding gap, I support looking at different ways of funding our roads in addition to the gas tax, such as vehicle miles traveled, which charges drivers by the miles that they travel.

For our national economy, we need to focus on freight infrastructure. Freight bottlenecks cost us approximately \$200 billion a year. Yesterday, I introduced the National Freight Network Trust Fund Act for a long-term fix that creates dedicated funding for our freight infrastructure.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this short-term fix and join me in looking forward to solving this problem long term.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), who is from one of the most innovative States in funding and moving projects forward at a very fast pace.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation.

Last year, I was honored to be conferee a for MAP-21, the highway bill, and I am proud of the bill that our conference committee produced and was subsequently signed into law. Our Nation's transportation projects are being completed faster, and States like my home State of Indiana receive more Federal funding than they had in the past.

We do need a long-term solution to fund our infrastructure. Today, however, we need to support this extension. This funding is critical for projects such as Interstate 69, which runs through my district.

With construction season underway, we need to ensure that every State can continue with the summer construction projects that are ongoing. This legislation is necessary to keep thousands of Americans working to rebuild our infrastructure—improving the flow of commerce and ensuring the safety of Americans as they travel.

I would like to thank Chairman CAMP and Chairman SHUSTER for their leadership, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

□ 1530

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), a distinguished member of our Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, we can pretend that we care about the future of America and its transportation system. We used to be number one in the world, widely recognized. We are now rated 26th, and we are moving down quickly.

The system is falling apart. There are 140,000 bridges that need repair or replacement, and 40 percent of the pavement on the National Highway System has failed to the point at which

you have to dig it up, not just resurface it. There is a \$70 billion backlog in our transit systems just to bring everything up to a state of good repair. That is not even to begin to think about building a 21st century transportation system to compete with the rest of the world. For the Chinese, 9 percent of their GDP goes to transportation. They want to be able to move people and goods more efficiently and to out-compete us. Even Brazil, 6 percent. India, 6 percent. The United States of America, 1 percent. We have got to get serious about this.

Today, we are going to do a little shuffling around of some money, and say, oh, we can pretend, by pension smoothing and this and that, that we are creating money so we get around not creating more debt or deficit here. Come on. Really, it is pretty phony stuff. Let's get real about how we are going to fund our transportation future.

We are fighting with people who believe in a theory called "devolution." That is, they want to devolve the duty of building a national transportation system to the 50 dispersed States and let them figure it out. We tried that. This is 1956. The brand new Kansas Turnpike ended in Emil Schweitzer's farm field for years because Oklahoma couldn't afford their part of that system until the Eisenhower bill passed, and we had a highway trust fund.

We know this works—user-fee based, a national system, coordinating among the States, not having roads that disconnect at the border, not tolling the heck out of everything, which some people would have us do, not fragmenting the system. What are you going to say to the Port of Los Angeles, where 40 percent of the freight comes into the country? Oh, you figure out how to get the freight out of L.A. to serve the rest of the country, and you pay for it. No. This is a national obligation. It is international and national competitiveness. We have to get serious, and this bill here today is not serious or long term.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), a long-term member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, someone who fights every day for West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member RAHALL for bringing this bill to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, more than 700,000 jobs and 6,000 road and bridge projects could be in jeopardy if payments from the Federal highway trust fund are delayed. I rise today in support of the Highway and Transportation Funding Act, which would prevent this catastrophic scenario.

In my home State of West Virginia, more than 200 projects are currently receiving Federal funding. If we fail to act now, we risk layoffs at the height of the summer construction season. In-

action would cripple the efforts of our State highway department to maintain our roads and bridges after a particularly harsh winter and to build new projects like U.S. Route 35, Corridor H, and the King Coal Highway in West Virginia.

American motorists, construction workers, and small businesses deserve certainty that the Federal Government will continue to invest in our Nation's infrastructure. Today's bill provides that certainty for the remainder of this construction season, but I wait, as most of us do, to complete the work on the longer term bill. I ask my colleagues to join me in passing the Highway and Transportation Funding Act.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our distinguished minority whip and a strong supporter of our infrastructure in this country.

Mr. HOYER. Those were the good old days, I tell my friend Mr. RAHALL, when I got an unlimited 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, there is some good news. The good news is this committee is chaired by someone who wants to invest in America, grow jobs, and expand our economy. I speak of my friend BILL SHUSTER, and I thank him for that. The other good news is that our ranking Democrat, NICK JOE RAHALL, has a history of making sure that America invests in its infrastructure.

The bad news is that this bill does not give what Mrs. CAPITO suggested it gives, and that is certainty. It gives a temporary, inadequate response to what is a long-term problem. I won't ask him the question, but I believe that Mr. SHUSTER absolutely agrees with me. We ought to find a fiscally sustainable funding source for our infrastructure and highway system.

Mr. Speaker, a well-maintained highway structure supports the growth of our economy and the creation of good jobs. That is why I have been advocating for a long-term, sustainable fix that makes investments in our roads and bridges and provides the certainty that needed repairs will be completed. I am for a big deal, not just for certainty in infrastructure but for certainty in the investment in our economy. I will continue to advocate that.

This bill, unfortunately, does not do that. It is better than doing nothing, but it does not do what we need to do. In fact, by implementing a short-term fix only until May, this bill promotes uncertainty for construction firms and other businesses that rely on projects paid for by the highway trust fund, which support American jobs. It also puts Congress in the position of having to deal with this issue next May, as next year's summer construction season is about to begin, without any certainty of what we will do.

Democrats would prefer to work with Republicans to pass a long-term fix now or, if we cannot do that, to reauthorize it for a few months so that we can return to this issue after the No-

ember elections and pass a long-term fix, but we cannot take the risk of allowing this fund to run dry this summer.

The highway trust fund supports the infrastructure improvements that enable manufacturers to move their products to market faster and help attract businesses and jobs from overseas. It helps us to Make It In America—manufacture it, grow it, sell it here and around the world. If we allow it to go broke, according to the Department of Transportation, our economy could lose as many as 700,000 jobs.

This bill, I think, will get some significant support from our side of the aisle but not because it is our choice, not because it is the right way to go. In my view, as I said, I don't want to hurt him with his party or with anybody outside of this Chamber, but I think Mr. SHUSTER agrees that we need a long-term solution. I urge my colleagues to work together in a bipartisan fashion to get a long-term, confidence-building resolution of this stop-and-jerk, or go-and-jerk, funding process that we are adopting.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I do agree with the distinguished minority whip that we need a long-term solution to the trust fund and a long-term bill to provide certainty to this Nation when it comes to our transportation system.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS), one of the newest members of the committee but one of the hardest-working members of the committee.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, supporting H.R. 5021 means protecting hundreds of thousands of jobs throughout this great country. More specifically, in Illinois, it means saving nearly 30,000 jobs and 4,000 construction projects that are already underway. Supporting this bill means improving our crumbling roads and bridges—a constitutional responsibility of this body's. Supporting H.R. 5021 means governing responsibly instead of creating yet another manufactured crisis that would add even more uncertainty and instability to a still struggling economy.

By extending this highway trust fund, which is not my first choice—if we extend this bill and these programs through May, we can continue working on that long-term highway bill that both sides of the aisle stand here and say that we need, and we can create jobs and keep up with our 21st century transportation needs. The highway trust fund has fallen short for many years, and we need to come up with long-term solutions.

I look forward to working with my colleagues from the other side of the aisle and with Chairman SHUSTER and his continued leadership.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, may I have the time remaining, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia has 1

minute remaining, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania has 6 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), the distinguished former chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. MICA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and the distinguished ranking member. Thank you for your hard work in trying right now to put a Band-Aid on our bleeding transportation funding. Thank you for trying to get the transportation cart out of the ditch.

Mr. Speaker, we have reached the eleventh hour, and soon projects will be closing down across the country. It is unfortunate that we are at this juncture on the road to funding transportation responsibly. We had a chance for a 5-year bill, and we did not have the leadership, I believe, from the White House. In fact, President Obama was AWOL during that entire process. Now, today, we see the President has been at a bridge, and he is going to be at another site. He is out at a research thing, talking about transportation funding.

Where was the President when Mr. Oberstar—the distinguished gentleman who recently passed away and who was chair of the committee—offered a bill, and he came and cut his legs out from underneath the Democrat chairman? We would have had a longer term, fully funded bill. If it is to secure our borders, where has he been? He says he doesn't do photo ops, but he is doing them now, and he will do them on transportation. He doesn't need to be at the bridge. He needs to be here, working with these distinguished Members of Congress for a long-term solution. He was absent at the border, and he is absent as we need to secure our Nation's infrastructure. This is not acceptable.

I support this measure because it is an extension of what we did. It doesn't have deficit spending. It is responsible for paying for it, and it doesn't have earmarks. The last bill had 6,300 earmarks—not this bill. I support the measure.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. We have no more speakers on our side.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL), a very distinguished member of our Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Thank you, Mr. RAHALL.

Mr. Speaker, transportation moves our economy, and modern infrastructure is a path to jobs and prosperity. I will vote for this stopgap measure, but

I want to echo the words of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have called for a long-term, sustainable fix of our highway trust fund so that the United States of America can compete in the world's market.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, in closing, much has been said today in dislike of this temporary fix, and I could not agree more. It is not my preference. We all want to address this in a long-term, robust manner. That is also the opinion of the Transportation Trades Department of the AFL-CIO, who say that further delay will only maintain the status quo in keeping workers off the job, undercutting long-term planning and hindering the country in advancing to a 21st century transportation system.

There are very similar views, like views, expressed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce when they say in a letter to Members of Congress that, in the Chamber's view, the longer the pass, the easier it will be for Congress to kick the can down the road and avoid the tough question of how we will maintain Federal investment in highway public transportation and highway safety.

I hope we come back before next May and address this issue.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, how much time is left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 4 minutes remaining.

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

First, I want to start off by expressing my condolences to a former chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. I guess, back then, it was Public Works and Transportation. Chairman Bob Roe, who chaired the committee in the eighties, passed away this morning, at 9:30, at the age of 90. I just want to say that my thoughts and prayers are with his family at this time.

□ 1545

I want to start in closing by thanking Chairman CAMP and Ranking Member LEVIN and the entire Ways and Means Committee for passing out, on a voice vote, H.R. 5021.

I would like to reiterate that H.R. 5021 is a clean extension of the surface transportation programs that continues the MAP-21 reforms. This extension is necessary to provide much-needed certainty and stability for States while we continue to work on addressing a long-term funding solution and a long-term reauthorization bill.

I am committed to that. I know that the Transportation Committee is going to work diligently with the Ways and Means Committee on funding a long-term solution to the funding and also to passing a strong long-term reauthorization bill.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

At the end of this month, States across the country will be forced to put road construction on hold if Congress cannot address the highway trust fund. At risk are hundreds of thousands of jobs in the construction industry.

A strong infrastructure is central to commerce, and at a time when millions of Americans are packing their bags to take a vacation or just traveling to work, we must ensure that projects can be completed so that the roads, bridges, and highways they travel on are modernized and safe.

The bill before us today, H.R. 5021, will provide enough funding to get us through May 21, 2015, giving States the ability to complete projects.

This bill is the only package with all provisions having a proven history of getting big bipartisan votes in both the House and the Senate. The three provisions—pension smoothing, custom user fees, and leaking underground storage tanks—have all been used previously in bills that received strong bipartisan votes.

Pension smoothing and LUST were included in the last bipartisan highway trust fund legislation. These are policies everyone is familiar with. They are policies that will provide the funding we need, and they are the only policies that will pass both the House and Senate in time to fund our highways after the end of this month.

A long-term solution would be my preference, and an important feature of my tax reform discussion draft would provide enough revenue to maintain the solvency of the highway trust fund for 8 years.

In the meantime, I hope all Members of Congress can work on a longer-term solution by the end of May next year. This won't be an easy task, so it is important that Congress has time to have a deliberative, open debate about bipartisan solutions, rather than trying to hit Americans who are already paying more for gas with a gas tax hike.

It is time to act now. State transportation departments have already started delaying or stopping certain highway projects to prepare for the fact that funding may fall short. Americans across the country deserve to see less gridlock on the roads and from their elected representatives.

These policies are straightforward and have a history of bipartisan, bicameral support.

I am encouraged that the White House issued their support for the House highway bill, so we have an opportunity to solve this problem today.

Mr. Speaker, I will enter into the RECORD the administration's statement of support.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
H.R. 5021—HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION
FUNDING ACT OF 2014

(Rep. Camp, R-Michigan, and Rep. Shuster, R-Pennsylvania, July 14, 2014)

With surface transportation funding running out and hundreds of thousands of jobs

at risk later this summer, the Administration supports House passage of H.R. 5021. This legislation would provide for continuity of funding for the Highway Trust Fund during the height of the summer construction season and keep Americans at work repairing the Nation's crumbling roads, bridges, and transit systems.

However, this legislation only provides a short-term fix to the Highway Trust Fund. It does not address the continued need to pass a long-term authorization bill that creates jobs and provides certainty for cities, States, and businesses. Congress should work to pass a long-term authorization bill well before the expiration date set forth in H.R. 5021. The President has been very clear that increasing investment in the Nation's infrastructure is a top priority. That is why the President laid out a vision for a 21st century surface transportation infrastructure, the GROW AMERICA Act, which would streamline project approval processes and implement innovative transportation policies that will make better use of taxpayer dollars while supporting millions of jobs and positioning the Nation's economy for lasting growth. That proposal is fully paid for through existing revenues and by reforming business taxes to help create jobs and spur investment while eliminating loopholes that reward companies for moving profits overseas.

The Administration is focused every day on what can be done to expand opportunity for every American. In today's economy, that means building a first-class infrastructure that attracts first-class jobs and takes American businesses' goods all across the world.

Mr. CAMP. We also have strong industry support in a letter to Congress from 62 organizations, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, American Road and Transportation Builders Association, the American Trucking Association, and the National Association of Manufacturers, which stated, "A long-term Federal commitment to prioritize and invest in our aging infrastructure and safety needs is essential to achieve this goal. Keeping the highway trust fund solvent is the first step."

Mr. Speaker, I will enter their statement of support into the RECORD as well.

JULY 14, 2014

TO MEMBERS OF THE U.S. CONGRESS:

The undersigned organizations representing every sector of the economy urge the House of Representatives and Senate to pass bipartisan legislation that will stabilize the Highway Trust Fund and prevent a shut-down of federal highway and public transportation investments across the country.

Our transportation infrastructure network is the foundation on which the nation's economy functions. American manufacturers, industries and businesses depend on this complex system to move people, products and services every day of the year.

As the World Economic Forum (WEF) noted in its 2013-2014 Global Competitiveness Report, infrastructure connects regions, integrates markets and provides access to markets and services. While this latest report places the U.S. economy fifth in its "Global Competitiveness Index," America's infrastructure network now ranks 15th globally.

Shortchanging the Highway Trust Fund is not the path to future economic growth, jobs and increased competitiveness. The possibility of a deficient Highway Trust Fund that shuts 100,000 construction projects

that support 700,000 jobs and puts all new highway, bridge and public transportation investments on hold will further harm an already fragile economy.

The U.S. economy requires a surface transportation infrastructure network that can keep pace with growing demands. A long-term federal commitment to prioritize and invest in our aging infrastructure and safety needs is essential to achieve this goal. Keeping the Highway Trust Fund solvent is the first step.

We urge Congress to avoid the immediate transportation cliff and improve the long-term fiscal condition of the Highway Trust Fund during 2014.

Sincerely,

National Association of Manufacturers, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, American Road & Transportation Builders Association, Associated General Contractors of America, National Retail Federation, American Trucking Association, U.S. Travel Association, American Farm Bureau Federation, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, NAACP, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, International Union of Operating Engineers, American Society of Civil Engineers, Laborers International Union of North America, National Association of Development Organizations, NAIOP, the Commercial Real Estate Development Association, American Public Transportation Association, Airports Council International—North America, Transportation for America, Building America's Future.

Smart Growth America, Commercial Vehicle Safety Alliance, The American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators, Governors Highway Safety Association, American Highway Users Alliance, American Public Works Association, American Council of Engineering Companies, National Stone Sand and Gravel Association, Transportation Intermediaries Association, The American Society of Landscape Architects, American Iron and Steel Institute, National Utility Contractors Association, American Concrete Pipe Association, American Concrete Pavement Association, National Ready Mixed Concrete Association, National Asphalt Pavement Association, Truckload Carriers Association, American Association of Airport Executives, International Bridge, Tunnel and Turnpike Association, Intelligent Transportation Society of America (ITS America).

Safe Routes to School National Partnership, League of American Bicyclists, Alliance for Biking & Walking, Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals, National Tank Truck Carriers, American Moving & Storage Association, NATSO, representing America's Truckstops and Travel Plazas, National Recreation and Park Association, Metropolitan Planning Council (Chicago, IL), American Traffic Safety Services Association, SMART—Transportation Division, Safe Kids Worldwide, PeopleForBikes—Business Network, PolicyLink, International Warehouse Logistics Association, The National Industrial Transportation League, The Coalition for America's Gateways and Trade Corridors, Association of Equipment Manufacturers, Portland Cement Association, Associated Equipment Distributors, National Electrical Contractors Association National Electrical Manufacturers Association (NEMA).

Mr. CAMP. A "yes" vote will avoid a last-minute crisis. We also need to fund important highway projects and ensure that thousands of jobs are not at risk.

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

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

I will support this bill because we are at the eleventh hour. No, it is not the eleventh hour; it is a few minutes before midnight.

Unless Congress acts by the end of this month, more than 100,000 transportation projects could be delayed and as many as 700,000 jobs put at risk, but this legislation is a patch when what our Nation's infrastructure needs is major repair. Doing nothing is not an option, but we should be doing much better.

The Republicans, I must say, in this House, talk a lot about the need for certainty, but they have riddled infrastructure funding with uncertainty. The fact that we are in this position illustrates just how little House Republicans have done, since they assumed the majority in 2011, to address the long-term problems facing the trust fund and our infrastructure.

Every Democrat on Ways and Means urged our chairman, Mr. CAMP, to hold a series of hearings on long-term financing options for the trust fund, yet the committee has not held a single hearing on this topic in the 3 years and 6 months the Republicans have been in the majority.

Since 2011, the committee has had nearly two dozen hearings on repealing or dismantling the ACA and, in the last 14 months, a half-dozen hearings on the IRS. Those are not the priorities that are going to lead to a long-term solution of the trust fund. The Nation, in a word, deserves better than this short shrift. It needs a long-term solution.

Democrats on Ways and Means proposed an extension until December 31 in order to pressure a long-term solution this year. All of us on the Democratic side voted "yes," and all of the Republicans voted "no."

Let me end with a word on unemployment insurance. Senate Democrats and Republicans passed a bill to extend unemployment insurance that included an almost identical set of offsets as those included in today's legislation.

The House Republicans refused to take up that measure, at the same time calling some of them—the offsets—pie in the sky and opposing the plan.

Well, here we are today on the floor of the House, and 3 million Americans are still waiting for House Republicans to allow just one vote on a bipartisan plan to extend unemployment benefits. It is time that House Republicans get priorities straight.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of my time now be given to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a distinguished member of our committee who has worked so hard with the rest of us on highway issues, to control.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

I am pleased that Congress is finally acting today, not with a looming crisis, but one that is already upon us. This is entirely predictable.

I have been arguing for months that Congress needs to act because the stop-gap measure we did last Congress was designed to create precisely this Congress at precisely this time.

Sixty-two groups may have signed on a letter of support, but they prefer us to act meaningfully for long-term funding. They accept this because it is the only alternative to shutting down activities this summer.

My Republican friends are unwilling—not unable—but unwilling to resolve the funding contradictions. Revenues have failed to keep pace with the demands of an aging growing Nation, making no change for 21 years, as our infrastructure ages and falls apart, our Nation continues to grow and transportation patterns change. It is guaranteed that we should change as well.

This Congress has refused to address its responsibilities. The House Ways and Means Committee has not had a single hearing on transportation finance. One of our most important responsibilities, uniquely ours, one that is unlike so many other items we deal with, it is possible to resolve. We haven't had a hearing in the 43 months that the Republicans have been in charge of Congress.

Now, I understand there are conflicts within the Republican Caucus. There are some that appear satisfied with locking us into a slow, steady decline called for in the Republican budget—no new projects until October of 2015 and a 30 percent reduction over the next decade, at exactly the time the Federal partnership should be enhanced, not reduced.

There are others in the Republicans whose answer is to just abandon ship, to give up on the Federal partnership, slash the Federal gas tax, and abandon any hope of a national transportation policy and partnership to help States with projects that are multistate in nature or that need to be done whether economic times are bad.

That would be tragic and wrong to abandon the partnership that has meant so much, but it is part of what is driving some of our Republican Tea Party friends. Just because there may not be a majority in the Republican ranks for either approach does not mean that we should continue to dither.

Because Republican friends are unwilling or unable to resolve this, we have frozen the Transportation Committee in place. They don't have a bill. They are not going to have a bill unless we resolve what the budget number is: increase, continue the downward slide, or abandon it altogether.

We will be no better off next May to resolve this question. In fact, we will be worse off because we will be in the middle of a Presidential campaign, with a new Congress, maybe new committee lineups.

So as one of the stakeholders told me as we filed out of the hearing room last week, May 2015 is really May 2017 and, I might add, at the earliest.

We should reject this approach to hand off our responsibilities. We should resolve the resource question, and we should commit that this Congress is not going to recess for August vacation, not going to recess to campaign in October, until we have worked to give the American people a transportation bill they need—deserve—to jump-start the economy, create hundreds of thousands of family-wage jobs, and strengthen communities and families across the Nation.

American infrastructure used to be the best in the world and a point of pride bringing Americans together. It is now a source of embarrassment and deep concern as we fall further and further behind global leaders.

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

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

In addition to the Statement of Administration Policy in support of the legislation which has been entered into the record, as well as a letter from 62 organizations in support of the legislation—including the American Trucking Association, American Farm Bureau, National Association of Manufacturers—I also have a letter from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which is the world's largest business federation, which represents more than 3 million businesses of all sizes, sectors, and regions, is key voting this legislation and has written a separate letter in support of this bill.

I would enter into the RECORD the Chamber of Commerce letter regarding H.R. 5021.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

Washington, DC, July 15, 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 urges you to vote for H.R. 5021, the "Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014," which would extend federal surface transportation programs and provide for a short-term solution for the Highway Trust Fund (HTF) shortfall. By the end of July, Congress must send to the President a measure that generates the necessary cash flows to support continued outlays from the HTF and affords much-needed continuity in the short-term for economic development, international trade, and job creation.

Then, it is imperative to immediately turn to identifying and advancing a bipartisan, sustainable, and long-term solution to the HTF that can achieve bicameral success. The Chamber urges leaders of both parties to put politics aside and come together on a shared solution to the HTF's structural deficiencies. The user-supported HTF has been a bipartisan compromise from its beginning. It is the offspring of a Democratic-controlled House and Senate in the 84th Congress and the Republican Eisenhower Administration.

For 58 years the HTF has served America's transportation infrastructure well and helped to create the world's largest economy; however, its long-term solvency has been compromised by a lack of action in both the legislative and executive branches.

The Chamber recognizes action on a short-term HTF fix as an important step and looks forward to working with you in the months ahead on a long-lasting remedy for the Highway Trust Fund. The Chamber urges the House to pass H.R. 5021, and may include votes on, or in relation to, this bill in our annual How They Voted Scorecard.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL), one of the champions on our committee for infrastructure in America.

Mr. PASCARELL. I thank the ranking member, Mr. Speaker, and I want to thank our chairman, our ranking member who was just here a few moments ago.

It is ironic, as I said earlier today, when we take up the transportation and infrastructure legislation that, just a few hours ago, the champion of transportation and infrastructure passed away. He was the chairman of the Transportation Committee. At that time, it was the Public Works Committee. He left the Congress in 1992, so it is ironic.

Mr. Chairman, through the Speaker, you have to understand the frustration that exists on both sides of the aisle on this legislation. We know what is needed. We know what is going to happen by the end of August. Many projects throughout the United States of America will just shut down or begin to shut down. Bills will not be paid. That is not good. That is not acceptable.

On the other hand, when the dust settles, the very committee that we represent, where everything goes through—the Ways and Means Committee—will have voted for close to \$1 trillion when the dust settles, unpaid for, permanent tax cuts, many of which are never meant to be permanent. Check the RECORD.

So we can do this and add \$1 trillion to the deficit, and we can't come up with a bipartisan 5-year or 6-year transportation plan for our roads?

Let's wait until the bridges fall down. Then we will do something about it.

□ 1600

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, estimates as to how much we need to invest simply to maintain and repair our existing surface transportation system run as high as \$177 billion per year. The actual capital spending in 2012 was only \$103 billion.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman

from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCHWARTZ), who has been a valued member of our committee, and we are going to miss her.

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, our manufacturers, small business owners, and everyday commuters require a modern transportation system. Simply put, our daily lives, our safety, and our economy all require a first-rate transportation system. But our Nation's infrastructure is crumbling, endangering travelers, lengthening commutes, and holding back economic growth.

In their latest report card, the American Society of Civil Engineers gave my own home State's roads and transit a D-minus. Sadly, Pennsylvania has the largest number of crumbling bridges in our Nation, at over 5,000. This is simply unacceptable.

With the highway trust fund running out of funds, we must act to ensure that important projects continue, that workers stay on the job, and that we do not fall further behind. But the bill before us is a temporary fix. Instead, this Congress should act on a robust transportation bill—not for a few months, but for years—a plan that will not only create jobs now but will help ensure our economic competitiveness and economic growth locally and nationally for years to come. We should do our job and pass a fully funded 6-year Federal transportation and infrastructure bill this year.

Putting this off does not make it easier. It does not build a stronger economy. While necessary, this bill is another missed opportunity by House Republicans who are short on vision, too willing to rely on fiscal gimmicks, and unable to find common ground to get the bill done—and done right.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the remaining time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). The gentleman from Oregon has 5¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), a valued member of our Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Oregon for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that we would be here passing a long-term transportation plan. Unfortunately, that is not the case.

However, I support H.R. 5021 as an initial step in strengthening the American infrastructure. This bill obviously provides immediate help to prevent default of the highway trust fund and prevents impending delays in transportation. Mr. Speaker, 30,000 people will continue to work in my State as a result of this bill and its passage.

So I commend us for at least reaching this agreement, keeping things moving, and I urge its passage.

Mr. CAMP. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a letter from the Associated General Contractors of America in support of H.R. 5021 and urging its passage.

THE ASSOCIATED GENERAL
CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA,
Arlington, VA, July 15, 2014.

Re Support H.R. 5021, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BOEHNER: On behalf of the Associated General Contractors of America (AGC), I urge you to support H.R. 5021, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014.

The Highway Trust Fund is running on fumes. The United States Department of Transportation (DOT) recently announced they will initiate cash management procedures for programs funded out of the Highway Account of the trust fund on August 1, 2014. This will force DOT to delay reimbursements to state departments of transportation for projects under construction or, in some cases, already completed. Further, if no additional revenue is found, the trust fund will not be able to support any new projects in 2015.

Bipartisan action is required to give states the funding certainty they need to issue highway construction contracts and to give the 10,000 construction firms engaged in highway, road and bridge construction the confidence they need to make hiring and capital investment decisions at the peak of the summer highway construction season. Providing revenue for the Highway Trust Fund will also guarantee the federal government can meet its obligations to reimburse states for highway and bridge construction projects already underway.

The looming insolvency of the Highway Trust Fund and the lack of long-term authorization stifles the economic impact of road construction. It undermines states' ability to best plan and manage their highway, bridge and transit construction programs. It also stretches state budgets and may increase their borrowing costs.

To that end, AGC urges the House to pass bipartisan legislation that can provide the certainty states need to make investment decisions and the industry needs to make critical business decisions. Focus must then turn to finding a bipartisan, bicameral solution this year to fund a multi-year reauthorization of MAP-21.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY D. SHOAF,
Senior Executive Director,
Government Affairs.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), an eloquent spokesperson for rebuilding and renewing America.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today really demonstrates the House Republican fear of even trying. Their guiding strategic principle in this Congress is to do nothing and to be sure that no one else can do anything; and when they are eventually overwhelmed by a self-created crisis, as they have done with our transportation system, then to do next to nothing.

Bridges can literally fall down, highways crumble, public transportation systems are hobbled, but the House Republicans continue to reject a normal reauthorization of the Transportation Act of the type that, for decades, had broad bipartisan support in this House.

The only thing bipartisan about this last-gasp desperate effort to prevent a stoppage of transportation projects and the various groups that have endorsed it is that, after having had presented as a purported serious proposal by House Republicans that the way to stop the traffic slowdown was to have a mail or postal slowdown to finance it, they see this as a chance finally to at least prevent temporarily a total shutdown of our transportation project system. And so they are going along with it. I am not.

I realize that to have a sound transportation system, you can't do it week to week or month to month. There has to be some long-term planning. These bridges cannot repair themselves. These potholes don't fill themselves. We often hear that freedom is not free. Well, neither are freeways.

We have to have the revenue to have the kind of responsible national transportation system of the type that Dwight Eisenhower once provided the lead on when there was bipartisan support for reasonable public investment. Our competitors understand this. They are out there designing a 21st century transportation system that will be competitive, and we are being left in the potholes.

It is essential that we have a long-term bill, not this type of stopgap measure.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I yield myself the remainder of the time.

I appreciate my friend from Michigan putting into the RECORD what can only be regarded as reluctant letters of support. I wish that some of my colleagues would have had time to look at it. It is not a ringing endorsement of what is before us. It is a reluctant acknowledgement that that is all we have time for, that is all the Republicans will allow.

I have worked with those groups, with the road builders, with the Chamber, with the AFL-CIO, with the contractors, with elements large and small, local governments, transit. They are unanimous in their effort, in their regard that we should deal with this in the big picture. A number of them had letters before the Ways and Means Committee that it should be done this year, not kicked forward. That is why I asked our Republican chairman to allow us to hear from these people.

If we would have heard from Peter Ruane from the Road Builders in person; Tom Donohue from the Chamber; Rich Trumka from the AFL-CIO; Terence O'Sullivan, the eloquent leader of the Laborers'; from the AAA and the truckers, Bill Graves, they wouldn't endorse this approach. They would be

talking about our getting down to business. But the Republicans would not allow us a hearing, not for 43 months. So they are reduced to offering tepid letters of support so the whole system doesn't fall apart.

Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully suggest that those are not a reason to move forward with this legislation and be happy. It is a sad commentary that this is the best that the Republicans think they can give us.

Those road groups who depend on moving freight, maintaining roads, who care about the health and well-being of our communities deserve better. Our families deserve better. The economy deserves better.

I hope that we will, in a moment, have a motion to recommit that will shorten the amount of time that we let this Congress off the hook and make sure that we don't adjourn this Congress without doing our job.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go through history. The former chairman of the Infrastructure Committee on the last large highway bill, SAFETEA-LU, that was passed, I had a dear friend from Minnesota named Jim Oberstar who served beside me and worked with me to write that piece of legislation. Finally, he became the chairman. What is impressive about that, this gentleman had more knowledge about transportation probably than anyone in this House has ever had, including myself.

I will tell you what was the biggest disappointment of his life is he wanted to write a transportation bill, a long-term transportation bill, and fund it. And guess who said no. Our President, Mr. Obama. His Secretary, a dear friend of mine, came down and said there is no way we are going to pass a long-term bill with full funding. He did not support Jim Oberstar.

What I wanted to do was to fully fund it, and I was opposed then by the seated President, George W. Bush.

In fact, if Mr. Oberstar had the opportunity, with the Senate being in the control of the President's party and the House being in the control of the President's party, we would not be here today. We would have infrastructure, bar none. We wouldn't be discussing what we are doing today.

This measure today is a stopgap measure. But this Congress has to wake up, and the President should have woken up then when he had control to pass legislation for the infrastructure of this country.

So, when we get accused on this side of not doing anything and making a stopgap measure, go back through history. This President has failed to recognize the importance. And for those interest groups, they should have been

on him at that time in support of Mr. Oberstar.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say respectfully, this is a two-way street. We have to understand this is a really important piece of legislation to keep us going, but then we have to solve it permanently. Let's be leaders on infrastructure, which we do not have down on Pennsylvania Avenue right now at this time.

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

I would add to the gentleman from Alaska's remarks by saying the Ways and Means Committee proposed a tax reform discussion draft that actually funded the highway trust fund for 8 years. Now my friends on the other side would like to shorten this temporary measure, which goes through the end of May, to just go through the end of December, and that is wrong for a couple of reasons.

First, the Senate bill that is being considered has the same length of time as the current House bill, so that would be out of step with the direction that the Senate is trying to go. We are obviously trying to form a bipartisan, bicameral piece of legislation here.

The second is that, if we only were to pass this along for a few months, all of the problems that the Members on the other side talked about would only be made worse, that is, there would not be the ability to plan over the winter, for example, for spring construction projects. To just extend it for a few months, again, makes it so temporary and so short that you would immediately have companies, States, employers hedging their bets on whether funding is going to continue after that time.

The construction season isn't just in the good months of the year, it also goes through the winter, and that is why it is so important that we get through the end of May to June 1 to give the Congress time to really come up with a long-term solution, which clearly everyone prefers on both sides.

So with that, I urge support for the legislation and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Transportation reports that the Highway Trust Fund will be unable to fully fund critical, ongoing highway programs as soon as August. This crisis stems from a fundamental mismatch between trust fund revenues and highway program spending that pre-dates enactment of the last surface transportation reauthorization that Congress enacted. Since 2008, Congress has bailed out the Highway Trust Fund with more than \$54 billion in transfers.

H.R. 5021 provides the necessary funds to keep the federal highway and transit programs running while Congress develops legislation to set these programs on a sound financial footing for the long term. I look forward to working with my colleagues to address the systematic factors that have been driving the Highway Trust Fund's bankruptcy.

Importantly, this bill follows a House budget rule that requires general fund transfers to the

trust fund to be fully offset. It should not become a recurring practice for taxpayers to bail out the highway and transit programs because Congress and the President are unable to make the changes necessary to avoid future trust fund insolvency.

My primary concern is with using pension smoothing as an offset. Based on CBO scoring, the bill produces ten-year savings through changing pension law, but these changes will likely be more than offset by greater federal obligations in the future. Ultimately, allowing additional smoothing now increases future liabilities for the taxpayer guarantee of private-sector pensions. In addition, we are increasingly using 10 years of savings to offset one year of costs as this bill does. It is progress to offset these costs, but we need to be reducing spending and deficits and when we increase spending, we should be offsetting the cost in as short a timeframe as possible.

Again, I look forward to working with my colleagues on legislation that will set the Highway Trust Fund on a sustainable path going forward, so that we can avoid the kind of stopgap legislation we are considering today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that the House is restoring a little sanity to this body by bringing up a clean extension of our nation's Surface Transportation Programs. These programs are too critical to our economy to become a political issue. The short-term Highway Trust Fund extension that the House is voting on today will keep workers on the job this summer and fall fixing our bridges, operating our transit systems and making our highways safer. Unfortunately, we're already behind the 8 Ball in preparing for surface reauthorization and have some serious work to do in deciding how we are going to fund the future of transportation in this country.

Developing a bill based on strong policy is always the best way to write legislation, but the most critical part of developing this next reauthorization bill is clearly finding a way to pay for it. Without that everything else is just talk.

As we prepare for reauthorization of MAP-21 we need to get serious about funding our nation's transportation system. We can't continue to provide grossly inadequate funding for our nation's infrastructure. We're failing to keep pace with our international competitors who are investing heavily in infrastructure, particularly rail infrastructure to move people, goods, and services in their countries. I agree we need to squeeze out every bit of efficiency we can through improved technology and innovation, but we are kidding ourselves if we don't think it will take a significant investment in our nation's infrastructure to truly solve the congestion problems we are facing.

The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee needs to take the bull by the horns and decide how we are going to fund all forms of transportation for the future. Our committee needs to have all possible options on the table to address our current shortfalls. The American Society of Civil Engineers has given our nation infrastructure a D grade. That is unacceptable for the greatest county in the world.

Transportation and Infrastructure funding is absolutely critical to the nation, and, if properly funded, serves as a tremendous economic and job creator. In fact, Department of Transportation (DOT) statistics show that for every

\$1 billion invested in transportation infrastructure, 44,000 jobs are created, as is \$6.2 billion in economic activity.

So, as the Transportation & Infrastructure committee prepares the next transportation reauthorization bill, I hope we can develop a long term bill with dedicated funding source for all modes of transportation so we can improve our nation's infrastructure, create jobs and improve the economy, and provide new and innovative transportation options for the traveling public.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant support of H.R. 5021, the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014. Once again, Congress has failed to lead on a critical issue that impacts the lives of every American. We need to make bold investments in our transportation infrastructure, which is currently in a state of disrepair. It should be embarrassing to every member of Congress that the American Society of Civil Engineers recently gave our nation's infrastructure a grade of "D+."

Instead of working towards a multi-year reauthorization of our surface transportation programs, which expire on September 30, 2014, Congress is once again kicking the can down the road. If Congress does not act to replenish the Highway Trust Fund, payments to states for transportation projects would be cut drastically. This would have detrimental impacts on our already modest efforts to improve our infrastructure and we must not allow this to occur. While I am disappointed in the lack of progress made on a permanent solution to this problem, I support this measure as a way to avoid catastrophe.

While Congress plays an important role in funding transportation infrastructure projects, states have an obligation in this area as well. I'm extremely disappointed that the Michigan State Legislature adjourned for the summer without reaching agreement on funding ongoing road projects in Michigan. All of our leaders, from Congress down to states, cities, and municipalities, need to make infrastructure spending a top priority rather than continuing to play politics with this issue.

While I urge adoption of this measure, I also hope my colleagues will join me in having a serious discussion about how to provide a long-term fix to our nation's infrastructure problems. Our constituents demand action on this critical issue.

Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I support efforts by Congress to continue funding the Highway Trust Fund. This fund provides \$3.2 billion of necessary resources for building and maintaining California's transportation system and growing the state's economy. With the passage of H.R. 5021, San Bernardino County's Omnitrans will be able to move forward with the purchase of 15 new transit buses to link the cities of Fontana, Ontario, Montclair, and Pomona. Projects like this are crucial to the local economy and construction projects across California's 35th Congressional District will continue through spring of next year.

This short term investment is an important first step, but it is time we make significant long term investments in the country's infrastructure and Congress must now take up The GROW AMERICA Act. This legislation is a four year reauthorization proposal that provides increased and stable funding for our nation's highways, bridges, mass transits, and

rail systems. This will provide critical investments to fix our failing roads and crumbling bridges to ensure the safety of our transportation systems. Sixty five percent of America's infrastructure is rated in less than good condition and one in four bridges requires significant repair. Congress must act now by investing in our infrastructure to increase safety, build our nation's transportation workforce, and increase opportunity for the middle class.

This legislation will provide \$5 billion in funding over four years for the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery Act. The TIGER grant program will continue to be available for another four years, extending successful transportation projects that serve the diverse travel and goods movement to meet the needs of the residents and businesses of California.

The GROW AMERICA Act will also empower regional and local communities to make transportation investments that support the growth of the economy and quality of life of the residents of California's 35th Congressional District. According to the Department of Transportation only 8 percent of federal highway dollars are now controlled by regional and local interests and additional authority over resources at the local level would increase the success of our transportation investments. This will ensure the public and interested parties can participate in the early development of transportation plans and review alternative development scenarios. Lastly, The GROW AMERICA Act will adopt local performance-based decision making to ensure regional priorities drive investment decisions and by implementing measures to reduce the amount of time to break ground on local projects.

This input from local stakeholders is very important for the communities I represent in the 35th Congressional District of California. As a major freight corridor for Burlington Northern-Santa Fe and Union Pacific Railroads, San Bernardino County needs additional investment in grade separation projects to reduce traffic congestion. It often loses out on infrastructure grants to larger metropolitan areas. The GROW AMERICA Act will take our role as a freight corridor into account when determining funding for the Inland Empire.

Again, I commend today's efforts to continue funding the Highway Trust Fund, but it is clear that the success of our economy relies on the strength of our infrastructure. I urge Congress take up the GROW AMERICA Act and make the critical transportation investments needed to create jobs and increase opportunity in California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 669, 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.

□ 1615

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I am, in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Blumenauer moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5021 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of title I, add the following:

Subtitle E—Modification of Extension Period
SEC. 1401. EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2014.

In this title, including the amendments made by this title any reference to "May 31, 2015" shall be treated as a reference to "December 31, 2014".

Add at the end of the bill the following:

TITLE III—SENSE OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEC. 3001. SENSE OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES REGARDING NEED TO PASS LONG-TERM TRANSPORTATION FUNDING BILL.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House of Representatives finds the following:

(1) The Highway Trust Fund is projected to become insolvent before the end of the fiscal year.

(2) The user-fee principle upon which the Highway Trust Fund was established is eroding.

(3) Since 2008, Congress has transferred \$54 billion from the general fund to the Highway Trust Fund.

(4) The primary funding mechanisms for the Highway Trust Fund have not been fundamentally addressed since 1993.

(5) Due to a decline in per capita miles driven, a decline in the purchasing power of highway excise taxes, and increased fuel efficiency, Highway Trust Fund revenues have not kept pace with the needs of United States infrastructure.

(6) United States infrastructure is falling behind the rest of the world.

(7) In 2013, the United States was ranked 25th globally in overall infrastructure quality.

(8) Short-term surface transportation extensions increase costs of transportation projects, limit the ability of state and local governments to plan infrastructure improvement, and ultimately have resulted in the degradation of United States infrastructure.

(b) SENSE OF HOUSE.—It is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) any long-term transportation reauthorization bill should, at a minimum, fund infrastructure spending at least to current levels plus inflation through fiscal year 2020, and

(2) by the end of calendar year 2014, the Committee on Ways and Means and Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives should each report legislation reauthorizing the surface transportation programs within their respective jurisdictions, and the House of Representatives should pass a long-term surface reauthorization bill to ensure the sustainability of the Highway Trust Fund and improve United States infrastructure.

In section 2001, strike "June 1, 2015" each place it appears and insert "January 1, 2015".

In the quoted matter proposed to be inserted by section 2002(a), strike the first dollar amount and insert "\$5,550,000,000".

In the quoted matter proposed to be inserted by section 2002(a), strike the second dollar amount and insert "\$1,450,000,000".

Strike section 2003 and insert the following (and redesignate the succeeding section accordingly):

SEC. 2003. CLARIFICATION OF 6-YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS IN CASE OF OVERSTATEMENT OF BASIS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (B) of section 6501(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of clause (i), by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii), and by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

“(ii) An understatement of gross income by reason of an overstatement of unrecovered cost or other basis is an omission from gross income; and”;

(2) by inserting “(other than in the case of an overstatement of unrecovered cost or other basis)” in clause (iii) (as so redesignated) after “In determining the amount omitted from gross income”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to—

(1) returns filed after the date of the enactment of this Act, and

(2) returns filed on or before such date if the period specified in section 6501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (determined without regard to such amendments) for assessment of the taxes with respect to which such return relates has not expired as of such date.

SEC. 2004. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON RETURNS RELATING TO MORTGAGE INTEREST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 6050H(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (C), by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (I), and by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraphs:

“(D) the unpaid balance with respect to such mortgage,

“(E) the address of the property securing such mortgage,

“(F) information with respect to whether the mortgage is a refinancing that occurred in such calendar year,

“(G) the amount of real estate taxes paid from an escrow account with respect to the property securing such mortgage, and

“(H) the date of the origination of such mortgage, and”.

(b) PAYEE STATEMENTS.—Subsection (d) of section 6050H of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (1), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting “, and”, and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

“(3) the information required to be included on the return under subparagraphs (D), (E), and (F) of subsection (b)(2).”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to returns and statements the due date for which (determined without regard to extensions) is after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 2005. PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO MEET DUE DILIGENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE CHILD TAX CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6695 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) FAILURE TO BE DILIGENT IN DETERMINING ELIGIBILITY FOR CHILD TAX CREDIT.—Any person who is a tax return preparer with respect to any return or claim for refund who fails to comply with due diligence requirements imposed by the Secretary by regulations with respect to determining eligibility for, or the amount of, the credit allowable by section 24 shall pay a penalty of \$500 for each such failure.”.

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

At the end of title I, as amended, add the following:

SEC. 1402. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In this title, including the amendments made by this title—

(1) any reference to a dollar amount relating to the period beginning on October 1, 2014, and ending on May 31, 2015, shall be treated as a reference to that dollar amount multiplied by 0.3786008230453; and

(2) any reference to “²⁴/₃₆₅” shall be treated as a reference to “⁹²/₃₆₅”.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a)(1) shall not apply to the dollar amount referred to in the matter proposed to be inserted by section 1001(c)(3)(B)(ii).

Mr. BLUMENAUER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to suspend the reading.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to recommit.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this may be the last chance Congress has to honor our commitments to provide answers about transportation funding and develop a framework that will guide the Federal partnership that has meant so much. The motion won't kill the bill, and it won't delay the bill. It simply reduces the funding to the amount necessary for Congress to do its job before we adjourn for the year. It is so that we cannot duck our responsibilities and hand this off not to the next Congress but to the Congress after that.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, in May of next year there will be no transportation bill, there will be no funding, and Congress will be even more nervous and confused with a transportation problem that will be more complex. It will be more expensive, and the politics, I am sad to say, will be harder, not easier.

My good friend, the chair of the Ways and Means Committee, does have a proposal. He has never had a hearing on it. And it was dismissed when it was announced by his own Speaker, if I quote: “Blah, blah, blah.”

This is a sad moment for me. But it is not too late for us to do something about it. We need to move forward and have a tighter timetable. Let's finally have a hearing in Ways and Means. Let's have a proposal going forward. I am perfectly willing to work in August to do this. I would be happy for us to

add days in September. We shouldn't recess in October to campaign and leave a big question mark. It is true that it takes time to put these things together, but we won't be putting it together next spring, mark my words.

The Republicans need to enable us to find out where they stand. Will they finally have a hearing on my friend Mr. CAMP's proposal? Will they slash the highway trust fund and abandon the responsibilities? Or will they just use the Ryan budget and reduce transportation 30 percent over the next 10 years and no new projects for 15 months?

Those are all legitimate issues. They deserve to have a day in court, and if we get down to work, we could resolve it. I am confident we can do it, and it will be just as easy, if not easier, to do now than waiting until next year when the clock will be ticking, when half the United States Senate will be running for President, and we will have a new lineup, other than the Speaker, who may be happy to have avoided it. It is not going to be any easier.

I respectfully suggest that we honor those 62 groups that want us to move. Look, they would much rather have us do it this year.

We had infrastructure that was once the envy of the world. Now it is a source of embarrassment. We are 27th in the world and sinking. Our problems are getting more expensive, and they are getting harder. I know how hard the job that the chair of the T&I Committee has. I respect him, I respect the committee, but they need to know exactly how much money they have got so they can fashion a bill, and if they did that, they would be able to crank one out, I am confident, in a month or two. But right now, after an entire Congress, they don't have a bill. We don't have a bill.

Those 62 groups and organizations don't have a path. What they have is a great big question mark next May when we start this all over again. This shouldn't be a partisan argument. I disagreed when President Bush shut it down. I disagreed that President Obama didn't move forward, but it is not Republicans versus Democrats. It is not House versus Senate. It is time for us to all come together and work as the stakeholders would have us do.

In fact, we don't even have to have any courage. We can just follow what those experts who represent truckers, AAA, local government, and contractors have offered as guidance. Read the special commissions that have reported to President Bush. This is not rocket science. It is will, it is action, it is deciding exactly how much we are going to spend and when.

Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully request that the House approve this motion to recommit, give us enough time and money to avoid the summer shutdown but not enough to let this Congress off the hook and hand it off to the 115th or the 120th Congress, but we do our job so America can do its.

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

NOT VOTING—12

Byrne	DesJarlais	Nunnelee
Campbell	Hanabusa	Rush
Carney	Kingston	Southerland
Davis, Rodney	Miller, Gary	Williams

□ 1652

Messrs. **FORTENBERRY, REICHERT, FINCHER, and DUNCAN** of South Carolina changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. **KIRKPATRICK, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Messrs. YARMUTH and CLEAVER** changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. **BLUMENAUER**. 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 367, noes 55, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 414]

AYES—367

Aderholt	Coffman	Foster
Amodio	Cohen	Frankel (FL)
Bachmann	Cole	Frelinghuysen
Bachus	Collins (NY)	Fudge
Barber	Conaway	Gabbard
Barletta	Connolly	Gallego
Barr	Conyers	Garamendi
Barrow (GA)	Cook	Garcia
Barton	Cooper	Gardner
Bass	Costa	Gerlach
Beatty	Cotton	Gibbs
Becerra	Courtney	Gibson
Benishek	Cramer	Gingrey (GA)
Bentivolio	Crawford	Goodlatte
Bera (CA)	Crenshaw	Granger
Billirakis	Crowley	Graves (GA)
Bishop (GA)	Cuellar	Graves (MO)
Bishop (NY)	Culberson	Grayson
Bishop (UT)	Cummings	Green, Al
Black	Daines	Green, Gene
Blackburn	Davis (CA)	Griffin (AR)
Bonamici	Davis, Danny	Griffith (VA)
Boustany	Davis, Rodney	Grijalva
Brady (PA)	DeFazio	Grimm
Brady (TX)	DeGette	Guthrie
Bralley (IA)	Delaney	Hahn
Brooks (IN)	DeLauro	Hanna
Brown (FL)	DelBene	Harper
Brownley (CA)	Denham	Hartzler
Buchanan	Dent	Hastings (FL)
Bucshon	Deutch	Hastings (WA)
Burgess	Diaz-Balart	Heck (NV)
Bustos	Dingell	Heck (WA)
Butterfield	Doyle	Hensarling
Calvert	Duckworth	Herrera Beutler
Camp	Duffy	Higgins
Cantor	Duncan (TN)	Himes
Capito	Edwards	Hinojosa
Capps	Ellison	Holding
Capuano	Ellmers	Honda
Cárdenas	Engel	Horsford
Carson (IN)	Enyart	Hoyer
Cartwright	Eshoo	Hudson
Cassidy	Esty	Huffman
Castor (FL)	Farenthold	Huizenga (MI)
Castro (TX)	Farr	Hunter
Chaffetz	Fattah	Hurt
Chu	Fincher	Israel
Cicilline	Fitzpatrick	Issa
Clark (MA)	Fleischmann	Jackson Lee
Clarke (NY)	Fleming	Jeffries
Cleaver	Flores	Jenkins
Clyburn	Forbes	Johnson (GA)
Coble	Fortenberry	Johnson (OH)

Johnson, E. B.	Moran	Schneider
Johnson, Sam	Mullin	Schock
Jolly	Murphy (FL)	Schrader
Joyce	Murphy (PA)	Schwartz
Kaptur	Nadler	Scott (VA)
Keating	Napolitano	Scott, David
Kelly (IL)	Neal	Serrano
Kelly (PA)	Negrete McLeod	Sessions
Kennedy	Neugebauer	Sewell (AL)
Kildee	Noem	Shea-Porter
Kilmer	Nolan	Sherman
Kind	Nunes	Shimkus
King (IA)	O'Rourke	Shuster
King (NY)	Owens	Simpson
Kinzinger (IL)	Palazzo	Sinema
Kirkpatrick	Pallone	Sires
Kline	Pascrell	Slaughter
Kuster	Pastor (AZ)	Smith (MO)
LaMalfa	Paulsen	Smith (NE)
Lance	Payne	Smith (NJ)
Langevin	Pearce	Smith (TX)
Larsen (WA)	Pelosi	Smith (WA)
Larson (CT)	Perlmutter	Southerland
Latham	Perry	Speier
Latta	Peters (MI)	Stewart
Lee (CA)	Peterson	Stivers
Levin	Petri	Swalwell (CA)
Lewis	Pingree (ME)	Takano
Lipinski	Pittenger	Terry
LoBiondo	Pitts	Thompson (CA)
Loeb sack	Pocan	Thompson (MS)
Lofgren	Poe (TX)	Thompson (PA)
Long	Polis	Thornberry
Lowenthal	Price (GA)	Tiberi
Lowe y	Price (NC)	Tierney
Lucas	Quigley	Tipton
Luetkemeyer	Rahall	Titus
Lujan Grisham	Rangel	Tonko
(NM)	Reed	Tsongas
Luján, Ben Ray	Reichert	Turner
(NM)	Renacci	Upton
Lynch	Rice (SC)	Valadao
Maffei	Richmond	Van Hollen
Maloney,	Rigell	Vargas
Carolyn	Roby	Veasey
Maloney, Sean	Roe (TN)	Vela
Marchant	Rogers (AL)	Velázquez
Marino	Rogers (KY)	Visclosky
Massie	Rogers (MI)	Wagner
Matsui	Rohrabacher	Walberg
McAllister	Rokita	Walden
McCarthy (CA)	Rooney	Walorski
McCarthy (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen	Walz
McCaul	Roskam	Wasserman
McCollum	Ross	Schultz
McGovern	Rothfus	Waxman
McHenry	Roybal-Allard	Webster (FL)
McIntyre	Royce	Wenstrup
McKeon	Ruiz	Whitfield
McKinley	Runyan	Wilson (FL)
McMorris	Ruppersberger	Wilson (SC)
Rodgers	Rush	Wittman
McNerney	Ryan (OH)	Wolf
Meehan	Ryan (WI)	Womack
Meeks	Sánchez, Linda	Woodall
Meng	T.	Yarmuth
Mica	Sanchez, Loretta	Yoder
Michaud	Sarbanes	Young (AK)
Miller (FL)	Scalise	Young (IN)
Miller (MI)	Schakowsky	
Moore	Schiff	

NOES—55

Amash	Hall
Blumenauer	Harris
Bridenstine	Holt
Brooks (AL)	Huelskamp
Broun (GA)	Hultgren
Carter	Jones
Chabot	Jordan
Clawson (FL)	Labrador
Clay	Lamborn
Collins (GA)	Lankford
DeSantis	Lummis
Doggett	Matheson
Duncan (SC)	McClintock
Foxx	McDermott
Franks (AZ)	Meadows
Garrett	Messer
Gohmert	Miller, George
Gosar	Mulvaney
Gowdy	Nugent

NOT VOTING—10

Byrne	Gutiérrez
Campbell	Hanabusa
Carney	Kingston
DesJarlais	Miller, Gary

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1659

Mr. **RUSH** changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4719, FIGHTING HUNGER INCENTIVE ACT OF 2014

Mr. **BISHOP** of Utah, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-522) on the resolution (H. Res. 670) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4719) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 3230, PAY OUR GUARD AND RESERVE ACT

Mr. **GALLEGO**. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 3230, the conference report on Veterans Access and Accountability.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Gallego moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 3230 (an Act to improve the access of veterans to medical services from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes) be instructed to recede from disagreement with section 601 of the Senate amendment (relating to authorization of major medical facility leases).

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The gentleman's notice will appear in the RECORD.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 661 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5016.

Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) kindly take the chair.

□ 1703

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole

House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5016) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, with Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, an amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) had been disposed of, and the bill had been read through page 152, line 15.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my dear friend from New York (Mr. SERRANO) for yielding.

I rise to speak on this bill, but not to offer an amendment. I don't offer an amendment because, to offer an amendment, I would have to identify an offset within the body of this bill. This bill is deeply and harmfully underfunded. Therefore, I will not seek to take from an object that already is underfunded to fund the elimination of the Election Assistance Commission.

At the outset, I want to say that I served on this subcommittee for 23 years. I know a little bit about the subject of this committee. Not only that, I was the sponsor of the Help America Vote Act with Bob Ney, my friend from Ohio. That bill overwhelmingly passed with over 350 bipartisan votes. Unfortunately, too frequently, bipartisanship eludes us in this body today.

I voted against Ryan-Murray because I said at that point in time it did not provide sufficient resources to meet the responsibility this Nation has to stay strong, stay free, and to grow our economy and grow jobs for our people.

As I said, I was the sponsor of the Help America Vote Act. Within that bill, we created the Election Assistance Commission. Again, it was overwhelmingly supported by both sides of the aisle and the United States Senate and signed into law by President Bush. The offices and programs covered under that program were focused on trying to assist States and local governments to ensure the appropriate administration of elections.

Is there anything, I ask my colleagues, more important in a democracy than ensuring that elections are well run and that every voter's vote counts? I suggest to you there is not.

The Election Assistance Commission, established by the Help America Vote Act in the aftermath of the 2000 Presidential election debacle, to be specific, had 357 Members of this body vote for it. The appropriations bill on this floor today, however, would essentially eliminate that commission.

I am not surprised because, frankly, when the Republicans became the ma-

ajority in this House, it was at that point in time they started focusing on the elimination of the Election Assistance Commission, as I said, designed to make our elections more efficient, fairer, and more honest.

Initially, my Republican colleagues suggested that the duties of the Election Assistance Commission would be done by the Federal Election Commission, which has a totally different responsibility, and that is a responsibility to make sure that the funding of elections is done appropriately and within the law.

I am going to vote against this bill not simply because of the zeroing out of the Election Assistance Commission. Very frankly, I am chagrined and disappointed that my Republican colleagues too often are trying to undermine America's right to vote, undermine America's incentive to vote, undermine the facilitating of Americans voting. Frankly, I don't understand that.

The Election Assistance Commission, for the first time in history, said that for over 200 years States and localities had run Federal elections. They were concurrent with State elections and local elections. But they ran our elections with no assistance from us—for President, Vice President of the United States, United States Senators, and Members of the House of Representatives. We did not participate.

Under HAVA, we have contributed a substantial sum of money so that they could update and make efficient the election systems that they had. But recently, the Republican Party, Mr. Chairman, has refused to recommend appointments for the Commission, and now they want to eliminate the Commission.

Mr. Chairman, in a country that looks at the right to vote and the exercising of franchise as central to our democracy, I would urge us to defeat this bill, to re-fund this critically important agency, and to do what we ought to do as Americans and as Members of this Congress.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRELINGHUYSEN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . The amount otherwise provided by this Act for "National Security Council and Homeland Security Council—Salaries and Expenses" for the National Security Council is hereby reduced by \$4,200,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from New Jersey and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce the amount available for the National Se-

curity Council staff by \$4.2 million, or by approximately one-third.

The National Security Council staff is the President's staff. They serve solely to provide advice to the President on national security matters. They have no authority to manage programs. They have no authority to allocate funds or otherwise decide spending levels. And they have no authority to determine or dictate congressional access to classified information involving sensitive military matters or operations. As the President's staff, it is appropriate that they are accountable to him, just as our staff is only accountable to us. Therefore, they are not subject to congressional questioning nor other forms of oversight.

Over the past few years, the size of the National Security Council's staff has grown, and it appears that they have moved beyond their Presidential advisory role to involve themselves in decisions which are not in their purview. Over the last few months, we have had several instances in which the National Security staff has mandated that the Department of Defense and other agencies selectively withhold information from congressional oversight committees.

While the President has constitutional authority as Commander in Chief to provide for the Nation's defense, this Congress was vested exclusively with the constitutional authority to fund that defense, a constitutional authority that is vested in the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Chairman, it is important that all appropriate oversight committees are not restricted from the information they need to have to do their jobs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the recognition, and I would strongly emphasize that I join with my chairman and colleague from New Jersey in support of his amendment. So that there is clarity as to the purpose of his offering this amendment, I would reiterate two of his remarks.

Over the last few months, we have had several instances in which National Security staff has mandated that the Department of Defense and other agencies selectively withhold information from congressional oversight committees, and in one case specifically, excluding the Appropriations Committee. As the chairman rightfully pointed out, the Congress is vested exclusively with the constitutional authority to fund that defense, and the authority in this instance rests with the Appropriations Committee.

The committee has included clear direction in the Fiscal Year 2014 Defense

Appropriations Act and in the House-passed Defense Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2015 for the Department to report on the conduct of various programs as well as the obligation and expenditure of associated funding.

□ 1715

This direction addresses not only funds expressly provided in the Department's appropriations bill but Department actions that may cause the reprogramming of funds provided by the Congress.

Accurate, complete, and timely reporting by the Department of Defense is essential for the committee to conduct its oversight responsibilities. It informs committee deliberations to prepare the annual appropriations bills. It helps prepare the committee for negotiations with the Senate, and at present, it will help the committee formulate recommendations on the recently submitted fiscal year 2015 budget amendment on the overseas contingency operations.

The committee's responsibilities for funding are specific. Article I, section 9 of the Constitution states:

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law, and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

I strongly urge the adoption of the gentleman's amendment, which underscores the constitutional prerogative of the Congress as well as of the Committee on Appropriations.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Let me thank Chairman CRENSHAW and Ranking Member SERRANO for this opportunity to propose this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the chairman for yielding and for bringing this to the attention of the full House. I will refer to the gentleman as "chairman" because I have the pleasure of serving on the Defense Subcommittee, and he acts as the chairman of that.

Mr. Chairman, as the chairman has said, the National Security Council and the National Security Adviser have gotten into a bad habit, I think, of bypassing the Appropriations Committee, including the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee and the ranking member of the subcommittee, when it comes to issues of national security. I can tell you firsthand that I have had situations in which I have asked for an update on some matters, and they haven't been followed up on.

I want to thank the chairman for his leadership in all things defense. I want to encourage my colleagues to follow his lead, and I urge that we adopt this amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into any contract with an incorporated entity if such entity's sealed bid or competitive proposal shows that such entity is incorporated or chartered in Bermuda or the Cayman Islands, and such entity's sealed bid or competitive proposal shows that such entity was previously incorporated in the United States.

Ms. DELAURO (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentlewoman from Connecticut and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 2 minutes.

My amendment would prohibit Federal contracts from going to entities incorporated in Bermuda and the Cayman Islands—the two nations most often abused as tax havens.

In the past few weeks, this body has accepted similar provisions for the Department of Defense Appropriations bill; the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development bill; and the Energy and Water bill. The latter passed on a rollcall vote.

As before, we should not be spending taxpayers' money on Federal contracts for companies that have renounced their American citizenship in favor of an island tax haven.

Let me quote from an article from Saturday's Washington Post by Allan Sloan, a senior-editor-at-large from Fortune, and the title of the article is: "Tax-Dodging Firms Are Sticking Us with the Bill."

He writes:

These companies don't hesitate to take advantage of the great things that make America America—our deep financial markets, our democracy and rule of law, our military might, our intellectual and physical infrastructure, our national research programs, all the terrific places our country offers for employees and families to live—but investors do hesitate, totally, when it is time to ante up their fair share of financial support for our system.

He is right, and we should not be rewarding bad behavior and gifting these firms with lucrative Federal contracts.

Nearly two-thirds of the companies that have established subsidiaries in

tax havens have registered at least one in Bermuda or in the Cayman Islands. If a firm is going to abuse tax loopholes by pretending to be from these two island nations, we should make sure we are doing business with companies that are paying their fair shares instead.

We now have taken strong, decisive, and bipartisan action against these tax havens in three appropriations bills. I urge all of my colleagues to act here as well and stand for American businesses that are meeting their responsibilities to our Nation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition even though I am not opposed to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, very briefly, this is one of those issues that really gets you angry. Both sides believe that people should play by the rules, and what you have are people not playing by the rules. People in my district, people in Ms. DELAURO's district and people in Mr. CRENSHAW's district have to pay their taxes and pay their taxes where they live. They don't have the option of doing these kinds of things. For me, it is not only a legislative issue but a personal issue—the fact that these folks continue to get away with this kind of a situation.

This is an issue that Ms. DELAURO has been working on for years. It is one that she deserves a lot of credit for, and that is why we have to thank her for it.

I would like to take this opportunity to yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Connecticut will control the remaining time of the gentleman from New York.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Connecticut has 5¼ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Thank you for your good work on this amendment. This will be the third bill that we have amended on it.

Mr. Chairman, seldom has a day gone by recently without a headline about some American company that is running for the border to avoid its tax bill. Indeed, today's New York Times has "Patriot Flees Homeland," "Drug Firms Make Haste to Elude Tax," and an excellent piece in Fortune magazine and The Washington Post that Ms. DELAURO referenced by Allan Sloan, entitled, "Positively un-American tax dodges."

It all gives new meaning to the term "sunshine patriot" when some corporation renounces its citizenship and

claims it is a citizen of the Cayman Islands or of Bermuda, where it does little or no business other than tax evasion.

The willingness of corporations to renounce their citizenship and leave America behind, at least in name only and at least when the tax bill is due but not when the desire for a government contract is there, has been recognized in the Senate Finance Committee, where Senator WYDEN will conduct hearings next week on the best legislative approach to put a stop to this. But we can do something today to put a stop to what are called “inversions,” which are truly perversions of the Tax Code. As Mr. Sloan writes, “Inverters are deserters.”

Today, Members can respond to this desertion by denying them government contracts. I would like to do more, but I believe this legislation adopted now in these other appropriations acts—repeating it for every one of them—will do a great deal to send a message about those who shirk their responsibilities to America at the same time they ask other taxpayers to use their tax money to finance government contracts.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. DELAURO. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. The amendment says, if you renounce your citizenship and go abroad to avoid paying taxes, don't come with your hand outstretched to ask other taxpayers who stayed here and worked and contributed to the success of America—those that are proud to be American businesses and are paying their fair share—to pay for you to get a government contract. Don't ask them to put up their tax dollars to pay for your success.

We believe that this approach provides protection to the Treasury and responds to those corporations that have abandoned America.

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

I mentioned Mr. Sloan's article of this past weekend, and I just want to read this quote because I think it really puts this whole issue into perspective:

How much more are we talking about inverters sucking out of the U.S. Treasury? There is no number available for the tax revenue loss that is caused by the inverters and the never-heres so far, but it is clearly in the billions. Congress' Joint Committee on Taxation projects that failing to limit inversions from evading their responsibility like this will cost the Treasury at least another \$19.5 billion over 10 years and possibly much, much more.

At a time when we struggle here day by day to look for the resources to extend unemployment benefits, to pass a highway trust fund, to increase the minimum wage, to increase the dollars for biomedical research, to look for funds for education in this Nation for our children, we have corporations that are siphoning off \$19.5 billion. Not only do they do that, but they take with them, and we give to them, billions in

Federal contracts. No more should we do it.

I and others long fought for this. We have passed through the appropriations process a ban on Federal contracts for U.S. companies that acquire businesses in lower tax jurisdictions, and then they claim that their headquarters are there despite still being U.S. companies. We can send another strong statement to these companies today as we have already done on Defense, on Energy and Water, on Transportation-HUD, by coming together and passing this amendment. I urge all of my colleagues to support it. Tell them that they are not allowed to give up their American citizenship and, yet, claim it for billions in Federal contracts.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BACHUS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to reinstall the Red Mountain sculpture on the plaza of the Hugo Black Courthouse in Birmingham, Alabama.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Alabama and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, this is a very straightforward amendment, which I am joined by my colleague, Ms. TERRI SEWELL, in offering.

The chief judge of the Northern District of Alabama, Karon Bowdre, and the U.S. marshal who was appointed under the previous administration but who serves under this administration, Martin Keeley, have designated this statue as a security risk. We are more concerned over the opinions of the senior officials in that bill than we are of the GSA's in not having that statue located where it poses a security risk to the employees and visitors to that courthouse. Accordingly, I ask for the support of this important amendment.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BACHUS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

□ 1730

Mr. CRENSHAW. I just want to let you know that we are happy to accept your amendment.

Mr. BACHUS. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL).

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. I want to thank the gentleman from my home State of Alabama for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my colleague's amendment to prohibit funding in the underlying bill from being used to reinstall the Red Mountain sculpture on the plaza of the Hugo Black Federal courthouse in Birmingham, Alabama.

Despite the security concerns shared by both the United States marshal and the chief justice, Karen Bowdre, the GSA has planned to reinstall the sculpture. Both Chief Justice Bowdre and Marshal Keely believe that the sculpture is nonessential and will pose a serious security risk if reinstalled.

Chief Justice Bowdre noted, in correspondence to GSA, that the location of the statue will be roughly 10 to 12 feet from the only public entrance door, which is completely made of glass and, further, that the monument would create a fatal funnel where someone could hide behind the statue and possibly not be seen and cause a security risk.

Federal law clearly states that the United States marshals have the final authority regarding the security requirements for the judicial branch of the Federal Government. The Administrative Office of the United States Court has also agreed with the chief justice and the U.S. marshal that the final authority over these matters should lie with the U.S. marshal.

If the marshal and the chief justice believe that putting the sculpture back could threaten the safety of our court, then GSA should follow the law and not put the monument back up. Unfortunately, GSA is ignoring the concerns of the court and has plans to reinstall the statue.

Now, while I am a steadfast supporter of the arts, I also believe that the safety of our courts and the citizens must come first. This amendment simply reinforces that GSA must follow the law by prohibiting the reinstallation of the sculpture at the Birmingham, Alabama, Federal courthouse.

I want to thank my friend, Congressman SPENCER BACHUS from Alabama, for introducing this bipartisan amendment and urge my colleagues to join me in support of it.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MAFFEI) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. MAFFEI. Thank you, Ranking Member JOSÉ SERRANO.

Mr. Chairman, I am here because, on March 14, 2013, in my upstate New York district, a school librarian named Lori Bresnahan and a 10-year-old child were attacked in a mall parking lot.

The attacker was facing Federal child pornography charges and was out on bail and ordered to wear an electronic monitoring bracelet. He disabled the bracelet, left his home, stabbed Mrs. Bresnahan to death, and sexually assaulted the young girl.

In the days following the attack, it was revealed that the attacker had been removing and reassembling the GPS monitoring bracelet. The device sent out tamper alerts every time he disabled the device, but the Federal probation office responsible for monitoring this defendant before his trial failed to respond to 46 total tamper alerts.

On the day of the attack, he again disabled his bracelet, and the office again ignored the alert. If they had investigated any of these 46 tamper alerts, maybe this tragedy could have been avoided.

This appropriations bill funds the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, the organization tasked with overseeing the system of Federal probation offices all over this country.

After this case, I wrote to the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, asking them to investigate this gross negligence. In their response was, "Nothing can excuse the deficiencies in the supervision of this case," but it also said, "Reduced resources due to the sequester is harming the efforts to keep it from happening again."

Mr. Chairman, we have addressed the sequester for now, but serious funding issues remain. The administrative office is continuing to use their funding to backfill cuts they have had to make in previous years.

We cannot allow funding issues to hamper efforts to prevent cases like this from happening again, and to be clear, this has happened again around the country.

I ask that the committee take note of the serious problem and ensure that the administrative office gets the funds it needs to enact real reform and protect our communities.

I want to thank particularly the ranking member's willingness to work with me, Chairman CRENSHAW and your staff and the minority staff, your willingness to work with me on this.

Tragedies do happen, but this one could have, should have been avoided, and I am dedicated to help Congress do anything in our power to make sure it never happens again in central New York or anywhere in this great country.

Mr. SERRANO. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman is seeking to bring the salaries and expense of the courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services up to an appropriate level in part, as he mentioned, to address a tragic incident that took place in his district.

It highlights the problems the judiciary suffered while under sequestration and with the lower funding levels that agencies in the executive branch have also had to face.

We will work with the gentleman, the majority, and with the judiciary, as we do every year, to ensure that we can meet their funding needs and address the gentleman's concerns.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO) in a colloquy and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chairman, in 2010, this body passed the Hiring Incentives to Restore Employment Act, the HIRE Act. Included in that measure was the Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act, or FATCA.

FATCA requires U.S. citizens living abroad to prepare tax returns that include both non-U.S. income and non-U.S. financial accounts. Additionally, FATCA requires financial institutions in other countries to report on assets held by American clients to the IRS.

If those institutions do not supply that information, they would be subject to a 30 percent withholding tax. In a recent report, nearly 77,000 institutions have agreed to hand over that information to the IRS.

The unintended consequences of this law are affecting over 7 million Americans living overseas. Due to the additional reporting burden, many institutions are simply denying access to our citizens.

Simply put, added regulations from the Federal Government are putting our citizens at a competitive disadvantage around the world, and foreign firms now view our citizens as too much of a hassle and a liability to hire, making America less competitive.

One of the solutions to this would be to switch from a citizen-based taxation to a territorial or to simply repeal FATCA.

The U.S. citizens who live and work abroad are our Nation's biggest spokesmen for our America and our way of life and what America stands for. They represent our country in areas of the world that typically see Americans in a skewed light. We, as those in government, should give them every opportunity to succeed throughout the world.

However, we have so many stories like the American living in Australia, where her husband is an Australian citizen and they share a mutual bank account, but they have to comply with IRS rules, and she has no income; or the gentleman from Thailand who has retired. He worked for a U.S. company for the last 15 years, and he has to abide by U.S. tax laws, even though he has been over there and he resides outside of the U.S.

What Fidelity Mutual told him is we can no longer accept your money and invest because you live outside of the U.S., but you are a U.S. citizen.

Mr. Chairman, this is unacceptable. We in government should do everything possible to bring certainty to our citizens, regardless of where they live, and as a sign of a true great Nation, it is the ability for the Nation's citizens to travel and work wherever they choose in the world, without being disadvantaged by their own government.

I look forward to working with my colleague from Florida.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman.

As you point out, this is an extensive regulation. It is going to have a profound and far-reaching impact on our economy.

I believe these regulations, as you pointed out, are fraught with unintended consequences. As you point out, the regulation is creating headaches for many Americans who must report their foreign financial activities on the U.S. tax return, so they spend countless hours to prepare and file their tax forms necessary to comply with the regulation.

Mr. Chairman, we don't need more burdensome regulations. We need some pro-growth tax reform, to make it easier for Americans, whether living at home or living abroad, to comply with our tax laws.

Now, it is good to go after tax dodgers, that is understandable, but this is overkill, and I look forward to working with the gentleman to address these unintended consequences.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. SCHAKOWSKY

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any person whose disclosures of a proceeding with a disposition listed in section 2313(c)(1) of title 41, United States Code, in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System include the term "Fair Labor Standards Act."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentlewoman from Illinois and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, all of us know that hardworking men and women in all of our districts are having a rough time these days. Many are paid low wages or wages that are not enough to meet their family's basic needs. Those problems are made even worse when workers are the victims of wage theft.

Billions of dollars are actually stolen from workers through wage theft, and wage theft occurs when workers are forced to work off the clock, denied earned overtime pay, or paid less than the minimum wage. Workers can lose pay because of illegal paycheck deductions, be denied their final paychecks, or not be paid at all.

Interfaith Worker Justice, based in Chicago, has been working to stop wage theft for years. In 2008, its executive director, Kim Bobo, wrote a book called “Wage Theft in America: Why Millions of Working Americans Are Not Getting Paid—And What We Can Do About It.”

My amendment is one step we can take to do something about it. My amendment is simple. The idea is the same idea that has been offered on the House floor by my friend and colleague, Representative KEITH ELLISON, and is supported by the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

It says that Federal contractors have a duty to pay their workers their legally-earned wages and that corporations that don't pay their workers their legally-earned wages shouldn't benefit from Federal contracts. Similar language has successfully been added to the Energy and Water and Department of Defense Appropriations bills.

Wage theft has been documented. One study of workers in Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York City found that 26 percent were paid below legal minimum wage levels, 76 percent were denied earned overtime, and 70 percent were not paid for work outside of their regular shifts.

The North Carolina Justice Center found that workers in that State lost \$33 million in pay because of wage theft over the course of 5 years. The Economic Policy Institute found that, “In total, the average low-wage worker loses a stunning \$2,634 per year in unpaid wages, representing 15 percent of their income.”

This is a problem in many sectors, and that includes Federal contractors. A report by the Senate Health, Education, and Labor and Pensions Committee revealed that 32 percent of the largest Department of Labor penalties for wage theft were levied against Federal contractors.

National Employment Law Project found that 21 percent of Federal contract workers were not paid overtime and 11 percent had been forced to work off the clock.

Federal contract employees deserve to receive the dollars they have earned, the dollars that they need, the dollars they would spend in their communities, and the dollars that taxpayers awarded the contractors for those wages.

All workers should be safe from wage theft, but my amendment is much more modest. It just says that a contract under this FY 2015 Appropriations bill can't be awarded to a corporation found to be in violation of wage requirements under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

It says that corporations that cheat their employees out of hard-earned wages are not deserving of taxpayer-funded Federal contracts. It sends a clear message: obey the law, pay your workers the wages they have earned, or we won't give you the benefit of a taxpayer-financed Federal contract.

□ 1745

Allowing corporations to get away with violating the law is not just bad for their workers and taxpayers, it is unfair to the businesses that are competing for Federal contracts but won't engage in wage theft to get a competitive edge.

Do we really want to tell corporations that they can violate the law and steal wages from their workers and still get a Federal contract, or do we want to take a small stand by saying that only companies that play by the wage rules we have enacted will be eligible?

I hope we can agree that breaking the law in order to underpay workers is not acceptable, certainly should not be rewarded, and certainly not with taxpayer dollars. I urge my colleagues to help the workers who work for us. Support the Congressional Progressive Caucus amendment.

I certainly urge a “yes” vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHA-KOWSKY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MEEHAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to modify or rebuild any portion of the White House bowling alley, including using phenolic synthetic material.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to the FY15 Financial Services Appropriations bill.

But first, before I start, I would like to commend Chairman CRENSHAW for his tireless commitment to stopping the culture of spending and continuing the culture of savings that we have seen from his subcommittee chairmanship. Given our country's current fiscal situation, we need to be mindful of our limited resources and that we need to do more with less. And one of the most basic concepts in budgeting is balancing wants versus needs. A need is something that you have to have, something you can't do without. A want is something that you would like to have. A good example is calcium. You know, calcium is necessary for survival, but ice cream, on the other, hand is a want. Everyone needs calcium, but plenty of people would do just fine without ice cream.

What will my amendment do? It will demonstrate to the taxpayers that this

Congress understands the difference between wants and needs. My amendment prohibits any funds from this bill being spent by the General Services Administration towards the renovation of the bowling alley in the White House Eisenhower Office Building.

With our Nation \$17 trillion in debt, upgrading the President's private bowling alley shouldn't be a priority. A spiffy new bowling alley may suit the wants for Commander in Chief, but I think I speak for the taxpayers of the Seventh Congressional District when I assert that it is certainly not a need. I think when the administration came forward with this proposal, they rolled a gutter ball.

The hardworking Americans expect and deserve better. These are difficult times in our country. This is no time for business as usual.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, this has very little to do with a bowling alley. This is not even about the picture of Richard Nixon fully dressed, bowling at the White House. This is about this desire of Republicans and the Tea Party segment of Republicans, in some cases, to make Barack Obama seem like an illegitimate President.

The legitimacy of his Presidency has been questioned on and on. There were questions about his birthplace. There were questions about what he said his religion was. There were questions about whether he was old enough to be President. There have been questions about everything. So now, these petty attacks continue.

This is a nonissue. This is a non-starter. First of all, this was about fixing up a bowling alley that has been there forever. I don't think the American public, with all due respect to the people in the gentleman's district, really spend a lot of time concerned about the fact that all Presidents—and I mean all Presidents—are not allowed just to pick up and go to a local place to have a beer or bowl a game of bowling or whatever. So this is not an issue that we should be dealing with.

But what is important about it is that GSA, furthermore, has canceled the project. The Federal contractor posting was pulled on July 9. So I am sure that the other side knows that this no longer is an issue, but it continues to be something that sounds good. I am sure people will be writing about it tonight, that the bowling alley was going to be built at the White House. No. This was an existing one that was going to be refurbished. That contract has been pulled back. That idea has been pulled back.

There just continues to be more and more and more of this petty attack on a President. And I think it is not so

much that he was elected President, which caused a lot of pain for a lot of people, but the fact that he was re-elected. That really has turned a lot of people to a point where they will come up with anything.

So by tonight, we may see even the plumbing at the White House attacked, as we did a couple of years ago. And at that time, I remarked that there hadn't been any plumbers at the White House since the Nixon administration, and that was the truth. We have leaks. We have a White House that needs fixing, and this Congress wastes time on these kinds of issues.

So I would just hope that the gentleman would pull his amendment. If he doesn't, then I would hope we could defeat the amendment because it is just silly and not necessary at all.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, I suspect it is only silly if you are the people who don't care about the important expenditures of the taxpayers of the United States of America. This isn't some trivial issue. This is a question of priorities at a time where every family is struggling.

And the justification here in Time magazine of one of the individuals was this needs renovations. Would you believe it? According to their first-person testimony—and this is just the staffers and the President—there is no electric scoreboard down there, so you have to score by hand. And that is just debilitating when you are focused on bowling a 300 like I am.

Well, maybe we ought to have people who are focused on other kinds of things at this point in time. This is a serious issue in terms of the mispriority of spending Federal dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to assert the appropriate priorities in terms of our spending, and I urge a "yes" vote.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, just in closing, it is silly. And I am not suggesting the gentleman is silly.

We spend money, large amounts of money on the military and on other things that we never, ever, ever attack. We send money overseas in misguided military situations, and we don't complain about that. But it makes good headlines to say that today we stopped the bowling alley from being built at the White House. "Refurbished" was the question at hand, and it has been pulled back since July 9. There is no plan whatsoever to do anything with the existing old, decrepit bowling alley at the White House.

So this is not a gutter ball. This is not a strike for anyone. This is just more of their silliness that we will see for the next 24 hours.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

Mr. GRAYSON. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, pursuant to the Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals—

(1) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(2) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1); or

(3) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds \$3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

Mr. GRAYSON (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical to other amendments that have been inserted by voice vote into every appropriations bill that has been considered under an open rule during this Congress. It is also identical to the amendment I offered to last week's Energy and Water bill, which was passed by voice vote.

My amendment expands the list of parties with whom the Federal Government is prohibited from contracting due to serious misconduct on the part of the contractors. It is my hope that this amendment will remain uncontroversial, as it has been, and will again be passed unanimously by this House.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAYSON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I would be pleased to accept the amendment.

Mr. GRAYSON. I thank the gentleman and yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the gentleman for his offer to engage in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, money market funds are an important tool used by a variety of different organizations, such as businesses, State and local governments, school districts, pension funds, nonprofits, and more. In fact, it is estimated that between 1985 and 2008, people and organizations that invested in money market funds have earned \$450 billion more than they otherwise would have earned.

Since the financial crisis, there has been significant discussion about regulating the industry further. In 2010, the Securities and Exchange Commission, or SEC, put in place new rules to prevent future runs by imposing additional disclosure and liquidity standards.

Even after these changes, the Federal Reserve, through the Financial Stability Oversight Council, has attempted to usurp the jurisdiction and expertise of the SEC and proposed additional regulations on money markets. While the FSOC has since backed off their proposal, the SEC is poised to vote soon on a rule to impose a floating net asset value on certain funds.

I share many of the concerns that commenters on the SEC's rule raised about how a floating net asset value would adversely impact money market funds and the people and organizations that rely on them. In fact, it is worth noting that, of the 1,428 comments on the rule, 98 percent were against the floating net asset value.

Before regulators impose any additional changes on money markets, they must be certain that the costs and benefits have been thoroughly weighed. This includes ensuring that the likely tax changes that will need to be considered with a floating NAV are reviewed by the public in an open and transparent manner before moving forward. We should not eliminate money markets as an option for businesses, communities, workers, and retirees to grow and thrive.

In closing, I would like to thank the committee for its positive report language with respect to money market funds and thank the chairman for his time and consideration of this important matter.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Well, I appreciate the gentleman giving attention to this issue.

As you noted, we have included report language on money market funds within the bill. We are concerned about the issue, and we will work with you as this bill moves forward.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the gentleman and look forward to working with him on this important issue.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHERMAN

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce final leasing accounting standard rules, regulations, or requirements in FASB Project 2013-270, Accounting Standards Update Topic 842.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from California and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 1800

Mr. SHERMAN. So much of what we do on this floor is so partisan, going over the same old issues. I bring to you an amendment that I cowrote with the Chamber of Commerce which deals with an issue that has not yet been discussed on this floor.

The Financial Accounting Standards Board is funded by the SEC through a convoluted process designed to claim that they are not a government agency, but they are funded by a mandatory tax, and if you don't follow their prescriptions, you can, indeed, face criminal, as well as civil, penalties.

If it is not broke, don't fix it. For 100 years, we had good rules on how to account for leases. The tenant pays rent, the owner of the building owns the building, and the financial statements disclose in the footnotes all the details any financial analyst would want to see.

Since it is not broke, the folks at the Financial Accounting Standards Board have decided to fix it. They want to list on every balance sheet in America the future amount that will be paid in all lease payments as a liability. The effect of that is to increase the liabilities shown on the balance sheets of American business by \$2 trillion. That is right, this is a \$2 trillion issue that has not yet been discussed on this floor.

The Financial Accounting Standards Board has done some outreach and taken some testimony. By the standards of the accounting world, they have listened. But by the standards of democracy that we are familiar with, trust me, far more is done before you permit a single three-story apartment building.

Mr. Chairman, almost 70 Members of Congress have urged the Financial Accounting Standards Board to stop. They keep going. They want to act in concert with the European International Accounting Standards Board, and that board is beholden to the European Parliament in Brussels. That is right. Those who, in effect, enact American law are not listening to Congress; they are listening to the only Parliament in the world held in lower esteem than Congress.

What will be the effect on our economy? Well, this will add \$2 trillion to the balance sheet liabilities of American businesses. It will put a tremendous disincentive on businesses to sign long-term leases. If your tenant won't sign a long-term lease, you can't fund a new building project, a new shopping center, or a new industrial park. So that is why an economic study funded by the American Association of Realtors, the Economic Roundtable, the Business Owners and Management Association, and others says that the best-case scenario is that this will destroy 190,000 American jobs and reduce our GDP by almost \$28 billion a year. The worst-case scenario is over 3 million jobs and nearly half a trillion dollars decline in our GDP.

It is time for us to tell the Financial Accounting Standards Board not to go down this road in an effort to fix something that isn't broken.

It is time, also, to focus on an additional disadvantage of this accounting proposal, and that is it will cause tens of thousands—hundreds of thousands—of businesses in this country to be in violation of their loan covenants, which means that they will have to immediately pay off their liabilities or renegotiate with their bankers, who will insist upon higher personal guaranties and higher interest rates, et cetera.

Thousands and thousands of long-term bonds that have been sold in the public market will be held to be in violation of their loan covenants and will become immediately due—not because the businesses were wrong, but because the accounting standards changed.

Now, I have often thought that accounting principles ought to be written by the Financial Accounting Standards Board and not by Congress. I am clinging to that belief. As I see this disaster unfold in the preliminary—in the discussions of the Financial Accounting Standards Board, it is harder and harder to cling to that belief. But I still retain hope that the accounting standards board will change direction and will not adopt this new policy, which solves no problem and which will add \$2 trillion to the liabilities of American business and cost us hundreds and hundreds of thousands of jobs.

Mr. Chairman, because I am hopeful that they will change course, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. FLEMING

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WENSTRUP). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement guidance FIN-2014-G001 (relating to BSA Expectations Regarding Marijuana-Related Businesses) issued on February 14, 2014.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Louisiana and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to stop the implementation of Treasury guidance that is in direct conflict with the Federal anti-money laundering statutes.

On February 14, 2014, the Department of the Treasury Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, FinCEN, issued compliance guidance for "Bank Secrecy Act, BSA, expectations for financial institutions seeking to provide services to marijuana-related businesses."

I am concerned that Treasury forgot one detail: the Bank Secrecy Act and Federal anti-money laundering laws are explicitly clear that banks and financial institutions may not engage in marijuana-related transactions.

Despite trending State laws, Federal law remains unchanged. The Controlled Substances Act prohibits the manufacture, possession, and distribution of marijuana. Anything but compliance with the CSA, the law of the land, will trigger criminal anti-money laundering penalties, fines, and possible incarceration for perpetrators.

Instead of issuing guidance to reinforce Federal prohibitions, the FinCEN memo offers banks ways to report suspicion activities as required under Federal law, while blatantly ignoring the fact that banks are not allowed to participate in any marijuana transactions, without exceptions. In other words, instead of enforcing the law, there is just a suspicion alert sent out, which we don't even know if anyone is even going to pay attention to. The very act of depositing drug money runs afoul of Federal law.

Mr. Chairman, it is important to note that the Department of Justice also issued a memo in 2014, "Guidance Regarding Marijuana Financial Crimes." This separate memo reinforces Federal law and outlines possible prosecution and criminal offense for "transactions involving proceeds generated by marijuana-related conduct."

My amendment would stop the Department of the Treasury from implementing their February 2014 guidance, which is confusing and is actually creating problems throughout the industry. And it is the government, again, it

is the administration not enforcing its own laws. This is nothing short of tacit approval for money laundering, all the while encouraging banks, credit unions, and other financial institutions to engage in illegal and criminal activities.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield some time to my good friend from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. Well, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and let me see if I got this straight. Right now, manufacturing, distributing, or dispensing marijuana is still illegal under federal law. Right?

Mr. FLEMING. That is correct, sir.

Mr. CRENSHAW. And the Bank Secrecy Act still prohibits banks from laundering the proceeds of illegal activities. Is that right?

Mr. FLEMING. Right.

Mr. CRENSHAW. But in spite of the Controlled Substances Act and despite the Bank Secrecy Act, Treasury has given banks guidance on how to facilitate the sale of marijuana. That seems wrong, absolutely wrong. This amendment corrects that wrong, so I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of other speakers, so I will be very brief.

This really has very little to do with the substance that we are talking about, or that appears to be marijuana. It is about the fact that, whether we like it or not, there are States that have already legalized either recreational use, in two cases, or medical use in 22 States, and those situations require banking decisions and banking abilities. Jack Lew, Secretary of the Treasury, said at our hearing:

Without any guidance there will be a proliferation of cash-only businesses, and that would make it impossible to see when there are actions going on that violate both Federal and State law.

So an attack on the use of marijuana may be misleading here because what we are doing is really ignoring the banking aspect of this and the fact that there have to be some regulations and some issues put in place to do the right thing and to uphold the law, the banking laws and other laws.

With that, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Chairman, I say to my friend, Dr. FLEMING, and to the chairman of the committee that the guidance has already been implemented—the guidance from the Justice Department, the guidance from the Treasury Department to banks and to the regulators how to report activity around a marijuana business.

Mr. Chairman, there are now 22 States that allow for medical mari-

juana. There are two States that have legalized it for all adult purposes. We are at 24 States, and by the end of this year, we will be at about 30 States.

What is happening is because banks may not be following—they are doing what Dr. FLEMING would like to see. They are operating just in cash, which creates its own potential for crime, robbery, assault and battery. You cannot track the money. There is skimming and tax evasion. So the guidance by the Justice Department and the guidance by the Treasury Department is to bring this out into the open.

Mr. Chairman, I will insert in the RECORD yesterday's article in USA Today concerning the security issues dealing with all cash accounts, and the Treasury officials there say:

Our goal is to promote financial transparency and make sure law enforcement receives the reporting from financial institutions that it needs to police this activity.

[From USA Today, July 13, 2014]

POTS OF MARIJUANA CASH CAUSE SECURITY CONCERNS

(By Trevor Hughes)

DENVER.—The unmarked armored truck rumbles to a stop in a narrow alley, and former U.S. Marine Matthew Karr slides out, one hand holding a folder, the other hovering near the pistol holstered at his hip.

With efficient motions he retrieves a locked, leather-bound satchel from a safe set into the truck's side and presses a buzzer outside the door. It swings open to reveal a cavernous warehouse filled with marijuana and a safe stuffed with cash.

Welcome to the rear guard of Colorado's rapidly expanding legal marijuana industry, where eager users pour millions of dollars—most of it in small bills—into buying pot, hashish, and marijuana-infused foods and drinks. All that cash adds up, and there are few places to put it: Federal regulations, which still classify pot as an illegal drug, make it difficult for marijuana producers to deposit their profits into traditional bank accounts.

And those cash-heavy small businesses make awfully attractive—and vulnerable—targets for criminals.

That's where Karr and the company he works for come in.

Heading through the warehouse where workers tend young marijuana plants, Karr greets a young woman, and the two empty a safe of tens of thousands of dollars in cash neatly packed in plastic envelopes. Like every room in this combined marijuana store and grow house, the smell of pot hangs heavy in the air. Karr double-checks the ledger, locks his satchel and hustles outside, where former cop Phil Baca waits at the wheel of the armored car.

Karr opens the truck's safe, pitches the satchel inside and climbs back into the passenger seat, an AR-15 rifle stashed behind him. It's a scene that plays out six times in three hours. Their take for the day: somewhere close to \$100,000 in cash.

"For the first three months, people were just keeping the money everywhere—in the walls, in mattresses, at home," says Sean Campbell, CEO of Blue Line Protection Group, which provides marijuana security services, including Karr, Baca and the armored car. "And banks don't even want to deal with it. You have a quarter-of-a-million dollars in cash show up all at once. The counting time alone is going to take an hour."

The unusual problem of having too much cash is forcing business owners to hire secu-

rity firms like Campbell's, especially after Denver police warned in June of a credible threat against marijuana stores and couriers.

Marijuana-store owners have suffered some smash-and-grab robberies over the last several years but surveillance systems and close police attention have solved many of them. Experts say those robberies were largely committed by amateurs, rather than sophisticated crime rings.

Campbell said he believes it will take a serious high-dollar heist to force smaller marijuana stores to take their security more seriously.

State law requires marijuana businesses to have security cameras and systems on the premises, and many have armed guards, but they remain easy targets. The stores and grow operations often are in remote industrial areas, in warehouses that have not been hardened against a determined intruder. Many stores have large amounts of pot sitting around in rooms secured only by flimsy wooden doors.

Options are limited, however. Unlike most other businesses, marijuana-store owners can't easily open bank accounts for fear of running afoul of federal law. Despite Washington state joining Colorado last week in legalizing sales of marijuana for recreational purposes and 23 states plus the District of Columbia permitting medical pot, the federal government still classifies the plant as an illegal drug more dangerous than cocaine or methamphetamine.

By opening a bank account, pot growers and shop owners run the risk of being charged with money laundering, because federal banking laws and regulations are deliberately aimed at tracking large flows of cash like those generated by both legal and illegal drug sales. A single such charge can bring decades in prison, and most banks and pot-shop owners don't want to run that risk.

"When you go into the business, and you know it's federally illegal, you're taking your chances," said Tom Gorman, who runs the federally funded Rocky Mountain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area task force. "That's the problem when the state legalizes something that remains illegal at the federal level."

While declining to be quoted by name, many marijuana store owners interviewed by USA TODAY shared tales of playing cat-and-mouse with banks, managing to keep accounts open for only a few months at a time before getting shut down.

U.S. Treasury officials require banks to file what are known as "suspicious activity reports" whenever they suspect someone is trying to launder money. Anyone bringing in a pile of cash sets off internal alarms for bank workers, pot-shop workers say. Federal financial-crimes investigators encourage banks to report suspected marijuana transactions because pot remains illegal at the federal level.

"Our goal is to promote financial transparency and make sure law enforcement receives the reporting from financial institutions that it needs to police this activity and to make it less likely that this financial activity will run underground and be much harder to track," said Steve Hudak, a spokesman for the Treasury Department's Financial Crimes Enforcement Network.

Tax-and-marijuana attorney Rachel Gillette said she's seen banks' concerns firsthand—several banks she deals with said they wouldn't let her open an account, even though both the federal and state government are allowed to deposit tax payments from pot sellers. Gillette said federally regulated banks say it's just easier for them not to risk getting their hands tainted by pot.

"They literally told me they would not take my account because I do business with

the marijuana industry," Gillette said. "That seems fundamentally unfair—the state is taking that money and putting it in the bank; the IRS is taking that money and putting it in the bank."

Gillette is suing the IRS on behalf of one of her clients who has been paying federal payroll tax bills with cash. The IRS calls for electronic payments and adds a 10% surcharge for cash payments, she said. With some marijuana businesses paying payroll taxes of \$100,000 a quarter, those penalties are substantial.

Colorado has tried to solve the problem with a new state law permitting creation of marijuana banking cooperatives, which would have the power to accept deposits, lend money and make electronic payments. But that system likely won't begin operating for at least another year, said Gov. John Hickenlooper, and even then federal officials would need to bless the plan.

The amount of cash already flowing through the fast-growing system has forced state tax officials to change how they accommodate payments. While Colorado allows businesses to pay their taxes in cash, most pay electronically. Marijuana businesses, however, must trek to a central Denver office, cash in hand, where they're met at the curb by armed guards and escorted inside. "Some people walk in with shoe boxes. Some people have it in locked briefcases. We've had people bring it in buckets," said Natriece Bryant, a spokeswoman for the Colorado Department of Revenue.

Campbell, who runs the armored-car company, said the vast cash flows are a clear come-on for criminals. He said he's working with banks to offer alternatives for marijuana businesses, including vault services. For many in the marijuana industry, the scene from the Emmy-winning television series *Breaking Bad* of a storage unit filled with drug cash hits uncomfortably close to reality.

Says Campbell, "You're effectively creating a magnet for crime."

Mr. PERLMUTTER. So I would urge a big "no" vote on this amendment. It is going backwards.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. So many have spoken on this floor in favor of states' rights. A majority of Americans live in States in which medical marijuana is legal, and yet we have this bizarre circumstance where these have to be all cash businesses. The result, as the gentleman from Colorado points out, is tax evasion—or potentiality for tax evasion—and also an invitation to crime—violent street crime—as people figure out how they can invade with guns a store that is licensed by my State or his State and try to steal huge quantities of cash.

It is absolutely absurd to tell people that they cannot use medical marijuana when they are in physical pain and they live in a State where that is allowed, and it is even more absurd to have to keep millions of dollars of cash there for the possible criminal taking because we have businesses that are actually operating that are outside the banking system.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Chairman, first of all, it is absolutely a fact that marijuana, the use of marijuana and the sale of marijuana, is against federal law. Now, you may want to change that law, but that is the law.

Also, our banking system, even those that are State banks, State charter banks, fall under a Federal banking system.

You are talking about money laundering. Well, what about other drugs? What about heroin? What about methamphetamines? Should we also have exemptions and carve-outs for those as well? Why even have a system that detects money laundering and actually enforces that if we are going to begin to create exemptions and carve-outs for that as well?

Also, I would remind folks that with regard to medical marijuana, that is still very controversial. The reason why marijuana is still a Schedule I drug, illegal, is that it is neither known nor accepted by authorities that raw marijuana has an acceptable medical use.

□ 1815

Now, yes, extracts of marijuana, even Marinol—which is synthetic THC—is a schedule III, like hydrocodone, and that can be prescribed and monitored by a physician. There is no problem with that, and the money can go into any banking system.

So if there are beneficial parts of the marijuana, we can extract that and create medication from it, whether it is liquid or tablet, injection or whatever, and then that will certainly be delivered, prescribed by physicians.

I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay a performance award under section 5384 of title 5, United States Code, to any employee of the Internal Revenue Service.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Arizona and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer one final amendment to the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act for the fiscal year 2015.

Let me first say that I am especially grateful to Chairman CRENSHAW and Ranking Member SERRANO for working with me on my variety of amendments to this bill. They have been exceptionally cooperative and congenial. I would also like to thank the staff of the Financial Services Subcommittee. They have also been very courteous and cooperative with my staff.

My final amendment to the bill seeks to effectuate a policy of accountability in government. Historically, the IRS has never been liked by the American people. The agency takes our hard-earned wages and enforces the Internal Revenue Code.

I would argue that the power wielded by this agency is matched only by the Department of Defense because, as we all know, the power to tax is the power to destroy, and although no one ever liked the IRS, most Americans quietly trusted them.

They trusted that the agency was enforcing the law with fairness and impartiality and were beyond reproach in terms of political pressure. That trust has not only been questioned, it has been annihilated.

This year, House Republicans have gone above and beyond to hold this President and his lawless administration accountable for their actions and inactions, and this is another opportunity to act rather than to speak.

My final amendment to the bill follows in the footsteps of another that I cosponsored and supported in the MilCon-VA Appropriations Act just a few weeks ago. This amendment would prohibit bonuses or performance awards to be paid to senior executive employees at the IRS.

The saying goes with great power comes great responsibility. The IRS is responsible for administering tax laws fairly and justly. They have failed at that responsibility, and they now must be held accountable. Senior management should never have let this happen.

Moreover, they should not be given performance awards in the wake of one of the largest scandals in recent history. Giving out bonuses is ludicrous and amounts to a slap in the face to the American public.

I would also like to quickly note that I appreciate the committee's inclusion of a provision, section 112, in the bill. That section prescribes that, before a bonus may be awarded to an IRS employee, an assessment of the employee's conduct, in addition to a mandatory check for back taxes or delinquent taxes, must be performed and taken into account.

As a duly-elected Member of Congress representing hundreds of thousands of Arizonans, I cannot, in good

conscience, allow any sort of bonus to be awarded to senior management at this rogue agency.

As long as I remain a Member of this body, I will seek to ensure that this policy becomes law each and every fiscal year. It is my hope that this amendment will ultimately be signed into law and that no bonuses at all will be awarded in the next fiscal year.

None should have been given this last year, but Commissioner John Koskinen decided to dole out bonuses anyway, despite the anger he knew it would cause. Overall, my hope is that this amendment will incentivize one of these senior executives at the IRS to come forth with copies of Lois Lerner's magically vanishing emails.

Should that day come and should the Congress and the American people receive closure to this scandal, I will cease my efforts to prohibit these awards, and the IRS may begin the process of rebuilding the trust it has so blatantly violated.

This agency has shown contempt for the American taxpayer, and the ensuing outrage at the IRS has been bipartisan. When the House voted on House Resolution 565 to demand that Attorney General Eric Holder appoint a special counsel to look into the scandal, 26 Democrats voted to support that measure.

As I mentioned with my last IRS amendment, if you disapprove of the IRS leaking tax information about the President's political opponents, then support my amendment.

If you disapprove of the IRS targeting conservative groups for their political beliefs, then support my amendment. If you disapprove of the IRS ignoring congressional subpoenas, then support my amendment.

If you disapprove of this agency stonewalling Congress, destroying evidence, and lying to the American people, then support my amendment. Finally, if you disapprove of IRS senior executives receiving bonuses for their failures, then support my amendment.

Again, I thank the chairman and ranking member for their continued work on the committee.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSAR. I will certainly yield to the chairman.

Mr. CRENSHAW. The gentleman has made a couple of interesting points that I think bear emphasis. Some of the actions of the IRS have been outrageous, and we have talked about that from time to time. As the gentleman pointed out, this year, \$63 million in bonuses were paid to IRS employees.

It is interesting they were paid by the new Commissioner when the prior Commissioner had decided that it was not appropriate to pay those bonuses, and then the new Commissioner testified before our subcommittee how he was outraged that he didn't have enough money to answer more than 61 percent of his phone calls.

I said: Sir, what is outrageous to me is you don't have enough money to an-

swer the phone calls, which is the first thing you ought to do, yet you paid \$63 million in bonuses, and then we find out that some of the people who received the bonuses were delinquent on their taxes.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. GOSAR. I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I get tired of saying this, but it has to be said. I realize that the other side's desire is to bring the IRS down to nothing. It is a constitutional question. We have the power to collect taxes. One would argue that we must have a department that collects taxes.

They may not always be the department—the agency—we want them to be. Both sides, whether one believes it or not, were outraged that something wrong might have been done, but to suggest and paint with a broad brush the whole IRS and say that everyone there at the senior level is not worthy of a bonus or not worthy of our respect is really to do a disservice to public service employees. These folks do a job. They do a job on a daily basis.

Are there problems with the IRS? There have always been problems at the IRS. Has the IRS been an agency that is loved by the American public? No, because we as Americans would love somehow to do everything we need to do, but have taxes that are either very low or nonexistent.

That is not a knock on us. We would all rather pay less taxes than we pay, but we continuously just spend time knocking and knocking. If you measure the time that we have spent on this bill so far and you measure how much of that time has been allocated to the IRS and to bringing it down, not to helping it in any way, not to coming up with any solutions—the whole argument has been they did something wrong, we are going to punish them.

We are not talking about children. We are not talking about a foreign government that attacked us. We are talking about an agency that might not have done everything the way we want them to do it, and therefore, we have to use our resources, our power, and our legislative ability to make them do a better job, to help them along the way, not to destroy them.

So here we are saying if you have executives at the higher level that are doing a good job, you can't help them in any way. You have to ignore that.

Now, we talk about morale. We talk about morale with our staff. We talk about morale with our Membership. Why do we have so many Members who are retiring?

If you asked them, a lot of them are retiring because we don't get along the way we used to or maybe because we spend so much time on wasteful issues.

So we can't paint with a brush the whole IRS. We have to find a way to help, to make them a better agency—yes, to use tough love.

Absolutely, I will be the first one to agree to that and to join the majority in doing that, but this whole word of punishing of a worthless institution, of a corrupt institution, of an institution that does not follow the law, that is not true, that is not fair, and that is not correct.

That is why this amendment is misguided, and it may do just the opposite, like so many of these amendments. By punishing, you bring down morale, and you bring down the support of those who could help us do a better job at the IRS like we all would like.

I hoped that we would get Mr. GOSAR to withdraw his amendment, but his facial expression tells me that I am crazy in asking that question. You don't have to agree that I am crazy in asking that question, but I think we should defeat this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF WASHINGTON

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used, with respect to the States of Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Washington, or Wisconsin or the District of Columbia, to prohibit or penalize a financial institution from providing financial services to an entity solely because the entity is a manufacturer, producer, or person that participates in any business or organized activity that involves handling marijuana or marijuana products and engages in such activity pursuant to a law established by a State or a unit of local government.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Washington and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer this bipartisan amendment to carry forth an important issue of public safety to provide legally-constituted marijuana businesses access to banking services. To do otherwise is to render them an all-cash sector of the economy, which is fraught with peril.

If you supported the Rohrabacher amendment to the Commerce-Justice and Science Appropriations which passed clearly, then you will support this as well. It brings forth the terms and conditions of the Department of Justice and Financial Crimes Enforcement Network.

Yesterday morning, on the very front page of USA Today was an article setting forth the dangers of all-cash businesses in our States that have approved legally marijuana-related businesses. In the words of the Attorney General:

You don't want just huge amounts of cash in these places. They want to be able to use the banking system. It is a public safety component. Huge amounts of cash, substantial amounts of cash just kind of lying around with no place for it to be appropriately deposited is something that worries me, just from a law enforcement perspective.

□ 1830

If you support public safety, if you supported the Rohrabacher amendment to the Commerce, Justice, and Science bill, you will support this amendment as well. In the interest of public safety, you will do this. Because in the words of the Department of Justice, the two most important terms and conditions: keep marijuana out of the hands of children and keep cash out of the hands of gangs and the cartels. To oppose this amendment is to support that, and I know you don't want that.

So, I urge you in the strongest terms to support this amendment, this bipartisan amendment, as was adopted earlier on the Commerce, Justice, and Science Appropriations bill.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: "An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

The amendment requires a new determination.

Therefore, I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Yes, I do.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Chairman, I would just urge the Chair, in ruling, that this does not change the law in any respect. It respects the guidance

that has been promulgated by the Justice Department and the Treasury Department and does not make a change and is not outside of the rules.

I would say to my friend from Florida that his point of order is incorrect, and would ask the Chair to rule that the gentleman's amendment is in order.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination as to the reason a financial institution provides financial services to an entity.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of chapter 29, 31, or 33 of title 44, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Michigan and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment which builds off the good work accomplished by Chairman CRENSHAW and Ranking Member SERRANO in the underlying bill.

At a recent Oversight and Government Reform Committee hearing, we had the opportunity to hear testimony from David Ferriero, the Archivist of the United States and head of the National Archives and Records Administration, which oversees the Federal Records Act.

In his testimony before Congress, Mr. Ferriero gave an account of how the IRS failed to notify him about the unauthorized disposal of Lois Lerner's hard drive, a hard drive which contained key emails and information about her actions in the targeting of conservative groups. In fact, during my questioning of Mr. Ferriero, he stated that the IRS "did not follow the law."

It is clear the IRS has not made it a priority to comply with the intent of the law, whether in the form of intimidating taxpayers, ignoring congressional requests for documents, or ignoring requirements to document valuable records that are in the public interest. My amendment would address one of these failures and prohibit any funds in this bill to be used by the IRS to act in contravention of the Federal Records Act.

It is a commonsense check on the IRS's recent behavior, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I just want you to know that in the bill we have a provision that applies to the IRS. This is a little bit broader, but I think it is a good amendment, so I encourage folks to support it.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is primarily concerned with records management at the IRS, which does not surprise us—the IRS again. However, this bill already contains a provision preventing the use of funds by the IRS to violate these very same sections of the code. In other words, the bill that we are debating today, the full bill, already accomplishes what the gentleman seeks to do. Every agency is already required to follow Federal records management law, so this amendment seems particularly unnecessary.

I realize Members on the other side want to continue to issue press releases stating how tough they are on the IRS, but there is no need to restate current law. I think that this one is different in the sense that while other amendments that I may not approve of or support speak to an issue that hasn't been spoken to before or repeat something we have dealt with before, this one speaks to an issue that Mr. CRENSHAW already took care of in the bill.

That is my opposition to it, and that is why I think the amendment is unnecessary.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from New York for his concern about this. I am concerned as well.

I appreciate the fact what the chairman has said, that this expands the reach; it expands the authority. If, indeed, all of our agencies had a requirement under the Federal Records Act and they followed it, I wouldn't be here. But under significant questioning of the Archivist of our Nation, he indicated to me under significant questioning that the IRS "did not follow the law."

That is the purpose of this amendment: to make sure there are more teeth available even than what is put in this good bill to make sure that the IRS follows the law.

I ask my colleagues for support for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FARENTHOLD
Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), add the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds in this Act may be available for the Office of Management and Budget to process or approve an apportionment request that does not include the following phrase: "Apportioned amounts are not available for any position that is held by an employee with respect to whom the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives has certified a statement of facts to a United States attorney under section 104 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 194).".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Texas and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to offer an amendment that would prohibit funding to any Federal employee who has been found in contempt of Congress.

As a member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, I have had serious concerns about the non-responsiveness of certain Federal officials to legitimate congressional oversight activities. In some of these situations, the actions have been taken by this House to hold these officials in contempt of Congress.

Specifically, my amendment prevents funds from being made available for the Office of Management and Budget to process or approve an apportionment request from an executive agency that does not include the following language:

Apportioned amounts are not available for any position that is held by an employee with respect to whom the President of the Senate or Speaker of the House of Representatives have certified a statement of facts to a United States attorney under section 104 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 194).

What the experts and lawyers tell me this means is we won't pay folks who have been held in contempt of Congress. The taxpayers don't need to be funding somebody who is not cooperating with their elected representative, and it has gotten so bad that this entire body has held them in contempt.

If somebody has failed to do his or her job in the private sector or in any other environment, they wouldn't get paid, and I think the Federal Government needs to follow this.

Let me give you a little bit of background on the process so you understand how this is going to work.

Funds apportioned to executive agencies are apportioned or handed out by the OMB. Executive agencies must submit a request to the OMB 40 days before the start of the fiscal year or within 15 days of the enactment of the appropriations act. The OMB then determines how the executive agency's fund will be apportioned.

This amendment would require an executive agency to include the quoted language in their apportionment request to the OMB, which would prevent the OMB from allocating funds to an

agency for the salaries of Federal employees who have been found in contempt of Congress.

To me, this is just common sense. We don't pay employees who don't cooperate with their boss. We are the elected representatives of the people. We are the boss, and we need to enact this legislation to ensure those in contempt of Congress do not continue to receive taxpayer funds.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay any individual at an annual rate of Grade 1, Steps 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6; or Grade 2 Step 1 or 2 as defined in the "Salary Table 2014-GS" published by the Office of Personnel Management. Further, none of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay any individual at an hourly basic rate of Grade 1, Steps 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6; or Grade 2, Step 1 or 2.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would end the Federal Government's practice of paying poverty wages to its workers and hopefully set an example for the private sector to stop paying poverty wages to its workers.

My metropolitan area of Florida has the lowest average wages of any of the 50 biggest cities in America. It is time to end this and to pay people fairly. A fair day's work should result in a fair day's pay.

The reason why we have to end poverty wages in America is simple. It is just too expensive to be poor in America. If you are poor, it is difficult to buy or rent a place to live, to buy or lease a car to drive, even to get electricity from a utility company, to save any money at all, or even open a bank account. It is just too expensive to be poor in America.

Journalist Barbara Ehrenreich put it best:

If you can't afford the first month's rent and security deposit you need in order to rent an apartment, you may get stuck in an overpriced residential motel.

If you don't have a kitchen or even a refrigerator and microwave, you will find yourself falling back on convenience store food, which—in addition to its nutritional deficits—is also alarmingly overpriced.

If you need a loan, as most poor people eventually do, you will end up paying an interest rate many times more than what a more affluent borrower would be charged.

To be poor—especially with children to support and care for—is a perpetual high-wire act.

□ 1845

Mr. Chairman, when I say "it's too expensive to be poor in America," I am not just quoting a poverty advocate. I am quoting Noah Wintroub, an official for JPMorgan Chase. Yes, even the bankers are telling us that it is too expensive to be poor in America.

Right now, the Federal Government can pay as little as \$8.62 an hour for a grade 1, step 1 worker. That is not enough. You get what you pay for. That is the capitalist way. If a government worker has to take another job just to get by, then that worker can't focus on doing a good job serving the public. If a Federal worker is working 80 hours a week instead of 40 just to survive, he is not going to do a good job at either job.

My amendment simply would not allow the government to pay anyone less than \$10.10 an hour—still a very modest amount. According to CBO, it doesn't cost the government a single dime extra. It is supported by the American Federation of Government Employees. Paying Federal workers \$10.10 an hour is still not enough, but at least it is a start.

Right now, the minimum wage gives you \$1,200 a month to live on if you work a full-time job for 40 hours a week. From that \$1,200 a month, you must pay your Social Security taxes, your Medicare taxes, pay for your food, your clothing, your housing, your transportation. You must also pay, by the way, for the food and clothing of your children.

That is not possible. It is simply not possible to live that way, and we can't expect people to do that. In fact, the taxpayers end up subsidizing them through food stamps, Medicaid, the earned income credit, and a dozen other ways that we make up for the shortfall when their employers are not paying them enough to keep them alive.

I think it is time that we take a stand. I hope this body sees the wisdom of paying at least Federal workers, to start, above poverty wages. I urge this body to accept this amendment and set a proper standard for labor in this country. Let's have \$10.10, not \$7.25. You can't survive on \$7.25.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I just got this amendment a little bit ago. I don't quite understand what the gentleman is trying to do.

As I read the amendment, it basically says you just can't pay Federal employees. If I am a Federal employee and somebody says you can't pay me this wage, I guess I can either come to work and not get paid or I can just decide that you decided not to pay me so I don't think I will come to work anymore.

I don't know how many people are affected by this, but I have got to believe

a lot of people would look at this and say: Gee, the gentleman from Florida says we are just not going to pay you.

I guess on behalf of the Federal employees, I have to oppose that, because I think all Federal employees ought to be paid. I don't think we should pass legislation saying they can't be paid.

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

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the creativity of my colleague from Florida's argument, but no one is suggesting Federal employees have to work for free. All this amendment does is simply eliminate the poverty rates set forth in the General Schedule and replaces them with the existing higher rates.

All we are saying here is that grade 1, steps 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 are below poverty level; grade 2, steps 1 and 2 are below poverty level.

I don't see how this amendment could possibly lead to the scenario that the gentleman from Florida, the chairman, is describing. It simply would mean that these workers would no longer be paid poverty wages. They would be paid under the existing GSA schedule a proper day's pay for a proper day's work.

Therefore, and given the fact that the AFGE, which is responsible for representing these workers, supports this amendment and rejects the nightmare scenario described by the gentleman from Florida, I would hope to have the gentleman from Florida's consent and support for this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I just want to read this again. It says that none of the funds made available by this act may be used to pay any individual at an annual rate of grade 1, step 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6.

So if you are grade 1, step 6, it says you can't be paid at that rate. It doesn't say anything about raising your salary or lowering your salary. It just says you can't be paid.

I really think that this is something we ought to reject. I urge my colleagues to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MASSIE

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act, including amounts made available under titles IV or VIII, may be used by any authority of the government of the District of Columbia to prohibit the ability of any person to possess, acquire, use, sell, or transport a firearm except to the extent such activity is prohibited by Federal law.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment that would stop the District of Columbia from taking any action to prevent law-abiding citizens from possessing, using, or transporting a firearm.

Despite the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *District of Columbia v. Heller* that struck down the unconstitutional D.C. handgun ban, it is still difficult for D.C. residents to exercise their God-given right to bear arms. Congress has the authority to legislate in this area pursuant to article I, section 8, clause 17 of the Constitution, which gives Congress the authority "to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever" over the District of Columbia.

Through unreasonable regulation, arbitrary time limits and waiting periods, and a ridiculous registration renewal process for guns that have already been registered, the government bureaucrats of the District continue to interfere with the District's residents' right to self-defense.

As the *Washington Times* reported earlier this year, the District of Columbia has passed the first law ever in the United States that requires a citizen who has already legally registered a gun to pay for reregistration, go to police headquarters and submit to invasive photographing and fingerprinting. This is pure harassment.

Why would the D.C. government want to punish and harass law-abiding citizens who simply want to defend themselves from criminals? As everyone with even the smallest bit of common sense knows, criminals, by definition, don't care about the laws. They will get the guns any way they can.

Does anyone actually believe that strict gun control laws will prevent criminals from getting guns? Strict gun control laws do nothing but prevent good people from being able to protect themselves and their families in the event of a robbery, home invasion, or other crime.

I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

"An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

It also adds a requirement on D.C. that it doesn't add anywhere else. It imposes additional duties by requiring law enforcement or the D.C. Council to determine what is prohibited by Federal law before they are allowed to legislate.

We know that folks like to sound good on certain issues by legislating from here, but the city council should not be asked to incur these extra duties that they don't have now.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chair, I certainly disagree with the gentleman's points there.

First of all, Congress has the constitutional authority to legislate and exercise over all matters in the District of Columbia. Furthermore, if a law enforcement officer in the District of Columbia is not already familiar with Federal laws, then I question whether he should be a law enforcement officer.

But most of all, I would make the point that the underlying bill already contains language that is virtually identical in form to the amendment that I have offered. For instance, section 809 states that "none of the Federal funds contained in this Act may be used to enact or carry out any law, rule, or regulation to legalize or otherwise reduce penalties associated with the possession, use, or distribution of any schedule I substance under the Controlled Substance Act."

There are multiple examples in the underlying bill where the structure of those portions of the bill are identical to my amendment and require knowledge of law.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination by the District of Columbia as to the state of Federal firearms law. The gentleman has not shown that this determination is already required.

The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Committee?

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes had it.

So the decision of the Chair stands as the judgment of the Committee.

□ 1900

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MARINO

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to collect any underpayment of any tax imposed by the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to the extent such underpayment is attributable to the taxpayer's loss of records (except in the case of fraud).

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARINO. I thank the chair and the ranking member for their hard work and dedication during the appropriations process, and I look forward to working with them on a number of important issues surrounding the treatment of taxpayers by the IRS.

Mr. Chairman, I will be withdrawing this amendment at the conclusion of my allotted time. However, I wish to make a point.

I agree with the steps the committee has taken within this legislation, but feel more must be done to ensure equal treatment for all taxpayers. My amendment would prohibit the IRS from pursuing claims against taxpayers for underpayment where the issue is lost records, except in the case of fraud.

According to its own publications, the IRS recommends that taxpayers keep records up to 7 years—and more in some cases—to respond to potential audits. This is often necessary for individuals and corporations to retain records for years and potentially longer for businesses depending upon the circumstances and types of records.

The loss of records can have significant repercussions for the taxpayer and can result in penalty fees and payments of back taxes with interest. Should these taxpayers be audited, the burden is on them—yes, the burden is on them—to produce proper records, not the IRS. While these regulations make sense, as we do not want taxpayers improperly withholding taxes they properly owe under the current tax system, it is unfortunate that the one agency promulgating the regulations does not follow these strict standards.

We now know the IRS, through its employee Ms. Lois Lerner, Director of Exempt Organizations, unfairly targeted and scrutinized conservative groups in their applications for tax-exempt status. Under the IRS' rules, Ms. Lerner was required to retain her records discussing policy decisions and discussions in paper form, including those related to the decision to probe conservative organizations. However, Ms. Lerner refused to follow protocol, and to make matters worse, her email copies were lost due to a so-called computer crash.

Given Ms. Lerner's blatant disregard to keep records properly in accordance with IRS rules, it is patently unfair to require taxpayers to follow such burdensome standards. In addition, the IRS Commissioner testified on the topic of Ms. Lerner's emails multiple times before the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, suggesting that there would be no issue in producing the emails. However, the Commissioner knew there was an issue with Ms. Lerner's computer in February and that the emails were certainly lost in March. Despite this knowledge, he failed to notify Congress until June.

This is outrageous. While the IRS is trying to evade explaining the loss of records, we should prohibit the IRS from mercilessly pursuing taxpayers for the exact same fault.

With that, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), my colleague and the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman's amendment even though I reserved a point of order.

I would just inquire if the gentleman intends to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MARINO. I do, I am going to do that in my closing, sir.

I thank the chairman for his support of the principle of my amendment. While I recognize this would be legislative language in an appropriations bill, I welcome the opportunity to work with the chair and my other colleagues to properly investigate this situation and ensure that similar situations of government abuse do not arise in the future.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF WASHINGTON

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have a new and improved amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used, with respect to the States of Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Washington or Wisconsin or the District of Columbia, to penalize a financial institution solely because the institution provides financial services to an entity that is a manufacturer, producer, or a person that participates in any business or organized activity that involves handling marijuana or marijuana products and engages in such activity pursuant to a law established by a State or a unit of local government.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman

from Washington and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a referendum on public safety. It follows the exact intent—but is technically perfected—of the earlier amendment that was offered, and I thank the gentleman from the majority for pointing out its technical flaws. They have been corrected.

It is a referendum on public safety. If you want to render an all-cash sector of the economy in the 23 States that allow for medical marijuana and in the two States that allow for the adult recreational use of marijuana, you will make them unsafe. That is for certain.

I entreat you to pick up yesterday's USA Today and read the excellent article, including the citation of several security experts, about what will happen with a certainty, inevitably, if we do not take this measure.

If you want to keep marijuana out of the hands of children and if you want to keep cash out of the hands of gangs and cartels, you will support this amendment.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the State of Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

The medical marijuana industry is rapidly taking root in Nevada. Our local governments are developing regulations and are issuing licenses as we speak. Yet representatives of this exciting industry continue to raise the same concern—a lack of access to banks, which is critical for the safe operation of any small business.

This commonsense measure would respect states' rights, add more transparency, facilitate regulations, protect the public, and foster the growth of small business. I urge a vote in favor.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the State of California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. I thank Congressman HECK for yielding and for his really bold and tremendous leadership on this.

I am proud to join you, Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. ROHRBACHER, in co-sponsoring this bipartisan, commonsense amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would provide important certainty to business owners, employees, government agencies, and financial institutions in 34 States and jurisdictions that have passed marijuana reform laws.

By prohibiting Federal agencies from unduly penalizing financial institutions for providing basic banking services, like opening a checking account, this amendment would ensure that legitimate business owners can comply

with State regulations and that regulators and law enforcement can hold businesses accountable.

□ 1915

I recently had a chance to visit one of these small businesses in my home district of Oakland, California, and know how big an impact the access to financial services can have.

When these businesses are unable to access financial services, they are forced to use unsatisfactory cash-based transactions that lack transparency, accountability, and create a threat to public safety.

I was proud to cosponsor a similar amendment to the Commerce, Justice, and Science Appropriations bill that passed the House. I want to thank Mr. HECK again for his leadership and hope this passes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, a little earlier, we had a discussion about this, and I pointed out that it is very clear that, right now, it is still illegal under Federal law to manufacture, to distribute, or to dispense marijuana. That is the Federal law.

There is also a Federal law that says banks can't launder the proceeds of illegal activities, and as we talked about earlier, we have got the fact that the Treasury has given guidance on how to facilitate the sale of marijuana.

The point is the law is the law. The Federal law, I just stated, and I don't think we can go around picking and choosing which States the Federal law applies to. The Federal law is the Federal law, and that is the way it ought to be.

I think that the fact that we have those two laws, when somebody violates those laws, that is wrong. Earlier this evening, we adopted an amendment that corrected that. This seeks to go back the other way.

I would just urge people to vote "no" on this because we have a Federal law that controls, and we can't pick and choose who gets to comply and who doesn't.

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

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Chairman, to my friend from Florida, I agree, except that the world has moved, and businesses that are legal in these vast array of States should be able to operate in a businesslike fashion.

They should be able to have checking accounts and credit cards and payroll accounts, instead of operating solely in cash that invites robberies, invites assault and batteries, invites tax evasion.

The system—the banking system should be able to provide for that, instead of just operating in a cash setting. So we need to limit and avoid the

crime that the cash invites, and we need to allow these businesses to operate in a businesslike fashion.

The States and the people of those States have chosen to move forward. We should not, through the banking system, try to stop that and then create crime in its wake.

Mr. HECK of Washington. First, let's correct the RECORD. The earlier vote did not approve the opposite amendment. In fact, the decision, as announced by the Chair, was to affirm the amendment, and then the rollcall was provided and is yet pending.

Secondly, the will of this body has, in fact, been manifested on one occasion, and that was an amendment highly similar to this one, to the Commerce, Justice, and Science Appropriations, and it passed by a clear bipartisan majority in this Chamber.

Lastly—and again, this is about public safety. This is about keeping marijuana out of the hands of children and cash out of the hands of the gangs and the cartels. That is what this amendment is about.

I am frankly stunned to learn that the party whose heritage was in support of states' rights now no longer sees fit to uphold those States who have gone in this direction who, through votes of people and votes of their duly-elected legislatures, have created tightly-controlled markets for this particular substance.

This is not about being in favor or against marijuana consumption. This is about public safety. This is about providing access to banking services for safe environments, safe communities, and I entreat you to support it as you once did before.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment made in order by the rule at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to confidentiality and disclosure of returns and return information).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Georgia and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I want to commend the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the work that he has done on this. This has been yeoman's work, a difficult task.

We haven't done a Financial Services appropriations bill in a number of years, and so I want to commend the chairman for his leadership on this issue.

My amendment deals with the Internal Revenue Service, and I know a lot of these amendments have addressed the issue.

The Internal Revenue Service, Mr. Chairman, as you and the American people know, by law—by law—may not release any personal taxpayer information. It must be protected, and it is clear that what we have had over the past year or so is the revelation of a huge violation of the public trust that has occurred as it pertains to the IRS' lawful requirement to protect taxpayer information.

Internal Revenue Code section 6103 is what this amendment deals with. It is a portion of the Code that is a taxpayer protection provision written to prevent unlawful disclosure of confidential taxpayer information.

The recent actions of the IRS, whether it is the targeting of conservative social welfare groups or the unlawful disclosure of an organization's confidential tax return and donor list, are nothing less than chilling, Mr. Chairman.

What the IRS has done is targeted conservative groups, allegedly to determine whether or not they ought to be granted tax-exempt status. In so doing, they have asked for those organizations' donor lists, the lists of hard-working Americans who have taken some of their resources and provided support for these organizations.

Then the IRS took that donor list information, not only kept the organization from getting tax-exempt status, as would be appropriate, took that donor list information and released it to political enemies or political opponents of the organization, apparently for political purposes.

This is outrageous activity, Mr. Chairman. This amendment is a very simple amendment that reminds the Internal Revenue Service that their primary responsibility is to serve the American taxpayer.

Given the information that has come to light over the last year or so, I would suspect that every Member of this Congress should support holding the IRS accountable to the rule of law.

The IRS has violated the trust of the American people, and it is imperative that this body hold the IRS accountable for their egregious actions.

It is a simple amendment. It is a commonsense amendment. It is an amendment that is supported and responsive to our constituents, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the

gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), the chairman.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think every American taxpayer needs to be assured that their personal information is going to be held in strict confidence, and that is what this amendment does.

I think, particularly at a time when the IRS has demonstrated a lack of ability to either self-police or self-correct, when each week we read about a new revelation of some sort of bureaucratic incompetence or maybe willful disregard for the law, I think it is more important than ever to make sure that every taxpayer knows that personal information is going to be held in strict confidence.

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the chairman for his support, and I urge support of this amendment by all colleagues in the House.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DESANTIS

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for any Internal Revenue Service instant message or other electronic communications system that is not operationally searchable and archivable at all times.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Chairman, it was really troubling to be reviewing emails that the IRS finally produced to us after we asked for these emails for over a year. Of course, they gave them to us on the afternoon of July 3, so as to minimize the press damage.

Basically, the emails showed Lois Lerner sending an email to a technician saying, you know, Congress will ask for our emails, and I have told people in the IRS they need to be careful about what they say; question, if we do an instant message in the system that is called OCS, will those be immune to congressional oversight?

The technician basically said, well, that is the default setting, you can make it so that it would be archivable and searchable.

That was very troubling because it was almost like Lerner, as a matter of

course, is conducting herself in a way to obstruct the proper oversight, and that is very troubling with an agency that is this powerful.

So I think what this amendment will do will be to simply prevent that. This is saying exactly what Lois Lerner was asking about, the settings. If you are going to use funds, the settings have got to be turned on, and if you don't, then you can't use funds to operate it.

So I think it is a commonsense amendment, and I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

Mr. Chairman, given that the point of order has been lodged, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw amendment No. 52.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DESANTIS

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Chair, as an alternative to the prior amendment, I offer amendment No. 54.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Internal Revenue Service to create machine-readable materials that are not subject to the safeguards established pursuant to section 3105 of title 44, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment accomplishes the similar objective that I articulated just a moment ago, and I would just add that it is very troubling, if you were called into court to defend yourself against the IRS and they asked you to produce certain documents in discovery and your defense was, well, the documents have been destroyed, you would be presumed essentially guilty. They would have an adverse inference lodged against you.

I think that is what this amendment is getting to. The IRS has to practice what they preach. They should be held to the exact same standards as the American people are held to with their taxes, and they should follow the record retention requirements under Federal law.

So I think it is a commonsense amendment, and I urge that my colleagues adopt the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield my remaining time to my colleague from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to applaud him for correcting any procedural flaws. He makes an excellent point, and I accept the amendment.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS).

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

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

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

□ 1930

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DESANTIS

Mr. DESANTIS. I have an amendment at the desk, Mr. Chair.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of funds made available by this Act to the Internal Revenue Service may be obligated or expended on conferences.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Florida and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Chair, last year, the House Oversight Committee conducted a hearing to review an IG report documenting a lavish conference that was put on by the IRS—over \$4 million for one conference. Expenses included \$135,000 on outside speakers, including \$17,000 for a speaker who created paintings on stage to make his point that one must free “the thought process to find creative solutions to challenges.”

The troubling thing about the report was that the bulk of that money, \$3.2 million, came from unused funds that were allocated for hiring. Now, this is at the exact same time that the IRS began to single out conservative groups that sought tax-exempt status, in part, they said, because the agency simply did not have the manpower to handle the number of applications pouring in.

Now, we have debunked that idea that somehow there was a torrent of applications, but golly gee, if that is really true, why are you spending \$3.2 million on these conferences? So I think the IRS has abused the trust of the American taxpayer with respect to conferences, and I think it should be held accountable.

Now, some say in response to this amendment that taxpayers need to be forced to fund these conferences because it helps with IRS employee morale. I have just got to tell you, I am more concerned with the morale of the American people. When taxpayers see an arrogant agency flout the law, refuse to produce evidence, and waste tax dollars, they become demoralized, and rightfully so.

So at a time when military officers are receiving pink slips, there is no way we should allow the IRS to persist with these conferences.

I yield back the balance of my time.
Mr. SERRANO. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I think the mistake we are making here is the one we have been making all day. Not only is it targeted only at the IRS, which seems to be the desire to continue to do this for the next 24 hours or for so long as this bill lasts, but secondly, it paints it with a wide brush. If you say no conferences of this type or if you limit the number of conferences, okay, we could discuss that; but to say that one agency in the Federal Government cannot have any kind of conferences, none at all—zero, nada—that really speaks to just a continuous desire to destroy the IRS.

Now, there were issues concerning the conferences. There were issues concerning the conferences for other agencies. We have dealt with that. We can deal with this. But to say no conferences at all is to suggest that an agency cannot operate the way it needs to at times.

So I think that this is just another attack on the IRS. It makes for good headlines, even at this time of night. I think it is the wrong thing to do, and I would hope that we could oppose it or that the gentleman will withdraw the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS).

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

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ (a) Each amount made available by this Act is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

(b) The reduction in subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to the following accounts and programs:

(1) Payment of Government losses in shipment under "Department of the Treasury—Bureau of the Fiscal Service".

(2) "Supreme Court of the United States—Salaries and Expenses".

(3) "United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit—Salaries and Expenses".

(4) "United States Court of International Trade—Salaries and Expenses".

(5) "Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services—Salaries and Expenses".

(6) Payment to judiciary trust funds for Judiciary Retirement Funds under section 624.

(7) Payments to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund for the Office of Personnel Management under section 624.

Mrs. BLACKBURN (during the reading). Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to waive the reading.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentlewoman from Tennessee and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), who has done a wonderful job bringing this bill to the floor.

As I do with all of the appropriations bills, it is a focus of mine to come in and ask for an additional 1 percent cut on top of the great work that has already been done.

I think it is important to give credit to our Appropriations Committee. This is a \$21 billion bill, and it is appropriating \$566 million less than what was appropriated in fiscal year 2014, and it is \$2.2 billion less than what the President requested. That is to be commended. Our appropriations team has done a terrific job on beginning to rein in what the Federal Government spends. The Republican House leadership is to be commended for making their focus to get our fiscal house in order.

I think we have to go a step further, and that is the purpose of my 1 percent across-the-board spending cut amendment. What we need to do now is to engage the bureaucracy, engage these Federal agencies, rank-and-file employees, to come to the table with their recommendations of how we continue to cut.

We are \$17 trillion in debt. We cannot continue to borrow 30 cents of every dollar that we spend. We have to think about the future for our children, our grandchildren. This is an amendment that we should all support because we do this for our children, for the sovereignty of our Nation, and for the fiscal health of our Nation for years to come.

I think it is important to note that through the years, Governors have used across-the-board spending cuts, Democrat Governors—a former Democrat Governor from my home State of Tennessee. You have got the Democrat Governor in New York. You have got the Governor over in Missouri. They have all used across-the-board cuts.

The American people like this idea. They like having the bureaucracy engaged in saving money. A Washington Post/ABC News poll from March 6, 2013, revealed that 61 percent of all Americans even supported a 5 percent across-the-board cut in Federal spending.

It is time for us to rein this in and get our fiscal house in order. This is a way to save an additional \$228 million.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to the amendment offered by my good friend from Tennessee. She makes an excellent point, and I think everyone agrees that we ought to try to rein in this culture of spending and put in place a culture of savings. I have been working my entire congressional career to do that.

One of the things that we do in the appropriations process is we have hearings. We listen to people. They try to justify their request. Sometimes when programs work well, they might receive an increase. When people are not doing very well, like the IRS, they have their request denied and are actually funded at lower levels.

What is interesting, last night on this floor, we added about \$1 billion to our debt reduction by taking that billion dollars out of the IRS. So when we set our priorities, we do that day to day. In this case, we had 12 hearings.

If you look at our bill, there are actually nine programs that are just flat out eliminated. They are gone. It wasn't a 1 percent or an X percent cut. It was just, that is not a program that is vital to the functioning of the Federal Government so it is gone. It has been eliminated. There are several agencies where we have reduced their funding because we figured out that they could do with a little bit less.

But when you take an additional 1 percent across the board after you have had a lot of time and energy put into place to set the right priorities, I don't think you take into consideration that some programs are better than others.

I know my friend from Tennessee cares a lot about Women's Business Centers, and they received an increase under our appropriations bill because we think they are doing a great job. The Small Business Administration does great work at creating private sector jobs. The Women's Business Centers, because we thought they were doing well, they received an increase. Now, I don't know that she really wants to cut them.

She says she is not going to apply these cuts to the Federal judiciary, and I think that is appropriate. Actually, the Federal courts are pretty happy. Last night, several millions of dollars were added to the Federal courts.

I guess the simple point is that you have to take into consideration the merit of every program. If we didn't do anything and we just showed up one day and said how should we fund these people, then I think it is appropriate to say, well, let's just cut them across the board. But when you spend time and energy in setting the priorities and making hard choices, that is what we have done, and we are proud of the work we have done. I appreciate her compliment that we have done great work.

The fact that she would like to cut 1 more percent across the board I don't

think is the right way to observe the situation. I appreciate what she is trying to do, but I don't think in this case it is the right approach.

I would also like to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), the ranking member.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in opposition to this amendment. The only difference here, Mr. Chairman, is that we are not attacking the IRS. Now we are attacking the Financial Services Subcommittee. The fact of life is that this committee took the biggest hit of any subcommittee in the House.

And while I may disagree with how some of the bill came out, I have made it clear to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW) that what I disagree with the most are the riders and the allocation. With a different allocation, we would have had a different bill. So to now cut 1 percent from the committee that took the biggest hit is really to just to try to cripple the bill completely, and it serves no purpose other than to be able to say that you cut it.

Now, it would be nice to see if these kinds of things were mean, what happened on the military budget every so often, but we are not going to see that. We are only going to see it on bills like this one, which really services a lot of people. I think that the chairman is right. I join him in opposing this amendment, and I hope that it will be defeated.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the work that the chairman has done on this bill, and our Appropriations Committee is to be commended.

I think we do have to recognize Washington has a spending problem. They don't have a revenue problem. They have got a spending and a priority problem. We see it every single day.

What I am asking is to engage those rank-and-file employees, have them find 1 penny on the dollar out of their appropriations that they could save in order to get this burden of debt off the backs of our children and grandchildren—one penny on the dollar. It has worked in the States. It works in our county and city governments. People like that and appreciate that you push for better stewardship, and it is the right thing for us to do as we watch the debt totals climb, skyrocket, and explode.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide funds from the Hardest Hit Fund program established by the Secretary of the Treasury under title I of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5211 et seq.) to any State or local government for the purpose of funding pension obligations of such State or local government.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentleman from Tennessee and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

□ 1945

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that would prevent the Federal Government from bailing out public pensioners in cities such as Detroit and Chicago.

We have been reading for the past several months that the Obama administration has been in talks with the city of Detroit to transfer \$100 million to the city.

According to an April 16, 2014, article from the Detroit Free Press, the administration has looked to transfer \$100 million from the Hardest Hit Fund to shore up Detroit's unfunded pension liability. The Hardest Hit Fund was created by the Obama administration in 2010 with money from the 2008 stimulus package. The money is meant to help States that have been adversely affected by the housing downturn, and that is according, again, to the Detroit Free Press.

The article adds that:

The \$100 million in Federal money was discussed Tuesday night in breakneck negotiations that resulted in a tentative deal to reduce pension cuts for the city's retired general workforce.

Mr. Chairman, I refuse to let Federal taxpayers be on the hook for unfunded pension liabilities made by Big Labor organizations. Cities such as Detroit, Chicago, and others where Big Labor has created extremely generous retirement benefits for public service workers are going to have to find their way out of the mess that they have created.

Now, it is my understanding that the city of Detroit has reached an agreement with the State of Michigan to shore up Detroit's unfunded pension liability for the time being. However, it does not foreclose this as a possibility to occur in the future for Detroit or any other city where Big Labor agreements have caused financial destruction.

According to an April 7, 2014, article from chicagobusiness.com, Chicago's unfunded pension liability stands at

\$19.5 billion. A February 20, 2013, article in Forbes notes that Federal bailouts of State pension funds "would implicitly encourage States to keep spending and doling out entitlements, as doing so is popular for politicians, even if unsustainable." The article adds that this is especially true in liberal-leaning areas where public-sector labor unions have a lot of control.

Mr. Chairman, we must foreclose the administration's bailout of Big Labor as a possibility. I refuse to stand by and watch hardworking taxpayers be on the hook for the irresponsible decisions of liberal, Big Labor groups.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I just want to agree with you that I don't think that taxpayers should bail out Detroit's pension shortfall or any other city's shortfall. So I want you to know that I support your amendment.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I appreciate that. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, this is really a mean amendment to single out one city, one city that is hurting; to single out labor when, in fact, it is not labor, but it is the people that have those pension plans and now may not have a pension plan, to single them out.

With all due respect to the gentleman, I am sure there have been many instances throughout history and in recent years when your area, your State, has been helped by Federal dollars when it was hurting, and we all got together and did that, be it a flood, be it a fire, be it a natural disaster. Whatever it may be, we came together to help. Detroit has its problems, and Detroit might have made some mistakes. But to single it out in an amendment and to say that we cannot help in any way, shape, or form is really mean, mean-spirited and wrong.

It may look good to single an urban center out. It may look good to single out a place that is hurting. But that is not the American way. The American way, I can tell you, as a New Yorker, when New York was hurting, people came to its aid. When we were attacked, we came to its aid.

Sure, this is different, but Detroit, it's hurting right now. And to single it out on this House floor at 10 minutes to 8, at this time, to single it out as not being worthy of Federal help, is really just wrong. And then to take the opportunity to attack organized labor by suggesting that somehow they are to blame and therefore they should not get any help is also mean-spirited.

So I have seen, in the time that I have been here, difficult amendments. But this one is one that really takes the cake. Mr. Chairman, Republicans

have supported bailing out banks and financial institutions that were deemed too large to fail. We were all for saving the auto industry, and I was for it, too. We were all for making sure that big institutions did not fail. And while I questioned it, many of us went along with it. And here to single out Detroit at its worst moment when it is hurting like no city has hurt in a long time is just the wrong thing to do.

If this is what the gentlewoman wants to do, I guess there is no way to stop her, but I would really wish that she would take a moment to think about this before she goes any further with this.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I find the gentleman's choice of words so interesting. I think he used "mean" and "mean-spirited" several times.

Let me tell you what is mean-spirited. Mean-spirited is looking at future generations and saying, you didn't want this, you didn't ask for it, but guess what? You have got a \$17 trillion bill on your head. Right now, the birth tax for every child born in this country is \$54,000. Is that good? Of course not. Is that mean-spirited? You bet it is. You are saying you owe this money like it or not because Washington can't get its spending habits under control. Washington is spending money it does not have to pay for programs that my grandkids do not want.

You are saying it is not the American way. Let me tell you something. Using borrowed money to pay for debts that have not been created by this government is not the way we do business.

I would remind you of a Congressman from Tennessee who stood on this floor at one point in history, and he reminded the body that this was not their money to give. It is the taxpayers' money. That Member of Congress was Davy Crockett.

This is the taxpayers' money. They expect us to be good stewards. Bailing out cities that have not been good stewards of their money is not what this body should be doing with Federal tax dollars that come into our coffers.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. It is amendment 080.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Federal Communications Commission may be used, with respect to the States of Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin, to prevent such States from implementing their own State laws with respect to the provision of broadband Internet access service (as defined in section 8.11 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations) by the State or a municipality or other political subdivision of the State.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to reserve a point of order mainly because we haven't seen this text or the amendment until this very moment. In fact, we still haven't seen it.

The Acting CHAIR. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentlewoman from Tennessee and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment seeks to prohibit any taxpayer funds from being used by the Federal Communications Commission, the FCC, to preempt State municipal broadband laws.

In other words, we don't need unelected Federal agency bureaucrats in Washington telling our States what they can and can't do with respect to protecting their limited taxpayer dollars in private enterprises.

As a former State senator from Tennessee, I strongly believe in states' rights. I know that is an issue that is important to many of my colleagues in this Chamber. And that is why I found it deeply troubling that FCC Chairman Tom Wheeler has repeatedly stated this past year that he intends to preempt states' rights when it comes to the role of state policy over municipal broadband.

Chairman Wheeler's statements posed a direct challenge on the constitutionality of States' sovereign functions. It wrongly assumes Washington knows what is best and forgets that the right answer doesn't always come from the top down.

Mr. Chairman, 20 States across our country have held public debates and enacted laws that limit municipal broadband to varying degrees. These State legislatures and Governors have not only listened but have responded to the voices of their constituents. They are closer to the people than the chairman of the FCC. They are accountable to their voters.

Mr. Chairman, States have spoken and said that we should be careful and deliberate in how we allow public entry into our vibrant communications marketplace, a sector of our economy that invests tens of billions of dollars each year, accounts for tens of thousands of jobs, and serves millions of consumers.

Municipal broadband projects have had a mixed bag of results. There have been some successes and also some spectacular failures that have left taxpayers on the hook. For example, look at the failed UTOPIA project that has created massive disruption and is challenging taxpayers. In fact, it was recently reported that the "residents of 11 Utah cities would be billed as much as \$20 a month as part of a plan to salvage the State's once-heralded UTOPIA fiber optic network."

That doesn't sound like a model the Federal Government needs to force against the wishes of State-elected officials. That doesn't sound like competition, and it sounds like another Federal bailout waiting to happen.

State governments across the country understand and are more attentive to the needs of the American people than unelected Federal bureaucrats in Washington. That is why this past June I was joined by 59 of our colleagues in sending a letter to Chairman Wheeler stating our concerns and requesting a response to a list of questions, questions that we are still waiting for him to respond to. The U.S. Senate also sent a letter to the FCC on this issue, and they are, likewise, waiting for a response. It seems the FCC is content to tell our States how they will manage their sovereign economic affairs, but they won't answer to the Congress who is responsible for exercising oversight of the agency.

Inserting the FCC into our State's economic and fiscal affairs sets a dangerous precedent and violates State sovereignty in a manner that warrants deeper examination. This Congress cannot sit idly by and let an independent agency trample on our states' rights. This is an issue that should be left to our States, and if it comes to a point where we need a national standard, then that debate should be held by Congress, not the FCC, and should be done with the participation of the American people. I urge adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. First, I wish to withdraw my point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. I do have, and I know it comes at a different time, but I do have letters from different groups opposing the amendment from the National League of Cities, National Association of Counties, National Association of Telecommunications Officers and Advisors, including the gentleman who gets credit for inventing the Internet, and I am not talking about Vice President Gore, I am speaking about someone else.

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS OFFICERS AND ADVISORS

JULY 15, 2014.

U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The National League of Cities (NLC), the National Association of Counties (NACo), and the National Association of Telecommunications Officers and Advisors (NATOA) strongly urges you to oppose any amendment to HR 5016 that would hamstring the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) from taking any action on—indeed, even discussing—the issue of state laws that prohibit or restrict public and public/private broadband projects. It is clear that such laws harm both the public and private sectors, stifle economic growth, prevent the creation or retention of thousands of jobs, and hamper work force development.

The United States must compete in a global economy in which affordable access to advanced communications networks is playing an increasingly significant role. As the FCC noted in challenging broadband providers and state and municipal community leaders to come together to develop at least one gigabit community in all 50 states by 2015: “The U.S. needs a critical mass of gigabit communities nationwide so that innovators can develop next-generation applications and services that will drive economic growth and global competitiveness.” This is especially true in rural America.

The private sector alone cannot enable the United States to take full advantage of the opportunities that advanced communications networks can create in virtually every area of life. As a result, federal, state, and local efforts are taking place across the Nation to deploy both private and public broadband infrastructure to stimulate and support economic development and job creation, especially in economically distressed areas. But such efforts are being thwarted in some areas by State laws that prohibit or restrict municipalities from working with private broadband providers, or developing themselves, if necessary, the advanced broadband infrastructure that will stimulate local businesses development, foster work force retraining, and boost employment in economically underachieving areas.

Consistent with these expressions of national unity, public entities across America are ready, willing, and able to do their share to bring affordable high-capacity broadband connectivity to all Americans. State barriers to public broadband are counterproductive to the achievement of these goals. Efforts to strip funding from the FCC to even discuss this issue, let alone take action, are misplaced and wrong. Please oppose any amendment to HR 5016 or any other measure that could significantly impair community broadband deployments or public/private partnerships.

Sincerely,

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES,
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES,
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS OFFICERS AND ADVISORS.

PRESERVING A FREE AND OPEN INTERNET

Whereas, since its inception, the Internet has existed based on principles of freedom and openness, core values that have made it the most powerful communication medium ever known; and

Whereas, the FCC is currently debating how to enshrine these Open Internet Principles into 21st century regulation; and

Whereas, the U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C. in 2010 determined that the long-observed Open Internet Principles of nondiscrimination, nonblocking, and transparency, described below, should not be declared in an FCC Policy Statement, but instead should be enshrined in a formal rule-making seeking to reinstate those principles; and

Whereas, the FCC issued its Open Internet Order, reinstating these rules for preserving a free and open internet, on December 23, 2010, formalizing the three basic protections: transparency, no blocking of lawful content and no unreasonable discrimination of network traffic; and these rules were made effective November 20, 2011; and

Whereas, these rules enshrine the values of what is commonly referred to as net neutrality; and

Whereas, the first principle of the Open Internet Order states that fixed and mobile broadband providers must publicly disclose accurate information regarding network management practices, performance characteristics, and commercial terms of their broadband services; and

Whereas, the second principle states that fixed broadband providers may not block lawful content, applications, services, or non-harmful devices; mobile broadband providers may not block lawful websites, or block applications that compete with their voice or video telephony services; and

Whereas, the third principle states that unreasonable discrimination shall not be permitted, that fixed broadband providers may not unreasonably discriminate in transmitting lawful network traffic; and

Whereas, these principles, applied with the complementary principle of reasonable network management, guarantee that the freedom and openness that previously enabled the internet to flourish as an engine for creativity and commerce under the protection of the original policy statement will continue, providing greater certainty and predictability to citizens, consumers, innovators, investors, and broadband providers, while retaining the flexibility providers need to effectively manage their networks; and

Whereas, since the beginning of the internet, broadband Internet access services have continued to invest in a single infrastructure which has increased average speeds for all users across our nation, without resorting to the practice of prioritization for users who can afford to pay the most; and

Whereas, online companies, or edge providers, have also invested in new innovative products and services that have driven economic growth and consumer demand for improved internet services and faster speeds from broadband internet access providers; and

Whereas, the dual investment of broadband Internet access service providers and edge providers has fostered a virtuous cycle of investment and innovation online; and

Whereas, two key rules of the three rules comprising the Open Internet Order, one pertaining to no blocking and another pertaining to no unreasonable discrimination, were again vacated on January 14, 2014 by the U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C. in the Verizon Communications Inc. v. Federal Communications Commission (2014), ruling that the FCC has no authority to enforce these rules; and

Whereas, the FCC on May 15, 2014, voted 3-2 to open the process of public comment on their proposed net neutrality rules that could in some circumstances allow paid prioritization of internet traffic based on a commercially reasonable standard; and

Whereas, paid prioritization under a commercially reasonable standard allows paid

prioritization that has heretofore been understood to be unjust and unreasonable; and

Whereas, unreasonable paid prioritization is antithetical to a neutral Internet, and nondiscrimination is an inherent and indivisible characteristic of net neutrality; and

Whereas, all data on the Internet should be treated equally, not discriminating or charging differentially by user, content, site, platform, application, type of attached equipment, and modes of communication; and

Whereas, innovation relies on a free and open Internet that does not allow individual arrangements for priority treatment over broadband Internet access service; and

Whereas, preventing access to any lawful websites, slowing speeds for services, or redirecting users from one website to a competing website creates asymmetrical access which is antithetical to an Open Internet; and

Whereas, startups are the engine of an innovation economy, yet may not have the cash flow to pay for paid prioritization, and will therefore be unable to compete with large companies to deliver content to customers, impeding startup growth, thus limiting economic development and the creation of jobs: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the US Conference of Mayors supports a free and open internet as outlined in the FCC's original Open Internet Order; and be it further

Resolved, That the US Conference of Mayors supports comprehensive nondiscrimination as a key principle for any FCC rule-making; and be it further

Resolved, That the US Conference of Mayors supports securing a commitment to transparency and the free flow of information over the internet, including no blocking of lawful websites and no unreasonable discrimination of lawful network traffic; and be it further

Resolved, That the US Conference of Mayors calls on the White House to offer their support of these principles; and be it further

Resolved, That the US Conference of Mayors calls on Congress to offer their support of these principles and if necessary use their lawmaking power to enshrine access to a free and open Internet and give the FCC a clear mandate; and be it further

Resolved, That the US Conference of Mayors recommends that the FCC preempt state barriers to municipal broadband service as a significant limitation to competition in the provision of Internet access.

COALITION FOR LOCAL INTERNET CHOICE

Washington, DC, July 15, 2014.

House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Coalition for Local Internet Choice has heard that Rep. Marsha Blackburn is planning to propose an amendment to House Appropriation bill H.R. 5016. The amendment would preclude the Federal Communications Commission from using its appropriated funds to take any action that would preempt a State law governing whether or to what extent the State or a municipality or other political subdivision of the State may provide broadband Internet access service. The Coalition urges you to oppose any such amendment.

As Congress and the Commission have often recognized, ensuring that all Americans have reasonable and timely access to advanced telecommunications capabilities, particularly in rural and other high-cost areas, is “the great infrastructure challenge of our time.” Toward this end, Congress has assigned the Commission a central role in defining the relevant terms and standards and in identifying and removing barriers to broadband investment and competition. While preemption of State barriers to

broadband investment and competition should be used rarely, in only the clearest of cases, it should not be ruled out categorically in all cases, as the Blackburn amendment would do.

Our Coalition was established to support local choice in acquiring advanced communications capabilities. Our members believe that communities should be free to decide to work with willing incumbents, enter into public-private partnerships, develop their own networks, if necessary, or do whatever else may work for their citizens, businesses, and institutions. Where communities have been free to do this, we have seen robust economic development enhanced educational and occupational opportunity, access to more affordable modern health care, improved public safety, greater energy efficiency and environmental protection, and much more that has contributed to a high quality of life. In contrast, where state barriers to community broadband initiatives and public-private partnerships exist, both the public and private sectors, particularly high-technology companies, are failing to meet their potential.

At this critical time in our country's history, we should not preclude or inhibit any potentially successful strategy that will enable our communities and America as a whole to thrive in the emerging knowledge-based global economy. Nor can we afford to take off the table any approach that may be necessary in certain cases to remove barriers to broadband investment and competition.

Sincerely,

JOANNE HOVIS,
Chief Executive Officer, CLIC.

Mr. SERRANO. Whatever happened to localism or local control? This amendment means the Federal Government will tell every local citizen, mayor, and county council member that they may not act in their own best interests.

Any such amendment is an attack on the rights of individual citizens speaking through their local leaders to determine if their broadband needs are being met.

Congresswoman BLACKBURN only has to drive an hour and a half down Interstate 24 to Chattanooga to see where the city-owned electric utility owns a broadband network. It charges \$70 per month, enough to cover expenses but affordable enough to attract businesses.

□ 2000

Her State passed a bill to prevent nearby towns from joining Chattanooga and to block other communities from doing themselves. Companies have moved jobs or expanded in Chattanooga after learning that the minimum connection speed on the city-owned network was faster than the maximum they had available at headquarters.

Preemption will not force anyone to do anything that the municipalities alone don't want to do. This is not about forcing States to do anything, but instead stopping States from choking grassroots competition and stopping States from blocking faster networks or new networks where none exist.

It may sound one way, but it is a total different interpretation that we

have, and this amendment could really hurt—in fact, may even hurt the efforts that she claims she wants to put forth.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to note that what this amendment does is to allow those citizens in those cities, in those States that have made this decision—this is how they want to handle broadband—to do it.

It gives the power to them. It keeps bureaucrats, sitting at the FCC, from making these decisions and overriding the wishes of our States and of those cities that are located therein. I urge adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to note that Chairman UPTON has legislation and has spoken out on this issue, and the whole issue here is to allow cities to do what they need to do without having the major cable companies and so on lobby the States and stop them from doing so.

Broadband is something that we need to expand—that may sound like a pun—to make it broader, not to make it limited. It should be available everywhere, and it should be available in every possible place—rural, suburban, inner city, in homes, in schools.

We have to build the infrastructure to make that happen. Again, I repeat, I really think that her intent is not being met by her amendment, and that is why I oppose it and hope we would all oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have one final amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Consumer Product Safety Commission to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule entitled "Voluntary Remedial Actions and Guidelines for Voluntary Recall Notices" (CPSC Docket No. CPSC-2013-0040).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 661, the gentlewoman from Tennessee and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit funds

for the voluntary recall proposed rule at the Consumer Product Safety Commission and would prevent them from moving forward with a rule that would cripple the highly successful voluntary recall program that is currently in place.

For nearly 40 years, the CPSC and manufacturers and retailers, big and small, have partnered to ensure that the system of voluntary recalls is effectively reducing the safety risks that are posed to the public.

In fact, the CPSC recently highlighted the success of the program, noting that 90 percent of the recalls through the award-winning Fast Track program are implemented within 20 days. The Fast Track program was created by former CPSC Chairman Ann Brown to greatly reduce the amount of time it takes recalls to be implemented.

Instead of working to increase the efficiency of its programs, the CPSC's proposed rule change effectively kills its most successful program. On May 30, Ann Brown, a Democratic former Chairman appointed by President Clinton, sent a letter to the Energy and Commerce Committee expressing deep concerns over the impacts of the Commission's proposed rule.

Concerning the substantive provisions of the proposal, former Chairman Brown stated:

A Fast Track procedure would be rendered impossible under these circumstances.

The success of this Fast Track program is based on the shared commitment of the Commission and the private sector to remove harmful products from the marketplace.

The Commission, however, now seeks to transform the voluntary recall process into a legal negotiation equivalent to a settlement agreement. The proposed substantive changes would require companies seeking to implement a recall to hire an attorney to negotiate binding and enforceable terms with the CPSC staff.

This places significant burdens on small businesses that use the Fast Track program because the program allows them to work with the Commission staff without having to pay expensive legal fees. The CPSC should not discourage companies from working closely, efficiently, and effectively with the CPSC when potential hazards or defects are identified.

As the letter from former CPSC Chairman Brown shows, this is not a political issue. Senators from Pennsylvania—CASEY and TOOMEY, a Democrat and Republican, respectively—submitted a letter in January for the docket, raising concerns about the proposed changes.

Senator KING sent the Commission a letter in March expressing similar concerns, and I include these letters, Mr. Chairman, from former Chairman Brown and from the Senators into the RECORD.

ANN BROWN,

Palm Beach Gardens, FL, May 30, 2014.

Hon. FRED S. UPTON,
*Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
 Washington, DC.*

Hon. HENRY A. WAXMAN,
*Ranking Minority Member, Committee on En-
 ergy and Commerce, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON AND RANKING MI-
 NORITY MEMBER WAXMAN, I had the privilege
 of serving as Chairman of the U.S. Consumer
 Product Safety Commission from March 1994
 until November 1, 2001. During my time as
 Chairman, we prevented numerous deaths
 and injuries through enforcement actions,
 product recalls and working with consumers,
 consumer groups and firms regulated by the
 Commission. Product safety is best accom-
 plished when government, industry and con-
 sumers work together.

Under the Consumer Product Safety Act
 (CPSA), manufacturers, distributors, and re-
 tailers of consumer products must report
 certain potential product hazards to the
 Commission. They must report immediately
 if they obtain information which reasonably
 supports the conclusion that a product (1)
 fails to comply with certain mandatory or
 voluntary standards, (2) contains a defect
 which could create a substantial product
 hazard, or (3) creates an unreasonable risk of
 serious injury or death.

If the Commission believes that a product
 presents a substantial product hazard to the
 public, it may pursue corrective action.
 Early in my Chairmanship, I learned that
 some number of companies were offering to
 conduct product recalls but because of en-
 trenching procedures, those firms were not
 allowed to proceed with a recall until the
 CPSC staff performed a technical evaluation
 of the product involved, agreed that there
 was a product safety problem by making a
 "Preliminary Determination" (PD) of haz-
 ard, and then sent a letter to the firm advis-
 ing it of the preliminary determination of
 hazard and requesting a product recall.

This process could and often did take many
 months—months without a recall, months
 where consumers were at risk, even though
 the firm was ready, willing and able to pro-
 ceed with a recall at the time of its report.
 We changed this bureaucratic process early
 in my tenure as Chairman by creating the
 Fast Track Product Recall program in Au-
 gust 1995.

Originally called the "No PD" program,
 firms who reported to CPSC, identified a
 product safety problem, agreed to and initi-
 ated a recall within 20 working days of their
 report, no longer required a staff technical
 evaluation of the problem reported. Rather
 than performing a technical evaluation to
 confirm the product problem reported upon,
 the CPSC staff evaluated the remedy pro-
 posed to assure that it adequately addressed
 the problem identified and spent time work-
 ing with the firm on conducting the product
 recall.

The Commission made this Fast Track pro-
 gram permanent on March 27, 1997, and it has
 been hugely successful. More than one-half
 of all CPSC recalls are now conducted
 through the Fast Track Program. Recalls
 conducted through this program benefit con-
 sumers, the recalling firm and the CPSC. Re-
 calls are announced faster better protecting
 consumers from injury. Recalling firms do
 not receive a letter stating that the CPSC
 staff has preliminarily determined their
 product is a substantial product hazard. And
 the government spend less resources investigat-
 ing a product that a company has al-
 ready agreed should be recalled.

The CPSC staff received a "Hammer"
 Award from Vice President Albert Gore's Na-
 tional Partnership for Reinventing Govern-
 ment for the Fast Track Product Recall Pro-

gram. This award honored federal employees
 for significant improvements to customer
 service and for making the government work
 more efficiently. Also in 1998, the Fast Track
 Program was named a winner of the pres-
 tigious Innovations in American Govern-
 ment award, an awards program of the Ford
 Foundation and Harvard University, admin-
 istered by Harvard University's John F. Ken-
 nedy School of Government in partnership
 with the Council for Excellence in Govern-
 ment.

Now this award winning program appears
 to face the risk of being unintentionally un-
 dermined by a rule proposed by the CPSC in
 November 2013 that is Intended to enhance
 voluntary recalls by setting forth principles
 and guidelines for the content and form of
 voluntary recall notices that firms provide
 as part of corrective action plans. One of the
 CPSC's proposals is to prohibit firms desir-
 ing to conduct a voluntary recall from dis-
 claiming that there is a hazard presented by
 their product unless the Commission agrees
 to the disclaimer. I am concerned that this
 proposal if adopted could undermine the effi-
 cacy of the Fast Track program. Another
 proposal would classify a voluntary Corrective
 Action Plan (CAP) as "legally binding"
 thus transforming a CAP into a Consent De-
 cree, potentially delaying an otherwise effec-
 tive recall weeks or even months due to hag-
 gling over legalities. A Fast Track procedure
 would be rendered impossible under these
 circumstances.

CPSC urges firms to err on the side of cau-
 tion by reporting potential product safety
 problems and conducting recalls. It is my un-
 derstanding that virtually every firm that
 reports under the CPSC mandatory reporting
 requirement and requests to participate in a
 Fast Track recall, asserts that their product
 does not present a substantial product haz-
 ard, but nonetheless they wish to conduct a
 recall. If reporting firms are not allowed to
 make this disclaimer, they have no incentive
 to participate in the Fast Track Program.

Not making the disclaimer may be per-
 ceived in product liability litigation as akin
 to admitting that the product reported on is
 a substantial product hazard. If so, reporting
 firms might just as well report to CPSC, not
 offer to conduct a recall, and take the
 chance that the CPSC staff might conclude
 their product is not a substantial product
 hazard and that no recall is necessary.

If this occurs, recalls would be delayed,
 CPSC would be required to use substantial
 technical resources to evaluate products so
 that the staff can determine whether to
 make a preliminary determination of hazard,
 and consumers are left unprotected poten-
 tially for many months.

I respectfully request that the Committee
 urge the Commission to consider its pro-
 posed rule carefully and to assure that it
 does not adversely affect CPSC's Fast Track
 Product Recall Program.

Sincerely,

ANN BROWN.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
 Washington, DC, January 30, 2014.

Re Proposed Rulemaking on Voluntary Prod-
 uct Recalls

ROBERT S. ADLER,
*Acting Chairman, U.S. Consumer Product Safe-
 ty Commission, Bethesda, MD.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN ADLER: We have recently
 become aware of a proposed rule by the Con-
 sumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC)
 that could greatly increase the cost and
 complexity of recalling harmful consumer
 products.

As you know, the agency currently oper-
 ates a "Fast Track" program that is well re-
 garded and has a history of success. Since its

inception in 1997, the program has allowed
 companies to recall products when they have
 reason to believe their products will harm
 consumers. The vast majority of companies
 across the nation comply with the program,
 and companies in Pennsylvania often ini-
 tiate product recalls as a precautionary
 measure, even where there is no evidence of
 injury to consumers. As the CPSC itself
 points out, the advantage of its award-win-
 ning program is that it permits companies to
 remove potentially hazardous products from
 the marketplace as quickly and efficiently
 as possible, without requiring CPSC staff to
 make a preliminary determination that the
 product is hazardous. Because the program
 makes recalls voluntary and utilizes stand-
 ard-form documents that can be expedi-
 tiously reviewed and executed, product re-
 calls occur rapidly and efficiently.

Unfortunately, the proposed changes seem
 to jeopardize the efficacy of the existing
 process, which could increase the risk of
 harm to consumers. The proposed rule makes
 "voluntary" product recall Action Plans le-
 gally binding and requires companies to
 state with specificity each instance in which
 a product causes harm. We worry that these
 changes may discourage companies from ini-
 tiating precautionary recalls and increase
 compliance and administrative costs. Com-
 panies that recall products will have to uti-
 lize lawyers to negotiate their "legally bind-
 ing" documents and will involve upper cor-
 porate management to approve forward-
 looking obligations. Similarly, the CPSC
 will have to devote more time and personnel
 to negotiating recall documents and may be
 subject to litigation to determine whether a
 particular product is hazardous. Given these
 issues, we are concerned that the proposed
 change could ultimately keep harmful prod-
 ucts on store shelves for longer periods of
 time, and thus increase the risk of harm to
 consumers.

Given the longstanding success of the Fast
 Track program, and the paramount impor-
 tance of maintaining effective procedures for
 recalling dangerous products, we encourage
 the Commission to very carefully consider
 any changes it seeks to make to its Fast
 Track recall program.

Sincerely,

ROBERT P. CASEY, JR.,
United States Senator.
 PATRICK J. TOOMEY,
United States Senator.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
 Washington, DC, March 21, 2014.

Hon. ROBERT S. ADLER,
*Acting Chairman, U.S. Consumer Product Safe-
 ty Commission, Bethesda, MD.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN ADLER: I write today to
 communicate serious reservations about the
 rulemaking being conducted by the Con-
 sumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC)
 regarding remedial actions and guidelines
 for voluntary recall notices. While framed as
 "interpretive" guidance, the CPSC's pro-
 posed rule makes substantial changes to cur-
 rent practice surrounding voluntary re-
 calls—changes that could result in signifi-
 cant compliance burdens for businesses wish-
 ing to voluntarily recall a product.

The CPSC currently has in place a highly
 successful "Fast Track" process that enables
 a company to make use of an expedited pro-
 cess, in consultation with the CPSC, to recall
 a defective product. This innovative program
 eases regulatory requirements and enables
 businesses to work with the CPSC to get de-
 fective products off store shelves within
 days, rather than the weeks and months a
 normal recall process might take. The "Fast
 Track" program demonstrates a smart blend
 of strong consumer protections and ease of
 business compliance, creating an environ-
 ment that encourages businesses to report

defective products and quickly remove them from circulation.

The proposed rule under consideration would make substantial changes to the “Fast Track” program and could threaten the incentives for businesses to undertake voluntary recalls, as well as substantially increase the cost of completing the process. Most significantly, the proposed rule makes the corrective action plans in voluntary recall agreements legally binding, which could dramatically shift the incentive structure for businesses to report incidences of defective products. Making a plan legally binding will slow down the voluntary recall process, leaving consumers at risk for a longer period of time as the plans will first need to be subject to detailed review by legal counsel.

The proposed rule would also allow the CPSC to require the adoption of a compliance program as a component of corrective action plans. This requirement—if not properly calibrated—could introduce further delays in the voluntary recall process, even when a business has no history of recalls or violations. Thus, in the midst of working with the CPSC on the parameters of a voluntary recall agreement, a business might also have to negotiate the parameters of a compliance program and provide description of said program in the recall announcement.

While Section 214 of the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act of 2008 required the CPSC to establish requirements for mandatory recall notices, the statute bears no mention of establishing similar requirements for voluntary recalls. I understand that the CPSC bases its authority to establish guidelines from language in a House committee report, but I am not convinced that the proposed rule’s sweeping changes to the existing voluntary recall process is congruent with either the intent of the statute or the language in the committee report.

Existing regulations require companies initiating a voluntary recall to propose and implement a formal corrective action plan, but these plans were never intended to be legally binding. Part 1115.20 of title 16 of the Code of Federal Regulations describes a corrective action plan as “[a] document, signed by a subject firm, which sets forth the remedial action which the firm will voluntarily undertake to protect the public, but which has no legally binding effect.” In effect, the regulations expressly prohibited the Commission from making these agreements legally binding in order to encourage—not deter—businesses to recall defective products. The CPSC’s proposed rules may have the opposite of the intended effect—and, at the very least, could substantially delay the timely distribution of product safety information to the public.

Make no mistake: I have long been an advocate for strong regulations that protect public health, safety, and the environment. However, I also believe that we must regulate in a manner that is sensitive to the burdens placed on individuals and businesses. My opinion is that the CPSC’s proposed rule may go too far—and may have the unintended consequence of delaying the recall process and extending the period of time in which defective items remain in circulation.

I urge the Commission to take my comments into consideration. The proposed rule could have a widespread and indiscriminate effect on voluntary recalls, and I ask the Commission to do its due diligence in fully vetting the impacts on businesses across the country, particularly for those wishing to initiate a voluntary recall as a precautionary measure. For large businesses, who already employ legal counsel and compliance officers, these new requirements will

be substantial; for small businesses, they could be crippling.

Sincerely,

ANGUS S. KING, JR.,
United States Senator.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I also ask that Members of this Chamber recognize that the proposed rule change would slow a process meant to be conducted with speed and without red tape and would harm a system that ensures that consumer products sold in the U.S. are the safest in the world.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, there is a contradiction with what the gentlewoman says because, on one hand, she doesn’t want government involved in localities, and on the other hand, she wants to tell localities how to act.

On the other hand, she doesn’t want us to tell the Consumer Product Safety Commission how to act, so it becomes very confusing. This is an issue we should leave to the discretion of the Consumer Product Safety Commission. This is not something we should be micromanaging the CPSC on.

Furthermore, it is a proposed rule, and the CPSC is simply reviewing comments at this stage, and that is important to note. They are simply reviewing comments at this stage. We in this body should let the process of issuing rules play out, as is required in law, instead of cherry-picking where and when we want to interfere.

This is simply not an area of over-regulation, since no regulation is yet in effect, so this amendment is unnecessary. I oppose the amendment, and I hope my colleagues will as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. I think the gentlewoman has very well explained the amendment. We have a system that has been working well for 40 years, and so I don’t think we need to make any unnecessary changes, and so I urge Members to support her amendment.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman.

I urge support of this amendment. The program in place at the CPSC has worked well. It is supported by both Republicans and Democrats. The process they are going through at CPSC is expending a tremendous amount of time and money.

Looking at setting up a system that would force these retailers into legal negotiations and settlements is not the way to address this.

The Fast Track program has been enormously successful. Former Chairman Brown worked during the Clinton administration—was appointed by President Clinton. They did a great job putting this program together. We

should leave it in place. I urge a “yes” vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, this agency is one of the better agencies. Every so often, we read about baby seats and blankets and all kinds of issues that affect our communities and our daily lives.

We should stop trying to attack it, as some people do. I just think that this is not a good amendment and that it should be defeated.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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

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

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA) having assumed the chair, Mr. WENSTRUP, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5016) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the further consideration of H.R. 5016, and that I may include tabular materials on the same.

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

There was no objection.

INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, it is good to be back here on the floor once again. Tonight, we want to carry on our long-running discussion about how to improve the American economy, how to create jobs here in this Nation and move us all forward, how to rebuild the middle class, how to make sure that every family has the opportunity

to earn a good living, buy a home if they want to, educate their kids, get health care, and enjoy the fruits of this great Nation.

We often talk about this in the context of Make It In America. This is our jobs agenda. This is the agenda about how to rebuild this Nation, and there are seven different parts to it: trade policy, which we are not talking about tonight; we will talk a little bit about taxes; energy, that is another day; labor; education; and research.

We are going to spend tonight talking about this issue, the infrastructure issue of this Nation.

Let's see, in California, it is right smack in the middle of commute time, 5:15. I am from California, and I know that my constituents in the Sacramento area on that great Interstate 80 are sitting there in a traffic jam.

□ 2015

What a surprise. Or maybe they are on the Caltrain returning from the San Francisco area and held up behind a freight train that is probably carrying bulk and crude oil to the refineries in the Bay Area. They are waiting and waiting and waiting, whether they are on the road or on the train or on the bus, waiting and waiting and waiting.

Folks, in case you didn't know it—and I know you did—we have got a transportation problem in America. We have got a very serious problem.

So as we talk about jobs, as we talk about our Make it in America agenda, we need to talk about infrastructure, we need to talk about transportation, because this is a big, big issue for America. It is an issue that affects every single one of us.

My district also has about, I don't know, 150 miles of Interstate 5. So as you travel from California and you head north, last winter or last year, you would get on Interstate 5, you would get past Seattle, and then you would come to a screeching halt. Why? Because the Interstate 5 bridge in Washington State, just as you got to the Canadian border, collapsed. Wow.

How could that happen in America? How could it be that our bridges on a major interstate connecting Canada, United States, and Mexico would collapse? Well, it is because we did not maintain that. It is because our transportation policies are the previous century's policies and they don't fit in this century.

So, all across America, you are going to see more of this. In a moment, I am going to turn to my colleague from New York (Mr. TONKO), and he will undoubtedly talk about the problem on that side.

It was a big day here in the Congress, because today we did what we do so very well: we kicked the can down the road. We have a major transportation crisis. This isn't the "bridge to nowhere," but this is where we are headed right now. We are headed for a transportation crisis, because in about 3 weeks, maybe 4 weeks, the transpor-

tation funds are going to run out of money.

So, in an effort to deal with this problem. The United States Congress, led by our Republican leadership, did what it has done for the last 3½ years, and that is taken their can and kicked it down the road. We passed a stopgap temporary transportation funding bill that will provide us with another 10 months of funding so that the rest of the Nation's transportation systems—the State governments, the local governments, the cities, and even the Federal Government—will be perfectly unsure what the game plan is for the future years.

How they will plan, nobody knows, because they don't know what to expect from the Federal Government in terms of funding beyond the next 10 months, which is precisely where we are today. So, doing our very best, the repeated process of kicking the can down the road, we did it once again. Now, I will admit, I voted for it. We had no options, unless we wanted to lose several tens of thousands of jobs.

This is what my State government gave to me. If we fall off the bridge and don't fund transportation, here is what will happen to California: 73,572 jobs will be jeopardized; 5,692 active highway and transit projects will come to a screeching stop, which is pretty much what the commuters are doing right now on Interstate 80 between Sacramento and Davis, where it is my district; and California has 172,201 miles of public roads that will continue to be in very, very poor condition.

So, given the options that our Republican leadership has presented to us—and, by the way, we don't do anything that they don't allow us to do—they gave us the opportunity to kick the can down the road. Okay, better than nothing, but not the solution.

I would like to now turn to my colleague from the State of New York to talk about this system from your area, and then I would like to go back to what we should be doing, what we must be doing, which is to put in place a 4-year transportation program that actually solves our transportation and infrastructure problems, the Grow America Act.

What is the view from the east coast? Any better than the west coast?

PAUL TONKO, my colleague, I yield to you.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative GARAMENDI.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for half the remaining time until 10 p.m. as the designee of the minority leader.

The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. TONKO. I believe that is 53 minutes, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you.

Representative GARAMENDI, let me, once again, thank you for leading us in this hour of discussion, 53 minutes worth of discussion, that focuses on the value added, the importance of investment in transportation projects.

Back to our humble beginnings as a Nation, we were able to cite the relevance of having investments made in transportation. Whether it was to address public safety, whether it was to address the needs of commerce, or to grow our Nation, transportation investments have always provided that lucrative dividend that enables us to be just that much stronger as a Nation, and certainly to build our competitiveness to the ultimate.

That is the wisdom here that comes with an associated investment in transportation. Now, we have throughout our history tremendously sound ideas of how we work together as a Nation with a vision, with a sense of purpose, that enabled us to move forward, whether that was investing in an Erie Canal that gave birth to a necklace of communities called "mill towns" that enabled people to tether their American Dream in those given locations, as they were to find life anew here in their new country, or whether it was the Transcontinental Railroad.

There was an investment, there was a plan, there was a vision shared by this Nation where we chose to go forward and invest those dollars so as to enable us to connect as a Nation, enable us to, again, sharpen the edge, the competitive edge of this country. Or perhaps it was an interstate highway system that found President Eisenhower working with Democrats and Republicans in Congress to put together this strategy, to have a better way to allow us as States, individual States, to, again, connect as a Nation.

So, we have been, or should be at least, inspired by these chapters of our history that showed that when we had this vision, when we executed this plan, when we dug deep to make the investment, and when we were bold in our initiative, great things happened. There were tremendous responses that came to build commerce, to provide for public safety, and to, again, connect the Nation.

Today, the saga is no different. We should respond again in robust fashion, and understand that in this new century it is important for us as we compete in a global economy to offer our business community the best sets of infrastructure investment so that we can move forward with that sound down payment that enables them to function and function well.

What we have seen here in the House, as my colleague from California just indicated, was a delay tactic, a kicking the can down the road, if you will. And as it was the only game in town, that was a "take it or leave it" situation, where we did not want a trust fund to be emptied, and we moved forward with this effort.

However, the leadership bringing their bill to this floor didn't even have enough Members of their majority to support this measure. So, they needed to reach to Democrats to say: okay, we will move forward with this short-term solution, it is not the optimum, it is not near what is needed, and so now the work should continue to put together a legitimate opportunity for us to avoid insolvency in the near future.

What do we need to do? We need to have a long-term strategy, we need to go forward to avoid what could have been without action today 700,000 jobs lost nationally and some 100,000-plus projects either delayed or coming to a grinding halt. We need to provide the predictability, the stability, for those groups that want to invest in our infrastructure.

No corporation, no group out there, no business which involves itself in improving our highways and bridges will take this method seriously unless they feel that, they sense that stability. So, let's go forward and be sound about the investments we will make in our infrastructure, and let's put together that long-term strategy, because as we have witnessed in the past, and understand it to be today, that investment in infrastructure is the rock-solid cornerstone of a stronger tomorrow.

Representative GARAMENDI, there is much work to be done. There is work to be done that will require investments into infrastructure, transportation and infrastructure, in every region of this country. We know that. Let's get serious about the business, and let's avoid these short-term strategies that, again, get into areas where we smooth pensions, which can create another crisis of another kind.

We need to do better than what was done today, and we need to go forward. There were attempts to improve this, but this was the measure that was put before us, and, again, people saw it as the only opportunity to avoid insolvency of that highway trust fund. So, here we are again challenged in this moment to go forward with much better vision, with bolder initiatives, and with deep-rooted commitment to the transportation needs of this Nation.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, thank you so very much. It is always good to be on the floor with you. Thank you so very much for bringing to our attention once again the history of this Nation, how it was built, the great infrastructure.

There is a report card out on how our infrastructure is today. This was put together by the engineers and others who do this kind of work. I am just going to read through this: aviation—these are our airports—D; bridges, C-plus; dams, D; drinking water, D; energy, D; hazardous waste, D; inland waterways, D; levees, D; ports, C—whoa, that is good; public parks and recreation, C-minus; rails, C-plus; roads, D; schools, D; solid waste, B—I guess we can get rid of our trash, that is good—transit, D; and wastewater, D. So, the entire infrastructure is D.

Do you want to know why? Well, here is the reason why. Short-term we run out of money.

Let's take a look here.

In 2002, we spent \$325 billion on non-defense structures, all of these things I just talked about, and that was 2002, at the beginning of the Bush Presidency. And then every year after that—we are now down to about \$225 billion.

So \$100 billion of investment, annual investment, disappeared, and so now we are running all of these D scores. It is fortunate that we are not asking for—well, I guess we are asking for reelection. We are in trouble.

Just by the way, I got a phone call from my wife, and she said: You know, about the pickup truck, John. I said: What about it? She said: I've got to take it in, the mechanic says the wheels are out of alignment. I said: How much is that going to cost? She said: Somewhere over \$100. On average, in San Francisco, \$782 is spent on every car every year to repair for the damages of the poor highways in California. I don't think I have New York, Mr. TONKO, but I suspect it is no better there.

Let's talk about the future. Excuse me, I am just stuck. I don't want to get stuck on the past, but it is pretty bad. Let's talk about the future.

Mr. TONKO. Before you go there, let me just share this, because even though it is 27 years old as a memory, it is still vividly captured by so many of us that lived in upstate New York. When I served in the New York State Assembly, Montgomery County, New York, is my home area. We are a donor county to the New York State Thruway system. Twenty-seven years ago, ten lives were lost when a Thruway bridge collapsed. It, obviously, was a terrible price for those ten individuals to pay. Their family members and friends would remind us that there is no pricetag that we can put on that loss.

□ 2030

I can tell you the economic impact on many counties in that region was severe. Interestingly, no one from that home county, my home county, was lost in that tragedy. Some in New York State paid dearly for that tragedy, but people whose home States were far away from New York were lost in that tragedy.

So that reminds all of us that we are all at risk, no matter where that deficiency may be, no matter where that lack of investment may fall. We are all at risk because we are interconnected, incredibly so, which is an undisputed fact. Any failure out there, any deficiency, challenges each and every one of us.

And so when we talk about the future, that past history of lack of investment needs to remind all of us that there is a worthiness here that this should be a high priority.

You talk about the delays that trip has measured. The impact on people

within the capital region that I represent in New York is some \$1,600 annually in terms of idle time, in terms of repairs required to their vehicles, in terms of accidents that might be caused by less than acceptable conditions on those roadways. So this is costing us, as you just indicated, annually.

We need to understand that it is about public safety and it is about avoiding accidents and tragedies. It is about connecting the Nation. It is about investing in commerce. That is what this is telling us. It is the requirement of this Chamber and the United States Senate and the White House to come together and get things done.

This President has urged us to accept his plans to close loopholes that will provide revenues in a long-term strategy, that will provide for work for millions of people in the trades industry, to put their skilled labor abilities to work for us as a nation and to make certain that future consequences like those that were faced in Montgomery County with the bridge collapse aren't repeated time and time again.

Before we go to the future, I just wanted to set that tone for some very tragic situations that we as a nation have endured. I am speaking of one assembly district in one State, but I know across the country there have been these terrible situations where the infrastructure weakness gripped us with pain and consequence.

Mr. GARAMENDI. No doubt about that. I am thinking about the Twin Cities. That was another bridge that collapsed more recently. These are real reminders of the necessity of dealing with the reality of transportation.

Fortunately, there is a way to solve the transportation and the infrastructure challenges of this Nation. It has been proposed by President Obama. It is called the GROW AMERICA Act. It specifically is designed to rebuild our crumbling transportation system.

It is a comprehensive plan. It deals with all of the various parts of the transportation and infrastructure system. There is a major piece for our rail. There is a major piece for inner city transit buses and transit within the cities. There is a piece for the ports, bridges, and highways. All of this is encompassed in the GROW AMERICA Act, which the President and Secretary Foxx of the Department of Transportation proposed a few months ago.

The legislation was presented to the House of Representatives, introduced here in the House by Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON about a month and a half ago, and it has simply sat there. The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee of this House has not taken it up, although it should.

We should be holding hearings on this issue, because this is what we need to address: the rail system, the buses, the ports, the bridges, the highways, the freight systems; the movement of men, women, materials, and freight all across this country.

The program is a very robust program, and over 4 years it will bring us almost back to what we were doing in 2002. Because in 4 years, we would be spending at the level of \$325 billion a year over that 4-year period of time.

But here is what it means for next year. If we were to pass the GROW AMERICA Act now rather than kicking the can down the road, beginning October 1, 2014, we would have \$7.6 billion to fix our highway system. We would have \$6.8 billion to improve public transportation: buses, light rail, and intracity rail. We would have \$3.4 billion for our rail systems, like what you have here in the Northeast Corridor. Out in California, we have the Capital Corridor, the train system between San Diego and Los Angeles, and so forth. And we would have \$1 billion for our freight transportation system, or a total of \$18.6 billion more in 2015 to fix our crumbling infrastructure.

This is a very robust investment and it covers all of these programs. Each of these programs are necessary in and of themselves, like the highway system, to fill the potholes so that men and women across the country don't have to, as I must do, take my pickup in for a front wheel realignment. And all of these other systems, like transit, rail, port and freight systems, we would be able to grow those. We would be able to begin to fix our infrastructure system, and we would put people back to work.

Mr. TONKO. Right.

What I like about the plan, Representative GARAMENDI, is that it is all-inclusive in terms of an umbrella approach that encompasses several policy areas. It is not just transportation, which is very valid and certainly urgent, but we also address environmental policy, energy policy, economic development policy, and urban policy.

There are a number of strategies that come together into this one initiative that allow us to be smart about our investments and to be efficient. And isn't that what people seem to call for when they go to vote each and every time for Congress?

People interpreted the 2010 election that the voters were saying government is the enemy, government is the problem, government is too big. I think the people said, no, we want efficient government, effective government.

That is what a strategy like this provides. It incorporates planning. It incorporates investing on a routine scale so that we are not doing these catch-up games that require down payments of interest before we even get some investments made in infrastructure. So I like this.

With the rail portion, we are talking about the most energy-efficient form of travel. In order for us to provide a benefit to the public or to commerce, a transportation quotient is an important factor in the household budget and planning that all of us do as households and in budgeting for business so that they can cut that factor and be competitive in landing the contracts

for the work that they do. So rail is an important component for that vision of providing a sounder outcome. It is better for the environment, and there is less pollution as we become more energy-efficient in our travel.

The next order of business is the connection with urban cores. Multimodal concepts enable us to again provide for the recovery of our inner urban cores. We have been lacking for sound urban policy in this Nation. It is time for us to have a heart for these urban cores and to put together smart growth strategies, which this sort of planning, this sort of vision enables us to do.

And the list goes on and on.

To your point, Representative GARAMENDI, we are going to put people to work, too. That is not a bad thing.

Instead of coming up with dollars to sue a President, why don't we invest in our infrastructure? We are going to rush around this week and come up with ways to make certain that we can go forward with a lawsuit against the President. We are going to invest hard-earned taxpayer dollars to prove a point, to stage some sort of political theater and not do the sort of priorities that the American public is calling on us to do.

They don't want this acrimony to be driven by additional digging into the pocket of the taxpayers. They want soundness and effectiveness of programs. They want to know that what we do will grow jobs, create a climate that fosters private sector job growth, enable us to be more competitive, enable our public to be more safe as we travel, and enable us to put people to work.

That is what people deserve. They are calling for that sort of vision and initiative. We owe it to the American public to put into play this long-term strategy that we know deep in our hearts is the best thing to do.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Representative TONKO, what is happening tomorrow? The Speaker and the leadership of this House are going to do a press conference to talk about suing the President?

Mr. TONKO. And there is talk of how we will provide the dollars to make that happen.

Mr. GARAMENDI. And we haven't taken up a transportation bill, have we?

Mr. TONKO. Right. I think the approvals we are looking for here ought to come for sound investments that will bear benefits for generations to come—and in a multiple order of effectiveness for various purposes, from jobs to safety to connecting for commerce and the like.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Let's put aside that lawsuit tomorrow and all the foolishness that it is and at least let you and me and whoever cares to join in this talk about substantive issues the American people really want, which is to do our work to put together programs that actually meet the needs of the people.

This is the President's proposal. I know the President has said if it has his name on it, it isn't going anywhere. So take his name off of it and let's just call it an American act.

What is it?

It is a 4-year program. It is 4 years of transportation infrastructure funding. As you said, it is holistic. It includes many different elements, including planning and research, as you just described. It is \$302 billion over the 4 years, which is a substantial increase over what we are presently doing. It is fully paid for and does not increase the deficit.

I love my charts. I hope the rest of you like them as much as I do. If you don't, I am going to show them anyway.

What happens when we invest a dollar in infrastructure is we actually grow the economy by \$1.57. So for every dollar we invest, we get economic growth. We increase the economy in this case by another 57 cents beyond the dollar that we have already spent. And as you just said, you are laying in place the foundation. You have made the capital investment that will endure for years to come.

Anyway, in 4 years, this GROW AMERICA Act is \$302 billion over the 4-year period. For transportation, the highway system has \$199 billion. That is a 22 percent increase over what we are currently spending. In the area of transit systems, it is \$72 billion over the 4-year period. That also is an increase. There is research, which we have talked about.

The multimodal, this I really like. You talked about the transit hubs, and that is an important piece, but the multimodal freight system is the ports, the trains, and the highways all coming together.

I know you have major projects in New York. You may want to talk about those.

These are the hubs for which our economy grows because it is the export as well as the import from overseas. It is the rail system that then takes those containers of that cargo and puts it on the rails to go across the country—whether it is BNSF, or UP on the west coast, or the CSX rail system on the east coast—and the trucks, and they all come together in a hub. So there is actually \$10 billion for those rail hubs. For the rail system itself to improve the Nation's rails, it is \$19 billion over the 4 years.

Then there are the special innovative programs that local governments want to do like the TIGER grants. These are local programs. That is \$5 billion.

□ 2045

It is a substantial growth in what we have been spending over the previous years, and you will remember the chart that shows the decline in spending. It is an opportunity for us to pick it up and push it forward at a much higher level, employing people, growing the economy in the process, and laying

down the foundation—the concrete, the steel, the bridges, the rails—upon which the economy will grow.

I know you have examples of this. Please, Mr. TONKO.

Mr. TONKO. What I would add to your support of statements would be that, as we delay, as we do these gimmicks, as we do these kicking the can down the road scenarios, there are projects lining up. They are building up.

We are not resolving the overall core of concern out there. In a way, projects are piling up. In New York, the American Society of Civil Engineers has given this country, as you stated earlier, a poor report card on our infrastructure.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Excuse me. Are you like California, with D ratings?

Mr. TONKO. Yes. I mean, we have some tough, tough issues to deal with, and this report card from professionals is telling the story as it is.

Today, nearly 13 percent of New York's bridges are deemed structurally deficient. Some 27 percent of the State's bridges are considered functionally obsolete. Now, that is piling up. It is not going to get better until we invest. As it piles up, these concerns or these benefits from this investment are not being shared with the country.

Now, people don't want to hear about climate change and global warming, but at least see it as a way to be more resourceful with the energy supplies that we do have. If you can't buy into the notion of cleaning up the air to avoid carbon emission and methane emission, at least see it as a way to pull cars off the highway and allow for mass transit, public transit, to enable us to better address the capacity situation of our roads and bridges throughout all of our States, then see it as a way to bring under control the transportation cost factor for commerce.

When you build this port system, when you connect with rail and highways and bridges and when you have the ultimate investment made in today's state-of-the-art infrastructure, you are providing this golden benefit to commerce, so that they can compete and can compete effectively in a global marketplace. It is driven by commerce, as is our public safety, as is our connectedness as a Nation.

So there are many benefits here. The multiple facets of all of this vision that the President has shared with this Congress should not be kicked aside. You don't kick this away, like you did the strategies and the solutions for our infrastructure needs. You sit down at a table together and perform, as this Nation expects us to on behalf of issues as critical as infrastructure.

We know what has to be done. Let's do it. Let's be the professionals as we come together in a bipartisan fashion and bicameral fashion—the legislative branch working with the executive branch—and get it done. We have been inspired throughout our history with

those concepts of the Erie Canal, the Transcontinental Railroad, the interstate highway system.

Here is our moment. Do we let it pass us by, or do we move forward and get it done in grand fashion, where we are pulling cars off the road, enabling people to enjoy the public and mass transit opportunities as a Nation and where we have state-of-the-art port facilities so that we can ship our goods and so that we can enable commerce to be given that muscle it needs, which is the American way?

Our grandparents knew about this. They handed us a better Nation. Where are we in this moment? As stewards of today's given strategy and policy, are we going to fail for the next generations? Or will they look at us someday and say: they got it, they did it, they did it well, and they did it with a sense of vision and planning and passion and commitment, and they scored for us as a generation, and now, we will build upon that success?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Si se pueda. Yes, we can.

Mr. TONKO. Yes, we can.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We can do it.

It is interesting that we spend a lot of time talking on the floor here in the Chamber about government regulation and red tape and all of that. In the GROW AMERICA Act, there are major reforms to speed up projects, to move projects faster—to get the concrete poured, to get the bridge built, to get the airport up and running.

Those reforms are very, very important. They, along with the overall bill, are languishing for lack of a hearing, for lack of action. We really have the opportunity to not only put the projects in place, but to put them in place faster with the reforms that are called for in the GROW AMERICA Act.

I was starting to talk about the TIGER programs. This is an opportunity for our local county, city, State to put forward innovative projects. For example, the systems that you were talking about, the transit hubs, those can be proposed. They can be graded based upon their utility, on their usefulness.

Those are then grant programs—public, local, State, together with the Federal Government. This is a substantial increase. I know these are very popular in California. We keep lining them up, but there hasn't been sufficient money. In the GROW AMERICA Act, there is a significant increase. Some \$5 billion would be available for these innovative transportation projects.

What is there not to like in this? It is fully paid for—interesting. It is fully paid for in two ways—one, on the existing excise tax on gasoline and diesel. It is not increased, but is still the same. Then the balance—that is, the increase—is to be paid for by closing tax loopholes on corporations.

It is interesting that today, as the President was talking about this and also talking about closing tax loopholes on corporations that are

offshoring American jobs, The Wall Street Journal—that rather famous and quite good newspaper—carried on its front page, “The Race to Cut Taxes Fuels Urge to Merge,” a cute headline.

Then, in The New York Times, another headline on the very same subject reads, “Drug Firms Make Haste to Elude Taxes.”

So right here in these two national newspapers are examples of the kinds of tax avoidance games that are being played by American corporations to avoid paying their fair share of the American taxes.

The President, in the GROW AMERICA Act said stop it, stop these kinds of tax loopholes, tax breaks, that American companies are taking to avoid paying their share of the burden of transportation. He wants to close these loopholes, and here are two that clearly ought to be closed immediately.

Mr. TONKO. When you look at that strategy, Representative GARAMENDI, you sense the fundamental fairness.

I look at projects like the efforts in New York where Governor Cuomo is leading this effort to make certain that we invest in the rebuild of the Tappan Zee Bridge. That takes traffic from the greater Metro New York area, the New York City area, and moves it along into upstate New York and into the Northeast area of our country—a major thoroughfare with a huge price tag.

Now, if we partner with our States, that is helping those individual States to endure, to provide for the resources needed to build these major projects and to do them well. Otherwise, it falls upon the local taxpayer and on State income taxes and what have you—or whatever the State revenue supplies are—so that there is this partnership that is strengthened when the Federal Government leads with a strong commitment to infrastructure improvements.

Now, in looking at the safety, the stretch is miles long as we travel from that metro area on the Tappan Zee Bridge into upstate New York. It was in need of improvement for quite some time, and I applaud the Governor for leading the effort now in putting it together, but, again, the Federal partnership here is important.

For us to continue to ask middle-income America to pay the bill—they are already saturated with these efforts. They know that they have been stressed out.

What this measure does is provide fundamental fairness again. It is not just about the projects done, the vision shared, the implementation of a plan. It is about a revenue side that comes together in a progressive fashion, in socially and economically just fashions, to make certain that there is an equal sense of responsibility to bear in terms of providing for the infrastructure improvements that we as a Nation, as an American society, require.

Let's go forward and be the bold pioneers, if you will, of this generation

and show people that we didn't miss the opportunity to invest in America. This Nation, as great as she is, with this economy as strong as it can be, requires assistance through our wonderful history, and this is not a surprise. It should not be a surprise. We need to constantly upgrade and improve and maintain our infrastructure.

Tonight, we have spent a lot of time, Representative GARAMENDI, talking about projects and initiatives that can move us forward, but there is also a commitment that needs to be made to the maintenance and operational costs of these systems.

If we don't commit to that, it sooner or later catches up with us, and then there are requirements for huge bond acts, or there are various ways to come up with strategies, and when you come into moments like this, you will have resistance from certain thinking, philosophical approaches in government, and it makes the job all the more difficult.

We know what needs to be done. We have been bolstered by our rich history. We were at our best when we invested in America. Let's learn from that. Let's seize the moment.

Let's go forward and commit to commerce, to safety, to the general public—to the needs of the general public. Let's provide for that strength of America, for that pioneer spirit that has always driven us.

I know I have talked about this so many times when I have been with you on the floor, but the pioneer spirit was on display when we built that Erie Canal. It was on display when those manufacturing towns built their factories.

It was on display when so many of our ancestors as immigrants came here and tethered their American Dream. They climbed that economic ladder. They ascended with those opportunities to provide for their families, for their children and grandchildren to go forward.

That is us. That is the synergy of this Nation. That is the passion of the American public. We deny that when we deny the vision, the plan, the investment, the policy, the initiative driven right on this floor that ought to be bipartisan in nature. Make no mistake about it—bipartisan in nature.

Let's move forward. Let's have that plan. Let's have that vision, and let's commit to this future.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We certainly can do it. We certainly ought to do it. Our predecessors have done it. There are 435 of us here in the House of Representatives, and the question is: Are we willing to do it?

It can be done. This plan, GROW AMERICA, is fully paid for. Yes, some corporations that are skipping out on their taxes would have to participate, and they should. They ought not be tax dodgers.

This is a very interesting plan put forward by our colleague JOHN DELANEY, a Representative from Mary-

land, that would take those profits that these corporations have stored overseas—profits that they have not paid taxes on in America—to repatriate, to bring that money back to America.

His program would generate, over a period of 10 years, \$720 billion to be used in public-private partnerships to build our infrastructure. There are many, many ideas about how this could be paid for. The President has laid out a plan not to raise the gasoline and the diesel tax, but rather to bring about some tax fairness, and corporations would be required to pay their fair share—all of it good.

I suspect we have maybe another 5 minutes or so, but I want to bring up one of our favorite subjects. I am going to put this up.

Here we are with the GROW AMERICA Act and all of the things that could be done. This is back to Make It In America. I love this photo. It is one of my favorites.

I know, often, you travel on the train from New York down to Washington, D.C.—or back—right about now. This locomotive, which is the most advanced electric locomotive in America, made in America, was paid for by a Make It In America strategy.

Part of the transportation program—the American Recovery Act—back in 2008 said that they put aside about \$700-plus billion for Amtrak all across the Nation to be used for improving the Amtrak system.

They said that that money would be used to build locomotives, and they said 100 percent American-made. Siemens, a German company, said, oh, \$700 billion for locomotives made in America, we are a German company, we can build those in America.

So in Sacramento, California, in the infrastructure program, Siemens has built a 100 percent American-made locomotive, and it is going to be operating very soon on the Northeast corridor.

This is a good thing. This is how we can rebuild the American middle class. This is how we can create jobs, using our infrastructure investments to build jobs in America.

It is a fundamental piece of our Make It In America strategy of rebuilding our manufacturing sector where you do have good, solid middle class jobs, where a family can earn a living without both husband and wife having to work all the time or maybe two or three jobs.

We are talking about the American Dream being restored, and the infrastructure is a fundamental piece of that—not just because it moves the economy, not just because it is foundational to economic growth, but because it is American middle class jobs.

□ 2000

It is the hardhats. It is the welder putting together the new locomotive. It is the engineer designing the system.

It is the accountant. It is the secretary handling the paperwork. It is America building each future.

The President has laid out a good plan. Is there some way better to do it? Put your ideas on the table, my colleagues, put your ideas on the table.

How can you do better than this GROW AMERICA Act? Let's get about doing it. This is our future. This is America's opportunity, and it is fully paid for, doesn't increase the deficit. In fact, it will grow the economy and provide us with those middle class jobs.

I know, Mr. TONKO, you have been at this for your entire career, as have I, and to be here in Congress, at this moment, when we had an opportunity, we missed it today. We missed the opportunity today to grow the American economy, and instead, we kicked the can down the road. Better than nothing, but not good enough—nothing to be proud of.

Mr. TONKO, a few seconds—I don't know how much time we have.

Mr. TONKO. I believe we probably have about 5 minutes now. I think we go to about 7 minutes after.

Look, I think what you point to—the gentleman from California is absolutely right on. It is a ripple effect. It is not just the rail tracks that are developed, the railways that are developed. It is not just the highways and bridges. It is incorporating rail cars.

Now, here is a ripple effect. As we have grown the efficiency of the system, now we are building, manufacturing rail cars, putting people to work, alternatively-fueled vehicles that can enable us to continue in that effort to reduce carbon emission and methane emission, making certain that, again, we go through this whole process, coming out more environmentally sound.

So, yes, today's vote was a big disappointment, in terms of what we could have accomplished. It was that short term, get out of this immediate challenge, and let's go forward.

There is not that vision. There is not that full in-depth plan that is required of us, and certainly, we fell short—far short of the mark that should have brought us across the finish line and enabled us to say, hey, we scored really well here, we put together a sound package.

This is about putting a strategy together that enables us to advance all of these cutting-edge technologies that enable us to strengthen the manufacturing base of America where these ripple effects reach us into our communities.

You talk about the locomotives of today and the future that are driven by the intellectual capacity of workers and researchers in this country. I think back on the industrial heritage of Schenectady, New York, that I represent here in the House.

The American Locomotive Company, ALCO, was producing tremendous cars that enabled us to again have that richness of rail history.

Well, you know, all through our history, there have been those decades and chapters that have inspired us because we met the task, we came ready to deliver, and we were not going to let any force stop us.

That is the greatness of America. That is how we achieved. That is how we climbed to our mountains, where people noticed America, where we were that beacon of hope, where the best things came from this Nation.

Are we ready to settle for second best? Fifth best? I don't think so. So let us move forward.

Other nations are investing in their infrastructure. You hear it all the time, about rail systems in Europe and Asia. You hear about the improvements that people have made with subway systems and the like.

We know that we have got the smarts to do it. We have got the intellectual capacity to lead not only this Nation, but the world, and as we go forward, let us be proud of the fact that we can come together, make things happen, and have that long-term strategy, which was just not here today for that vote. It was not here today for that vote.

I will repeat myself. The Republican majority didn't have their votes enough to pass the measure, so they obviously didn't believe in what they were doing, and it is unfortunate. It was the only game in town. It was the only plan placed on the table.

We need to do better than this, and we can. So our bright days of tomorrow lie ahead of us, only if we are ready to muster up the boldness to make it happen.

Representative GARAMENDI, to you to close.

Mr. GARAMENDI. It is time to close. We can build America. We can build our infrastructure. The President has laid out a worthy plan, comprehensive, and all of the elements of the infrastructure that we must do. It is fully paid for. It is a good starting point.

Maybe there is a better way of doing it, but we cannot get it done with short-term, kick the can down the road bills, such as was passed today, but that is better than not doing anything.

This is the American future, and the question for all of us, 435: Why did we come here? Did we come here just to pass the time, or did we come here to really build America?

We are going to Make It In America. We are Americans, and we will make it.

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

THE VIOLENCE IN ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized until 10 p.m. as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate that recognition.

First of all, I would like to direct attention to the Middle East, to our dear

friend and ally, Israel, and the fact that I pointed out to Prime Minister Netanyahu twice, a few years apart, that going back to the very inception of Israel as a nation more than 3,000 years ago, there has never been a time when Israel gave away land trying to buy peace, that that land was not ultimately used as a staging area from which to attack it.

It has been true all those years, the original founding of Israel, the promised land, going through the division of Israel into two kingdoms, northern and southern, and then the rejuvenation really of that nation in the late 1940s.

No matter which President, no matter which party the President was from, no matter which Secretary of State was pushing to get a Nobel Peace Prize by trying to bring people together, anyone that pushed and forced Israel to give away land ended up bringing about attacks on Israel because they gave away land that should have been Israel's.

Southern Lebanon has been the source of so many attacks and kidnappings, intrusions into Israel. The Gaza Strip had so many Israeli families living peacefully, greenhouses, methods of taking care of themselves.

In an act—a unilateral act by Israel to attempt to secure a bit of peace, Israel gave away the Gaza Strip, now governed by Hamas, a terrorist organization that the United States through this administration is funding because we are funding the Palestinians and they have the relationship now with Hamas.

So we are taking American tax dollars from many people in the United States who do not believe it is a good idea to curse Israel and to supply money to its enemy, so Israel can be attacked, and yet, that money is being taken and given to them.

They can say because money is fungible, where we are not actually using the money you give us to attack Israel, and they can also claim they are not actually using the money that we give them to teach hatred in textbooks and all kinds of ways actually, including the naming of holidays after barbarians who have committed attacks on innocent people and killed innocent people. They name holidays after them. They name streets after them.

Here in the United States, we tend to name holidays or streets after people like Martin Luther King, Jr., who subscribed to peaceful means of protest, who would never encourage killing or attacks to achieve what Hamas and the PLO have utilized.

It is time to cut off the money. Until they quit teaching hatred, they quit utilizing funds to attack Israel, you cut off their funds. You cut off the teaching of hatred, and you have got a shot at some semblance of peace in the Middle East.

In the meantime, Israel is being attacked—every day, the rockets flying, hoping—the Palestinians hoping that maybe they will kill some innocent Israeli people.

Wouldn't that be great, they are thinking, if we could just kill maybe some children, maybe blow off some legs and arms? What a great accomplishment Hamas and the PLO can be thrilled about.

Of course, Hamas took over from the PLO in governing, but the area is no more peaceable, and it is time to cut off all American funding to any area that subscribes to the shooting of rockets to kill innocent people, as is going on in the Middle East, enemies of Israel attempting to kill innocent Israelis.

There was an attempt by Israel to enter into an Egyptian-brokered ceasefire with Hamas, but according to The Jerusalem Post story, by Yaakov Lappin, that collapsed Tuesday when Gazan terrorists continued to fire rocket barrages on the south, center, and north of Israel.

A fragment from a mortar shell killed an Israeli man, Dor Chanin, 37. Chanin had come as a civilian volunteer to distribute food to soldiers at Erez.

□ 2115

It is time to quit aiding and abetting the attacks on our friend Israel. It is time to start helping them.

And when it comes to the disastrous effort to negotiate with terrorist leaders in Iran—they are developing nuclear weapons. They are developing the ability to develop nuclear weapons because they have their centrifuges spinning. And I think those who say they want enough nuclear material to produce several nuclear weapons at the same time, they are not going to just do one. They are going to wait until they have enough to do several so that they can spread out, be difficult to track and be difficult to stop before they utilize them to destroy Israel, as the Little Satan, as they see it, and the United States, as the Great Satan.

It has been described in one of Joel Rosenberg's novels far too accurately: Even though Iran is developing intercontinental ballistic missiles that could carry nuclear warheads to the United States—"the Great Satan" they call us—they really don't even need those. They could put them on a cargo ship, a yacht, whatever, and bring them over—have one in New York, have one in Chicago, have one up the Potomac. And they could pretty well devastate American economic powerhouse cities. If they put one in New Orleans, the Houston ship channel, there goes most of our refined gasoline.

It is time for America to wake up. This administration is not adequately protecting us, and that is why our Attorney General has now finally admitted this month, in an ABC interview, that, in effect, he is extremely concerned and in fear more now of a terrorist attack than he has been at most any time in his time as Attorney General. And this is a guy that knows terrorism. I mean, he has helped terrorists in his role prior to working for this administration. He is quite familiar with

what they are capable of doing. So for him to say that, people ought to take notice.

Of course we have our Secretary of State, John Kerry, in an article of July 15 from *The Weekly Standard* by Jeryl Bier. The headline, “Kerry: I Get ‘A Little Uptight When I Hear Politicians Say How Exceptional We Are.’”

Heaven forbid that we should realize the capability of America and that there is no other nation in the history of the world that has fought, has lost lives of our military, has spent tremendous amounts of our treasure not to create an empire, but simply to bring liberty and freedom to people we don’t even share languages with, we don’t share religions so much with. Nations haven’t done that. America is an exceptional nation, and we are losing that exceptional status.

So perhaps I will make our Secretary of State feel much better and be much prouder as I say that under this administration—as has been pointed out to me by Africans in Nigeria, by Africans in Togo—the United States has gotten much weaker in world opinion under this President. So that should make our Secretary of State feel very, very pleased because a Member of Congress is not claiming to be exceptional. We are. But really, I am claiming that Nigerians and others who were so pleased, as they told me, that you elected your first Black President have now grown scared as they have watched America, under this President, get weaker and weaker and become far less exceptional in the eyes of the world as we once were.

One of the problems has been that this country has been under assault, has been under an invasion through our southern border. As border patrolmen will attest, the Tucson sector of our 2,000-or-so-mile border on the south had traditionally been where there were more people coming into this country illegally.

We have an area in Arizona where there is a national park on the American side, where the sign has been seen—and I have had a picture of it here on the floor—during the Obama Presidency that simply directs American citizens, warns them not to use this area because there are criminals and drug activity in the national park. So American citizens are encouraged to use an area north of the interstate because this administration has just pretty well relegated that area to criminals from outside of this country. That would mean that is a failure to adequately provide for our common defense, and it might be support for Andrew McCarthy’s book title, “Faithless Execution.”

Now, I feel like the appropriate thing to do is to pass the resolution that I filed a year ago here in this House that goes through explaining how the President has failed to secure our country, has failed to secure our borders. We don’t want our borders closed. I certainly don’t. Immigration is a wonder-

ful thing. There is no country in the world where they have five times our population, or less—no country allows 1 million people or more to come into their country legally. We do.

We love immigration. It is a great thing. “*E pluribus unum*,” the Latin phrase meaning, out of many, one, has been a part of the Great Seal since the 1770s. It is on the ribbon that runs through the beak in the eagle’s mouth on one side of the Great Seal.

I was taught, growing up, that our melting pot is one of the many things that has made us so great. People come here, assimilate, speak the same language, love the same country, and become Americans.

Well, we have seen hyphenated Americans become the order of the day in recent years. And I so look forward to the day, if it ever arrives—and I hope and pray it does—when, once again, we are Americans.

I know on 9/12/2001, as I looked around our courthouse square, the hundreds of people there—all races, both genders, lots of national origins—but that day, we were all Americans. There were no hyphenated Americans, not on 9/12. Through the tragedy and the hate and the death and the sorrow of 9/11/2001, on 9/12, we saw our Nation shine, a compassionate nation, a caring nation, but also a nation committed that we would not be struck again.

And now—I mean right now—our Attorney General, under this administration, refused to prosecute what a Federal district court said were the named coconspirators of those convicted of supporting terrorism, which was echoed by the U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. These were front organizations for the Muslim Brotherhood. There was plenty of evidence to support that they were coconspirators with the convicted defendants in supporting terrorism, and this administration, this Attorney General, refused to prosecute them.

Under this administration, they even got a heads-up from Russia, you have a Muslim coming back in named Tsarnaev who has been to a terrorist area. He has been radicalized. And Russia warned not once, but twice. And this administration that has removed information about radical Islam from its training materials for the different departments—and I have reviewed some of it that they have removed.

We were told that most of it that they removed from the FBI training materials. Well, people who have not been allowed to fully see and be trained on what radical Islam is were sent out to the mosque where Tsarnaev went regularly, not to ask questions about has Tsarnaev talked about Qutb that wrote “*Milestones*” that Osama bin Laden credits with having brought him along the road to terrorism, to violence. They didn’t know the questions to ask. So the only reason we had the FBI sent out under this administration was for the outreach program.

They were so ignorant that while the outreach program was going on, what

was really happening and what had happened at that mosque and who had been radicalized and who had not, that the Director of the FBI did not even know that the founder of the two Muslim mosques there in the Boston area were founded by a man named al-Amoudi, who had helped the Clinton administration and then helped the Bush administration until he was found to be supporting terrorist activity. He was arrested just right out here at Dulles International Airport, and he is now doing over 20 years in Federal prison for supporting terrorism. He was the founder of the Islamic Society of Boston, which founded those mosques.

The FBI Director didn’t even know. They didn’t go out there and talk to anybody about whether or not Tsarnaev had been radicalized. But lo and behold, they said, hey, we talked to Tsarnaev himself, and he didn’t admit that he was radicalized. And we talked to his mom, and she didn’t admit that he was radicalized. So apparently they thought he was good. And people died and lost limbs in Boston.

Instead, we have seen spying on American citizens to an extent that it is hard to believe we have reached here in America, where you have the NSA getting everybody’s phone logs of all calls they make—and this is all reported in public formats, in the public media—where you have the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau that was established to protect us from unscrupulous banks and banking habits and practices. That was done when we had a majority of Democrats in the House and Senate. They set it up where that Bureau would never have to be responsible to Congress at all. We could never have oversight. They would get their money from the Federal Reserve so they could run independently. And what have they done? Well, they have been gathering debit and credit card purchase and use information on Americans.

Some of us think that if they really want to protect us from unscrupulous bank practices, they ought to wait until we tell them that we have been treated unfairly and then go after the criminal. That is really what the Constitution Bill of Rights anticipates. You don’t go gathering everybody’s personal information, except on probable cause. You get a warrant.

□ 2130

But not now. This administration has the CFPB that is gathering information in the name of protecting us. I don’t want that kind of protection. I want them to leave us alone and quit drawing and gathering all the personal data on people in America. It is none of your business unless there has been a crime, and then, and only then, your gathering should be based on probable cause.

We have got the ability of the United States Government to use drones, thermal imaging, and all kinds of technology to spy on American citizens

like never before. We have the ability, as this administration has shown, to be concerned about an American citizen in Yemen who was radicalized, who was a terrorist, even though he had met with people in this administration, met with people in the prior administration, and had led prayers here on Capitol Hill of Muslim staff members. Wouldn't it have been interesting if this administration had decided to capture him during one of his numerous trips into the United States instead of blowing him up in Yemen? It might have been interesting to find out what he had to say about the people he worked with in this administration and the prior administration on Capitol Hill.

Well, how, one might wonder, could an American citizen be radicalized to hate Americans so well? If you go look at his life, his parents were not American citizens. They came into the United States on a visa for college. That is when he was born and taken back to Yemen. In Yemen growing up he learned to hate America.

How many people has this happened to? We know the Muslim Brother who was leading Egypt and weaponizing the Sinai, which is still an area of devastation because of all the weapons Morsi made sure were there. Morsi's wife had a daughter here in the United States, an American citizen, and obviously he didn't care a whole lot for America.

So I had a resolution a year ago that just went through all the whereas explaining that there is no need to pass any bill through the House and Senate to secure our border or to do immigration reform until the President actually goes through the effort of securing our borders. He has got the money. Some people have already forgotten that Secretary of Homeland Security Napolitano just announced one day that even though Congress had appropriated \$4 billion to provide a virtual fence in areas that a fence would be difficult, she just decided that was not practical, too expensive. So she would not do a virtual fence. And so what happened to the \$4 billion? What happened to our security? Well, we didn't get secured, and we didn't get the virtual fence. There was clearly some wasted money in that area. But we still have got to get control of our border.

But when you have a President who has not done anything significant to secure our border but has, in fact, pronounced a new law, the initials of which are DACA, he just pronounced a new law that had not been passed by Congress but had simply passed the lips of our President. Here is the new law. Here is what you can do to get amnesty. And he pronounced amnesty in what USCIS has announced has been over 550,000 cases. Our President pronounced an amnesty law into effect that provided amnesty already to over 550,000 people who had come in illegally.

The New York Times and others have said that just in very recent months,

we have had an additional 300,000 people come into our country illegally. And, this week, we get the report that 38 people have been deported. Well, if you do the math, that means that those 850,000 who came in illegally who had a 100 percent chance of getting to stay here because of this administration not enforcing our law and not enforcing our border, that 100 percent chance of getting to stay here got dramatically reduced. Because of this administration's wonderful efforts, it has now been reduced from a 100 percent chance of staying here to a 99.9955 percent chance of staying here. And that should certainly scare anyone who had started planning a trip into this country illegally, that their odds of staying here had dropped from 100 percent clear down to a 99.995 percent chance of getting to stay here.

I still come back to the resolution I filed a year ago. Until the President shows he is going to secure the border, we shouldn't pass anything. As our own Speaker has said, we can't trust this President. When the Secretary of Homeland Security can just say, I don't want to spend \$4 billion you guys appropriated for a fence, I am going to do something else. Really? Well, I guess you can do that if you are a bit lawless.

But if we are going to be a nation of laws, then laws that have been duly passed by Congress and signed by other Presidents should be enforced, otherwise we become like the countries that people are fleeing.

It was rather emotional Saturday night to be down right near the river where children and adults were being processed—processed meaning they have to ask each one of them numerous questions, normally in Spanish. And there are some articles of clothing they are not allowed to take in to the detention area. And when she was asked, were you glad to leave home, she began to cry. She didn't mention she was so glad to get away from all the violence. She didn't mention that things were so terrible at home she couldn't stand to stay, she looked so forward to coming to America. She cried. She missed her home. She missed her relatives that were there. Break your heart. One of the most beautiful little girls I have ever seen. It is a wonder she didn't get drawn into sex trafficking. She was a gorgeous little girl. And I know beautiful girls. My wife and I have had three.

Border Patrolmen have talked about, and it has been reported, dead children. Their bodies have been found, one washed up. As this administration continues to lure people into America, that has now been admitted by this administration, that the President's own amnesty bill that he pronounced into law has been luring people up here. Secretary of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson admitted that in an op-ed that he wrote for Spanish-language newspapers. It is time to stop luring young children and adults into the United

States into the arms of human traffickers. It is time to stop.

Of course, I mention there is one way that we could stop very quickly the massive invasion that is going on because the ability to stop an invasion like we are seeing now was even anticipated by our Founders, and they put it in the third clause of section 10 of article I of our Constitution. That says:

No State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any duty of tonnage, keep troops, or ships of war in time of peace, enter into any agreement or compact which another State, or with a foreign power, or engage in war, unless actually invaded.

Not by a foreign army, it doesn't say that; not by a military, it doesn't say that; just invaded. And there is a great law review article from a Michigan law journal that discusses this provision. It has not been utilized before. There are no cases that we can find that have utilized this. But perhaps it is time to use it now.

But it says, unless actually invaded or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay.

The Attorney General himself has said the threat of another terrorist attack is scarier now than it has been. And we know that there is an increased number of what are called SIAs, those who would be special interest aliens that come from countries like Syria, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. They are coming in from nations where there are leaders who want to destroy us.

It is worth trying to make sure we don't have terrorists coming through our southern border because we know there are lots of people coming through that don't get caught. Even though, as one of the border patrolmen said here when I was down there: It is interesting—we used to chase them, and now they chase us. Talking about people coming in illegally.

But not all of them chase the Border Patrol. If someone is paid megabucks to be brought into the United States, it can be done, while Border Patrol is spending an hour, hour and a half processing a massive number of groups coming in, 10, 12, 16, 18, 27, and they are having to process all those, and we have such a limited number of border patrolmen, plenty of opportunities to bring in anybody the drug cartels have been paid to bring in with whatever they are bringing.

So we have a resolution. It hasn't been filed yet, but it says:

Whereas this provision in the Constitution, therefore, recognizes the continued right of individual States to use force in self-defense if "actually invaded, or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay";

And whereas an unprecedented, organized, mass invasion of the United States is occurring along our southern border;

Whereas before this invasion Marine Corps General John Kelly, commander of the U.S. Southern Command, or SOUTHCOM, in testimony before committees in each House of Congress, the House Armed Services Committee in

February, and the Senate Armed Services Committee in March, warned of the security threats to the United States from criminal networks and terrorist organizations penetrating the United States through our southern border and since the invasion he has warned that the situation poses “an existential threat to the United States”;

□ 2145

This general who has been overseeing our military in our southern area says that the threat to our country is a threat to our very existence. Our continued existence is at risk with what is going on at the southern border. This resolution goes on:

Whereas, credible sources have reported plans for an even larger invasion;

Whereas, between June of 2012, when the Obama administration unilaterally implemented the Deferred Action For Childhood Arrivals (DACA) through March of 2014, approximately 550,000 illegal aliens received temporary deferred action, according to USCIS;

Whereas, Department of Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson admitted that DACA was in fact luring people to cross the U.S. border, whether they were eligible for the deferred action or not, in an opinion editorial he wrote for Spanish-language newspapers;

Whereas, a court order signed on December 13, 2013, by U.S. District Judge Andrew S. Hanen of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas found as factual that “The DHS, instead of enforcing our border security laws, actually assisted the criminal conspiracy in achieving its illegal goals.” The U.S. Court also found that a private citizen doing the exact things that DHS is doing “would, and should, be prosecuted for this conduct.” Additionally, the Court found that “The DHS has simply chosen not to enforce the United States’ borders laws,” and that the “DHS is rewarding criminal conduct,” and that “these illegal activities help fund the illegal drug cartels which are a very real danger for both citizens of this country and Mexico”;

Whereas the State of Texas reported it has identified, between October of 2008 and April of 2014, a total of 177,588 unique criminal alien defendants booked into Texas county jails who are responsible for at least 611,234 individual criminal charges over their criminal careers, including 2,993 homicides and 7,695 sexual assaults;

Think about that, Mr. Speaker: 177,588 criminal aliens booked for crimes in Texas. People are being killed in America and specifically, according to these figures, 2,993 that we know of by criminal aliens in this country. And they have committed at least 7,695 sexual assaults.

You want to talk about a war on women, this administration will not defend the women of America from criminal aliens by the thousands and hundreds of thousands. Well, we know thousands, and we know people are coming in by the hundreds of thousands illegally, and this administration wants to talk about other people having a war on women when they will not defend the women that are being sexually assaulted by illegal aliens in this country. In Texas alone, we know of 7,695 such assaults:

Whereas the Department of Homeland Security, through the General Services Administration, issued a solicitation in January, 2014, which proves the falsity of statements by officials in that Department, that they had no knowledge that this mass invasion would occur;

Whereas in 2014 there has occurred a sharp increase in the number of Special Interest Aliens apprehended illegally crossing the United States border, being from terrorist-sponsored or affiliated countries such as Syria, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Nigeria, and Somalia;

Whereas Attorney General Eric Holder acknowledged in an ABC news story in July of 2014 that there exists a clear and present danger of imminent terrorist attack from “a situation that we can see developing” and “more frightening than anything I think I have seen as Attorney General”;

Whereas the Commander in Chief of the United States appears to be either unwilling or unable to exercise his constitutional responsibility to defend this country from imminent danger or invasion;

Resolved, it is the sense of the House of Representatives that all Governors of the States along the southern border, and other States willing to assist them, are urged to exercise the right of self-defense against invasion or imminent danger as will not admit of delay as provided for in article I, section 10 of the United States Constitution.

Some would say, How would you pay for that?

Well, how about for one thing we eliminate the child tax credit for people who are here illegally that are getting back much more, many thousands more dollars, than they actually pay in?

How about—and we are told a hundred billion or so is sent by people who are illegally in this country to their home country—how about, for allowing people to be here illegally, we put a 5 percent tax on that \$100 billion going out of this country? We could pay for whatever we need very quickly.

Well, we have a bill that has been filed. It has gotten a lot of acclaim, and in the remaining minutes I would just like to look at some of this bill that my good friend, Senator JOHN CORNYN, and my good friend, HENRY CUELLAR, a fellow House Member, have filed. We have a copy of what is being proposed. It has been sent to different folks on Capitol Hill. And it does, at page 2, take a shot at changing the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008. It makes a shot at fixing that. How ironic that Wilberforce, the champion of ending slavery in all of the British Empire, had this bill named for him that was supposed to help stop sexual trafficking, but as a result of this bill and the President’s Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, as a result of that bill countless children have been lured into sexual slavery.

We can’t even be told a number, but we are told that it is definitely happening. As the drug cartels are paid to humanly traffic people up, they find people who would make attractive sex slaves, and so an effort to stop sexual trafficking has actually helped create more. But anyway, the first few pages deal with that.

It does say on page 4 that such person may not be placed, talking about unaccompanied children—which, by the way, having been to the border a number of times, it is clear to me there is no child coming across the border unaccompanied unless they are teenagers. The children you see are accompanied by somebody. And even if the coyote leaves them right before they go into the custody of Border Patrol, they were accompanied right up until that time. But unaccompanied minors under this proposed new bill may not be placed in the custody of a nongovernmental sponsor or otherwise released from the custody of the United States Government until the child is repatriated unless the child is the subject of an order under section 235(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

It goes on, the next section, 102, defines the term “asylum officer,” which means an immigration officer, and it puts some pretty tough conditions, including has had substantial experience adjudicating asylum applications. So that means we are going to have to have people who have been doing this a lot. You couldn’t have fair judges sent there if they haven’t had substantial experience adjudicating asylum applications. That seems a little unnecessary.

Anyway, then it sets deadlines, 7 days and 72 hours shall issue an order, but then it does indicate if it is impractical by reason of an alien’s mental incompetency for the alien to be present, the Attorney General shall prescribe safeguards to protect the rights and privileges of the alien. The alien shall be given the privilege of being represented at no expense to the government, shall have a reasonable opportunity to examine evidence, present evidence, and cross-examine witnesses.

On page 8 is Withdrawal of Application for Admission. In the discretion of the Attorney General—and that is the guy that hasn’t been enforcing the law as it is, who is currently in contempt of Congress, who has been obfuscating on Fast and Furious and on other serious crises in our government, has at least been complicit in failing to bring forth evidence and to prosecute people timely, including the IRS scandal, and now we are going to give him a lot of discretion here, that is a matter of concern.

Anyway, it says based on a preponderance of the evidence, the judge has got to find that the alien is likely to be eligible for any form of relief of removal. Anyway, basically what it is saying is that in general, an applicant for admission must establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the alien is likely to be eligible for any form of relief from removal. So if they just say, well, there is a good chance we are likely to be eligible, not that we are going to prevail, but it is just likely we are going to be eligible, then they get to go around that requirement.

If an immigration judge determines that the unaccompanied alien child has

not met the burden of proof required under the subsection, the judge shall order the alien removed unless the alien claims an intention to apply for asylum or that the alien has a fear of persecution. So we have some rigorous steps in here in this bill, and they will be ordered to be removed, unless, of course, if the alien claims an intention to apply for asylum or a fear of persecution. Well, that lets him sidestep some of those requirements.

Page 11, if the officer determines credible fear of persecution, the alien shall be held in the custody of the Secretary for Health and Human Services. Really, I thought that had been one of the problems created by prior law, of giving custody to Health and Human Services. For heaven's sake, let's leave custody with the people dealing with the immigration issues. Let's leave it in Homeland Security. Let's not be transferring people to another department because we have seen what HHS does. They transfer them all over the country, and there are consequences there because now we find out that under a HUD requirement, those people may be eligible for housing which will allow the government to rezone your neighborhood.

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

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on July 15, 2014, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 1813. To redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 162 Northeast Avenue in Tallmadge, Ohio, as the "Lance Corporal Daniel Nathan Deyarmin, Jr., Post Office Building".

H.R. 1376. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 369 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive in Jersey City, New Jersey, as the "Judge Shirley A. Tolentino Post Office Building".

H.R. 255. To amend certain definitions contained in the Provo River Project Transfer Act for purposes of clarifying certain property descriptions, and for other purposes.

H.R. 272. To designate the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense joint outpatient clinic to be constructed in Marina, California, as the "Major General William H. Gourley VA-DOD Outpatient Clinic".

H.R. 291. To provide for the conveyance of certain cemeteries that are located on National Forest System land in Black Hills National Forest, South Dakota.

H.R. 330. To designate a Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at the March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California.

H.R. 507. To provide for the conveyance of certain land inholdings owned by the United States to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona, and for other purposes.

H.R. 876. To authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1158. To direct the Secretary of the Interior to continue stocking fish in certain

lakes in the North Cascades National Park, Ross Lake National Recreation Area, and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area.

H.R. 1216. To designate the Department of Veterans Affairs Vet Center in Prescott, Arizona, as the "Dr. Cameron McKinley Department of Veterans Affairs Veterans Center".

H.R. 2337. To provide for the conveyance of the Forest Service Lake Hill Administrative Site in Summit County, Colorado.

H.R. 3110. To allow for the harvest of gull eggs by the Huna Tlingit people within Glacier Bay National Park in the State of Alaska.

H.R. 803. To reform and strengthen the workforce investment system of the Nation to put Americans back to work and make the United States more competitive in the 21st century.

H.R. 356. To clarify authority granted under the Act entitled 'An Act to define the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and for other purposes'.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 16, 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:

6399. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michael R. Moeller, United States Air Force, and his advancement on the retired list to the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6400. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter notifying that the Department intends to assign women to previously closed positions in the United States Army Special Operations Command; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6401. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting Annual Report on the Activities of the Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation (WHINSEC) for 2013 to the Committee on Armed Services.

6402. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, GSA, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Limitation on Allowable Government Contractor Compensation Costs [FAC 2005-75; FAR Case 2014-012; Item III; Docket 2014-0012, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM75) received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6403. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, GSA, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; EPEAT Items [FAC 2005-75; FAR Case 2013-016; Item I; Docket 2013-0016, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM71) received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6404. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, GSA, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's

final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Contracting with Women-Owned Small Business Concerns [FAC 2005-75; FAR Case 2013-010; Item II; Docket 2013-0010, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM59) received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6405. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, GSA, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-75; Small Entity Compliance Guide [Docket No.: FAC 2014-0052, Sequence 3] received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6406. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, GSA, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-75; Introduction [Docket No.: FAR Case 2014-0051, Sequence No. 3] received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6407. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report on the operations of the Exchange Stabilization Fund (ESF) for Fiscal Year 2013, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 5302(c)(2); to the Committee on Financial Services.

6408. A letter from the Chief Executive Officer, Anti-Doping Agency, transmitting the Agency's 2013 Annual Report and Financial Audit; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6409. 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; Illinois; Revision to the Chicago 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Plan [EPA-R05-OAR-2014-0274; FRL-9912-57-Region 5] received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6410. 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; Maine and New Hampshire; Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R01-OAR-2012-0733; EPA-R01-OAR-2012-0935; A-1-FRL-9911-51-Region-1] June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6411. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans for North Carolina: State Implementation Plan Miscellaneous Revisions [EPA-R04-OAR-2007-0602; FRL-9912-83-Region 4] received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6412. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Nitrogen Oxide Combustion Turbine Alternative Control Requirements for the Milwaukee-Racine Former Nonattainment Area [EPA-R05-OAR-2014-0206; FRL-9912-56-Region 5] received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6413. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan; Listing of Trustee Designations [FRL-9739-9-OW] received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6414. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oklahoma: Incorporation by Reference of Approved State Hazardous Waste Management Program [EPA-R06-OAR-2013-0461; FRL-9911-76-Region 6] received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6415. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0336; FRL-9912-64-Region 9] received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6416. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Disapproval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania Portable Fuel Container Amendment of Pennsylvania State Implementation Plan [EPA-R03-OAR-2014-0298; FRL-9912-21-Region 3] received June 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6417. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Nevada; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [NV 126-NBK; FRL-9908-86-Region 9] received June 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6418. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Partial Approval and Partial Disapproval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; South Dakota; Revisions to South Dakota Administrative Code; Permit; New and Modified Sources [EPA-R08-OAR-2014-0241; FRL-9912-24-Region 8] received June 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6419. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Partial Exemption of Certain Chemical Substances from Reporting Additional Chemical Data [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2012-0221; FRL-9910-84] (RIN: 2070-AK01) received June 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6420. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Modification of Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances; Update of Chemical Identities [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2014-0276; FRL-9910-51] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received June 17, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6421. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 14-21, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6422. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 14-30, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6423. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of

State, transmitting a report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6424. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the former Liberian regime of Charles Taylor that was declared in Executive Order 13348 of July 22, 2004; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6425. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to transnational criminal organizations that was declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6426. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Lebanon that was declared in Executive Order 13441 of August 1, 2007; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6427. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6428. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Indianapolis, transmitting the 2013 Statements on System of Internal Controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Indianapolis, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6429. A letter from the Acting Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled "District of Columbia Agencies' Compliance with Fiscal Year 2014 Small Business Enterprise Expenditure Goals through the 2nd Quarter of Fiscal Year 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6430. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification that the Department issued payments to eligible local governments under the Payments In Lieu of Taxes (PILT) Program; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6431. A letter from the Chief, FWS Endangered Species Listing Branch, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Species Status for *Ivesia webberi* [Docket No.: FWS-R8-ES-2013-0079] (RIN: 1018-AZ12) received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6432. A letter from the Chief, FWS Endangered Species Listing Branch, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for *Ivesia webberi* [Docket No.: FWS-R8-ES-2013-0080] (RIN: 1018-AZ57) received June 25, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6433. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric

Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Dolphin and Wahoo Fishery Off the Atlantic States; Amendment 5 [Docket No.: 130403322-4454-02] (RIN: 0648-BD08) received June 30, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6434. A letter from the President, National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, transmitting the 2013 Annual Report of an independent auditor who has audited the records of the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 4514; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6435. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of action taken to extend the "Memorandum of Understanding Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Cambodia Concerning the Imposition of Import Restrictions on Archaeological Material from Cambodia from the Bronze Age Through the Khmer Era"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6436. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, "Part D Plans Generally Include Drugs Commonly Used by Dual Eligibles: 2014"; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

6437. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-502, "Transfer of Jurisdiction Over Lot 802, Square 4325 within Fort Lincoln New Town Emergency Approval Resolution of 2014"; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Oversight and Government Reform.

6438. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department requests be enacted during the second session of the 113th Congress; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Oversight and Government Reform, Energy and Commerce, Science, Space, and Technology, the Judiciary, Rules, Natural Resources, Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, Foreign Affairs, and Veterans' Affairs.

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. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 670. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4719) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions for food inventory (Rept. 113-522). 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 Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. COLE, and Mr. SALMON):

H.R. 5107. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to reduce the fuel economy obligations of automobile manufacturers whose fleets contain at least 50 percent fuel choice enabling vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 5108. A bill to establish the Law School Clinic Certification Program of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. COOK, Mr. DENHAM, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. COSTA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MCKEON, Ms. CHU, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. HAHN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BERA of California, Mr. HONDA, Mr. NUNES, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. Cárdenas, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. BASS, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. VALADAO):

H.R. 5109. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1048 West Robinhood Drive in Stockton, California, as the "W. Ronald Coale Memorial Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. WALDEN (for himself, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. DUFFY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. GARDNER):

H.R. 5110. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal rebasing of payments for home health services, as required under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and to replace such rebasing with a Medicare home health value-based purchasing program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 5111. A bill to improve the response to victims of child sex trafficking; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 5112. A bill to provide eligibility for veterans benefits for individuals who served in the United States merchant marine in the Southeast Asia theater of operations during the Vietnam Era; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. HALL):

H.R. 5113. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to end the increased Federal funding for Medicaid expansion with respect to inmates' hospital care under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, to apply the savings towards a 2015 Medicare Advantage stabilization program to help protect seniors' choices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CUELLAR (for himself, Mr. BARBER, and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 5114. A bill to facilitate the expedited processing of minors entering the United States across the southern border and for

other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Homeland Security, Armed Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCALLISTER:

H.R. 5115. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the beneficiary travel program of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MEADOWS (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.R. 5116. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to train Department of Homeland Security personnel how to effectively deter, detect, disrupt, and prevent human trafficking during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 5117. A bill to make competitive awards to national estuary programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TERRY (for himself, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. LANCE, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. LONG, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK):

H.R. 5118. A bill to direct the Attorney General to report to Congress on the numbers of aliens unlawfully present in the United States who appear and fail to appear before immigration judges for proceedings under section 240 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 5107.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 5108.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 8.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 5109.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 5110.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Consistent with the original understanding of the commerce clause, the authority to

enact this legislation is found in Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

The SAVE Medicare Home Health Act repeals the rebasing cuts to home health services contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. These cuts restrict patient access to home health services and reduce patient-centered control of health care decisions. By removing these cuts, the bill removes government intrusion into the doctor-patient relationship, which is protected by the 9th and 10th Amendments to the Constitution.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 5111.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BISHOP OF GEORGIA:

H.R. 5112.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Commerce clause

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 5113.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 1, of the United States Constitution

This states that "Congress shall have power to . . . lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.R. 5114.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. MCALLISTER:

H.R. 5115.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 5116.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment XIII

Section 1, "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction."

Section 2, "Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 5117.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. TERRY:

H.R. 5118.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 4, (authorizing Congress "To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization . . .").

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 303: Mr. FORBES, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HORSFORD.
 H.R. 333: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
 H.R. 543: Mr. GOHMEYER.
 H.R. 690: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 795: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
 H.R. 800: Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.
 H.R. 842: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 988: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 996: Mr. LOEBSACK.
 H.R. 997: Mr. LUCAS.
 H.R. 1179: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
 H.R. 1250: Mrs. LOWEY.
 H.R. 1328: Mr. TIERNEY.
 H.R. 1354: Ms. BONAMICI.
 H.R. 1462: Mr. MAFFEI.
 H.R. 1515: Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 1518: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. KIND, and Mr. WALZ.
 H.R. 1555: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 1556: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 1563: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 1573: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 1696: Mr. DELANEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 1795: Mr. BARROW of Georgia.
 H.R. 1878: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
 H.R. 1893: Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
 H.R. 2013: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
 H.R. 2116: Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 2355: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 2398: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
 H.R. 2453: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. NUNES, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. STEWART.
 H.R. 2457: Mr. MORAN.
 H.R. 2468: Mr. POMPEO, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 2482: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 2529: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
 H.R. 2673: Mr. HARPER, Mr. JONES, and Mr. MEADOWS.
 H.R. 2780: Ms. ESTY.
 H.R. 2902: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
 H.R. 2959: Mr. HARRIS.
 H.R. 2990: Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 3097: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 3116: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 3322: Ms. WATERS and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 3461: Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 3482: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 3486: Mr. MESSER and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
 H.R. 3494: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
 H.R. 3665: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 3680: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MENG, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 3722: Mrs. ELLMERS and Mr. BENISHEK.
 H.R. 3732: Mrs. LUMMIS.
 H.R. 3742: Mr. MCCAUL.
 H.R. 3867: Mr. RAHALL.
 H.R. 3899: Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 3970: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 3991: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
 H.R. 3994: Mrs. LUMMIS.
 H.R. 4103: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
 H.R. 4143: Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 4156: Ms. Frankel of Florida, and Mrs. WAGNER.
 H.R. 4158: Mr. BUCSHON.
 H.R. 4250: Mr. RENACCI.
 H.R. 4252: Mr. WALBERG.
 H.R. 4271: Mr. CLAY and Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 4305: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
 H.R. 4325: Mr. PETERS of California.—
 H.R. 4351: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.
 H.R. 4365: Mr. UPTON and Ms. SINEMA.—
 H.R. 4385: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 4389: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
 H.R. 4426: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H.R. 4449: Mrs. BACHMANN.
 H.R. 4450: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. BERA of California.
 H.R. 4456: Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 4466: Mr. MCALLISTER.
 H.R. 4510: Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 4515: Mr. NOLAN.
 H.R. 4521: Mr. JONES, Mr. HARPER, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. MEADOWS.
 H.R. 4546: Mr. RUIZ.
 H.R. 4566: Mr. RIBBLE.
 H.R. 4567: Mr. KLINE.
 H.R. 4578: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 4582: Mr. MORAN.
 H.R. 4594: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 4612: Mr. MESSER and Mr. PITTENGER.
 H.R. 4651: Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
 H.R. 4698: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
 H.R. 4709: Mr. HOLDING, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
 H.R. 4741: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H.R. 4761: Mr. LOEBSACK.
 H.R. 4808: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 4836: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 4837: Mr. PETERS of Michigan and Ms. JENKINS.
 H.R. 4841: Mr. POLIS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 4854: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 4857: Mr. SCHOCK.
 H.R. 4867: Mr. LAMALFA.
 H.R. 4871: Mr. JOLLY.
 H.R. 4886: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 4906: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
 H.R. 4930: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 4960: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
 H.R. 4961: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. MARCHANT.
 H.R. 4969: Mr. GRIMM and Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 4979: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 4980: Mr. WAGNER, Mr. ROSKAM, Ms. BASS, and Mr. LANCE.
 H.R. 4985: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. PETERS of Michigan.
 H.R. 4986: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GARCIA, and Mr. POSEY.
 H.R. 4989: Mr. POMPEO and Mr. HARTZLER.
 H.R. 4991: Mr. BARROW of Georgia.
 H.R. 5005: Mr. POLIS, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H.R. 5007: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. ENYART, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 5009: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms.

FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 5010: Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 5024: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 5026: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
 H.R. 5034: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
 H.R. 5051: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. NOLAN.
 H.R. 5053: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 5059: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ENYART, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. COOK, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 5060: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 5077: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. BARR, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BUCSHON.
 H.R. 5083: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
 H.R. 5084: Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 5089: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. MICA, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. GARCIA, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. DESANTIS.
 H.J. Res. 118: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. NUNNELEE, and Ms. JENKINS.
 H.J. Res. 119: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BEATTY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BUSTOS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. ESTY, Mr. LOWEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. LYNCH.
 H. Con. Res. 69: Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. ESCHOO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. HONDA.
 H. Con. Res. 95: Mr. LUCAS.
 H. Res. 477: Mr. HIMES.
 H. Res. 612: Mr. JONES.
 H. Res. 620: Mr. BARROW of Georgia and Mr. BRADY of Texas.
 H. Res. 622: Mr. JORDAN.
 H. Res. 623: Mr. CLAY.
 H. Res. 644: Mr. KLINE, Mr. DESANTIS and Mr. JONES.
 H. Res. 665: Mr. COLE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. LONG and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
 H. Res. 667: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. LEE of California.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER

H.R. 5021 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 or rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 5016

OFFERED BY: MRS. BLACKBURN

AMENDMENT No. 10: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following: SEC. ____ Each amount made available by this Act (other than an amount required to be made available by a provision of law) is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

H.R. 5016

OFFERED BY: MRS. BLACKBURN

AMENDMENT No. 11: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide funds from the Hardest Hit Fund program established by the Secretary of the Treasury under title I of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5211 et seq.) to any State or local government for the purpose of funding pension obligations of such State or local government.

H.R. 5016

OFFERED BY: MR. GRAYSON

AMENDMENT No. 12: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, pursuant to the Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals—

(1) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property; or

(2) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1); or

(3) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that ex-

ceeds \$3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

H.R. 5016

OFFERED BY: MR. FRELINGHUYSEN

AMENDMENT No. 13: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. The amount otherwise provided by this Act for “National Security Council and Homeland Security Council—Salaries and Expenses” for the National Security Council is hereby reduced by \$4,200,000.

H.R. 5016

OFFERED BY: MR. MARINO

AMENDMENT No. 14: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to collect any underpayment of any tax imposed by the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to the extent such underpayment is attributable to the taxpayer’s loss of records (except in the case of fraud).

H.R. 5016

OFFERED BY: MR. MASSIE

AMENDMENT No. 15: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act, including amounts made available under titles IV or VIII, may be used by any authority of the government of the District of Columbia to prohibit the ability of any person to possess, acquire, use, sell, or transport a firearm except to the extent such activity is prohibited by Federal law.

H.R. 5016

OFFERED BY: MR. SHERMAN

AMENDMENT No. 16: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce final leasing accounting standard rules, regulations, or requirements in FASB Project 2013-270, Accounting Standards Update Topic 842.

H.R. 5016

OFFERED BY: MS. SCHAKOWSKY

AMENDMENT No. 17: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following: S6201

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with any person whose disclosures of a proceeding with a disposition listed in section 2313(c)(1) of title 41, United States Code, in the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System include the term “Fair Labor Standards Act.”.

H.R. 5016

OFFERED BY: MR. POSEY

AMENDMENT No. 18: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Office of Personnel Management may be used to process or pay any annuity payment under chapter 83 or 84 of title 5, United States Code, to a former Federal employee with respect to whom the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives has certified a statement of facts to a United States attorney under section 104 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 194).