



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 23, 2015

No. 48

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 23, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVE WOMACK 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 6, 2015, 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 1:50 p.m.

DON'T ALLOW USTR HALF-TRUTHS ON KOREA FTA

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, last week in an unprecedented new transparency, the Obama administration sent up Special Trade Ambassador Froman and Secretary Lew to talk about his proposed Trans-Pacific Partnership. Now, you might remember that until now, if a Member of Congress wished to see this secret agreement, they would have to go to a special secure room, were not allowed to

take notes, and couldn't talk about it. At the same time, it is shared in realtime with 500 multinational corporations who don't have to go to a secure room and are involved in the negotiations. But they came forward and they gave us some facts, figures, and statistics. Unfortunately, the statistics were not accurate.

Special Trade Representative Froman said that we are running a trade surplus with our free trade agreement countries. Wrong. False. Actually, in 2013 we had \$180 billion goods deficit; and, yeah, we had a \$75 billion services deficit. The aggregate means \$105 billion deficit.

Now, they kind of turned a little trick here. They pretend that something made entirely in China, shipped to Los Angeles, and then shipped over the border to Mexico is a U.S. export. Well, yeah, it created one trucking job and maybe one longshoreman job, but the manufacturing jobs are all in China. This is a new trick, and it still doesn't get them to balance, but they like to pretend.

Then we were treated to some half-truths. I said: "Well, isn't this substantially based on the Korea Free Trade Agreement?"

"Yes, it is."

"Is that a success?"

"Oh, yes, it is. Well, look. In fact, look here. Isn't this incredible? \$100.5 billion of exports from the U.S. to Korea."

Oh, well, wait a minute. That is half the truth. Here is the other half. Actually, \$14.7 billion in goods from Korea to here. So we ran a massive and growing trade deficit since we entered into this agreement.

I have tried to get specific with them. I said: "How about autos? We were going to open up the auto market."

And they have something to tout. Our auto exports are up 140 percent. Wow. That sounds pretty darn good.

And Koreans' are only up by 50 percent. Wow. That means we are winning. Well, no, because U.S. auto exports went from 14,000 to 34,000; Korean auto exports went from 827,000 to 1.3 million. That means we ran a deficit of 461,402 more autos created in Korea and exported here since we entered into this trade agreement. Yet that is what they are modeling this new agreement on.

They are saying the tremendous success of NAFTA and Korea is what we want to duplicate in this Trans-Pacific Partnership which will include such honest actors as Vietnam, where they can use prison and child labor, and a number of other countries. Japan has engaged in currency manipulation distortion for decades to advantage their goods against ours, and then when asked about currency manipulation, they say: "Absolutely not. We can't have that discussion here. It would be to our disadvantage."

No. It would be to the disadvantage of some multinational corporations who take advantage of currency manipulation, like China and Japan, to make their goods cheaper, to put people out of work here and capture more manufacturing over there. Oh, yes, there is one big winner in currency manipulation who is worried about any restrictions on currency and capital flows. That would be Wall Street.

Mr. Speaker, the two big winners for the U.S. in these agreements are the pharmaceutical industry—oh, what a wonderful, good friend to Americans. How many people does that employ here other than sales reps? It is almost all manufactured overseas now—and Wall Street. That is the way all these trade agreements have worked: a few very selected winners in the U.S.; the big losers are U.S. workers and U.S. manufacturing.

The question I have been asking since I opposed NAFTA more than 20 years ago is: How can you be a great nation if you don't make things anymore?

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.

H1809

THE HYPOCRISY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the United Nations and what can only be described as its increasingly outrageous actions on the world stage. How else would you describe planning a conference on gender equality, feminism, and sexual violence that invited only men to participate? or telling the Catholic Church that its pro-life stance equals psychological torture?

Well, last week, the United Nations really went off the deep end when its Commission on the Status of Women adopted a resolution that singles out and condemns Israel for violating the rights of women. That's right. This Commission condemned a country that has guaranteed women equality in work, education, health, and social welfare for more than 60 years. It denounced a country where rape, including spousal rape, is a felony punishable by 16 years in prison, whose Ministry of Social Affairs operates battered women's shelters and a hotline for reporting abuse and whose parliament passed nearly 50 initiatives to promote gender equality and empower women over the past 4 years. It accused the only country in the Middle East that fully respects the rights of women with violating the rights of women.

To say I wholeheartedly disagree with this fiction the U.N. has concocted would be an understatement. Let's look at the facts.

On its Web site, the Commission lists selected grim statistics for the status of women in the world: They inform us that one in three women have experienced physical or sexual violence; they let us know that 120 million girls have been forced into intercourse or other sexual acts at some point in their lives; and they tell us 133 million women and girls have undergone female genital mutilation.

When you consider those numbers, it is mind-boggling that the Commission believes that Israel is the only one of the 193 U.N. member states worthy of condemnation for its record on women's rights. How is that even possible? Israel's entire population is less than 10 million.

According to the World Health Organization, nearly 40 percent of all murders of women worldwide are carried out by an intimate partner. Yet dozens of countries around the world do not have specific laws against domestic violence. Where is the Commission's condemnation of Russia and Kenya? of Burkina Faso and Pakistan? of Congo and Lesotho? of Niger?

Why didn't the Commission cite Sudan, where the legal age of marriage for girls is 10 years old and 88 percent of women under 50 have undergone female genital mutilation?

Why didn't the Commission condemn Iran, where a woman's testimony is

only worth half of a man's in court, and rape within marriage is not recognized as a criminal offense?

Where is the censure of India, where statistics show a rape occurs every 22 minutes? Why didn't the Commission want to talk about the victims in that country, who include a nun in her seventies who was gang-raped by a group of bandits when she tried to prevent them from committing a robbery in a Christian missionary school, as well as two teenaged cousins from a low caste who didn't have a toilet in their home and were raped, strangled, and found hanging from a tree because they went outside to relieve themselves during the night.

Why aren't these countries worthy of the same denunciation? You might be surprised to learn they all sit on the Commission on the Status of Women. That's right. Some of the world's worst violators of women's rights sit on a commission that calls itself "the principal global intergovernmental body exclusively dedicated to the promotion of gender equality and the empowerment of women."

It is clear from the facts that this single-minded attack is just the latest salvo in the U.N.'s never-ending anti-Israeli agenda, and it is time we stand up for our friend and ally.

As a founding member of the U.N. and a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council, United States has a duty to insist on a higher standard. The status quo is simply unacceptable.

HONORING GRETCHEN MILLER KAFOURY

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, Gretchen Miller Kafoury passed away 2 weeks ago in Portland. She left us at age 72, far too soon, only recently retired from her amazing career. It was my honor to have served with Gretchen in the Oregon Legislature in the seventies, on the Multnomah County Commission in the eighties, and the Portland City Council in the nineties.

She fulfilled responsibilities in each office with a passion, a dedication to the underprivileged, a hardheaded realism; plainspoken, down-to-earth, warm and generous in spirit personally and professionally.

She started her career as a Peace Corps volunteer in Iran. She loved that country and its people. Throughout her life, that experience informed her views of the Middle East, her knowledge of the warmth and support by the Iranian people for Americans.

Gretchen offered a voice in our community for a more thoughtful approach to that country, including at least attempting diplomatic efforts. It is too bad she couldn't have talked to some people in Congress who were either too afraid or distracted to try diplomacy.

Despite her well-earned reputation as a liberal firebrand, she was always sup-

portive of thoughtful and diplomatic efforts of cooperation, negotiation, and listening.

She was extraordinarily effective in advancing the interests of her constituents. Her legacy includes a facility for the homeless with her name on it and countless projects and programs that she helped conceive and advance. She helped shape policies in human services, land use, and the arts.

Her legacy also includes her daughters, Katharine and Deborah. Part of that political legacy is a daughter, Deborah, who served in the leadership of the Oregon Legislature, following in her mother's footsteps, and is currently chair of the Multnomah County Commission on which Gretchen so honorably served.

She was an educator, having taught for more than 10 years, most recently at the Portland State University Hatfield School of Government.

She was a pioneer in women's rights, having famously helped lead the efforts to integrate the previously all-male Portland City Club. In our community, it was very significant in and of itself as a powerful signal of the acceptance of women, not just rhetorically. It was part of a cause for which she devoted her entire life. Women, gay rights, minorities, Gretchen was a tireless champion for people who needed a tireless champion.

For all the joys of working with Gretchen, I will remember her best as a friend. Highlights include spending time with her at her lovely beach retreat on the Oregon coast or a fabulous trip to New York with our then-spouses that included running the New York Marathon, theater, good food, and fabulous company.

Over four decades, Gretchen Kafoury helped make our community more liveable and more humane, and we are grateful.

PORT OF KENNEWICK'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 100th anniversary this month of the Port of Kennewick, located in my congressional district in Benton County.

For 100 years, the port has been a driver of economic development, transportation improvement, job creation, and opportunities for the mid-Columbia region. Voters approved the creation of the port in 1915, after the construction of the Dalles-Celilo Canal, which allowed boats to navigate from the Pacific to the upper stretches of the Columbia and Snake Rivers.

Looking back on its industrial legacy, the port has entered an exciting new phase of redevelopment in recent years. The revitalized port, which is Washington State's fifth oldest, promises to create tourism and recreational

opportunities in the Tri-Cities, drawing visitors to our area with projects that include the Clover Island Marina, Columbia Drive, and Vista Field.

This month we celebrate 100 years of economic opportunity and look forward to continued progress at the Port of Kennewick.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

Reverend Elias Correa-Torres, Belmont Abbey, Belmont, North Carolina, offered the following prayer:

Loving God, source of all wisdom, You lead us in discovering what is true and good, so that human society may come to reflect Your loving order.

Bless the work of the people's House, inspire all those who labor in it with Your wisdom and truth. Give them a spirit of enthusiasm and joy in their worthy efforts, and may they find fulfillment in their service. As they seek to advance the common good, guide them in making right decisions and carrying them out with true justice, helping them to be particularly attentive to the needs of those who cannot fend for themselves, or who struggle with little hope.

May the work of this House help advance a peaceful society in our Nation and foster unity in mutual goodwill, so that in all things, You may be glorified.

We ask all this in Your most holy name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PITTENGER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

BUDGET

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

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan once told us that the nine most terrifying words in the English language are: "I'm from the government, and I'm here to help."

Well, the kind of help we have received, Mr. Speaker, has been more regulations, a greater tax burden, a bigger bureaucracy, and no growth for the American family, for American business.

This week, we have the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to change this course by passing the House 2016 budget, which cuts \$5.5 trillion in spending while strengthening vital programs; calls for a fairer, simpler Tax Code to promote good-paying jobs and an opportunity economy; completely repeals ObamaCare; and puts a premium on accountability, efficiency, and effectiveness in all areas of the Federal Government.

Now is the time to restore common sense and fiscal sanity to Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support the House 2016 budget.

PRESIDENT'S NEW REGULATIONS ON HYDRAULIC FRACTURING

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, President Obama released new regulations for hydraulic fracturing and once again turned his back on job creation in an attempt to appease a small but vocal group of environmental extremists.

These new regulations are unnecessary and threaten the potential growth of jobs on Federal lands and across the Nation.

Production of shale resources has grown by leaps and bounds in recent years, and much of this growth has been due to private sector innovation, coupled with sensible regulations at the State and local levels.

As one of the top producers of natural gas, Pennsylvania continues to help drive record-breaking oil and natural gas production here at home.

Since 2006, Marcellus producers have contributed over \$1 billion in State taxes, along with half a billion dollars in road construction.

Communities in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District have greatly benefited from the technology and safety advancements that make natural gas readily available.

This success has been made possible due to regulations administered at the State level, not by adding the bureaucracy of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I will work with my colleagues in Congress and do all that I can to stop top-down policies such as this that undermine economic progress and energy security.

HOUSE BUDGET PROPOSAL

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, last month, President Obama released his budget proposal. It, as expected, increases taxes and spending without balancing the budget and allows Social Security and Medicare to go bankrupt. The President's refusal to address the compounding national debt emphasizes his disinterest in being a leader.

Fortunately, we in the House are leading. Our budget offers a stark contrast. We implement commonsense reforms, balance the budget, eliminate wasteful government spending, repeal ObamaCare in full, and preserve Social Security and Medicare for current beneficiaries and future generations.

Our budget restores the principle of federalism—the foundation of our Constitution—empowering States, local communities, and the real drivers of opportunity and prosperity, the American people.

I look forward to the debate this week in the House and working to ensure the proper balance between our national security interests and our long-term deficit reduction.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 20, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on March 20, 2015, at 2:24 p.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits the District of Columbia's Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Request Act.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA'S FISCAL YEAR 2015 BUDGET AND FINANCIAL PLAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-19)

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 Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to my constitutional authority and as contemplated by section 446 of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act as amended in 1989, I am transmitting the District of Columbia's fiscal year (FY) 2015 Budget and Financial Plan. This transmittal does not represent an endorsement of the contents of the D.C. government's requests.

The proposed FY 2015 Budget and Financial Plan reflects the major programmatic objectives of the Mayor and the Council of the District of Columbia. For FY 2015, the District estimates total revenues and expenditures of \$12.6 billion.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 20, 2015.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia) at 4 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

TENANT INCOME VERIFICATION RELIEF ACT OF 2015

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 233) to allow reviews of certain families' incomes every 3 years for purposes of determining eligibility for certain Federal assisted housing programs.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 233

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 "Tenant Income Verification Relief Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. REVIEWS OF FAMILY INCOMES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The second sentence of paragraph (1) of section 3(a) of the United

States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(a)(1)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: "; except that, in the case of any family with a fixed income, as defined by the Secretary, after the initial review of the family's income, the public housing agency or owner shall not be required to conduct a review of the family's income for any year for which such family certifies, in accordance with such requirements as the Secretary shall establish, which shall include policies to adjust for inflation-based income changes, that 90 percent or more of the income of the family consists of fixed income, and that the sources of such income have not changed since the previous year, except that the public housing agency or owner shall conduct a review of each such family's income not less than once every 3 years".

(b) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER PROGRAM.—Subparagraph (A) of section 8(o)(5) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(5)(A)) is amended by striking "not less than annually" and inserting "as required by section 3(a)(1) of this Act".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to add extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 233, the Tenant Income Verification Relief Act, and I am proud to cosponsor it with my colleague from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

This is a very simple bill that helps relieve stressful burdens of fixed-income tenants who participate in the housing choice voucher and project-based housing programs all across the country. Additionally, it is a responsible reform bill that will allow housing authorities to work more efficiently and effectively at less cost to the taxpayers.

I have heard from housing authorities from Columbus, Ohio, from Circleville, Ohio, from other parts of my district, and throughout the country about how burdensome this requirement is on elderly tenants as well as on the housing authorities.

Current law requires tenant verification of income at move-in and recertification annually. This legislation allows for the recertification of residents' incomes every 3 years rather than annually for individuals and families on fixed incomes.

It will permit housing authorities to verify these tenants' incomes when they change as well as annually. Based on a recent U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development study of these 2 million residents on fixed in-

comes, about half of them are on very fixed incomes that are not changing. Most of them are using Social Security as their main source of income.

This bill is a great first step toward ensuring our Nation's low-income families have safe places to live, while also reducing administrative burdens on families and on these housing authorities and toward saving taxpayer resources. I ask my colleagues to join me and Mr. PERLMUTTER in supporting this commonsense legislation.

Finally, I would like to thank the gentleman from Colorado for his leadership and for his commonsense approach on this legislation.

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

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

I want to thank Mr. STIVERS for joining me in H.R. 233, and I want to thank the chairman of the committee, Mr. HENSARLING, and the ranking member, Ms. WATERS, for their support of this bill as well.

Mr. STIVERS has described it well, but I think we should go through it one more time, just so the record is clear for future generations.

H.R. 233, the Tenant Income Verification Relief Act of 2015, represents a bipartisan effort to aid our most vulnerable constituents and to provide marginal regulatory relief to public housing authorities and to those who have privately owned rental properties who wish to service housing vouchers.

Currently, private property owners and State and local housing agencies must review income annually for all rental assistance recipients. That includes recipients who receive most or all of their income from fixed sources—such as from Social Security or other pensions—and, therefore, see little income change from year to year.

Our legislation reduces administrative burdens by allowing for the recertification of rent and income to occur every 3 years rather than annually for those on fixed incomes. In other words, housing authorities and those who accept vouchers would be allowed to conduct triennial income recertifications for households of which 90 percent or more of their income is fixed.

The annual review requirement also places burdens on those within fixed income households themselves, who must gather and submit information needed to verify income and deductions and who, in some cases, must go to agencies for in-person reviews.

The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, which wrote in support of H.R. 233, said that this change would substantially reduce paperwork burdens for low-income seniors and for people with disabilities and administrative costs for agencies and owners.

More than half of rental assistance recipients are elderly or disabled, who often rely on fixed incomes, and income reviews are the single largest source of rental assistance administrative costs.

Due to ongoing budget pressures, our public housing authorities are struggling to manage their Section 8 housing programs. In fact, it is estimated the amount Congress appropriates to fund the housing choice voucher program is only 74 percent of what is actually required to run the program.

The Public Housing Authorities Directors Association wrote to me, saying:

Both in principle and in practice, your bill is a commonsense approach to streamlining Federal rental assistance programs at a time when scarce financial resources are straining housing authorities' program delivery.

Since continued budget pressures are precluding Congress from funding the cost of administering this program 100 percent, we must look at solutions to control expenses or the cost of running the program.

This provision or concept is not new. In fact, it has been included in several comprehensive Section 8 reform bills by both Democrats and Republicans. In fact, the administration included language similar to H.R. 233 in the 2016 budget proposal.

I stand here today with my friend, Mr. STIVERS from Ohio, with a reasonable and commonsense proposal, making our public housing programs more efficient, and we all want to find ways to make our government run more efficiently.

I have a number of letters to include for the RECORD.

PUBLIC HOUSING AUTHORITIES
DIRECTORS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, January 12, 2015.

Hon. ED PERLMUTTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERLMUTTER: On behalf of the Public Housing Authorities Directors Association (PHADA), I would like to thank you for introducing the Tenant Income Verification Relief Act of 2015 (HR 233) as an original co-sponsor. If enacted, this bill would allow Housing Authorities (HAs) to conduct triennial recertifications for households where 90 percent or more their income is fixed.

Passage of the Tenant Income Verification Relief Act of 2015 would benefit millions of low-income elderly and disabled households with fixed incomes in the Section 8 Tenant-Based Voucher and Public Housing programs. Fixed-income households, who are served by Housing Authorities, would benefit if they could be spared from having to go through the burdensome, confusing and stressful recertification process annually but to do so every three years instead.

Many households who receive Federal rental assistance live on fixed incomes. According to HUD's Resident Characteristics Report August 2013 through November 2014, approximately 20 percent of voucher-assisted households have a disabled head of household and approximately 22 percent have an elderly head of household. Approximately 17 percent of Public Housing-assisted households have a disabled head of household and approximately 31 percent have an elderly head of household. Although HUD's national data reflects a degree of overlap in households' types of income, approximately 55 percent of households receive Supplemental Security Income (SSI), Social Security and/or a pension for all or some of their annual income, in both Section 8 tenant-based and Public Housing programs.

Your legislation would also produce cost-savings for Housing Authorities, which struggle each year from downward funding prorations in Section 8 voucher program administrative fees and/or the Public Housing Operating Fund. Taken together, the above figures illustrate the scope and scale of relief that would benefit applicable low-income households and the Housing Authorities that serve them.

Legislation regarding triennial recertifications for fixed-income households has been a feature of both House and Senate authorizing rental assistance reform bills for several years, but has not been enacted into law yet. PHADA has demonstrated the adverse impacts of downward funding prorations, in terms of Housing Authorities' operations to serve low-income households, participating property owners and the communities in which they live. Introduction of the bill is an important step for future action that could not come a moment too soon.

Both in principle and practice your bill is a common sense approach to streamlining Federal rental assistance programs at a time when scarce financial resources are straining Housing Authorities' program delivery. Given the urgent need for relief to low-income households and Housing Authorities, we believe that the bill can and should be enacted either as an amendment or a stand-alone bill as soon as possible.

Thank you and your staff for working on issues important to HAs and the low-income people they serve. PHADA and its members look forward to working with you and your colleagues to secure passage of the bill.

If you need any information or have questions, please feel free to call me at 202-546-5445.

Sincerely,

TIMOTHY G. KAISER,
Executive Director.

MARCH 20, 2015.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The real estate industry is pleased that Congress supports efforts to streamline rental assistance programs. Our industry believes it is imperative for Congress to pass legislation that will improve the federally assisted housing rental programs for both residents and owners alike: doing so saves taxpayer dollars and eliminates inefficiencies. We support H.R. 233, the "Tenant Income Verification Relief Act of 2015" introduced by Congressman Perlmutter (D-CO) and Congressman Stivers (R-OH).

Our organizations represent owners, management companies, lenders, builders, developers, and housing cooperatives. We have long-supported these programs. The Housing Choice Voucher program provides rental subsidies to approximately two million low income households who obtain housing in the private rental market. This program broadens the range of housing choices for families seeking affordable housing, has a high success rate and serves as the cornerstone for public federal housing policy. The Project-Based Rental Assistance programs house nearly 1.3 million families and elderly households in privately owned housing—representing successful public and private partnerships that not only provide quality housing but often connect residents with services. This is particularly important for elderly residents, who may otherwise be forced to move to nursing homes. These programs are essential tools that also preserve and expand the supply of quality affordable housing, a necessity in today's tight rental markets.

However, in spite of the overall success, the programs suffer under the weight of too many inefficient and duplicative requirements. The myriad overlapping and redun-

dant procedures make the programs difficult to administer and, with respect to the voucher program, deter many professional landlords from participating. As such, we have worked diligently with Congress for several years to formulate common sense legislation that would streamline the sometimes burdensome procedures associated with operating and maintaining an assisted housing portfolio.

H.R. 233 significantly reduces administrative burdens by allowing for the recertification of residents' income to occur every three years rather than annually for those residents on fixed incomes, permitting verification review efforts to focus on those whose incomes change.

We urge you to support efforts to streamline the assisted housing programs and urge Congress to pass H.R. 233, the "Tenant Income Verification Relief Act of 2015."

Sincerely,
Council for Affordable and Rural Housing (CARH); Institute of Real Estate Management (IREM); Leading Age; National Apartment Association (NAA); National Affordable Housing Management Association (NAHMA); National Association of Home Builders (NAHB); National Association of Housing Cooperatives (NAHC); National Association of Realtors (NAR); National Leased Housing Association (NLHA); National Multifamily Housing Council (NMHC).

CENTER ON BUDGET
AND POLICY PRIORITIES,
Washington, DC, March 17, 2015.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING, Chairman,
Hon. MAXINE WATERS, Ranking Member,
Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING AND RANKING MEMBER WATERS: The Tenant Income Verification Relief Act of 2015 (H.R. 233) is a well-designed, common sense measure to ease administrative burdens in federal rental assistance programs while maintaining key protections for low-income program participants. We strongly recommend that Congress move promptly to enact the bill.

Currently, owners and state and local housing agencies must review income annually for all rental assistance recipients. That includes recipients who receive most or all of their income from fixed sources such as Social Security or SSI and therefore see little income change from year to year. This requirement imposes sizable administrative costs. More than half of rental assistance recipients are elderly or disabled households that often rely on fixed incomes, and income reviews are the single largest source of rental assistance administrative costs. The annual review requirement also places burdens on the fixed-income households themselves, who must gather and submit information needed to verify income and deductions and in some cases must go to agency offices for in-person reviews.

HUD has eased burdens modestly by administratively streamlining review requirements for fixed-income households (and has proposed regulations to codify the change), but HUD lacks authority to allow less frequent reviews because the annual income review requirement is statutory. H.R. 233 would reduce the frequency of required reviews for fixed-income families to once every three years and direct HUD to establish procedures to adjust income for inflation in the intervening years. This change would substantially reduce paperwork burdens for low-income seniors and people with disabilities and administrative costs for agencies and owners. The need for the administrative savings is particularly acute now, since both the

Public Housing Operative Fund and Housing Choice Voucher administrative fees have been deeply underfunded in recent years.

The changes in H.R. 233 have been proposed in a series of bills that received strong bipartisan support. For example, provisions similar to H.R. 233 were included in both the Affordable Housing and Self-Sufficiency Improvement Act (AHSSIA), which a subcommittee of the House Financial Services Committee approved by a voice vote in January 2012, and the Section 8 Voucher Reform Act (SEVRA), which the House passed 333-83 in July 2007.

Congress should enact this important, timely, well-vetted proposal without further delay.

Sincerely,

BARBARA SARD,
Vice President for Housing Policy.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOUSING
AND REDEVELOPMENT OFFICIALS,
Washington, DC, March 19, 2015.

Hon. ED PERLMUTTER,
Longworth Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. STEVE STIVERS,
Longworth Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REP. PERLMUTTER AND REP. STIVERS: On behalf of the over 22,000 members of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials (NAHRO), I am writing today to underscore our strong support for the expeditious approval of the Tenant Income Verification Act of 2015 (HR 233) that you are both sponsoring.

This common-sense legislation would amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to allow PHAs to reduce the frequency of re-examinations for families that receive at least 90 percent of their income from fixed sources. PHAs would not be required to review a public housing or Section 8 family's income for any year for which the family certifies that it has a fixed income and the source of the income has not changed since the previous year. PHAs would be required to conduct a review of the family's income not less than once every three years; in any year in which a PHA does not conduct a review of income, a family's prior year income determination would be adjusted by applying an inflationary factor.

NAHRO strongly supports the bill's focus on reducing unnecessary administrative burdens. We also believe this legislation properly balances the need to maintain responsible government protections; the legislation does not adversely impact residents and provides long-overdue administrative relief that will increase local PHA's ability to address other pressing needs. Responsible reform legislation such as this ultimately enables PHAs to work more efficiently and effectively at less cost to the federal government.

NAHRO has been working with both HUD and members of Congress to bring about responsible programmatic and regulatory reforms. This legislation is a strong and necessary step forward. In this regard, we were pleased to see that the Administration included language similar to HR 233 in the FY 2016 budget proposal. We urge the House to approve this legislation under suspension of the rules so that it can be promptly sent to the Senate for adoption.

We stand ready to continue to work with members of Congress on both sides of the aisle to approve properly balanced programmatic reforms that sustain the ability of PHAs to provide decent, safe and affordable housing for vulnerable families.

Respectfully,

SAUL N. RAMIREZ JR.,
Chief Executive Officer, NAHRO.

NATIONAL LOW INCOME
HOUSING COALITION,
Washington, DC, March 18, 2015.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chair, House Committee on Financial Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. MAXINE WATERS,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING AND RANKING MEMBER WATERS: On behalf of the National Low Income Housing Coalition, I am pleased to support H.R. 233, legislation that would allow public housing agencies to reduce the frequency of income recertifications for HUD rent assisted households whose income is at least 90% from fixed-income sources. Income recertifications for fixed-income households would be only every three years, instead of annually.

NLIHC members include non-profit housing providers, homeless service providers, fair housing organizations, state and local housing coalitions, public housing agencies, private developers and property owners, housing researchers, local and state government agencies, faith-based organizations, residents of public and assisted housing and their organizations, and concerned citizens. We do not represent any sector of the housing industry. Rather, NLIHC works only on behalf of and with low income people who need safe, decent, and affordable homes, especially those with the most serious housing problems, including people who are homeless. NLIHC is funded entirely with private contributions.

Because a tenant's share of rent is based on income, recertifications are done to make sure tenants are paying the correct amount of rent. The Department of Housing and Urban Development estimates that fixed-income families are about 50% of all public housing, housing choice voucher, and project-based rental assistance tenants. If implemented, this policy change could substantially reduce administrative duties for public housing agencies and owners, as well as recertification time for tenants.

This is an idea whose time has come. One of the suggestions resulting from the 2005 National Housing Voucher Summit, which NLIHC convened, was to implement rent simplification policies, including reducing the income recertification period for people whose income is largely from fixed sources, such as Social Security and SSI, to three years. In the years when recertifications are not required, Summit participants recommended, tenant incomes could be adjusted based on the cost-of-living adjustment in any income maintenance program in which the household participates.

We applaud Representatives Ed Perlmutter and Steve Stivers for introducing this important legislation and hope that Congress acts swiftly toward its enactment.

Sincerely,

SHEILA CROWLEY,
President and CEO.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that we pass this today here on the floor of the House and that the Senate passes it quickly and sends it to the President's desk.

I thank my friend, Mr. STIVERS, for joining me on this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I just want to ask all of my colleagues to support this legislation. It is common sense, and it simplifies an administrative burden. It saves money for taxpayers, and it allows people on fixed incomes, whether they be senior

citizens or disabled, to have less onerous burdens. This is a commonsense bill.

I thank the gentleman from Colorado for his leadership, and I urge everyone to support this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 233.

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.

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING ASSISTANCE AND SELF-DETERMINATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 360) to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 360

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 "Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Reauthorization Act of 2015".

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. References.

TITLE I—BLOCK GRANTS AND GRANT REQUIREMENTS

Sec. 101. Block grants.
Sec. 102. Recommendations regarding exceptions to annual Indian housing plan requirement.
Sec. 103. Environmental review.
Sec. 104. Deadline for action on request for approval regarding exceeding TDC maximum cost for project.

TITLE II—AFFORDABLE HOUSING ACTIVITIES

Sec. 201. National objectives and eligible families.
Sec. 202. Program requirements.
Sec. 203. Homeownership or lease-to-own low-income requirement and income targeting.
Sec. 204. Lease requirements and tenant selection.
Sec. 205. Tribal coordination of agency funding.

TITLE III—ALLOCATION OF GRANT AMOUNTS

Sec. 301. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 302. Effect of undisbursed block grant amounts on annual allocations.

TITLE IV—AUDITS AND REPORTS

Sec. 401. Review and audit by Secretary.
Sec. 402. Reports to Congress.

TITLE V—OTHER HOUSING ASSISTANCE FOR NATIVE AMERICANS

Sec. 501. HUD-Veterans Affairs supportive housing program for Native American veterans.

Sec. 502. Loan guarantees for Indian housing.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 601. Lands Title Report Commission.

Sec. 602. Limitation on use of funds for Cherokee Nation.

Sec. 603. Leasehold interest in trust or restricted lands for housing purposes.

Sec. 604. Clerical amendment.

TITLE VII—DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FOR ALTERNATIVE PRIVATIZATION AUTHORITY FOR NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING

Sec. 701. Demonstration program.

Sec. 702. Clerical amendments.

TITLE VIII—HOUSING FOR NATIVE HAWAIIANS

Sec. 801. Reauthorization of Native Hawaiian Homeownership Act.

Sec. 802. Reauthorization of loan guarantees for Native Hawaiian housing.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, wherever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4101 et seq.).

TITLE I—BLOCK GRANTS AND GRANT REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 101. BLOCK GRANTS.

Section 101 (25 U.S.C. 4111) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by adding after the period at the end the following: “The Secretary shall act upon a waiver request submitted under this subsection by a recipient within 60 days after receipt of such request.”; and

(2) in subsection (k), by striking “1” and inserting “an”.

SEC. 102. RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING EXCEPTIONS TO ANNUAL INDIAN HOUSING PLAN REQUIREMENT.

Not later than the expiration of the 120-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and after consultation with Indian tribes, tribally designated housing entities, and other interested parties, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall submit to the Congress recommendations for standards and procedures for waiver of, or alternative requirements (which may include multi-year housing plans) for, the requirement under section 102(a) of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4112(a)) for annual submission of one-year housing plans for an Indian tribe. Such recommendations shall include a description of any legislative and regulatory changes necessary to implement such recommendations.

SEC. 103. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW.

Section 105 (25 U.S.C. 4115) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “may” and inserting “shall”; and

(B) by adding after and below paragraph (4) the following:

“The Secretary shall act upon a waiver request submitted under this subsection by a recipient within 60 days after receipt of such request.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) CONSOLIDATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW REQUIREMENTS.—If a recipient is using one or more sources of Federal funds in addition to grant amounts under this Act in carrying out a project that qualifies as an affordable housing activity under section 202, such other sources of Federal funds do not

exceed 49 percent of the total cost of the project, and the recipient’s tribe has assumed all of the responsibilities for environmental review, decisionmaking, and action pursuant to this section, the tribe’s compliance with the review requirements under this section and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 with regard to such project shall be deemed to fully comply with and discharge any applicable environmental review requirements that might apply to Federal agencies with respect to the use of such additional Federal funding sources for that project.”.

SEC. 104. DEADLINE FOR ACTION ON REQUEST FOR APPROVAL REGARDING EXCEEDING TDC MAXIMUM COST FOR PROJECT.

(a) APPROVAL.—Section 103 (25 U.S.C. 4113) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) DEADLINE FOR ACTION ON REQUEST TO EXCEED TDC MAXIMUM.—A request for approval by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to exceed by more than 10 percent the total development cost maximum cost for a project shall be approved or denied during the 60-day period that begins on the date that the Secretary receives the request.”.

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 4 (25 U.S.C. 4103) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (22) as paragraph (23); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (21) the following new paragraph:

“(22) TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COST.—The term ‘total development cost’ means, with respect to a housing project, the sum of all costs for the project, including all undertakings necessary for administration, planning, site acquisition, demolition, construction or equipment and financing (including payment of carrying charges), and for otherwise carrying out the development of the project, excluding off-site water and sewer. The total development cost amounts shall be based on a moderately designed house and determined by averaging the current construction costs as listed in not less than two nationally recognized residential construction cost indices.”.

TITLE II—AFFORDABLE HOUSING ACTIVITIES

SEC. 201. NATIONAL OBJECTIVES AND ELIGIBLE FAMILIES.

The second paragraph (6) of section 201(b) (25 U.S.C. 4131(b)(6)); relating to exemption) is amended—

(1) by striking “1964 and” and inserting “1964.”; and

(2) by inserting after “1968” the following: “, and section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968”.

SEC. 202. PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.

Section 203(a) (25 U.S.C. 4133(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraphs (2) and (3)”;

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) APPLICATION OF TRIBAL POLICIES.—Paragraph (2) shall not apply if the recipient has a written policy governing rents and homebuyer payments charged for dwelling units and such policy includes a provision governing maximum rents or homebuyer payments.”.

SEC. 203. HOMEOWNERSHIP OR LEASE-TO-OWN LOW-INCOME REQUIREMENT AND INCOME TARGETING.

Section 205 (25 U.S.C. 4135) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking “and” at the end; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, in the case of rental housing that is made available to a current rental family for conversion to a homebuyer or a lease-purchase unit, that the current rental family can purchase through a contract of sale, lease-purchase agreement, or any other sales agreement, is made available for purchase only by the current rental family, if the rental family was a low-income family at the time of their initial occupancy of such unit; and”;

(2) in subsection (c), by adding after the period at the end the following: “The provisions of such paragraph regarding binding commitments for the remaining useful life of the property shall not apply to improvements of privately owned homes if the cost of such improvements do not exceed 10 percent of the maximum total development cost for such home.”.

SEC. 204. LEASE REQUIREMENTS AND TENANT SELECTION.

Section 207 (25 U.S.C. 4137) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) NOTICE OF TERMINATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the owner or manager of rental housing that is assisted in part with amounts provided under this Act and in part with one or more other sources of Federal funds shall only utilize leases that require a notice period for the termination of the lease pursuant to subsection (a)(3).”.

SEC. 205. TRIBAL COORDINATION OF AGENCY FUNDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title II (25 U.S.C. 4131 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 211. TRIBAL COORDINATION OF AGENCY FUNDING.

“Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a recipient authorized to receive funding under this Act may, in its discretion, use funding from the Indian Health Service of the Department of Health and Human Services for construction of sanitation facilities for housing construction and renovation projects that are funded in part by funds provided under this Act.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 210 the following new item:

“Sec. 211. Tribal coordination of agency funding.”.

TITLE III—ALLOCATION OF GRANT AMOUNTS

SEC. 301. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

The first sentence of section 108 (25 U.S.C. 4117) is amended by striking “such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2013” and inserting “\$650,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019”.

SEC. 302. EFFECT OF UNDISBURSED BLOCK GRANT AMOUNTS ON ANNUAL ALLOCATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III (25 U.S.C. 4151 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 303. EFFECT OF UNDISBURSED GRANT AMOUNTS ON ANNUAL ALLOCATIONS.

“(a) NOTIFICATION OF OBLIGATED, UNDISBURSED GRANT AMOUNTS.—Subject to subsection (d) of this section, if as of January 1 of 2016 or any year thereafter a recipient’s total amount of undisbursed block grants in the Department’s line of credit control system is greater than three times the formula allocation such recipient would otherwise receive under this Act for the fiscal year during which such January 1 occurs, the Secretary shall—

“(1) before January 31 of such year, notify the Indian tribe allocated the grant amounts

and any tribally designated housing entity for the tribe of the undisbursed funds; and

“(2) require the recipient for the tribe to, not later than 30 days after the Secretary provides notification pursuant to paragraph (1)—

“(A) notify the Secretary in writing of the reasons why the recipient has not requested the disbursement of such amounts; and

“(B) demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the recipient has the capacity to spend Federal funds in an effective manner, which demonstration may include evidence of the timely expenditure of amounts previously distributed under this Act to the recipient.

“(b) ALLOCATION AMOUNT.—Notwithstanding sections 301 and 302, the allocation for such fiscal year for a recipient described in subsection (a) shall be the amount initially calculated according to the formula minus the difference between the recipient's total amount of undisbursed block grants in the Department's line of credit control system on such January 1 and three times the initial formula amount for such fiscal year.

“(c) REALLOCATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any grant amounts not allocated to a recipient pursuant to subsection (b) shall be allocated under the need component of the formula proportionately amount all other Indian tribes not subject to such an adjustment.

“(d) INAPPLICABILITY.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply to an Indian tribe with respect to any fiscal year for which the amount allocated for the tribe for block grants under this Act is less than \$5,000,000.

“(e) EFFECTIVENESS.—This section shall not require the issuance of any regulation to take effect and shall not be construed to confer hearing rights under this or any other section of this Act.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 302 the following new item:

“Sec. 303. Effect of undisbursed grant amounts on annual allocations.”

TITLE IV—AUDITS AND REPORTS

SEC. 401. REVIEW AND AUDIT BY SECRETARY.

Section 405(c) (25 U.S.C. 4165(c)) is amended, by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) ISSUANCE OF FINAL REPORT.—The Secretary shall issue a final report within 60 days after receiving comments under paragraph (1) from a recipient.”

SEC. 402. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

Section 407 (25 U.S.C. 4167) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “Congress” and inserting “Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, to the Committee on Indian Affairs and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, and to any subcommittees of such committees having jurisdiction with respect to Native American and Alaska Native affairs.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY TO RECIPIENTS.—Each report submitted pursuant to subsection (a) shall be made publicly available to recipients.”

TITLE V—OTHER HOUSING ASSISTANCE FOR NATIVE AMERICANS

SEC. 501. HUD-VETERANS AFFAIRS SUPPORTIVE HOUSING PROGRAM FOR NATIVE AMERICAN VETERANS.

Paragraph (19) of section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(19)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) NATIVE AMERICAN VETERANS.—

“(i) AUTHORITY.—Of the funds made available for rental assistance under this subsection for fiscal year 2015 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary shall set aside 5 percent for a supported housing and rental assistance program modeled on the HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (HUD-VASH) program, to be administered in conjunction with the Department of Veterans Affairs, for the benefit of homeless Native American veterans and veterans at risk of homelessness.

“(ii) RECIPIENTS.—Such rental assistance shall be made available to recipients eligible to receive block grants under the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4101 et seq.).

“(iii) FUNDING CRITERIA.—Funds shall be awarded based on need, administrative capacity, and any other funding criteria established by the Secretary in a notice published in the Federal Register, after consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, by a date sufficient to provide for implementation of the program under this subparagraph in accordance with clause (i).

“(iv) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—Such funds shall be administered by block grant recipients in accordance with program requirements under Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 in lieu of program requirements under this Act.

“(v) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive, or specify alternative requirements for any provision of any statute or regulation that the Secretary administers in connection with the use of funds made available under this subparagraph, but only upon a finding by the Secretary that such waiver or alternative requirement is necessary to promote administrative efficiency, eliminate delay, consolidate or eliminate duplicative or ineffective requirements or criteria, or otherwise provide for the effective delivery and administration of such supportive housing assistance to Native American veterans.

“(vi) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly consult with block grant recipients and any other appropriate tribal organizations to—

“(I) ensure that block grant recipients administering funds made available under the program under this subparagraph are able to effectively coordinate with providers of supportive services provided in connection with such program; and

“(II) ensure the effective delivery of supportive services to Native American veterans that are homeless or at risk of homelessness eligible to receive assistance under this subparagraph.

Consultation pursuant to this clause shall be completed by a date sufficient to provide for implementation of the program under this subparagraph in accordance with clause (i).

“(vii) NOTICE.—The Secretary shall establish the requirements and criteria for the supported housing and rental assistance program under this subparagraph by notice published in the Federal Register, but shall provide Indian tribes and tribally designated housing agencies an opportunity for comment and consultation before publication of a final notice pursuant to this clause.”

SEC. 502. LOAN GUARANTEES FOR INDIAN HOUSING.

Section 184(i)(5) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1715z-13a(i)(5)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by inserting after the period at the end of the first sentence the following: “There are authorized to be appropriated for such costs \$12,200,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019.”; and

(2) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking “2008 through 2012” and inserting “2015 through 2019”; and

(B) by striking “such amount as may be provided in appropriation Acts for” and inserting “\$976,000,000 for each”.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 601. LANDS TITLE REPORT COMMISSION.

Section 501 of the American Homeownership and Economic Opportunity Act of 2000 (25 U.S.C. 4043 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “Subject to sums being provided in advance in appropriations Acts, there” and inserting “There”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1) by striking “this Act” and inserting “the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Reauthorization Act of 2015”.

SEC. 602. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR CHEROKEE NATION.

Section 801 of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Reauthorization Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-411) is amended by striking “Temporary Order and Temporary Injunction issued on May 14, 2007, by the District Court of the Cherokee Nation” and inserting “Order issued September 21, 2011, by the Federal District Court for the District of Columbia”.

SEC. 603. LEASEHOLD INTEREST IN TRUST OR RESTRICTED LANDS FOR HOUSING PURPOSES.

Section 702 (25 U.S.C. 4211) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting “, whether enacted before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this section” after “law”; and

(2) by striking “50 years” each place such term appears and inserting “99 years”.

SEC. 604. CLERICAL AMENDMENT.

The table of contents in section 1(b) is amended by striking the item relating to section 206 (treatment of funds).

TITLE VII—DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FOR ALTERNATIVE PRIVATIZATION AUTHORITY FOR NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING

SEC. 701. DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

Add at the end of the Act the following new title:

“TITLE IX—DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FOR ALTERNATIVE PRIVATIZATION AUTHORITY FOR NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING

“SEC. 901. AUTHORITY.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other authority provided in this Act for the construction, development, maintenance, and operation of housing for Indian families, the Secretary shall provide the participating tribes having final plans approved pursuant to section 905 with the authority to exercise the activities provided under this title and such plan for the acquisition and development of housing to meet the needs of tribal members.

“(b) INAPPLICABILITY OF NAHASDA PROVISIONS.—Except as specifically provided otherwise in this title, titles I through IV, VI, and VII shall not apply to a participating tribe's use of funds during any period that the tribe is participating in the demonstration program under this title.

“(c) CONTINUED APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN NAHASDA PROVISIONS.—The following provisions of titles I through VIII shall apply to the demonstration program under this title and amounts made available under the demonstration program under this title:

“(1) Subsections (d) and (e) of section 101 (relating to tax exemption).

“(2) Section 101(j) (relating to Federal supply sources).

“(3) Section 101(k) (relating to tribal preference in employment and contracting).

“(4) Section 104 (relating to treatment of program income and labor standards).

“(5) Section 105 (relating to environmental review).

“(6) Section 201(b) (relating to eligible families), except as otherwise provided in this title.

“(7) Section 203(g) (relating to a de minimis exemption for procurement of goods and services).

“(8) Section 702 (relating to 99-year leasehold interests in trust or restricted lands for housing purposes).

“SEC. 902. PARTICIPATING TRIBES.

“(a) REQUEST TO PARTICIPATE.—To be eligible to participate in the demonstration program under this title, an Indian tribe shall submit to the Secretary a notice of intention to participate during the 60-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this title, in such form and such manner as the Secretary shall provide.

“(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.—Upon approval under section 905 of the final plan of an Indian tribe for participation in the demonstration program under this title, the Secretary shall enter into a cooperative agreement with the participating tribe that provides such tribe with the authority to carry out activities under the demonstration program.

“(c) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not approve more than 20 Indian tribes for participation in the demonstration program under this title.

“SEC. 903. REQUEST FOR QUOTES AND SELECTION OF INVESTOR PARTNER.

“(a) REQUEST FOR QUOTES.—Not later than the expiration of the 180-day period beginning upon notification to the Secretary by an Indian tribe of intention to participate in the demonstration program under this title, the Indian tribe shall—

“(1) obtain assistance from a qualified entity in assessing the housing needs, including the affordable housing needs, of the tribe; and

“(2) release a request for quotations from entities interested in partnering with the tribe in designing and carrying out housing activities sufficient to meet the tribe’s housing needs as identified pursuant to paragraph (1).

“(b) SELECTION OF INVESTOR PARTNER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), not later than the expiration of the 18-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this title, an Indian tribe requesting to participate in the demonstration program under this title shall—

“(A) select an investor partner from among the entities that have responded to the tribe’s request for quotations; and

“(B) together with such investor partner, establish and submit to the Secretary a final plan that meets the requirements under section 904.

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—The Secretary may extend the period under paragraph (1) for any tribe that—

“(A) has not received any satisfactory quotation in response to its request released pursuant to subsection (a)(2); or

“(B) has any other satisfactory reason, as determined by the Secretary, for failure to select an investor partner.

“SEC. 904. FINAL PLAN.

“A final plan under this section shall—

“(1) be developed by the participating tribe and the investor partner for the tribe selected pursuant to section 903(b)(1)(A);

“(2) identify the qualified entity that assisted the tribe in assessing the housing needs of the tribe;

“(3) set forth a detailed description of such projected housing needs, including affordable housing needs, of the tribe, which shall include—

“(A) a description of such need over the ensuing 24 months and thereafter until the expiration of the ensuing 5-year period or until the affordable housing need is met, whichever occurs sooner; and

“(B) the same information that would be required under section 102 to be included in an Indian housing plan for the tribe, as such requirements may be modified by the Secretary to take consideration of the requirements of the demonstration program under this title;

“(4) provide for specific housing activities sufficient to meet the tribe’s housing needs, including affordable housing needs, as identified pursuant to paragraph (3) within the periods referred to such paragraph, which shall include—

“(A) development of affordable housing (as such term is defined in section 4 of this Act (25 U.S.C. 4103));

“(B) development of conventional homes for rental, lease-to-own, or sale, which may be combined with affordable housing developed pursuant to subparagraph (A);

“(C) development of housing infrastructure, including housing infrastructure sufficient to serve affordable housing developed under the plan; and

“(D) investments by the investor partner for the tribe, the participating tribe, members of the participating tribe, and financial institutions and other outside investors necessary to provide financing for the development of housing under the plan and for mortgages for tribal members purchasing such housing;

“(5) provide that the participating tribe will agree to provide long-term leases to tribal members sufficient for lease-to-own arrangements for, and sale of, the housing developed pursuant to paragraph (4);

“(6) provide that the participating tribe—

“(A) will be liable for delinquencies under mortgage agreements for housing developed under the plan that are financed under the plan and entered into by tribal members; and

“(B) shall, upon foreclosure under such mortgages, take possession of such housing and have the responsibility for making such housing available to other tribal members;

“(7) provide for sufficient protections, in the determination of the Secretary, to ensure that the tribe and the Federal Government are not liable for the acts of the investor partner or of any contractors;

“(8) provide that the participating tribe shall have sole final approval of design and location of housing developed under the plan;

“(9) set forth specific deadlines and schedules for activities to be undertaken under the plan and set forth the responsibilities of the participating tribe and the investor partner;

“(10) set forth specific terms and conditions of return on investment by the investor partner and other investors under the plan, and provide that the participating tribe shall pledge grant amounts allocated for the tribe pursuant to title III for such return on investment;

“(11) set forth the terms of a cooperative agreement on the operation and management of the current assistance housing stock and current housing stock for the tribe assisted under the preceding titles of this Act;

“(12) set forth any plans for sale of affordable housing of the participating tribe under section 907 and, if included, plans sufficient to meet the requirements of section 907 regarding meeting future affordable housing needs of the tribe;

“(13) set forth terms for enforcement of the plan, including an agreement regarding jurisdiction of any actions under or to enforce the plan, including a waiver of immunity; and

“(14) include such other information as the participating tribe and investor partner consider appropriate.

“SEC. 905. HUD REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF PLAN.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the expiration of the 90-day period beginning upon a submission by an Indian tribe of a final plan under section 904 to the Secretary, the Secretary shall—

“(1) review the plan and the process by which the tribe solicited requests for quotations from investors and selected the investor partner; and

“(2)(A) approve the plan, unless the Secretary determines that—

“(i) the assessment of the tribe’s housing needs by the qualified entity, or as set forth in the plan pursuant to section 904(3), is inaccurate or insufficient;

“(ii) the process established by the tribe to solicit requests for quotations and select an investor partner was insufficient or negligent; or

“(iii) the plan is insufficient to meet the housing needs of the tribe, as identified in the plan pursuant to section 904(3);

“(B) approve the plan, on the condition that the participating tribe and the investor make such revisions to the plan as the Secretary may specify as appropriate to meet the needs of the tribe for affordable housing; or

“(C) disapprove the plan, only if the Secretary determines that the plan fails to meet the minimal housing standards and requirements set forth in this Act and the Secretary notifies the tribe of the elements requiring the disapproval.

“(b) ACTION UPON DISAPPROVAL.—

“(1) RE-SUBMISSION OF PLAN.—Subject to paragraph (2), in the case of any disapproval of a final plan of an Indian tribe pursuant to subsection (a)(3), the Secretary shall allow the tribe a period of 180 days from notification to the tribe of such disapproval to re-submit a revised plan for approval.

“(2) LIMITATION.—If the final plan for an Indian tribe is disapproved twice and resubmitted twice pursuant to the authority under paragraph (1) and, upon such second re-submission of the plan the Secretary disapproves the plan, the tribe may not re-submit the plan again and shall be ineligible to participate in the demonstration program under this title.

“(c) TRIBE AUTHORITY OF HOUSING DESIGN AND LOCATION.—The Secretary may not disapprove a final plan under section 904, or condition approval of such a plan, based on the design or location of any housing to be developed or assisted under the plan.

“(d) FAILURE TO NOTIFY.—If the Secretary does not notify a participating tribe submitting a final plan of approval, conditional approval, or disapproval of the plan before the expiration of the period referred to in paragraph (1), the plan shall be considered as approved for all purposes of this title.

“SEC. 906. TREATMENT OF NAHASDA ALLOCATION.

“Amounts otherwise allocated for a participating tribe under title III of this Act (25 U.S.C. 4151 et seq.) shall not be made available to the tribe under titles I through VIII, but shall only be available for the tribe, upon request by the tribe and approval by the Secretary, for the following purposes:

“(1) RETURN ON INVESTMENT.—Such amounts as are pledged by a participating tribe pursuant to section 904(10) for return on the investment made by the investor partner or other investors may be used by the Secretary to ensure such full return on investment.

“(2) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—The Secretary may provide to a participating tribe, upon the request of a tribe, not more than 10

percent of any annual allocation made under title III for the tribe during such period for administrative costs of the tribe in completing the processes to carry out sections 903 and 904.

“(3) HOUSING INFRASTRUCTURE COSTS.—A participating tribe may use such amounts for housing infrastructure costs associated with providing affordable housing for the tribe under the final plan.

“(4) MAINTENANCE; TENANT SERVICES.—A participating tribe may use such amounts for maintenance of affordable housing for the tribe and for housing services, housing management services, and crime prevention and safety activities described in paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively, of section 202.

“SEC. 907. RESALE OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

“Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a participating tribe may, in accordance with the provisions of the final plan of the tribe approved pursuant to section 905, resell any affordable housing developed with assistance made available under this Act for use other than as affordable housing, but only if the tribe provides such assurances as the Secretary determines are appropriate to ensure that—

“(1) the tribe is meeting its need for affordable housing;

“(2) will provide affordable housing in the future sufficient to meet future affordable housing needs; and

“(3) will use any proceeds only to meet such future affordable housing needs or as provided in section 906.

“SEC. 908. REPORTS, AUDITS, AND COMPLIANCE.

“(a) ANNUAL REPORTS BY TRIBE.—Each participating tribe shall submit a report to the Secretary annually regarding the progress of the tribe in complying with, and meeting the deadlines and schedules set forth under the approved final plan for the tribe. Such reports shall contain such information as the Secretary shall require.

“(b) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit a report to the Congress annually describing the activities and progress of the demonstration program under this title, which shall—

“(1) summarize the information in the reports submitted by participating tribes pursuant to subsection (a);

“(2) identify the number of tribes that have selected an investor partner pursuant to a request for quotations;

“(3) include, for each tribe applying for participating in the demonstration program whose final plan was disapproved under section 905(a)(2)(C), a detailed description and explanation of the reasons for disapproval and all actions taken by the tribe to eliminate the reasons for disapproval, and identify whether the tribe has re-submitted a final plan;

“(4) identify, by participating tribe, any amounts requested and approved for use under section 906; and

“(5) identify any participating tribes that have terminated participation in the demonstration program and the circumstances of such terminations.

“(c) AUDITS.—The Secretary shall provide for audits among participating tribes to ensure that the final plans for such tribes are being implemented and complied with. Such audits shall include on-site visits with participating tribes and requests for documentation appropriate to ensure such compliance.

“SEC. 909. TERMINATION OF TRIBAL PARTICIPATION.

“(a) TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION.—A participating tribe may terminate participation in the demonstration program under this title at any time, subject to this section.

“(b) EFFECT ON EXISTING OBLIGATIONS.—

“(1) NO AUTOMATIC TERMINATION.—Termination by a participating tribe in the demonstration program under this section shall not terminate any obligations of the tribe under agreements entered into under the demonstration program with the investor partner for the tribe or any other investors or contractors.

“(2) AUTHORITY TO MUTUALLY TERMINATE AGREEMENTS.—Nothing in this title may be construed to prevent a tribe that terminates participation in the demonstration program under this section and any party with which the tribe has entered into an agreement from mutually agreeing to terminate such agreement.

“(c) RECEIPT OF REMAINING GRANT AMOUNTS.—The Secretary shall provide for grants to be made in accordance with, and subject to the requirements of, this Act for any amounts remaining after use pursuant to section 906 from the allocation under title III for a participating tribe that terminates participation in the demonstration program.

“(d) COSTS AND OBLIGATIONS.—The Secretary shall not be liable for any obligations or costs incurred by an Indian tribe during its participation in the demonstration program under this title.

“SEC. 910. FINAL REPORT.

“Not later than the expiration of the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this title, the Secretary shall submit a final report to the Congress regarding the effectiveness of the demonstration program, which shall include—

“(1) an assessment of the success, under the demonstration program, of participating tribes in meeting their housing needs, including affordable housing needs, on tribal land;

“(2) recommendations for any improvements in the demonstration program; and

“(3) a determination of whether the demonstration should be expanded into a permanent program available for Indian tribes to opt into at any time and, if so, recommendations for such expansion, including any legislative actions necessary to expand the program.

“SEC. 911. DEFINITIONS.

“For purposes of this title, the following definitions shall apply:

“(1) AFFORDABLE HOUSING.—The term ‘affordable housing’ has the meaning given such term in section 4 (25 U.S.C. 4103).

“(2) HOUSING INFRASTRUCTURE.—The term ‘housing infrastructure’ means basic facilities, services, systems, and installations necessary or appropriate for the functioning of a housing community, including facilities, services, systems, and installations for water, sewage, power, communications, and transportation.

“(3) LONG-TERM LEASE.—The term ‘long-term lease’ means an agreement between a participating tribe and a tribal member that authorizes the tribal member to occupy a specific plot of tribal lands for 50 or more years and to request renewal of the agreement at least once.

“(4) PARTICIPATING TRIBES.—The term ‘participating tribe’ means an Indian tribe for which a final plan under section 904 for participation in the demonstration program under this title has been approved by the Secretary under section 905.

“SEC. 912. NOTICE.

“The Secretary shall establish any requirements and criteria as may be necessary to carry out the demonstration program under this title by notice published in the Federal Register.”

SEC. 702. CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.

The table of contents in section 1(b) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 705 the following:

“TITLE VIII—HOUSING ASSISTANCE FOR NATIVE HAWAIIANS

“Sec. 801. Definitions.

“Sec. 802. Block grants for affordable housing activities.

“Sec. 803. Housing plan.

“Sec. 804. Review of plans.

“Sec. 805. Treatment of program income and labor standards.

“Sec. 806. Environmental review.

“Sec. 807. Regulations.

“Sec. 808. Effective date.

“Sec. 809. Affordable housing activities.

“Sec. 810. Eligible affordable housing activities.

“Sec. 811. Program requirements.

“Sec. 812. Types of investments.

“Sec. 813. Low-income requirement and income targeting.

“Sec. 814. Lease requirements and tenant selection.

“Sec. 815. Repayment.

“Sec. 816. Annual allocation.

“Sec. 817. Allocation formula.

“Sec. 818. Remedies for noncompliance.

“Sec. 819. Monitoring of compliance.

“Sec. 820. Performance reports.

“Sec. 821. Review and audit by Secretary.

“Sec. 822. General Accounting Office audits.

“Sec. 823. Reports to Congress.

“Sec. 824. Authorization of appropriations.

“TITLE IX—DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FOR ALTERNATIVE PRIVATIZATION AUTHORITY FOR NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING

“Sec. 901. Authority.

“Sec. 902. Participating tribes.

“Sec. 903. Request for quotes and selection of investor partner.

“Sec. 904. Final plan.

“Sec. 905. HUD review and approval of plan.

“Sec. 906. Treatment of NAHASDA allocation.

“Sec. 907. Resale of affordable housing.

“Sec. 908. Reports, audits, and compliance.

“Sec. 909. Termination of tribal participation.

“Sec. 910. Final report.

“Sec. 911. Definitions.

“Sec. 912. Notice.”

TITLE VIII—HOUSING FOR NATIVE HAWAIIANS

SEC. 801. REAUTHORIZATION OF NATIVE HAWAIIAN HOMEOWNERSHIP ACT.

Section 824 (25 U.S.C. 4243) is amended by striking “such sums as may be necessary” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “\$13,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019.”

SEC. 802. REAUTHORIZATION OF LOAN GUARANTEES FOR NATIVE HAWAIIAN HOUSING.

Section 184A(j)(5) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1715z–13b(j)(5)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by inserting after the period at the end of the first sentence the following: “There are authorized to be appropriated for such costs \$386,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019.”; and

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking “for each of fiscal years” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019 with an aggregate outstanding principal amount not exceeding \$41,504,000 for each such fiscal year.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to add extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

We are here today to support H.R. 360, the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Reauthorization Act.

This is truly a bipartisan bill. It has been over 2 years in the making. Beginning in early 2013, DON YOUNG and TOM COLE, who are both Republicans, joined with me and Democrats GWEN MOORE, DENNY HECK, DAN KILDEE, TULSI GABBARD, and a host of others from the Democrat side to make a bill that truly works across both aisles and that is widely supported by tribes.

Transformational in its opportunities for Native Americans, it has been widely recognized by those tribes. Most importantly, it is a bill for which we can come together and all be proud of cosponsoring. The legislation before us is just that; it shows that colleagues, regardless of political affiliation, can come together and get the job done.

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

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

I have said so many times that this has taken a tremendous amount of work and team effort and good will to get us to the place at which we are today. I want to thank all of our cosponsors. It really has been a heavy lift, and I can tell you how appreciative I am.

It has been so wonderful working with Mr. PEARCE. He has just been levelheaded and calm all the way. Of course, with regard to Mr. COLE, Mr. HECK, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. YOUNG, we have all worked so closely together for 2 years to craft this bipartisan legislation.

I need to also recognize the leadership role of our ranking member, Ms. WATERS. She has had a few concerns, but she has been engaging and constructive.

The National Congress of American Indians, the National American Indian Housing Council, and many individual tribes from all across the country have provided comments, education, and energy every step of the way.

I think that this legislation, Mr. Speaker, honors the trust relationship of the United States Government, and it respects tribal sovereignty of the nations of the First People, but I don't want to make short shrift of the concerns that have been raised.

For example, I wish we could have provided more funding, given the dire need. However, this legislation is the product of a truly bipartisan process. It is not that all of us agree 100 percent on every provision, but we keep talking, and we keep working, and we have done that until we have come up with

a bill that may not be perfect but that serves the people for whom it is intended, and it is very good for tribal communities.

The need for affordable housing in Indian Country just cannot be understated. Some of the poorest and most remote communities in this country are Native American communities.

In fact, the three poorest communities in the United States of America are Native American. NAHASDA provides tribal governments the ability to provide safe and affordable housing to tribal communities that is consistent with their status as sovereigns.

A few improvements that I would like to highlight are that it expedites certain Federal approvals. It makes all native people eligible for NAHASDA funds. It preserves provisions protecting Cherokee Freedmen.

Expediting approval ends administrative duplication and delays, approval which is essential due to unique timing and building challenges on reservations.

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

□ 1615

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with Ms. MOORE in recognizing the actions of Ms. WATERS, the ranking member, truly, truly asking the questions that needed to be asked, but then finally reconciling on some of those issues. Also, the chairman, Chairman HENSARLING, has been in the same position, and Leader MCCARTHY bringing this bill to the floor as he has, I would like to express that.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is very important when we look at this extremely significant piece of legislation to recognize, as my good friend from Wisconsin said, this is a trust obligation of the United States Government. This isn't a housing handout. This isn't some special deal. This is something, an obligation that we assumed in negotiation with tribes over many decades, many different situations. If people are living in Indian Country, particularly on reservations, and don't have adequate housing, the Federal Government has a responsibility to do something about it, something we have recognized since the 1960s, something, as my friend Mr. PEARCE said, we institutionalized in 1996.

This has been a good program for a long time. It has been a block grant program, which has empowered tribes. One of the things I love about this legislation is, in a bipartisan sense, we continue to do that. We provide a lot more flexibility for tribes to actually control their own affairs, meet their own needs.

As Ms. MOORE suggests, we all wish the sum could be more. \$650 million is a lot of money, but spread across a pop-

ulation of almost three million individuals and over 57 million acres, an area of land about the size of Wyoming, it is maybe not as much as we would like, particularly given the severe needs, but it is a good faith effort, and it is appropriate given the difficult financial times we are in.

Again, we have had tremendous support across Indian Country. As both speakers previously mentioned, National Congress of American Indians, particularly the National American Indian Housing Council, has worked hand-in-glove with Members on both sides of the aisle to build this program.

My friends were very fulsome in their praise for various Members, and I wouldn't disagree with anybody they mentioned, but I have got to hold, particularly, Mr. PEARCE up not only for his tremendous work on this, Ms. MOORE as well, but for their persistence in this. They brought this legislation to the floor in the last Congress, having worked out the difficulties, formed a bipartisan compromise and coalition and, frankly, brought their leaders along with them, I think, educating their respective leaders in the process. We got that through the House last time on a bipartisan basis. The Senate wasn't able to act, and I am very pleased to see that they have come back again this quickly in the session. Hopefully we will have a little bit better response on the other side. I don't think there was any opposition; they just didn't get it done in the press of business toward the end of the year. They are going to have plenty of time to do that.

This is an excellent piece of legislation. As my friends have both suggested, it is an example of how well we can work together when we focus on the problems instead of sometimes the partisan and philosophical divisions that separate us. I reflect, as I am looking here on the floor, that I usually like to think of myself as a right-wing conservative Republican, but I can't get to the right of my friend Mr. PEARCE, as hard as I try; and my friend Ms. MOORE—we have worked together on TRIO programs, on violence against women, now on this—is certainly well to the left of me on a lot of issues. So anything that can bring the three of us together is pretty inclusive in this body, and you won't have much excuse.

I am particularly pleased to see my friend Mr. KILDEE on the floor, who continues a family tradition of working in the forefront of Native American issues.

It is a good piece of legislation. It has been worked on hard by people that really know what they are doing. They brought the body along. So I certainly urge its passage and again want to congratulate, particularly, Mr. PEARCE and Ms. MOORE for their absolutely stellar work in this case. It would not have happened without their efforts.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, it is so wonderful always to work with Mr. COLE.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend Ms. MOORE for yielding and for her leadership on this very important issue. I also thank Mr. PEARCE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. COLE on the other side, as well as Ms. GABBARD, whom I have worked with on this legislation, along with Mr. HECK and, now, Mr. TAKAI.

I think what this legislation proves is that when we set out to solve a problem and focus on the things that we can agree upon, we can get a lot done. This is a good bill. It is not the bill that any one of us individually would have written had we been left alone to produce this legislation with only our own perspectives and our own interests. It is a bill that is a result of compromise.

There are elements of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, that I would prefer not have been included; and I am sure Mr. PEARCE and others are aware that I would have preferred that the pilot program that allows for a form of privatization, a direct grant to private developers, not be included. I would prefer that the entirety of the funds be used specifically to empower tribes, and tribes alone, to determine the use of the dollars. After all, they have had the ability to make those decisions and enter into agreements with private individuals as well.

I only say that to make sure that the RECORD is clear and that I state my objection to that particular portion, but to help point out a larger, I think, more important point. I am sure Mr. PEARCE, Mr. COLE, and Mr. YOUNG could find sections, provisions, of this legislation that they would prefer to excise or maybe something that they would have preferred to have included that they were not able to get in the bill; but because the focus here, from the very beginning, in the last Congress and again in this one, as Mr. COLE said, is that we have an obligation to live up to our trust responsibilities to this Nation's first people, that trust responsibility comes ahead of whatever differences we might have on specific policy approaches.

Since we took that approach—and Mr. PEARCE and Ms. MOORE both deserve great credit for being able to put aside the differences that they had—we were able to get this legislation to the floor with what I think is enormous support within the House of Representatives. It is a testament to our recognition of that trust obligation, and it is something that I am very pleased to carry on. As was stated, my uncle worked on these issues, and I know that he would be proud to see us working together to continue to live up to that important trust obligation.

Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting this legislation. I thank all my colleagues for their work on this.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Wisconsin has 15 minutes remaining.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to let Mr. PEARCE know I have two more speakers, and then I will be prepared to close.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Ms. WATERS and especially the chairman, Mr. PEARCE, for this legislation. It is something that we have worked on together with TOM COLE, many in this room. I would like to thank the Hawaiian delegation. It has always been an honor and a pleasure to work with the Hawaiian delegation with Alaska. They are two noncontiguous States, and we work well together and we will continue to do that.

Mr. KILDEE, I thank you for your uncle; he and I were dear friends and worked together on a lot of issues. I always respected that. I would like to thank the staff. Let's all not kid ourselves; the staffs of all our offices really put this together with our little bit of advice. Alex has worked very hard on my side, and I know your side has worked really well. That is a classic example, when staffs are willing to work together with the Members, Members are willing to work together, we can accomplish these goals.

This is just not a bipartisan piece of legislation. This is legislation that is needed by American Indians, Alaska Natives. It has worked well, and I am hoping—I have talked to the Senators on the other side—that in reality we will get this legislation passed very quickly. This is a win-win situation for all of us, so I think we should take great honor and recognize what has been, will be done here today, and accomplish a goal that many times is not achieved.

So again, I, with great feelings, thank each Member that has been involved in this, especially for the first people of America.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that Mr. YOUNG from Alaska has really made a very important point to have thanked our staffs. I was remiss in not doing that. So I would like to add my voice to those Members who really, really appreciate the hard work that our staffs provide.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I am rising in strong support of H.R. 360 today.

Since 1996, this legislation has been authorized twice, both times with broad bipartisan support in both Chambers of Congress. Since its enactment, this legislation has strengthened indigenous self-determination by empowering Native nations, by assisting with affordable housing needs.

In my home State of Hawaii, it has increased home ownership among Native Hawaiians by more than 2 percent, bringing hope to many people who are living paycheck to paycheck. At the same time, we are seeing poverty and public assistance have decreased. Today more Native Hawaiians are likely to be employed in professional or managerial occupations than in the past, and life expectancy has increased by almost 3 years. This legislation makes a difference to real families.

One of these families is Francis Paaluhi and her sisters who live in Nanakuli. They inherited a home from their parents, who passed away, which was built in the 1940s and was in dire need of repairs. There were large holes in the roof and floors; bedroom walls were buckling; broken windows covered with tarps. The Paaluhi sisters did not have the means to pay for the needed repairs, and they couldn't afford a new home. They also didn't qualify for an FHA loan or any other loan. The Department of Hawaiian Homelands made a grant available because of this legislation for \$15,000. Just \$15,000 gave this family the ability to make a down payment with assistance from a low-interest USDA construction loan. They were able to build a structurally safe and comfortable home for them and their children to live.

This is just one example of the many families whose lives have been directly impacted and changed because of this legislation. It is an important step toward removing roadblocks to economic success, not only in Hawaii but in Native communities across the country, and it reaffirms the House's longstanding commitment to tribal sovereignty and self-determination.

Like all those who spoke before me, I would like to thank my colleague Representative PEARCE for introducing this bill, for his persistence and leadership continuously in bringing this about; Representative MOORE for leading the charge courageously on our side of the aisle; Ranking Member WATERS for continuing to move this bill forward; also, my long-time colleague and friend from Alaska, Representative YOUNG; and my colleague DAN KILDEE, all of whom worked very hard on this legislation. I urge my colleagues to join this bipartisan coalition in supporting the passage of H.R. 360.

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

As I go through my district, there are many who wonder why do we have a bill like this. Frankly, it is a treaty responsibility. The responsibility has been signed between the Native Americans and the Federal Government saying that we have a trust responsibility to them.

As I travelled around the reservations in my district, I began to be aware of a circumstance that I had not previously been aware of: houses that were maybe several hundred years old, people still living in those. There is one area with no sewer at all. There are

cardboard shacks, people living in situations that they should not be living in today.

□ 1630

Those things exist. The legislation in front of us today doesn't change the responsibility of the government. It doesn't increase the amount of the dollars flowing to it. It simply tries to make the process a little more streamlined.

I would like to acknowledge that HUD, at one point, was rigorously opposing the transparency, rigorously opposing those reforms that we were putting into their systems. They had duplications of processes that would literally take years in order to get approval to build houses, and we simply said it does not have to be that way.

A second thing struck me. I watched my family grow out of abject poverty into a home ownership culture. Our first home that we purchased was \$800, and then we moved up to a \$1,500 home. Finally, we thought we really had arrived when we got to the \$2,500 home, and then a \$15,000, 5-acre property.

And so the pilot project that Mr. KILDEE—and he has had great discussions with me—but the pilot project is inserted into the bill in order to facilitate allowing Native Americans to own their own homes on the reservations. It has been very difficult up to now. We addressed those problems which have created a culture of poverty through the years.

So, even though we might have a different view on how to get there, we do not, as Democrats and Republicans, disagree on the fact that prosperity will begin with home ownership. And this pilot project in here—completely voluntary—allows people to move directly into home ownership. It allows the Native American tribes to start to encourage home ownership on the reservations in order to preserve the cultures there.

The reforms that we have put in for the Native Americans themselves were extremely important. Some of the processes have worked very badly. I have had extraordinarily frank conversations with Native Americans across the country, talking about the need to move to more transparent processes—to processes that make sure the money gets into the homes where they are building them.

And so that is the purpose of this legislation. I, again, commend Congresswoman MOORE because she and I really started the process. And then DENNY HECK, DAN KILDEE, DON YOUNG, and TOM COLE were all sitting there, and we chipped away at it from each side. We got the reforms in. We got the wording in that would allow Indian tribes across the country to feel like they are participating in this.

It is a very difficult process—again, a 3-year process—and I am proud of the legislation we are bringing to the floor today and proud of the efforts on behalf of each one of the people who have been involved here.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to my good friend from Hawaii (Mr. TAKAI).

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Speaker, today, I stand in support of H.R. 360, the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Reauthorization Act of 2015.

This legislation reaffirms the United States trust responsibility to American Indian and Alaska Native nations and provides necessary tools to the native people of our country for sustainable solutions to poverty that often plague their communities.

I would also like to thank Chairman PEARCE; Ranking Member WATERS; Mr. YOUNG; Ms. MOORE; Mr. KILDEE; the senior Member from Hawaii, Ms. GABBARD; and the numerous other congressional Members who have fought for years to reauthorize NAHASDA, and thank them for also including support to Native Hawaiian housing organizations, which provide adequate housing to descendants of Hawaii's indigenous people.

NAHASDA's reauthorization does not merely provide funding for adequate housing programs, it also provides vital resources to foster the indigenous cultures of our great Nation, which faced near extinction during the atrocities committed to expand our Nation and the Federal assimilation policies of the 20th century.

For some indigenous people, living on their aboriginal lands is a vital part of preserving and living their culture. Unfortunately, Hawaii has one of the highest costs of living in the Nation, so support through NAHASDA is essential to Native Hawaiian families who wish to remain on their ancestral lands but face the ever growing price of homes, land, utilities, and food. So many families who have lived in Hawaii for generations upon generations are now moving out of our State because of the cost of living.

I hope my colleagues understand not only the vital importance of adequate housing for the less fortunate among Native communities, but also its vital importance for fostering the indigenous cultures of our democracy. This diversity of culture is what makes our Nation great.

So, please join me in supporting this measure.

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

I am so happy that the Hawaiian and Alaskan contingencies have commented on this. I think it is important that this bill include all native people.

I am so happy that the Senate is now working on a version of NAHASDA that is similar, and I hope that we will all be able to quickly reconcile our differences and get a reauthorization to the President's desk. I look forward to him signing H.R. 360 into law.

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

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

At one point, Chairman HENSARLING earlier in the process said he was not wildly ecstatic about the bill coming before his committee if 100 years from now Native Americans were going to be in the same circumstance they were in today. So, again, that was one of the elements of trying to find and facilitate home ownership among Native Americans so they could begin their growth towards prosperity.

When Indian tribes see this bill, they say: If you can actually get that through, if you can actually get both sides to agree on it, it will be transformational. Well, that is what I came here to do. I came here to be a part of things that transform the way that we approach different programs, not to just drift along and reauthorize. And so it is with that backdrop that we began to construct the bill.

Again, I would like to thank Ranking Member WATERS for her support. I would like to thank Chairman HENSARLING and Leader MCCARTHY for their support. I especially would like to thank my friends on the other side of the aisle for working through the very difficult discussions so that we are able to find a bill that does reach market efficiencies, does make the government more effective and efficient, that does do things that both political parties want to achieve.

We all want to achieve the same things. We approach it from a different point of view. So I can't say enough to my friends on the other side of the aisle: Thank you very much for your hard work and dedication.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I recommend and request that everyone support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, this bill will provide an important and long overdue reauthorization of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act or NAHASDA.

Through NAHASDA, the federal government provides housing assistance to Native Americans and Native Hawaiians in a way that is tailored to address their unique housing needs, while respecting their right to self-determination. These groups experience some of the poorest housing conditions in our country so it is very important that we reauthorize the programs within NAHASDA.

As a supporter of the reauthorization of NAHASDA, I did not object to the bill before us today moving forward under suspension.

However, as I have pointed out in the past, this bill fails to ensure certain basic protections for the communities that rely on NAHASDA—and as a result—I will oppose this measure.

Despite my repeated objections, Republicans have refused to include a provision in this bill that offers protections for the Cherokee Freedmen. As many people know, the Cherokee Freedmen are the descendants of former African American slaves of the Cherokee, who are facing possible expulsion by the Cherokee nation.

For the past several years, under the leadership of former Members including Carolyn Kilpatrick and Mel Watt, the Congressional Black Caucus has stood up for the rights of

the Cherokee Freedmen. But Republicans have consistently refused to acknowledge this tragic history and do something to bring justice to this situation. And this bill is no exception. During the Committee markup, they rejected my amendment, which would have made NAHASDA funding to the Cherokee contingent on full recognition of the Freedmen as citizens of the Cherokee Nation.

My position on this issue remains steadfast, and I cannot support continued silence in the face of such injustice. That is why I will not support this bill unless it grants the Freedmen the justice they deserve.

I am also withholding my support from this bill because it contains a provision that would seriously undercut the central goal of providing affordable housing for low-income Native Americans. This bill would waive a long-standing tenet of affordable housing known as the "Brooke Rule," which states that the maximum rent paid by assisted households must be no more than 30 percent of their income.

The Brooke Rule is a basic safeguard that exists in the public housing and Section 8 programs. It ensures that federally subsidized housing is affordable for the lowest-income households. By stripping away this basic safeguard, this bill would make low-income Native Americans vulnerable to unlimited increases in rent without any kind of hardship exemptions in place.

This is simply unacceptable. It is a basic purpose of NAHASDA to provide housing for low-income Native Americans, and this provision would seriously undermine that purpose. Republicans may not be concerned about the plight of the lowest-income Native Americans who rely on NAHASDA programs, but they are at the top of my concerns when it comes to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to sincerely thank Ms. MOORE, Mr. HECK and Mr. KILDEE for their efforts to reach a bipartisan agreement on this bill. However, I cannot support this reauthorization bill in its current form for all of the reasons I have stated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 360, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS BUDGET PLANNING REFORM ACT OF 2015

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 216) to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a Future-Years Veterans Program and a quadrennial veterans review, to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a Chief Strategy Offi-

cer, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 216

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 "Department of Veterans Affairs Budget Planning Reform Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF STRATEGIC PLANS TO IMPROVE PROGRAMS AND BENEFITS FOR VETERANS.

(a) FUTURE-YEARS VETERANS PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 119. Future-Years Veterans Program

"(a) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress each year, at or about the time that the President's budget is submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, a Future-Years Veterans Program reflecting the estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations included in that budget. Any such Future-Years Veterans Program shall cover the fiscal year with respect to which the budget is submitted and at least the four succeeding fiscal years.

"(b) CONSISTENCY.—(1) The Secretary shall ensure that amounts described in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2) for any fiscal year are consistent with amounts described in subparagraph (B) of such paragraph for that fiscal year.

"(2) Amounts referred to in paragraph (1) are the following:

"(A) The amounts specified in program and budget information submitted to Congress by the Secretary in support of expenditure estimates and proposed appropriations in the budget submitted to Congress by the President under section 1105(a) of title 31 for any fiscal year, as shown in the Future-Years Veterans Program submitted pursuant to subsection (a).

"(B) The total amounts of estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations necessary to support the programs, projects, and activities of the Department of Veterans Affairs included pursuant to paragraph (5) of section 1105(a) of title 31 in the budget submitted to Congress under that section for any fiscal year.

"(c) CONTENTS.—The Future-Years Veterans Program under subsection (a) shall set forth the five-year plan of the Department to address the commitment of the United States to veterans and the resources necessary to meet that commitment and shall be developed and updated, as appropriate, annually by the Secretary. Each Future-Years Veterans Program shall include an explanation of—

"(1) the information that was used to develop program planning guidance for the Future-Years Veterans Program; and

"(2) how the resource allocations included in the Future-Years Veterans Program correlate to such five-year strategy.

"(d) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall publish on a publically accessible Internet website of the Department each Future-Years Veterans Program submitted pursuant to subsection (a)."

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 118 the following new item:

"119. Future-Years Veterans Program."

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 119 of title 38, United States Code, as added by paragraph

(1), shall apply with respect to the preparation and submission of the budget request for the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2020 and fiscal years thereafter.

(b) QUADRENNIAL VETERANS REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Such chapter is further amended by adding after section 119, as added by subsection (a)(1), the following new section:

"§ 120. Quadrennial veterans review

"(a) REQUIREMENT.—(1) Not later than fiscal year 2019, and every fourth year thereafter, the Secretary shall conduct a review of the strategy for meeting the commitment of the United States to veterans and the resources necessary to meet that commitment (in this section referred to as a 'quadrennial veterans review').

"(2) Each quadrennial veterans review shall include a comprehensive examination of the policies and strategies of the United States with respect to veterans, including recommendations regarding the long-term strategy and priorities for programs, services, benefits, and outcomes regarding veterans and guidance on the programs, assets, capabilities, budget, policies, and authorities of the Department.

"(3) The Secretary shall conduct each quadrennial veterans review in consultation with key officials of the Department, the heads of other Federal agencies, and other relevant governmental and nongovernmental entities, including State, local, and tribal government officials, members of Congress, veterans service organizations, private sector representatives, academics, and other policy experts.

"(4) The Secretary shall ensure that each quadrennial veterans review is coordinated with the Future-Years Veterans Program required under section 119 of this title.

"(b) CONTENTS OF REVIEW.—In each quadrennial veterans review, the Secretary shall—

"(1) delineate a veterans strategy consistent with the commitment of the United States to veterans and refine a strategy for the types of, and provision of, programs, services, benefits, and outcomes consistent with current authorities and requirements;

"(2) outline and prioritize the full range of programs and capabilities regarding veterans provided by the Federal Government;

"(3) identify the budget plan required to provide sufficient resources to successfully execute the full range of such programs and capabilities;

"(4) include an assessment of the organizational alignment of the Department with respect to the strategy referred to in paragraph (1) and the programs and capabilities referred to in paragraph (2);

"(5) review and assess the effectiveness of the mechanisms of the Department for executing the process of turning the requirements identified in the quadrennial veterans review into a plan to meet such requirements, including an expenditure plan for the Department; and

"(6) identify emerging trends, problems, opportunities, and issues that could affect veterans or the Department during the ten-year period following the period covered by the review.

"(c) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—(1) The Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report regarding each quadrennial veterans review. The Secretary shall submit the report in the year following the year in which the review is conducted, but not later than the date on which the President submits to Congress the budget for the next fiscal year under section 1105 of title 31.

"(2) Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

“(A) the results of the quadrennial veterans review;

“(B) a description of the challenges to, and opportunities for, the assumed or defined veterans-related interests of the Nation that were examined for the purposes of that review;

“(C) the strategy for meeting the Nation’s commitment to veterans, including a prioritized list of the missions of the Department;

“(D) a description of the interagency cooperation, preparedness of Federal assets, infrastructure, budget plan, and other elements of the programs and policies of the Nation associated with the strategy referred to in subsection (b)(1) that are required to execute successfully the full range of programs and capabilities identified in such strategy and the programs and capabilities outlined under subsection (b)(2);

“(E) an assessment of the organizational alignment of the Department with the strategy referred to in subsection (b)(1) and the programs and capabilities outlined under subsection (b)(2), including the Department’s organizational structure, management systems, budget and accounting systems, human resources systems, procurement systems, and physical and technical infrastructure;

“(F) a discussion of the status of cooperation among Federal agencies in the effort to promote national support for veterans;

“(G) a discussion of the status of cooperation between the Federal Government and State, local, and tribal governments in supporting veterans and providing programs, services, benefits, and outcomes to assist veterans;

“(H) an explanation of any underlying assumptions used in conducting the review; and

“(I) any other matter the Secretary considers appropriate.

“(d) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall publish on a publically accessible Internet website of the Department each quadrennial veterans review submitted pursuant to subsection (c).

“(e) INDEPENDENT VETERANS REVIEW PANEL.—(1) Not later than February 1 of a year in which a quadrennial veterans review is conducted under this section, the Secretary shall establish an independent panel to be known as the Independent Veterans Review Panel (in this subsection referred to as the ‘Panel’). The Panel shall have the duties set forth in this subsection.

“(2) The Panel shall be composed of 10 members who are recognized experts in matters relating to veterans. The members shall be appointed as follows:

“(A) Two by the chairman of the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives.

“(B) Two by the chairman of the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate.

“(C) Two by the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives.

“(D) Two by the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate.

“(E) Two by the Secretary, who shall serve as co-chairs of the panel.

“(3) Members shall be appointed for the life of the Panel. Any vacancy in the Panel shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

“(4) The Panel shall have the following duties with respect to a quadrennial veterans review:

“(A) While the review is being conducted, the Panel shall review the updates from the Secretary required under paragraph (7) on the progress of the conduct of the review.

“(B) The Panel shall—

“(i) review the Secretary’s terms of reference and any other materials providing the basis for, or substantial inputs to, the work of the Department of Veterans Affairs on the quadrennial veterans review;

“(ii) conduct an assessment of the assumptions, strategy, findings, and risks included in the report on the quadrennial veterans review required in subsection (c);

“(iii) conduct an independent assessment of a variety of strategies for delivering services and support to veterans;

“(iv) review the resource requirements identified pursuant to subsection (b)(3) and, to the extent practicable, make a general comparison to the resource requirements to support the strategies assessed under this subparagraph; and

“(v) provide to the Committees on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives and the Secretary, through the report under paragraph (7), any recommendations the Panel determines appropriate.

“(5) If the Secretary has not appointed members to the Panel under paragraph (2)(E) by February 1 of a year in which a quadrennial veterans review is conducted under this section, the Panel shall convene for its first meeting with the remaining members.

“(6) Not later than three months after the date on which the report on a quadrennial veterans review is submitted under subsection (c) to the Committees on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Panel shall submit to such committees a report containing an assessment of the quadrennial veterans review, including a description of the items addressed under paragraph (4) with respect to that quadrennial veterans review.

“(7) Periodically, but not less often than every 60 days during the life of the panel, or at the request of the co-chairs, the Secretary shall brief the Panel on the progress of the conduct of the quadrennial veterans review.

“(8)(A) The Panel may request directly from the Department such information as the Panel considers necessary to carry out its duties under this subsection. The Secretary shall cooperate with the Panel to ensure that information requested by the Panel under this subparagraph is promptly provided to the maximum extent practical.

“(B) Upon the request of the co-chairs, the Secretary shall make available to the Panel the services of any federally funded research and development center that is covered by a sponsoring agreement of the Department.

“(C) The Panel shall have the authorities provided in section 3161 of title 5 and shall be subject to the conditions set forth in such section.

“(D) Funds for activities of the Panel shall be provided from amounts available to the Department.

“(9) The Panel shall terminate 45 days after the date on which the Panel submits the report on the quadrennial veterans review under paragraph (6).”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 119, as added by subsection (a)(2), the following new item:

“120. Quadrennial veterans review.”

(c) POLICY GUIDANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Such chapter is further amended by adding after section 120, as added by subsection (b)(1), the following new section:

“§ 121. Policy guidance

“The Secretary shall provide annually to the appropriate officials of the Department written policy guidance for the preparation and review of the planning and program recommendations and budget proposals of the

elements of the Department of such officials. Such guidance shall include guidance on the objectives of the Department in accordance with Future-Years Veterans Program under section 119 of this title and the quadrennial veterans review under section 120 and the resource levels projected to be available for the period of time for which such recommendations and proposals are to be effective.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 120, as added by subsection (b)(2), the following new item:

“121. Policy guidance.”

SEC. 3. CHIEF STRATEGY OFFICER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 3 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 323. Chief Strategy Officer

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall designate the Assistant Secretary whose functions include planning, studies, and evaluations as the Chief Strategy Officer of the Department. The Chief Strategy Officer shall advise the Secretary on long-range strategy and implications.

“(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Chief Strategy Officer is the principal advisor to the Secretary and other senior officials of the Department, and shall provide independent analysis and advice to the Secretary and such officials. The Chief Strategy Officer shall carry out the following responsibilities:

“(1) Conducting cost estimation and cost analysis for the programs of the Department.

“(2) Establishing policies for, and overseeing the integration of, the planning, programming, budgeting and execution process for the Department.

“(3) Providing analysis and advice on matters relating to the planning and programming phase of the planning, programming, budgeting and execution process, and the preparation of materials and guidance for such process, as directed by the Secretary, working in coordination with the Assistant Secretary for Management.

“(4) Developing and executing the Future-Years Veterans Program of the Department, as specified under section 119 of this title.

“(5) Developing resource discussions relating to requirements under consideration in the quadrennial veterans review under section 120 of this title.

“(6) Formulating study guidance for analysis of alternatives for programs and initiatives, including any necessary acquisitions, development, or procurement commensurate with such alternatives, and performance of such analysis as directed by the Secretary.

“(7) Reviewing, analyzing, and evaluating programs for executing approved strategies and policies, ensuring that information on programs and expected outcomes is presented accurately and completely.

“(8) Ensuring that the costs of programs and alternatives are presented accurately and completely by assisting in establishing standards, policies, and procedures for the conduct of cost estimation and cost analysis throughout the Department, including guidance relating to the proper selection of confidence levels in cost estimates generally and for specific programs of the Department.

“(9) Conducting studies at the request of the Secretary regarding costs, policy assumptions, and strategic implications of current policies and possible alternatives.

“(10) Communicating directly to the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs about matters for which the Chief Strategy Officer is responsible without obtaining the approval or concurrence of any other official within the Department.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 322 the following new item:

“323. Chief Strategy Officer.”.

SEC. 4. PROHIBITION ON NEW APPROPRIATIONS.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act or the amendments made by this Act. This Act and such amendments shall be carried out using amounts otherwise available for the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and add extraneous material on H.R. 216, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 216, as amended, would revise the process by which the Department of Veterans Affairs prepares its annual budget as a means to provide Congress with greater transparency regarding VA's alignment of resource requirements with its strategic goals.

The bill directs the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit annually to Congress a Future-Years Veterans Program reflecting estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations included in the budget for that fiscal year and the subsequent 4 fiscal years.

The bill would also require the Secretary, in 2019 and every 4 years thereafter, to conduct a review of the strategy for meeting the Nation's commitment to veterans and the resources needed to implement the strategy. To assist the Secretary in carrying out the 5-year plan and the quadrennial review, the bill would require the Secretary to designate a chief strategy officer to advise the Secretary on long-range VA strategy and implications.

Finally, the bill puts in place a 10-member panel to study the quadrennial review and report back to the Congress on the panel's opinions of the review's findings. The combination of the 5-year budget look-ahead, the quadrennial review, and the panel is intended to increase our ability to determine VA's future needs in a manner that provides checks and balances that currently do not exist.

Mr. Speaker, this really is a commonsense bill. No longer would VA be able to announce ambitious goals such as ending homelessness or eliminating the claims backlog without Members of Congress and the public having insight into the estimated long-range re-

sources that are going to be needed to meet those goals.

With a \$168 billion budget, veterans and taxpayers deserve full transparency when it comes to how scarce resources are planned to be allocated.

I must also add that this bill makes no additional fund available and would require VA to accomplish this bill's requirements within its existing resources.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 216, as amended, the Department of Veterans Affairs Budget Planning Reform Act of 2015.

This bill represents a bipartisan effort of the Veterans Affairs' Committee, building on the work of former Ranking Member Michael Michaud and current Ranking Member CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

I also want to thank Chairman JEFF MILLER, Mr. DOUG LAMBORN of Colorado, and all of the members of the committee for their efforts on behalf of this bill.

H.R. 216 would codify and strengthen efforts by the VA to improve the manner in which it matches resources with requirements. H.R. 216 will improve transparency and give us in Congress, veterans, and the American people a better sense of where the VA is going and how it intends to get there.

It is often said that the journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step. Far too often, it seems that, in terms of budget planning, the VA is focused on the single step and not the thousand-mile journey.

Currently, the majority of the VA's programs are provided funding under what is called “advance appropriations.” This means that the VA budget is put in place well before the start of the fiscal year in which it will be needed.

□ 1645

This also means that the VA is attempting to estimate the demands it will face many, many months down the road. H.R. 216 will assist the VA in ensuring that these estimates are as reliable as possible.

H.R. 216 will provide the necessary framework for the VA to strategically determine how best to meet the needs of veterans, while ensuring that this framework and these decisions are transparent and justified. This will assist our work here in Congress and give veterans the peace of mind that the VA is looking to the future and not caught in the past.

H.R. 216 would require the VA to lay out a 5-year budget plan beginning in fiscal year 2020. This budget plan would be informed by a quadrennial review, initially required in fiscal year 2019, and then upgraded every 4 years. This would give the VA plenty of time to ensure that its internal processes can support these requirements.

H.R. 216 would also require the Secretary to provide annual policy guidance to ensure that near-term budgets are aligned with the VA's longer-term strategic outlook.

Many of the challenges the VA is facing today are remarkably similar to the problems it was facing when I served on the committee two decades ago. There is always a challenge to fit the available resources to the immediate needs and to focus on what will be required in the months ahead. It is easy to lose focus on where we are going while meeting the emergencies and crises of today.

I believe that H.R. 216 will assist all of us in keeping the entire journey in mind and not the single step. It will provide the information we need to look ahead, enable veterans and the American people to have the information they need to be assured that we are on the right track, and better enable the VA to get the resources it truly needs to meet the challenges it faces.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no speakers, so if the gentleman is prepared to close, I am also prepared to close.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 216.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I do want to thank my good friend, Mr. CLYBURN, for helping manage this bill for Ms. BROWN and also to say thank you to our former colleague, Mr. Michaud, who did, in fact, work long and hard to get this piece of legislation brought to the floor.

Once again, I encourage all Members to support H.R. 216, as amended.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 216, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PROVIDING MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO UKRAINE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 162) calling on the President to provide Ukraine with military assistance to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 162

Whereas the existence of an independent, democratic, and prosperous Ukraine is in the national interest of the United States;

Whereas the Russian Federation under President Vladimir Putin has engaged in relentless political, economic, and military aggression to subvert the independence and violate the territorial integrity of Ukraine;

Whereas this aggression includes the illegal and forcible occupation of Crimea by Russian military and security forces;

Whereas this Russian aggression includes the establishment and control of violent separatist proxies in other areas of Ukraine, including arming them with lethal weapons and other materiel including tanks, artillery, and rockets that have enabled separatist militias to launch and sustain an insurrection that has resulted in over 6,000 dead, 15,000 wounded, and more than a million displaced persons;

Whereas military and security forces of the Russian Federation have been infiltrated into these areas of Ukraine and continue to provide direct combat support to the separatist groups in this conflict;

Whereas failure to stop this aggression by the Russian Federation against Ukraine, especially its unprovoked and armed intervention in a sovereign country, illegal and forcible occupation of its territory, and unilateral efforts to redraw the internationally-recognized borders of Ukraine undermines the foundation of the international order that was established and has been defended at great cost by the United States and its allies in the aftermath of World War II;

Whereas Russian aggression against Ukraine is but the most visible and recent manifestation of a revisionist Kremlin strategy to redraw international borders and impose its will on its neighbors, including NATO allies;

Whereas on September 18, 2014, President Petro Poroshenko addressed a Joint Meeting of Congress at which he thanked the United States for the military assistance it has provided to defend the freedom and territorial integrity of his country and asked for “both non-lethal and lethal” military assistance, stating that “one cannot win a war with blankets”;

Whereas the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Martin Dempsey stated on March 3, 2015, that “we should absolutely consider providing lethal aid” to Ukraine;

Whereas Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter stated on February 4, 2015, during his confirmation hearing that he is “very much inclined” toward providing Ukraine with weapons to defend itself;

Whereas Congress provided the President with the authorization and budgetary resources to provide Ukraine with military assistance to enhance its ability to defend its sovereign territory from the unprovoked and continuing aggression of the Russian Federation, including in the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014, which was signed into law on December 18, 2014;

Whereas the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 specifically authorizes the provision of anti-armor weapons, crew-served weapons and ammunition, counter-artillery radars, fire control, range finder, and optical and guidance and control equipment, tactical troop-operated surveillance drones, and secure command and communications equipment;

Whereas even as it faces a massive military assault, Ukraine is confronting an economic crisis that requires both long-term financial and technical assistance by the United States and the international community, especially the countries of the European Union and the International Monetary

Fund, as well as fundamental economic and political reforms by the government of Ukraine;

Whereas the United States and its allies should provide assistance to support energy diversification and efficiency initiatives in Ukraine to lessen its vulnerability to coercion by the Russian Federation;

Whereas the United States and its allies should continue to work with Ukrainian officials to develop plans to increase energy production and efficiency in order to increase energy security beyond the short-term;

Whereas the United States, in close cooperation with international donors, has provided Ukraine with macro-economic assistance to boost Ukraine's economy; and

Whereas the United States and its allies need a long-term strategy to expose and challenge Vladimir Putin's corruption and repression at home and his aggression abroad: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives strongly urges the President to fully and immediately exercise the authorities provided by Congress to provide Ukraine with lethal defensive weapon systems to enhance the ability of the people of Ukraine to defend their sovereign territory from the unprovoked and continuing aggression of the Russian Federation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as always, Mr. ROYCE, the chairman of our Committee on Foreign Affairs, appreciates Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL of New York's leadership in support of the people of Ukraine.

Last week, March 18, Mr. Speaker, marked the 1-year anniversary of Russian President Vladimir Putin's invasion and occupation of Crimea.

During the past year, Russia has strengthened its hold over the peninsula, expanded its military presence, and increased its oppression of the minority Tatar population and others who refuse to bend to its occupation.

Putin's success in Crimea emboldened him to expand his aggression into eastern Ukraine. Last April, Chairman ED ROYCE of California, chairman of our committee, led a delegation to Ukraine and traveled to the Russian-speaking east.

The many Ukrainians that Ranking Member ENGEL and Mr. ROYCE met with wanted to be Ukrainians, not separatists; yet Moscow moved from forcibly seizing Crimea to aggressively supporting militant separatists in eastern Ukraine.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the conflict in the east has resulted in over 6,000 deaths, at least 15,000 wounded, and more than 1 million displaced persons.

This carnage is the work of the separatist forces controlled by Moscow, which has supplied them with massive amounts of weapons and has even sent in Russian military forces in combat-supporting roles.

As Assistant Secretary Victoria Nuland testified before the Foreign Affairs Committee this month, Russia “has thousands and thousands” of soldiers operating in Ukraine. As she summed up:

This is a manufactured conflict controlled by the Kremlin, fueled by Russian tanks and heavy weapons, financed at Russian taxpayers' expense.

Mr. Speaker, the administration's response to this crisis has been tepid at best. Six months ago, the President of Ukraine stood in this very Chamber and, while thanking the United States for our assistance so far, asked for defensive weapons to enable Ukraine to defend itself against superior forces. Pointedly, he told both Houses of Congress, “One cannot win a war with blankets,” which is what we are providing.

Earlier this month, Members met with the First Deputy Speaker of the Ukrainian parliament, who said that his country urgently needs antitank weapons, such as the Javelin; radar to pinpoint enemy fire; and communications equipment to overcome Russian jamming.

Ukrainian forces cannot match the advanced equipment that Russia is pouring into eastern Ukraine. There is no shortage of the will to fight, only a shortage of defensive weapons.

Legal authority for such assistance was made crystal clear by the Congress in December by passing the Ukraine Freedom Support Act. Top administration officials, including Secretary of Defense Carter and Chairman Dempsey of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have indicated support; indeed, this weekend, NATO's top military commander asked: Is inaction an appropriate action? We know his answer is “no.”

Unfortunately, for Ukrainians and for international security, President Obama has chosen inaction in the guise of endless deliberation; but there is far more at stake here than the fate of Ukraine, Mr. Speaker.

This unprovoked attack on a peaceful country, the forcible occupation of its territory, and an effort to unilaterally redraw its internationally recognized borders will undermine the foundation of the international order that was established and has been defended at great cost by the United States and our allies.

The world is closely watching what we will do to help Ukraine defend itself from outright assault. If it is too little, too late, those with designs on a neighboring country will feel all that more emboldened.

The people of Ukraine are not asking for us to fight for them. They are only

asking for the weapons they need to defend themselves.

I ask our colleagues to vote for this bipartisan resolution urging the administration to provide this critical assistance to Ukraine before it is, indeed, too late.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I want to, again, thank our chairman emeritus of the Foreign Affairs Committee, my dear friend from Florida ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, who is very eloquent. I want to stand by every word she uttered. I agree with her 100 percent.

I want to also thank our chairman, ED ROYCE, who also has been steadfast in fighting for the freedom for the people of Ukraine, and it has been a pleasure to work with him on a bipartisan basis.

This is a bipartisan issue. Policy like this should not be partisan, and that is why we are rising today, as Democrats and Republicans—really, as Americans—to say enough is enough in Ukraine.

As I have been saying for months, we cannot view the crisis in Ukraine as just some faraway conflict or someone else's problem. This war has left thousands dead, tens of thousands wounded, a million displaced, and has begun to threaten the post-cold war stability of Europe. In fact, Mr. Putin is knocking us back into the cold war, the bad old days of the cold war.

The battle is being waged in the haze of a massive, Kremlin-backed propaganda campaign aimed at eroding confidence in the West and democratic institutions, the same propaganda permeating allied countries on the Russian frontier that we are treaty-bound to defend.

Under the corrupt and repressive rule of Vladimir Putin, Russia has become a clear threat to a half century of American commitment to and investment in a Europe that is whole, free, and at peace, a Europe where borders are not changed by force.

What Putin is doing is he is changing borders by force on the continent of Europe for the first time since World War II. This cannot stand. The United States cannot turn a blind eye to it. The United States cannot put its head in the sand and act like any other country and pretend that maybe this will go away.

In 1938, another dictator named Adolf Hitler invaded Czechoslovakia and said he was going into the Sudetenland to protect ethnic Germans. Mr. Putin said the same thing about Crimea. He was going into Crimea to prevent the hurt of ethnic Russians—same nonsense.

Hitler got away with it in 1938, and there were people who said: Well, you know, if we just give him the Sudetenland, he will be happy. He will be content. He will leave us alone. His aggression will stop.

Some people today are saying the same thing: Just give Putin Crimea. Just give Putin a little bit of the eastern part of Ukraine, and he will be happy. He will go away. He won't threaten anything else.

□ 1700

You don't satiate a bully by giving him what he wants early on because it only whets his appetite for worse things to come; and at the point later on when you have to go at the bully, it will be much, much harder to defeat him, to stop him than it was if you had simply stood up to him when he started his aggression. This is what is happening now in Ukraine.

This war poses the greatest threat to European security since World War II, and we shouldn't take it lightly. We shouldn't be idle; we shouldn't sit back, and we shouldn't let other countries tell us what to do.

Last year, Ukraine President Poroshenko stood in this very Chamber at a joint session of Congress and related the challenges facing the people of Ukraine. They desire to reclaim their dignity and rebuild their country's future. He asked that we help the men and women fighting a war against a neighbor that they had once looked to as a friend. He told us they needed defensive weapons. They needed weapons. He said that the blankets that we are sending do not win a war.

Last month, I saw President Poroshenko again, in Europe. And he again pled for military assistance—not to attack Moscow, not to defeat the Russian army, not even to push the Russians out of Ukrainian territory, but simply to hold the line, to slow Russia's advance, and to give his government breathing room to focus on other threats, such as keeping the Ukrainian economy afloat.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow Europe's border lands to once again become Europe's blood lands. Fortunately, there is still time for the United States to act in a moderate but decisive fashion to help Ukraine defend itself, to limit Russia's ability to further destabilize our friends and allies and our friends in Ukraine, in particular, and to safeguard our interests and defend our values across this region.

All the countries—and some of them NATO members, some of them not; some of them part of the former Soviet Union, some of them not; some of them former Eastern Bloc nations, some of them not—all of the ones that border on Russia are all worrying because they think that if Putin can get away with what he wants to get away with in Ukraine, will they be next.

The United States is not being asked to send ground troops to Ukraine. The United States is not being asked to get itself involved in another war. We are simply being asked to give the Ukrainians methods to defend themselves, the weapons to defend themselves. I can't think of anything more reasonable.

We have held hearings on Ukraine. We have passed resolutions of support. We have sent legislation to the President's desk. It was the last thing we passed in the last Congress. The President signed it into law, authorizing an array of assistance, including the defensive arms Ukraine so desperately needs. And here we are again to renew this call, to remind the people of Ukraine that they are not alone, and to send an unambiguous message to the administration, to the President, and to our allies in Europe that the time has come to do more. We must meet this threat together because we all have a stake in how this ends.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Chairman ROYCE.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as my good friend ELIOT ENGEL from New York explained, last April, we took a delegation to Ukraine, not just to the western part of the country, but, most importantly, we went to the east. We went to Dnipropetrovs'k. We went as far east as we could go, up against the border there of Donetsk and Luhans'k.

We had an opportunity to have a dialogue with the Ukrainian people. We reached out to civil society. We set up meetings with women's groups and lawyers' groups. And across the spectrum in eastern Ukraine, speaking to Russian-speaking Ukrainians, we got, I believe, a good idea of what was on their minds—I think there were about eight members of our delegation—and they were sharing with us these words:

What Putin is doing, what the Russians are doing right now is going out on the Internet and recruiting every skinhead and malcontent in the Russian-speaking region that they can find. And then they train these young men, and then they send them over the border to create mayhem. And what we are trying to do here—this was the explanation from the Ukrainians—we are trying to catch them. They speak with a different accent than we do, so we can catch them, and we try to hold them until this war is over. But increasingly, we find that what is happening is that the Russians are sending their own troops over. They are sending their own armor. They are sending over military equipment that we cannot defend against.

And what they said to us is: We are not asking you for your assistance in this fight. All we are asking is that we might have the defensive weapons to check this assault so that we can defend ourselves in this city. We need antitank weapons.

You and I know, by the way, Mr. Speaker, that when those tanks come, those are not going to be Ukrainian separatists driving those tanks. Those are going to be Russian tankers in those tanks.

So this is what they are asking us for, and they have asked for month after month after month in order to set up a strategy that would cause the Russians to believe there were some kind of credible deterrence. But instead, we now see that Russia may try to secure a land bridge to Crimea. In other words, this conflict might escalate because of additional Russian aggression. Or they might seize strategic ports along the Black Sea, additional ports.

You have 6,000 people so far that have lost their lives—that I know of in the conflict, from the reports I have read. You have 1 million Ukrainians that have been made refugees, that have pulled west out of the area. And obviously, to date, the actions taken by the U.S. and our EU allies, including economic sanctions and aid and diplomatic isolation—all of the talk, none of that has checked Russian aggression—or, I should say, Putin's aggression here. And over the past year, he has clearly become bolder, even menacing NATO countries, as he seeks to divide the alliance.

Now, the Obama administration and our European allies have put hope in diplomatic and cease-fire arrangements, but, frankly, that is not working. So we come back to the request.

And this month, we met with the first deputy speaker of the Ukrainian Parliament, as ELIOT ENGEL shared here today on the floor, who said that his country urgently needs antitank weapons, such as the Javelin, and radar to pinpoint enemy artillery fire that is coming into their towns and communications equipment to overcome Russian jamming. That is the request. Ukrainian forces cannot match the advanced equipment that Russia is pouring into eastern Ukraine.

And there is no shortage of the will here on the part of the Ukrainians. We saw many volunteers in their local militia there in Dnipropetrovsk taking up their position, but what they have is a shortage of defensive weapons.

At this committee's hearing last month, Secretary Kerry said that the Obama administration has still not made a decision on whether to send defensive lethal military aid to Ukraine 6 months—this is 6 months—after President Poroshenko told us, as we sat here in this joint session of Congress to hear his remarks, that one cannot win the war with blankets.

So we are at a turning point, and I think I agree with the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) on this. It is one of historic importance. If we allow aggression against Ukraine to stand without us at least offering the Ukrainians the ability to defend themselves, we will signal to the world that our willingness to defend the post-

World War II international order is crumbling. The semblance of rules the world has abided by will be severely weakened. The result could usher in an era of instability and conflict in many regions, with consequences no one can predict. Or we can allow the Ukrainians to defend themselves, and that is what we do with this legislation.

The Ukrainian people are asking for our help to stop Russia's efforts to sever their country. They are not asking us to do any of the fighting for them. They are only asking us for the defensive weapons that they need to defend themselves. And by passing this bipartisan resolution overwhelmingly, the House will send a strong message to the administration that it must act quickly and decisively if the U.S. is to help the Ukrainian people save their country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to my good friend from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution offered by my friend, the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and supported strongly by the chairman of the committee and the former chair of the committee, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

This resolution is bipartisan and reflects the will of Congress that the nation of Ukraine deserves every opportunity to chart a future based on democracy, territorial integrity, and freedom from Russian aggression.

I am the former chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, signed in Helsinki in August of 1975. In that agreement, the then-Soviet Union and 34 other nations signed a document which said that you could not change borders by other than peaceful means.

Vladimir Putin has broken that agreement, but he has also broken the agreement that, in 1994, we entered into with Ukraine in consideration of their giving up their nuclear weapons. Vladimir Putin has sent Russian troops into another nation. He has tried to mask it. He has tried the pretense that this is simply separatists who are active; but, very frankly, those troops in Ukraine have admitted to the press that they are from Russia.

Vladimir Putin's support for violent separatists has destabilized a large region in eastern Ukraine and has led to the illegal—illegal—Russian occupation of Crimea. And the world hasn't done much to discourage not only the actions of Mr. Putin, but others who would learn the lessons of his actions.

The sanctions that the United States and its allies have imposed against Putin and his closest supporters, as well as measures to isolate Russian businesses that have enabled this aggression, are having serious effects, but not yet the effect that we want.

I believe that our Nation also has a responsibility to stand shoulder-to-shoulder with the people of Ukraine and their democratically elected government by sending them the tools they need to defend themselves. This is not a new position for me. When the Serbs effected a genocide in Bosnia Herzegovina, we had an arms embargo on the people of Bosnia while arms were flowing in from other parts of the world to Serbia. I thought that was wrong.

I think today the unwillingness or inability to create a consensus for giving to a people the ability to defend themselves is not good policy. If we continue to do so, there is no doubt in my mind that Mr. Putin will continue on his path of aggression and acquisition.

Mr. Speaker, we must continue to support Ukraine on its march towards greater democracy, stronger human rights, and a brighter future for its people. I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this resolution.

□ 1715

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding and for his sponsorship of this resolution with Mr. ENGEL and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mr. Speaker, ISIL is on the march. Civil war appears imminent in Yemen. Libya has now become a full-fledged terrorist training center threatening all of north Africa. And Iran moves closer to nuclear capacity every day. So it is understandable that the attention of the media and the American people seem to be focused elsewhere other than on Ukraine.

But I just returned a week ago from leading a bipartisan delegation of the Defense Appropriations Committee to Ukraine, and I am here to report that the situation there is downright alarming.

Today, weeks after agreeing to a cease-fire, Vladimir Putin is using Ukraine as a test bed for a new type of warfare by using proxy insurgents and Russian special forces, army troops, to carry out his campaign to reclaim Ukraine as part of the old Russian empire. After annexing Crimea a year ago, he is transforming that peninsula into a heavily armed Russian camp—a platform indeed.

Mr. Speaker, blankets, night-vision goggles, and meals that are ready to eat are not enough. Ukraine needs non-NATO ally military support, and it needs it now.

Ukraine's courageous President, Petro Poroshenko, appealed to us again to provide lethal weaponry—antitank weapons, small arms, and anti-aircraft systems—to help them defend their territory from the Russian onslaught. It is all about preserving and protecting Ukraine's independence. That is what this is all about: the largest country in Europe. He knows he cannot win a war against Russia, but he believes that the

lethal support will at least raise the price of aggression for Russia.

I think our committee tends to agree. Our delegation left Kiev believing that the future of Ukraine is a matter of significant importance to the national security of these United States.

My colleagues, Western and Eastern Europeans are watching intensely with apprehension how our President responds. They are looking closely, as are our adversaries and the Russian leadership. What future steps will they take if we do not act now?

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to show the leadership, our President, and this administration that this resolution makes sense. They need to give Ukraine this non-NATO ally support, and they need to do it now.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), my good friend.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Ladies and gentlemen, on the bleached bones of many past great nations are written those pathetic words: Too late. Too late. We moved too late to save them.

History is cluttered with them. We are almost at that point with Ukraine. Anyone who has followed the Russian model under Putin knows full well what his aim is to reclaim that territory, that empire, of the old Soviet Union. Now, if Ukraine goes, what happens to Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia? And just today in the news we hear where Russia has threatened a nuclear response, I believe it is, to Denmark.

Now, what is happening in the world? The world now is a very dark, a very dangerous, and a very evil place. And when those three things get together, there must be that shining light on the hill that shows the way out of the darkness. Throughout history, that light has been the United States of America.

We must act here. Let us hope that President Obama will hear our plea as Democrats and as Republicans. We have got to help save Ukraine from Russia.

I serve on the NATO Parliamentary Assembly. For 12 years I have served on NATO. I have served as the chairman of the Science and Technology Committee.

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

Mr. ENGEL. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. I am here to tell you, ladies and gentlemen, if we don't act here, there will be a devastation on the European continent the likes of which we have not seen since World War II. We don't need to repeat that. Let us rise to this occasion. Let us do the right thing. Let us be that shining light on the hill that shows the way out of this darkness.

Mr. Speaker, there are some times in life you have just got to stand up to the bully. The United States must stand up to Putin and let him know

that there is a light in this world, and the United States is going to show the way. The best way to do that today is to pass this resolution, and let's send Ukraine the military help that they need to protect themselves and the legacy of this fine country.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to close.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I will close now, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me say that by passing this resolution, the House sends a clear message of support and solidarity to the people of Ukraine. It is past time that our government does more to help these true friends of liberty defend their land and deter aggression. I know that if the United States shows leadership here, others will follow.

I am very pleased to be the primary sponsor of this important resolution. I thank Chairman ROYCE for working with me on this. The two of us have worked very, very closely together, particularly on Ukraine, and we both feel very, very strongly. I agree with every comment that was uttered today by all the people speaking on this resolution.

We are the United States of America. We are a beacon of freedom to the world, and if we don't act now, who will? Again, let me reiterate: the people of Ukraine are not looking for American troops, and they are not looking for American boots on the ground. There is no slippery slope here. They are just looking for the weapons to defend themselves. They don't have those weapons. We do. If we care about freedom and we care about fighting aggression, we need to give the people of Ukraine the right and the means to defend themselves. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this very important resolution.

I again thank Chairman ROYCE, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just go to the words that Mr. DAVID SCOTT reminded us that echo down through history: Too late. Too late.

We have given the authority to the administration many months ago to transfer defensive weapons to Ukraine that can be used to check further aggression. That has not happened. This bipartisan resolution will direct the administration to take that step so that Ukrainians can defend themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote for this bipartisan resolution urging the administration to provide this crucial assistance to Ukraine before it is, in fact, too late for the Ukrainians to defend themselves.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 162, a resolution which urges the President to utilize his authority, granted by Congress in December of last year, to begin providing military aid to the government of Ukraine.

Since the February 2014 Revolution in which the corrupt then-Ukrainian President

Viktor Yanukovich fled the country, the Russian Federation has made every effort through political, economic, and military means to subvert both the independence and the democratic aspirations of the Ukrainian people.

I strongly support the current policy of the United States not to recognize the absorption of Crimea into Russia through referendum—a referendum that took place against the backdrop of masked gunmen, widely believed to be unmarked Russian special forces, commandeering Crimean government buildings and intimidating voters.

In a recently aired Russian television documentary, President Putin acknowledges that plans were already in place to reabsorb Crimea into Russian territory weeks before the March 2014 referendum was held.

Russia has covertly infiltrated sovereign Ukrainian territory repeatedly, providing tanks, artillery, and rockets to separatist militias, which has resulted in a conflict leaving over 6,000 dead, 15,000 wounded, and more than a million displaced persons.

Mr. Speaker, Russia is openly breeding opposition to Ukrainian democracy through its veiled support of separatists, who on July 17, 2014, destroyed Malaysia Airlines Flight 17, a civilian airliner, utilizing a Russian-made missile which took the lives of all 298 innocent persons on board.

The United States has already made available to Ukraine economic and non-lethal equipment meant to shore up the country from Russian-backed rebels.

However, it is clear now that Russia has no intention of ceasing aggression against the democratic government of Ukraine.

The time has come for the United States to provide military aid to Ukraine to shore up its military, a military under assault by these Russian-backed separatists who have repeatedly broken their promises for a ceasefire against the democratic nation of Ukraine.

This military aid was requested by Ukraine's democratically elected president Petro Poroshenko, in a joint meeting of Congress on September 14, 2014, and is endorsed by both Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Martin Dempsey and Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has no intention of allowing Russia to redraw international borders as it pleases and subverting the democracy of our Ukrainian ally.

That is why I strongly support this resolution giving President Obama explicit authorization to provide military aid to the Ukrainian government.

With this aid, the United States is affirming its continued support of the Government of Ukrainian in its struggle to resist this heinous aggression from Russia.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members to join me in voting for this resolution.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bipartisan resolution urging the President to provide defensive weapons to Ukraine.

This week marks the one-year anniversary of Russia's annexation of Crimea and it has been almost a year-and-a-half since the protests in Maidan where the Ukrainian people stood together demanding a democratic and sovereign state. This past year-and-a-half has been a somber time for all of us, as we learn of the 6,000 deaths, the millions of wounded and displaced, and the enormous suffering endured by the Ukrainian people.

Now more than ever, the United States needs to stand with Ukraine by providing defensive weapons to help Ukraine counter Russian aggression and move past the current crisis. We should provide defense provisions, such as anti-tank weapons, counter-artillery radars, and ammunition to counter Russia-backed separatists. In doing so, we show solidarity with the Ukrainian people who have demonstrated their willingness to do their part, and we make it more difficult for Russia to wage a proxy war against Ukraine while publicly denying it.

To be sure, there is no quick or military solution to the problem. Defensive weapons alone cannot shield Ukraine from Russia's aggression—but they can help the Ukrainian effort in continuing to build a sovereign state, free from Russia's interference. And there is much more we can do. We should provide humanitarian assistance to embattled regions, help train the judiciary and law enforcement, and share our expertise in law and medicine.

I have tremendous hope for Ukraine's future. Its people have shown time and again their determination to build a democratic Ukraine with prosperity shared by all Ukrainians. Let us help them now with the defensive weapons they need.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 162.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CONDEMNING THE ATTACK ON THE NIGERIAN TOWN OF BAGA

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 53) condemning the cowardly attack on innocent men, women, and children in the northeastern Nigerian town of Baga, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 53

Whereas on the night of January 3, 2015, the terrorist group Boko Haram launched a horrific attack on innocent men, women, and children in the northeastern Nigerian town of Baga;

Whereas the terrorists of Boko Haram used assault rifles, grenade launchers, and fire to slaughter innocent civilians and the scope of casualties in this one attack totals in the hundreds and possibly thousands;

Whereas some nongovernmental organizations have described the attack in Baga as the terrorist group's "deadliest massacre" to date;

Whereas Nigerian security forces have been largely unable to prevent Boko Haram's territorial advances in the northeast since July 2014;

Whereas human rights groups have indicated that the Nigerian state security forces should improve efforts to protect civilians during offensive operations against Boko Haram;

Whereas this Islamist terrorist group, designated as a United States Foreign Terrorist Organization in November 2013, has killed over 5,000 people in Nigeria in 2014 alone and displaced over 1,000,000 innocent people;

Whereas Boko Haram has launched attacks in the neighboring countries of Cameroon, Niger, and Chad;

Whereas Boko Haram's leadership has voiced support for and received some funding and training from other Islamist terrorist groups, such as al Qaeda and its affiliates, and has recently embraced propaganda tactics similar to the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL);

Whereas Boko Haram's leadership pledged official allegiance to ISIL, which ISIL has publicly accepted;

Whereas Boko Haram has abducted hundreds of civilians, using women and children as slaves, subjecting them to sexual abuse, and deploying them as suicide bombers, and forcibly recruiting boys as child soldiers;

Whereas Boko Haram has threatened to disrupt the Nigerian elections and attacks such as the one in Baga may result in many Nigerians being unable to vote in the upcoming national elections;

Whereas election-related violence in Nigeria has occurred in successive elections, including in 2011, when nearly 800 people died and some 65,000 were displaced in clashes following the presidential election;

Whereas President Goodluck Jonathan, Major General (retired) Muhammadu Buhari, and other presidential candidates signed the "Abuja Accord" on January 14, 2015, committing themselves and their campaigns to refrain from public statements that incite violence, to run on issue-based platforms that do not seek to divide citizens along religious or ethnic lines, and to support the impartial conduct of the electoral commission and the security services;

Whereas Secretary of State John Kerry traveled to Nigeria on January 25, 2015, to emphasize the importance of ensuring the upcoming elections are peaceful, nonviolent, and credible;

Whereas Nigeria was scheduled to hold national elections on February 14, 2015, but the elections were postponed for 6 weeks and are now scheduled for March 28, 2015;

Whereas political tensions in the country are high, and either electoral fraud or violence could undermine the credibility of the upcoming election;

Whereas Nigeria is Africa's largest economy, biggest oil producer, and most populous nation, making it an influential country in the region; and

Whereas Nigeria is an important partner of the United States and it is in the best interest of the United States to maintain close ties with Nigeria: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its strong support for the people of Nigeria, especially the men, women, and children in northeastern Nigeria, including the town of Baga, who have been terrorized, abducted, trafficked, and murdered by the terrorist group Boko Haram;

(2) condemns Boko Haram for its violent attacks on civilian targets, including schools, mosques, churches, villages, and markets in Nigeria;

(3) expresses concern about the possibility of an expanded relationship between Boko Haram and ISIL in light of Boko Haram's pledge of allegiance to ISIL;

(4) encourages the Government of Nigeria to strengthen efforts to protect civilians

from the terrorists of Boko Haram, including through cooperation with neighboring countries and other international actors;

(5) urges all political candidates to uphold the commitments outlined in the "Abuja Accord" and the Government of Nigeria to hold their elections without further delay on March 28, 2015;

(6) remains committed to protecting democratic principles and universal human rights worldwide;

(7) supports United States assistance to the Government of Nigeria to combat Boko Haram and search for those who have been abducted by Boko Haram; and

(8) applauds the countries of the region and the African Union for their efforts to establish a regional security force, which will include Chad, Niger, Nigeria, Cameroon, and Benin, to combat Boko Haram and supports offers of robust security assistance to strengthen the force's capacity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous materials in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as always, I very much appreciate the assistance of Mr. ENGEL in moving this resolution today to the House floor, and I commend Ms. KELLY, a new member of the committee, for her focus on this important issue. The Africa Subcommittee chairman, CHRIS SMITH, and the ranking member of that committee, KAREN BASS, have also done in-depth work on Nigeria, and on Boko Haram in particular. I appreciate their travels to Nigeria.

Mr. Speaker, Nigeria holds a critical presidential election this weekend. It is expected to be the continent's most consequential political event in years. Africa's most populous nation has over 70 million registered voters who will report to more than 100,000 polling stations.

I had the opportunity, with DON PAYNE, to lead a delegation years ago with election observer responsibility there for one of these national elections in Nigeria, along with General Colin Powell at the time.

Let me tell you, the political environment is always tense, but it is especially tense now. The leading candidates are neck and neck, as was the case then.

I just have to say that we have seen Nigeria transition from military rule to democracy in the election that General Powell and I witnessed, and that was a very peaceful—very peaceful—time. But recent elections in Nigeria have seen political violence, and we are right to be concerned.

This resolution urges all political candidates to respect their pledges of nonviolence and insist that the government hold a free, fair, and credible election, and that they do so on time. This election date has already been postponed once.

Meanwhile, Nigeria continues to face grave insecurity in the north at the hands of Boko Haram, which loosely translates to “Western education is sin.” This Islamist terrorist organization indiscriminately kills in mass and pillages villages in their quest to establish a sharia state. Satellite images document that after Boko Haram comes through, villages are literally wiped off the map.

The group is responsible for 5,000 deaths last year, in 2014, and displacing over 1 million people last year, making this organization, by the way, one of the world’s most deadly. But this weekend, forces fighting Boko Haram reported discovering another hundred bodies in a shallow mass grave. We don’t really know how many they have killed out there in total, but we know that the killing continues.

Mr. Speaker, after watching Boko Haram’s violence, I wasn’t surprised to see that that group pledges allegiance to ISIS. ISIS publicly accepted the overture claiming this new relationship expands their self-declared caliphate to west Africa. At the same time, we have seen Boko Haram’s propaganda increase in quality, mimicking the production of ISIS videos sweeping what we call the virtual caliphate on the Internet.

So the good news, Mr. Speaker, is that Nigeria’s neighbors, Chad, Niger, and Cameroon, have all been making progress in the fight against Boko Haram under a newly established African Union regional force.

□ 1730

They have rescued more than 30 northern Nigerian towns to date from Boko Haram and from that harsh rule. This is a good beginning, but this African Union regional force lacks equipment and it lacks training. This resolution expresses the House’s support for robust security assistance to these troops in their fight against Boko Haram.

Nevertheless, we cannot rely solely on other countries in the region. Nigeria’s security forces should have the lead role to play. If dismantling Boko Haram is the goal, we need a well-trained, well-equipped Nigerian military. We must make sure there are no impediments, legislative or otherwise, to providing this much-needed assistance.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong support of H. Res. 53.

I would like to begin by commending our colleague ROBIN KELLY, our colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee. She is a new member of the committee. We are delighted to have

her. I want to commend her for introducing this important resolution, which condemns the brutal terrorist group Boko Haram and calls for free, fair, and on-time elections in Nigeria.

I also want to commend our colleague FREDERICA WILSON of Florida, who has raised this issue more than anyone else time and time and time again with resolutions on the House floor and just in general. So I want to thank Ms. WILSON of Florida.

I want to thank CHRIS SMITH and KAREN BASS of our committee, the Africa Subcommittee, who have also together pushed for a resolution of importance as this.

For 5 years, Mr. Speaker, Boko Haram has torn a path of violence and destruction across northeastern Nigeria, ruthlessly killing civilians, kidnapping children, and looting and destroying towns. In the last year, they have started to swallow up territory and, just a few weeks ago, they pledged allegiance to ISIS, the Islamic State.

The Nigerian Government has a responsibility to protect its citizens, but, obviously, it hasn’t done nearly enough to confront this horrific group. Only in the past month, with Presidential elections looming, has Nigeria seemed to get more serious about turning back the tide of Boko Haram.

In recent weeks, neighboring countries, including Chad, Niger, and Cameroon, have stepped up their efforts to combat the group, and we have seen real results. In some cases, troops in those nations have had to occupy towns they have liberated inside Nigeria because Nigerian forces simply aren’t showing up to do their part. That is, obviously, disgraceful.

Instead of providing professional security forces and long-term economic investment into a long neglected region of the country, what I see are last minute political stunts to persuade Nigerian voters to reelect President Jonathan.

That brings me to the second subject of this resolution: Nigeria’s upcoming elections. Presidential elections were supposed to take place on February 14, but were delayed until March 28 because of concerns about Boko Haram. Many believe this delay was politically motivated. Elections lacking legitimacy in Nigeria, which is Africa’s most populous nation, could, obviously, send a destabilizing shock wave across the continent.

This resolution urges the Government of Nigeria to hold elections on March 28, without further delay, and for all parties to refrain from violence.

Mr. Speaker, Nigeria is a huge nation. It is the largest nation populationwise in Africa. What happens in Nigeria is very important. What happens in Nigeria counts. Nigeria needs to set a strong example for the region and for the continent by holding credible elections and by getting serious about Boko Haram. Nigeria needs to send a very strong message about that.

I strongly support this resolution and urge all my colleagues to support it as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD), chairman of the Information Technology Subcommittee of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

I had the honor of serving my country for almost a decade as an undercover officer in the CIA. I was in the back alleys and bazaars of South Asia and the Middle East. I was the guy recruiting spies and stealing secrets and collecting intelligence on threats to our homeland, so I know a little something about dealing with bad guys. I looked our enemies in their eyes and I know what they were capable of.

Those who are committed to spreading terror, murdering and destroying the lives of the innocent, such as Boko Haram, cannot be reasoned with because they are not reasonable. They cannot be bargained with because they do not value the lives of others. They have nothing to lose. Only their destruction will stop their reign of terror over the men, women, and children of northeastern Nigeria.

So I encourage the United States to help. Let’s help Nigeria and other nations, such as Chad, Niger, and Cameroon, to help their citizens. When terrorists such as Boko Haram are allowed to operate unchecked, our world is less safe and less free.

As the greatest and the freest Nation in the world, let’s extend a hand to our friends in Nigeria and let them know that we stand with them in this war on terror.

I want to thank the chairman for this resolution. And I want to thank my colleague from Illinois, Congressman ROBIN KELLY, for her hard work and leadership on this resolution.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, my friend.

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me, with enthusiasm, thank the chairman of the full committee, Mr. ROYCE, and the ranking member, both my friends, and my friend from New York (Mr. ENGEL). We have worked together on a number of issues.

I am both a student of Nigeria and a Member of Congress who has one of the largest—I am being polite. I believe I have the largest population of Nigerian Americans in my congressional area, which is in Houston, Texas. And we are very proud of the contributions that Africans from the continent but, in particular, in this instance, Nigerian Americans have made over the years.

I am also privileged to chair with Congressman CHABOT the Nigerian Caucus. I invite my colleagues to join because Nigeria is the largest population and I think the largest economy. I know that South Africa has been touted as such, but the numbers go up and down. There are many good people in Nigeria who want a better education for their children and for that economy to help develop all of Nigeria.

I represent a number of energy companies who have been in Nigeria for at least half a century. But, more importantly, we have seen Nigeria do some very positive things. And might I first make sure that I mention Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY, who I know is en route. I want to thank her for her leadership on this legislation. I am delighted to cosponsor. I had likewise introduced legislation that was legislation sponsored by myself and Congressman CHABOT. But I am delighted to have the opportunity to support this legislation, which is, in essence, a combination of our points about Nigeria. And also to acknowledge Congresswoman CAROLYN MALONEY and Congresswoman FREDERICA WILSON, whom we have been working together with on Boko Haram.

My point is that Nigeria has had some positive successes. It is one of the only and first states on the continent to fight and successfully overcome Ebola, to have the kind of medical care and science to make sure that they eliminated Ebola in Nigeria, even though one of the first cases was in Nigeria by way of someone traveling to Nigeria.

Of course, we have faced a crisis not of the making of the Nigerian people but in a northern state, unfortunately through the misunderstandings and the horrors of believing—not only believing but evidence—that the resources of Nigeria did not reach northern state, Bono state. ISIS was able to root its evilness. And, of course, it has been in Nigeria for a period of time.

However, the acts of Boko Haram came to our attention with the taking of 165-plus girls and boys that we all know in terms of the tragedy of taking the girls.

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

Mr. ENGEL. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 2 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman.

And we began this campaign of “bring the girls back.”

In the spring of 2014, I led a bipartisan delegation to Bono state and met with families whose girls had been taken and whose girls were still taken. I met with Jubilee, an organization that had saved some of the girls and were educating them here.

This resolution is particularly important because it tracks the legislation I authored, H. Res. 143, and condemns the cowardly acts of what has occurred through Boko Haram, particularly in the town of Baga, where it is alleged

that thousands were killed. It also focuses on the Nigerian election, where we are asking that the elections pending this weekend will be held expeditiously and safely.

I want to mention that we understand that Boko Haram is a heinous evil group that kills children and men and women and innocent persons and burns down villages and intimidates people who just want democracy and an opportunity to live. That means these elections are crucial. And those who stand for election, they must stand for democracy and the ending of the siege of Boko Haram in whatever way it can be.

Let me express my gratefulness to the African Union, of which I raised a question with them, led by Chad and Nigeria and other countries to fight off the siege of Boko Haram. But let me be very clear that Boko Haram wants to be associated with ISIS. They want to continue to be heinous and evil and dangerous. They must be weeded out, and the continent of Africa must stand with them.

I do want to acknowledge that there has been a victims fund set up. It is important for the Government of Nigeria to fund that victims fund and use that victims fund for the broken families and broken children. We know that Boko Haram has caused the death of over 9,000 persons.

This resolution asks for the recognition of the dangers of Boko Haram and the elimination of Boko Haram and the safety and security of a strong election.

Mr. Speaker, as I close, let me simply say that I urge the candidates to stand for peaceful elections. I urge the people to exercise their right to vote. I urge the international community to continue to support and promote a safe and free and fair election. And I urge the winner to bring people together and to stop this horrible siege.

I ask my colleagues to support the resolution, H. Res. 53.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong and enthusiastic support of H. Res. 53, a resolution condemning the cowardly attack on innocent men, women and children in the Northeastern Nigerian town of Baga.

This resolution also urges the Government of Nigeria to hold a safe, free, and fair election on March 28, 2015.

I thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for their commitment to peace, security, stability, justice and democracy around the world in general and in Nigeria in particular, and for shepherding this important resolution to the floor.

I also thank the gentlelady from Illinois, Congresswoman KELLY, for introducing this resolution which I am proud to co-sponsor.

Also I want to thank the Ranking member KAREN BARR and Chairman SMITH of the African Sub-Committee.

Mr. Speaker, many of us are very passionate about this very important issue of peace, security, stability and democracy in Nigeria.

Nigeria, a regional giant and one of Africa's largest economies, possesses abundant nat-

ural resources and a historically capable military force which has provided regional stability and humanitarian support to its African neighbors and other countries around the world.

We also recognize that peace, security and a stable economy in Nigeria have a great bearing on global peace, security and stability because of its posture in the African continent.

Mr. Speaker, since I have been in Congress, I have worked to promote peace, security, stability, democracy and economic empowerment in Nigeria.

Indeed, earlier this year, I authored H. Res. 143, a resolution urging the government of Nigeria to move forward expeditiously with national general elections.

Also, last year in response to the devastating kidnapping of the Chibok school girls, I led a bipartisan congressional delegation to Nigeria, along with my colleagues FREDERICA WILSON, Steve Stockman and LOIS FRANKEL.

While we were in Nigeria, we met with key stakeholders for peace in Nigeria: political, community and civil society leaders.

During our meeting with these leaders on the ground in Nigeria, we called for the creation of a Nigerian fund to compensate the victims of the Boko Haram attacks, starting with the families of the kidnapped schoolgirls.

Thus, H. Res. 53, the resolution offered by Congresswoman KELLY, is a continuation of prior concerted efforts to catalyze peace, security, stability, and free and fair elections in Nigeria.

Mr. Speaker, Nigeria's efforts to adhere to democratic political processes, including safe, free, and fair elections are under direct attack by the terrorist group Boko Haram.

Boko Haram's terroristic activities are intended to wreak havoc on and incite fear on the part of the Nigerian people in order that they stay away from the polls.

These violent threats by Boko Haram are in direct derogation of the constitutionally protected rights of the Nigerian people to exercise their right to vote.

For instance, Boko Haram has caused the death of over 9,000 persons, according to a report by the Council on Foreign Relations and over 1.5 million persons have been displaced in Nigeria and regionally as reported by Amnesty International.

In addition to the kidnapping of children such as the school girls from the Government Girls Secondary School in the Northeastern province of Chibok, Boko Haram has become more brazen with children now being used as bomb shields as recent news reports inform us.

Boko Haram is decapitating and slicing the throats of women, leaving them for dead.

These terrorists have taken over villages, raping, pillaging and stealing the resources of innocent villagers who are not able to defend themselves.

Mr. Speaker, Boko Haram is a rogue bully and terrorist organization that needs to be dismantled and defeated.

Nigeria's success in combatting national and regional extremism is critical to the security not only the Nigerian and African people but of the United States and the global community.

Our commitment to promoting democracy and security in Nigeria and Africa continues to be underscored by each and every cowardly brutal act by Boko Haram.

It is critically important that we remain steadfast in our resolve to defeat Boko Haram

in view of the fact that this band of cowards and terrorists has now cast its lot with ISIS.

Today, by this resolution, the United States stands in solidarity with the Nigerian people in condemning Boko Haram and supporting a government that promotes peace, security, stability and democracy in Nigeria.

We stand together in promoting the Nigerian people's constitutional right to exercise their right to vote and have their voices heard.

Today, 5 days before March 28, the National elections, a historical day for the country of Nigeria, I have four concluding points to make:

1. I urge Presidential candidates Goodluck Johnathan and Muhammadu Buhari to adhere to the 2015 Abuja Accord to avoid any conduct or behavior that will endanger the political stability and national security of Nigeria and fully abide by all rules and regulations as laid down in the legal framework for elections in Nigeria;

2. I urge the Nigerian people to exercise their right to vote and promote peace as they engage in this sacred act of lending their voices to the political process which will affect their future and the future of Nigerian youth;

3. I urge the international community to continue to support and promote a safe, free and fair election in Nigeria and sustainable democracy to promote economic upward mobility in Nigeria and opportunities for youth; and

4. I urge the winner of the national election, whomever he may be to protect the Nigerian people from the scourge of Boko Haram, and to help find the abducted girls and work with the United States and regional governments in Africa to contain and ultimately defeat Boko Haram.

Mr. Speaker, peace in Nigeria requires democratic elections, the creative weapons of transparency, peace coalition building, addressing grievances, negotiations, the use of social media, infrastructure building and political intellectual capital building.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY), the author of this resolution.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for their bipartisan leadership in helping bring the attention of Congress to the vile acts of the terror group Boko Haram.

This weekend, the international community received the sickening news that a mass grave with beheaded remains was uncovered in formerly Boko Haram-held territory in northern Nigeria.

It still stands that America will never tolerate terrorism, and this Congress will never abide terrorists. Despite their beliefs, a few things about Boko Haram are quite clear to the world.

Abubakar Shekau's acts are cowardly. He remains a man who fears the power of the people of Nigeria, a man afraid of the promise and potential of girls who are educated and whose minds will change the world.

History will not celebrate Boko Haram because they are on the wrong side of it. They have mistaken cow-

ardice for courage, and their crimes against innocent men, women, and children cannot be forgiven.

It has been 10 months since the world demanded that Boko Haram bring back the 200 school girls they kidnapped because they wanted to be educated. They defied these calls.

Boko Haram has murdered scores of innocent Nigerians—an estimated 17,000 since 2011. And this month, we received the news that they have sworn allegiance to ISIS.

I, like so many across the world, was outraged at the brutality and senselessness of Boko Haram's crimes. Victimizing innocent men, women, and children for perverse ideological gain will never be tolerated or treated as just by the international community.

With our vote today, this committee and this Congress can affirm that we stand for the human rights, dignity, and security of the Nigerian people; that we will not tolerate a world in which Boko Haram, or any terrorist organization, can slaughter innocent civilians; that we respect the right of women to be educated without the threat of violence; and that we support free and fair elections free of suppression and intimidation.

□ 1745

We say this positively on this House floor, and we stand today with the force and confidence that is much stronger than groups of the likes of Boko Haram.

I thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL, Congresswoman FREDERICA WILSON for her constant leadership on this issue, Congressman WILL HURD of Texas for being the first to come across the aisle and lend his name to this resolution, and I thank all of the other Members who stood up and spoke out against the cowardly acts of Boko Haram and ISIS. I urge my colleagues to pass this important resolution.

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

In our committee, we heard the testimony of Deborah Peters, a young girl from northern Nigeria. She survived, but she was tied to her father's body and her brothers, who were massacred by Boko Haram.

She came to tell us about what it was like, of her girlfriends or her schoolmates, of course, who have never been returned and of her chilling account of the practices committed as that village was decimated—"decimated" is not the right word—as that village was eliminated.

I mean, we are talking about communities here—villages—in which there are a handful of survivors when Boko Haram comes through, of young people like Deborah who are left with a world shattered, with their families massacred and, in her case, in front of her very eyes.

Now, as this country of Nigeria prepares for elections, this insurgency that is burning in the north is creating

a huge problem. U.S. support for the African Union force, which is making some gains in stomping out Boko Haram's violent march, has got to be stepped up. The region's stability depends on it.

In the meantime, I just want to say that the presidential election in Nigeria is going to be critical not just for Nigeria, but for the region. Nigeria has the largest population and the largest economy. The outcome could have a far-reaching impact.

This resolution puts the House's views on record, and I thank Ms. KELLY for that. It spells out the need for a nonviolent, free, and fair election. Not only do I thank her for drafting this resolution, but I thank her and ELIOT ENGEL and CHRIS SMITH and all of our committee members who have been focused on Nigeria and Boko Haram.

It is a necessity that we devote more time and energy to this mission of trying to figure out how we can bring support to the Nigerian military in their effort to suppress Boko Haram.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

In closing, I would like to, once again, thank Congresswoman KELLY and, certainly, Chairman ROYCE, along with other Members who have worked on this issue—I mentioned FREDERICA WILSON—for helping to highlight the major challenges facing Nigeria today. Nigeria is a critical ally of the United States, and Congress must stay strongly engaged on these key issues of democracy and security pertaining to Nigeria.

Lastly, let me thank the leadership for moving this resolution to the floor in a timely manner before the upcoming election in Nigeria. I urge a "yes" vote.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 53, as amended.

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

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "A resolution condemning the cowardly attacks on innocent men, women, and children in northeastern Nigeria by Boko Haram and urging a peaceful and credible national election".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 360, by the yeas and nays,

House Resolution 162, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING ASSISTANCE AND SELF-DETERMINATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 360) to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 297, nays 98, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 130]

YEAS—297

Abraham	Clay	Dold
Adams	Cleaver	Duckworth
Aguilar	Clyburn	Duffy
Amodei	Coffman	Edwards
Ashford	Cole	Ellison
Bass	Collins (NY)	Ellmers (NC)
Beatty	Comstock	Engel
Becerra	Conaway	Eshoo
Benishkeh	Connolly	Esty
Bera	Conyers	Farr
Beyer	Cook	Fattah
Bilirakis	Cooper	Fincher
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Fitzpatrick
Blum	Costello (PA)	Forbes
Bonamici	Courtney	Fortenberry
Bost	Cramer	Foster
Brady (PA)	Crawford	Frankel (FL)
Brady (TX)	Crenshaw	Frelinghuysen
Brooks (IN)	Crowley	Fudge
Brownley (CA)	Cuellar	Gabbard
Bustos	Cummings	Gallego
Butterfield	Curbelo (FL)	Garrett
Calvert	Davis (CA)	Gibbs
Capps	Davis, Rodney	Gibson
Capuano	DeFazio	Gowdy
Cárdenas	DeGette	Graham
Carney	Delaney	Grayson
Carson (IN)	DeLauro	Green, Al
Cartwright	DelBene	Green, Gene
Castor (FL)	Denham	Grijalva
Castro (TX)	Dent	Guinta
Chabot	DeSaulnier	Guthrie
Chu, Judy	Deutch	Hahn
Cicilline	Diaz-Balart	Hanna
Clark (MA)	Dingell	Harper
Clarke (NY)	Doggett	Hastings

Heck (NV)	Marino	Sanchez, Loretta
Heck (WA)	Matsui	Sarbanes
Hensarling	McCarthy	Schakowsky
Herrera Beutler	McCollum	Schiff
Higgins	McDermott	Schock
Hill	McGovern	Schrader
Himes	McHenry	Schweikert
Honda	McKinley	Scott (VA)
Hoyer	McMorris	Scott, David
Hudson	Rodgers	Serrano
Huffman	McNerney	Sessions
Huizenga (MI)	McSally	Sewell (AL)
Hunter	Meadows	Sherman
Hurd (TX)	Meehan	Shimkus
Hurt (VA)	Meeke	Shuster
Israel	Meng	Simpson
Issa	Messer	Sinema
Jackson Lee	Miller (MI)	Sires
Jeffries	Moolenaar	Slaughter
Jenkins (KS)	Moore	Smith (MO)
Jenkins (WV)	Moulton	Smith (NE)
Johnson (GA)	Mullin	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (OH)	Murphy (FL)	Smith (TX)
Johnson, E. B.	Murphy (PA)	Speier
Johnson, Sam	Nadler	Stefanik
Joyce	Napolitano	Stivers
Kaptur	Neal	Swalwell (CA)
Katko	Neugebauer	Takai
Keating	Noem	Takano
Kelly (IL)	Nolan	Thompson (CA)
Kennedy	Norcross	Thompson (MS)
Kildee	Nugent	Thompson (PA)
Kilmer	Nunes	Thornberry
Kind	O'Rourke	Tiberi
King (NY)	Pallone	Tipton
Kline	Pascrell	Titus
Kuster	Paulsen	Tonko
LaMalfa	Pearce	Torres
Lance	Pelosi	Trott
Langevin	Perlmutter	Tsongas
Larsen (WA)	Peters	Turner
Larson (CT)	Peterson	Upton
Latta	Pingree	Valadao
Lawrence	Pocan	Van Hollen
Lee	Poliquin	Vargas
Levin	Polis	Veasey
Lewis	Posey	Vela
Lieu, Ted	Price (NC)	Visclosky
LoBiondo	Price, Tom	Walden
Loeb sack	Quigley	Walters, Mimi
Lofgren	Rangel	Walz
Long	Reed	Wasserman
Lowenthal	Reichert	Schultz
Lowe y	Rice (NY)	Watson Coleman
Lucas	Rigell	Webster (FL)
Luetkemeyer	Roby	Welch
Lujan Grisham	Rogers (KY)	Whitfield
(NM)	Rooney (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Lujan, Ben Ray	Ros-Lehtinen	Womack
(NM)	Ross	Yarmuth
Lummis	Roybal-Allard	Young (AK)
Lynch	Ruppersberger	Young (IA)
Maloney,	Ryan (WI)	Young (IN)
Carolyn	Sánchez, Linda	Zeldin
Maloney, Sean	T.	Zinke

NAYS—98

Aderholt	Foxx	Newhouse
Allen	Franks (AZ)	Olson
Amash	Gohmert	Palazzo
Babin	Goodlatte	Palmer
Barletta	Gosar	Perry
Barr	Graves (GA)	Pittenger
Barton	Graves (LA)	Pitts
Bishop (MI)	Griffith	Poe (TX)
Black	Grothman	Ratcliffe
Blackburn	Hardy	Renacci
Boustany	Harris	Ribble
Brat	Hartzler	Rice (SC)
Bridenstine	Hice, Jody B.	Rohrabacher
Brooks (AL)	Holding	Rokita
Buck	Huelskamp	Rothfus
Bucshon	Jolly	Rouzer
Burgess	Jones	Royce
Byrne	Jordan	Russell
Carter (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Salmon
Carter (TX)	Kinzinger (IL)	Sanford
Clawson (FL)	Kirkpatrick	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Culberson	Loudermillk	Stutzman
DeSantis	MacArthur	Velázquez
DesJarlais	Marchant	Wagner
Duncan (TN)	Massie	Walker
Emmer (MN)	McCauley	Walters, Maxine
Farenthold	Mica	Weber (TX)
Fleischmann	Miller (FL)	Wenstrup
Fleming	Mooney (WV)	Westerman
Flores	Mulvaney	

Westmoreland	Williams	Wittman	Woodall	Yoder	Yoho
--------------	----------	---------	---------	-------	------

NOT VOTING—37

Bishop (UT)	Granger	Richmond
Blumenauer	Graves (MO)	Roe (TN)
Boyle, Brendan	Gutiérrez	Rogers (AL)
F.	Hinojosa	Roskam
Brown (FL)	Hultgren	Ruiz
Buchanan	King (IA)	Rush
Chaffetz	Knight	Ryan (OH)
Cohen	Labrador	Scalise
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Doyle, Michael	Love	Stewart
F.	McClintock	Walberg
Duncan (SC)	Payne	Walorski
Garamendi	Pompeo	Wilson (SC)

□ 1857

Messrs. YOHO, LAMBORN, JOLLY, WESTERMAN, PALAZZO, KINZINGER of Illinois, SALMON, STUTZMAN, ROYCE, BUCSHON, RENACCI, and MILLER of Florida changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. WELCH, SMITH of Texas, SERRANO, ELLISON, VAN HOLLEN, DENHAM, and SHUSTER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCSALLY). The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our country in Iraq and Afghanistan and their families, and of all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

PROVIDING MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO UKRAINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 162) calling on the President to provide Ukraine with military assistance to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 348, nays 48, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 131]

YEAS—348

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodi
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cicilline
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Duckworth
Duffy
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold

Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Levin
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)

Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascarell
Paulsen
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schiff
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (VA)

Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Walker
Walters, Mimi
Walz

Wasserman
Schultz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—48

Amash
Beyer
Bonamici
Capuano
Chu, Judy
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Conyers
DesJarlais
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Farr
Frankel (FL)
Fudge

Grijalva
Hahn
Honda
Huelskamp
Huffman
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Lawrence
Lee
Lewis
Loebsack
Lowenthal
Massie
McGovern
Meeks

Moore
Mulvaney
Nadler
Nolan
O'Rourke
Pocan
Posey
Rohrabacher
Schakowsky
Schrader
Speier
Takano
Tsongas
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch

NOT VOTING—36

Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Chaffetz
Cohen
Davis, Danny
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duncan (SC)
Garamendi

Granger
Graves (MO)
Gutiérrez
Hinojosa
Hultgren
King (IA)
Knight
Labrador
Lipinski
Love
McClintock
Payne
Pompeo

Richmond
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Roskam
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Smith (WA)
Stewart
Walberg
Walorski
Wilson (SC)

□ 1908

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 131 on Calling on the President to provide Ukraine with military assistance to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity, H. Res. 162, I am not recorded because of prior commitments in the Congressional District. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AN AMERICAN BUDGET, A FAMILY BUDGET

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, we have all had hands-on experience balancing a budget, sitting at the kitchen table long after the kids have gone to bed shuffling through bills and pay stubs. We all know the feeling. In my family, balancing our budget isn't just a priority, it is a requirement. We must view America's budget the same way.

The House Republican Balanced Budget for a Stronger America is not

only realistic, but proactive. Our budget not only balances in less than 10 years, it does so without raising taxes. It places our country on a path to pay off the overwhelming mound of debt we face and creates a simpler Tax Code to ensure we continue to flourish.

Mr. Speaker, our kitchen table may be bigger and the voices may be louder, but the same rules apply. Our budget balances and provides American families with the security they deserve.

BRING OUR GIRLS HOME

(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. Mr. Speaker, we are approaching the 1-year anniversary of the kidnapping of more than 200 Nigerian girls by psychopaths who call themselves Boko Haram. Since their abduction, almost every week has brought fresh reports of outrages and slaughters by the terrorists, but only silence about the girls. There have been some unconfirmed reports that some of the girls have been taken across Nigeria's borders and that some have died of snakebites and illness.

Recently, the Emir of Kano in Nigeria challenged every Muslim leader in the country to speak up and put an end to Boko Haram in their country. That is a good start. But let's also call on all of the leaders of Africa to unite, to rid their government and their continent of Boko Haram, and, as one, to do everything in their power to Bring Back Our Girls. Let's reunite them with their families. Let's end this horror. Let's Bring Back Our Girls.

HONORING JIM SMITH, ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY BASKETBALL TEAM COACH

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

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Jim Smith, the longtime coach of St. John's University's basketball team.

Coach Smith just completed his 51st season as the winningest college basketball coach at any level in Minnesota history. Nationwide, he is ranked 14th in the NCAA, with a career record of 786 wins and 556 losses.

His legacy lives beyond the statistics as well. Beloved both on the court and in the greater Collegeville community, Coach Smith is known for being inspiring, competitive, and one of the friendliest people you would have the pleasure of meeting. This legendary coach leaves behind big shoes to fill.

Thank you for everything you have done, Coach Smith. Enjoy your retirement.

EXTENDING CONDOLENCES TO THE SASSOON FAMILY OF BROOKLYN, NEW YORK, FOR THEIR UNSPEAKABLE LOSS

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

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a very heavy heart. This weekend, my district experienced an unspeakable loss. One of our families in the Midwood section of Brooklyn lost seven of its children to a horrific fire. I wanted to come to the floor to just extend our condolences to the Sassoon family, where mother and daughter are currently hospitalized. We are wishing them a speedy and healthy recovery.

To the extended community, we all mourn the loss of these children, and we will do everything we can going forward to impress upon the community, those with large families, the importance of fire safety, and that we make sure that we keep our loved ones safe by having fire detectors on every floor of our homes and fire extinguishers where possible.

□ 1915

DO NOT BAN MOM'S BROWNIES FROM SCHOOL

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my mother makes wonderful double-chocolate brownies. As a kid, I would take them to school, and the PTA would sell them in the school bake sale to raise money for projects like uniforms for the school band and cheerleaders.

When our four kids were in school, they would take brownies for school bake sales as well. And now my grandkids can still use their great-grandmother's brownie recipe for school bake sales.

But warning, Mr. Speaker: the Federal school food police are regulating school bake sales. You see, now the government wants to control and, in some cases, prohibit school bake sales in the name of making kids healthier. No more homemade cupcakes, brownies, or baked goods unless they meet government calorie, sugar, and fat standards. Not healthy, sayeth the bake sale police.

The Federal Government is becoming the parent of American kids. What is next? Are they going to tell schoolkids what they can wear?

Parents and schools should decide whether to have bake sales or not. Uncle Sam doesn't know better. Parents know better.

Let Mom's homemade brownies back in the schools.

And that's just the way it is.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The Chair will remind all

persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

EMPOWERING PATIENTS WITH FSAs AND HSAs

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, today is the fifth anniversary of the President's new health care law, and it is apparent that the law has made it much more difficult for hardworking Americans to have flexibility with their own health care choices.

For instance, health care savings accounts and flexible savings accounts put power in the hands of patients by letting them make their own decisions when it comes to their own care.

But the new health care law actually prohibits someone from using their own money in their own health care savings account or flexible spending account to purchase simple over-the-counter medications like Advil or Claritin unless they first get a doctor's prescription. This makes absolutely no sense.

Today, I am introducing the Family Health Care Flexibility Act that will restore the ability of parents to take control of their own decisions when it comes to the care of their children in purchasing over-the-counter medications without a doctor's prescription.

Mr. Speaker, instead of a top-down, one-size-fits-all centralized health care system, we need solutions that provide patients with greater value, more choices, and lower costs.

JOINT REAPPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS TO BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces, on behalf of the Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives and the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate, their joint reappointment, pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1381), as amended by Public Law 114-6, of the following individuals on March 23, 2015, each to a 2-year term on the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance:

Mr. Alan V. Friedman, Los Angeles, California

Ms. Susan S. Robfogel, Rochester, New York

Ms. Barbara Childs Wallace, Ridgeland, Mississippi

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Illi-

nois (Ms. KELLY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, first, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington, Congresswoman DELBENE.

REMEMBERING THE HIGHWAY 530 MUDSLIDE

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise today to honor, recognize, and remember the events from 1 year ago when lives in my district changed in a matter of seconds. Part of a mountain-side slid into the Steelhead Haven neighborhood, claiming 43 lives, numerous homes, and damaging public infrastructure.

The people of Oso, Darrington, Arlington, the Stillaguamish Tribe, and the Sauk-Suiattle Tribe will never be the same, but I have great faith in these communities.

The Highway 530 mudslide was a heartbreaking disaster. It caused unbelievable devastation and tragic loss of life. But even through such a painful tragedy, it has been inspiring to see how the community has come together, people doing everything they can to help each other. Their response in the face of calamity has been incredible.

I joined these communities yesterday to honor the memories of those we lost and recognize everyone's efforts, including the first responders who selflessly risked their lives to save others.

Recovery continues to be a slow, difficult process, but I am confident that through our work together we will continue to get through these difficult times stronger and closer than ever.

Federal, State, and local agencies like the Federal Emergency Management Agency, or FEMA, and the State Department of Transportation responded to calls for aid when our communities needed roads rebuilt, an extension for filing taxes, help to get kids to school, or to find new housing.

I will continue to push for resources until these communities are fully restored. But instead of simply sending aid after a disaster, lawmakers need to do more to ensure that we fund programs and research efforts to prevent future natural disasters from becoming national tragedies.

One thing that struck me most while spending time in these communities and with local emergency command centers was the spirit, courage, and cooperation of everyone who pitched in to help.

FEMA officials even commented that this was the first time they allowed locals to be so heavily involved in rescue efforts. They did so because the people of these communities brought unique skills, experience, and determination. For example, loggers understood how to use heavy machinery in a challenging environment with 40 feet of mud, rocks, and trees. It was the first natural disaster where everyone—Federal and local—worked together so well.

Lawmakers in our Nation's Capital could learn a lot from the people of

Oso, Darrington, and Arlington. We too need to work together to ensure our communities are better prepared for natural disasters and landslides, in particular.

During this session of Congress, I plan to introduce legislation that would standardize and share research and mapping methods across the country while increasing funding for research and hazard assessments in high-risk areas. In addition, a primary goal of my bill will be to determine a national strategy to increase public awareness of the risks associated with landslides and identify slide-prone areas. We must also create education programs and increase rapid response efforts because, as we all know too well, disasters strike with little warning.

We will never forget those who were lost in the slide and the incredible community that continues to be "Oso strong."

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as we enter the final week of Women's History Month, the Congressional Black Caucus would like to use tonight's Special Order hour to examine the unique challenges that women face in America today. Many of these experiences are shared across the socioeconomic spectrum, and some are more specific to African American women.

The late poet and author Maya Angelou once said:

Each time a woman stands up for herself, without knowing it possibly, without claiming it, she stands up for all women.

There is much truth to these words, and our Nation has been strengthened by women who have taken stands for their rights. But tonight, the Congressional Black Caucus also stands up for millions of women across America.

Tonight, we will examine gender pay gaps, workforce treatment, family issues, health disparities, and a host of other concerns women face in America.

Each Women's History Month we recognize those pioneers who broke glass ceilings and paved the way for women's rights and equality: Abigail Adams; Phillis Wheatley; Lucretia Mott; Sojourner Truth; Harriet Tubman; Ella Baker; Rosa Parks; the Honorable Shirley Chisholm; Coretta Scott King; Ruth Bader Ginsberg; and the Honorable Loretta Lynch.

Still, we can't lose sight of the challenges that remain for women. We must all continue the work needed to eliminate gender inequalities once and for all.

Fifty years after President John F. Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act into law, women continue to earn less than men. Women make only 78 cents for every dollar earned by men, amounting to a yearly gap of \$11,000 between full-time men and women. That \$11,000 lost could purchase 89 more weeks of food, or more than 3,000 additional gallons of gas, or more than 1 year of rent for a woman's family.

For African American women and Latinas, the pay gap is even larger. Af-

rican American women on average earn only 64 cents and Latinas on average earn only 55 cents for every dollar earned by white, non-Hispanic men.

Nearly two-thirds of minimum wage workers are women. Yet, the minimum wage has not kept up with inflation over the last 45 years. With the minimum wage now, using inflation-adjusted terms, minimum wage women are earning more than 30 percent lower than they were in 1968.

These economic disparities are just a few of the issues facing women that we will address tonight. I want to thank the chairman of the CBC, the Honorable G.K. BUTTERFIELD, for allowing us to address this important topic tonight.

I now yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of Ohio, Congresswoman JOYCE BEATTY.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois, for leading us in tonight's Special Order to address the unique challenges black women face.

It is certainly fitting, Mr. Speaker, that we are discussing the contributions of women in our society during March as we celebrate Women's History Month.

Let us acknowledge those who have sacrificed and led the charge in women's rights, voting rights, civil rights, and rights in this Chamber.

Black women have consistently played a critical role in our Nation's history. In Congress, women like Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm, the first African American female to serve in Congress and to run for President of these United States. Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, first black woman in Congress from the deep South.

When I think of Shirley Chisholm, I remember the words that we still hear and say so often when we talk about women: unbought and unbossed.

Women like Carol Moseley Braun, who became the first African American female woman elected to the United States Senate.

Patricia Roberts Harris, the first black woman to serve in a Presidential Cabinet and the first woman to hold two Cabinet positions—the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and, later, Secretary of Health and Human Services.

And then from my great State of Ohio, the seventh-largest State in this Nation, Stephanie Tubbs Jones, only to be followed by two women, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE and myself, representing the Third Congressional District.

Even in the face of grave opposition and unequal treatment throughout our Nation's history, black women have continued to stand strong and contribute to the well-being of their families and our country as a whole, women like the women who serve in the Congressional Black Caucus, women like the women who serve in this Chamber, women like the only female to serve as Speaker of this House, NANCY PELOSI.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, here we are in 2015, and a black female leader is waiting to lead the critically important office of the United States Attorney General. No one can say she is unqualified, no one can say she is inexperienced, no one can say she hasn't or didn't perform well, Mr. Speaker. Just a couple weeks ago, 8 hours of testimony, more than 900 questions answered, and yet, she is left waiting, waiting longer than the previous combined times of the seven previous Attorney Generals. For 132 days, Mr. Speaker, Ms. Lynch has been waiting for a vote. Mr. Speaker, that is three seasons.

□ 1930

In the fall, the Senate failed to take up the nomination. In the winter, the Senate dithered on her nomination. Here we are, now in the spring, and we are waiting.

Mr. Speaker, what is the Senate waiting for? Our Nation needs an Attorney General, and holding this nomination hostage is senseless and reckless.

I strongly urge the Senate Republican leadership to stop playing politics with law enforcement and national security and to vote on the confirmation of Loretta Lynch to serve as our next Attorney General.

Ms. Lynch is eminently qualified and is a proven leader with an exemplary record at the Department of Justice. She is a brilliant, well-educated, and experienced lawyer twice before confirmed. It is well past time for the United States Senate to move forward with the nomination of Loretta Lynch, a black woman and nominee for United States Attorney General and, possibly, another first in our history.

As I always like to say, Mr. Speaker, firsts are never good unless there can be a second and a third and a fourth. If we make this first happen, as we have done in the past, then there can be other women standing here and sitting where you are sitting.

I honor Ms. Lynch and all of the strong black women who have paved the way for each successive generation, for my granddaughter so that she can know that there are women who can stand up in this Chamber and speak on this floor.

That is what the Congressional Black Caucus' Special Order, in part, is about because, every day, black women hold their families together as primary caregivers; they support their children and continue to preserve and persevere when our society fails to deliver on equal rights.

Equal rights in pay equity, health care, and education are priorities for me in this Congress and for millions of women across this Nation. The pay gap is startling, but it is real because we know, when women succeed, America succeeds. In Ohio and across the Nation, women make 77 cents to every \$1 a white man makes, and for African American women, it is 66 cents for every \$1 that they make.

Five years ago today, President Obama signed the Affordable Care Act into law. Our Nation took a giant step forward—a giant leap—in saving lives and making health care a right for all, not just for the privileged few. The Affordable Care Act has important implications for black women as they face longstanding and persistent disparities in health care and in health in general.

Mr. Speaker, again, I would like to thank my colleague, the Congresswoman from Illinois, for bringing forth this topic. I would also like to thank all of the members of the Congressional Black Caucus for hosting this Special Order hour.

There are countless black women whose names may not appear prominently in our history books, who may not ever appear on this floor or be recognized in this Congress or in this country, women like my 91-year-old mother in Dayton, Ohio, who reared four daughters and told us and taught us about the value of standing up for what you believe in.

They are women who won't appear in our history books but whose sweat and blood and strength are woven into our national identity. I honor all of these women. They continue to inform me and inform my sense of pride and dignity as an American.

I am going to end with the same quote that my friend and colleague started with, a quote by the late Maya Angelou, "Each time a woman stands up for herself, without knowing it possibly, without claiming it"—Mr. Speaker, as I stand today—"she stands up for all women."

Thank you.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you, my friend from the great State of Ohio, Congresswoman JOYCE BEATTY. Your points about Loretta Lynch are so pertinent. Despite the gains we have made, we still have a long way to go.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is now my great privilege to yield to my friend from the great State of New Jersey, Congresswoman BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I want to thank the gentlewoman, my colleague from Illinois, for providing this opportunity for me to share with you this evening.

I am also honored to join my Congressional Black Caucus colleagues on the floor as we celebrate Women's History Month, and I am particularly grateful to our chairman, Chairman Butterfield.

This year's commemoration of the women who have shaped this Nation is

especially important here in this body because, for the first time, more than 100 women hold seats, speaking on behalf of Americans from Alaska to Florida.

This year, the Congressional Black Caucus includes 20 women who are fighting for working families, for better wages, for more funding for better education, and for the many other policies that will make our Nation stronger and our families healthier.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be the very first African American woman to represent the State of New Jersey in Congress and to be the only woman currently serving in this delegation. These are outstanding firsts, and I am thrilled to be one of them, but this is 2015, Mr. Speaker, and we shouldn't still be speaking about "firsts" and "onllys" when it comes to women. There may be 104 of us, but women still make up only 20 percent of Congress while we make up more than half of the population.

Women across this country still earn just 78 cents for every \$1 that is earned by men, and we have heard that women of color, particularly African American women, earn even less than this.

Women still face a culture that questions our ability to excel in science and tech-focused fields, a culture that rushes to blame victims of sexual assault instead of protecting them, a culture that doubts that women are capable of making choices about their own health without the interference from lawmakers, who in the majority are men.

Women's History Month is about celebrating trailblazers, but it is also about honoring the strength of all women and recognizing that we are just as capable as men and are just as ready to bring something to the table.

We just celebrated the 50th anniversary of the marches from Selma to Montgomery, and in the process, we paid tribute to many of the leaders who risked their lives on the Edmund Pettus Bridge that day.

Most people connect these events with Dr. Martin Luther King or our esteemed colleague Congressman JOHN LEWIS, but Amelia Boynton Robinson was among the first to bring the organizers to Selma. Even fewer know Viola Liuzzo, who paid the ultimate price for joining the march as she saw men and women brutalized on that bridge purely because of the color of their skin.

I mention those names, Mr. Speaker, because, when it comes down to it, women have been leading for generations, even if it has been behind the scenes and without recognition.

I join my colleagues in paying homage to a long history of amazing women; but I also ask every Member of this body: What are we doing to make history? What are we doing to build an economy in which women are equals and a society in which women are respected? What are we doing to make the phrase the "first woman of history" an unnecessary question?

When we look at the opportunities before us, we know, Mr. Speaker, it is now that we have the opportunity to make history—right now. We have the opportunity to make history with the first woman, an African American, as the U.S. Attorney General of this great country, and we have an opportunity in the near future to say that there has been a woman elected President of the United States.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you to the great gentlewoman of New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, it is during Women's History Month when we recognize the contributions and achievements of women throughout the course of history. Many of these women have had distinguished public service careers, from President Franklin Roosevelt's Secretary of Labor—Frances Perkins—to the first female Cabinet Secretary, to current Secretaries Sylvia Mathews Burwell, Sally Jewell, and Penny Pritzker, and National Security Adviser Susan Rice.

Women like them have a proud and established record of providing wise and honest counsel and of leading our government through important and transformational times.

Right now, the Obama administration is awaiting Senate confirmation for a woman who is eminently qualified for the position of U.S. Attorney General, our Nation's chief law enforcement officer. The first woman to hold this position was Janet Reno under President Bill Clinton.

Attorney General Reno strongly defended the Constitution, promoted civil liberties, and captured and convicted domestic and foreign criminals. The second woman—but not the last woman—to hold the position of Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, will be Loretta Lynch.

Once confirmed by the United States Senate, Ms. Lynch will make history by being the first African American woman to serve as Attorney General. She will join the proud ranks of Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, former Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary, former Labor Secretary Alexis Herman, and Patricia Roberts, who was the first female African American Cabinet Secretary who served as both Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Loretta Lynch, as you have heard over and over and as we know, is eminently qualified to be Attorney General, Mr. Speaker. A graduate of Harvard University and of Harvard Law School, Ms. Lynch has had a distinguished legal career. She is universally recognized for her keen analytical skills and her passion for the law.

Ms. Lynch is also uniquely fit to serve the role for our Nation at this critical point in our national discourse. As U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of New York, Ms. Lynch currently serves as the chief Federal prosecutor for Brooklyn, Queens, Staten Island, and Long Island.

At this time, I yield to my distinguished colleague from New York, HAKEEM JEFFRIES.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank my good friend and colleague, Representative KELLY from the great State of Illinois, for, once again, presiding over this CBC Special Order, this opportunity for members of the Congressional Black Caucus to speak directly to the American people for 60 minutes on matters of great importance.

Mr. Speaker, certainly, members of the Congressional Black Caucus recognize the strength, the vitality, the intelligence, and the importance of African American women to the African American experience in this great country—in fact, to the American experience.

Consistently, it has been black women who have fought hard to bring American democracy to life, to continue the march to perfect a more perfect Union.

I think often of the role that Harriet Tubman played—a bold, fearless woman who managed to free herself from the horrific bondage of slavery in the South and make it to the North but who then decided, at great sacrifice to her own potential well-being, to go back down South an additional 19 times, freeing more than 200 black slaves.

I also find it fascinating that, when Harriet Tubman once was asked about her heroics—who spent many of her final years in New York—was dismissive. She said: “I could have freed more if they only knew that they were slaves.”

I think Harriet Tubman gave us some words of wisdom that can serve many communities all across the country today that are still struggling to deal with social and economic injustice. She said: “I could have freed more if they only knew that they were slaves.” Sometimes, we have folks who remain trapped in their own circumstances because they have a mindset issue. Harriet Tubman helped to perfect our democracy.

Mentioned earlier by some of my distinguished colleagues were some of the other contributions that were made during the civil rights struggle, and there were many African American women who haven't always gotten the credit for playing a leading role in the civil rights movement—designed, again, to help perfect American democracy—dealing with Jim Crow and racial segregation in the South and in many parts of this country.

I think it was Fannie Lou Hamer who famously said, “I am sick and tired of being sick and tired,” when asked why she stepped forward at great sacrifice to herself. I think there are still a lot of Americans in many parts of this country, when it comes to the prison industrial complex, when it comes to the problem of the police's use of excessive force, and when it comes to the issue of income inequality, who still draw inspiration from Fannie Lou

Hamer's words of being sick and tired of being sick and tired.

□ 1945

Now, I also stand here today as someone who proudly represents the Eighth Congressional District in New York, a district that in part was once represented by the Honorable Shirley Chisholm. Of course, great women in the Congress today like JOYCE BEATTY and ROBIN KELLY and MARCIA FUDGE and others stand on Shirley Chisholm's shoulders. She was the first African American woman ever elected to the House of Representatives in 1968. I am proud to represent part of the district that she once served. She was one of Brooklyn's gifts to this country and, in fact, to the world.

I am struggling today because, here again, Brooklyn is once again prepared to share some of our tremendous human capital and wealth with this great country in the form of Loretta Lynch, by way of North Carolina. For the life of me, I haven't been able to figure out what the holdup is, why it is so difficult for Senate Republicans and for the majority simply to hold a vote so we can confirm Loretta Lynch as the Nation's chief law enforcement executive.

We have heard every excuse in the book as to why Loretta Lynch is twisting in the wind, and none of them are legitimate. I don't want Loretta Lynch to be confirmed because she would be the first African American woman to serve as our Nation's Attorney General leading the Department of Justice; I want her confirmed because she is the best qualified person for the job. Don't trust me, HAKEEM JEFFRIES from Brooklyn. Rudolph Giuliani, of all people, the great law and order mayor of New York City, former Federal prosecutor, U.S. attorney for the Southern District of New York, and many, many others—Democrats, Republicans, people from the North, the South, the East, and the West—have all said Loretta Lynch is a talented law enforcement professional and the right person for the job at this particular point in time.

What in the world is the holdup? I can't figure it out. Is it a problem with her personal background? Let's see. She is the daughter of a school librarian and a Baptist preacher. That can't be the issue.

What is the holdup? Is there a problem with her legal education? I don't think so. She is a graduate of Harvard Law School.

What is the problem? Does she not have enough law enforcement experience? She is practically a career Federal prosecutor, who clearly has the ability to allow the law and the facts dictate her decisionmaking process.

Is there an issue that she hasn't been adequately vetted? Well, she has actually been unanimously confirmed by the United States Senate, not once but twice, to be the U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of New York. I think she has been vetted.

Well, is it that the Senate doesn't have the ability to walk and chew gum at the same time, as MITCH MCCONNELL indicated? We have got to deal with other matters. Other matters? I don't get it. She has been waiting longer than the five previous Attorney General nominees, combined, since being voted out of the Committee on the Judiciary.

We need all hands on deck. There are terrorists all across the world who want to strike the United States of America, and we are holding up the chief law enforcement officer of this country? Then we hear the excuse: Well, we don't like her position on the President's executive action on immigration. You don't like her position? She is the President's nominee. What position do you expect her to have?

That is not even a legitimate argument because you had no problem confirming Ash Carter to be the Secretary of the Department of Defense, and my good friends on the other side of the aisle on the other side of the Capitol are obsessing about two things: the President's executive action on immigration as well as the President's negotiations with Iran along with, or as part of, the P5+1. Ash Carter presumably supports those negotiations. You can't stand them so much so that you even wrote to the Iranian mullahs. I mean, that should shock the conscience of the American people. You can't stand the Iranian negotiations, but you didn't hold up Ash Carter's nomination.

So for the life of me, I am trying to go through a process of elimination to figure out what is the reason that you have held up Loretta Lynch's nomination. What is the reason? Why are we waiting so long? You have got to come up with a good answer to the fact that she is being treated like a second-class citizen.

Unfortunately, as we go down the checklist of excuses that you have provided, not a single one of them hold up. So I am just hopeful over the next couple of days, as we bring Women's History Month to a close, that you will have the decency to do what is right for the American people and allow Loretta Lynch to have an up-or-down vote so we can finally allow democracy to flourish in what allegedly is supposed to be the world's greatest deliberative body. Allow democracy to flourish; give Loretta Lynch a vote so we can get back to doing the real business of the American people.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Representative JEFFRIES, thank you for continuing to lift the nomination of Loretta Lynch, and also thank you for highlighting Harriet Tubman, a fine example of someone who helped improve the quality of life for her fellow brothers and sisters.

“I am sick and tired of being sick and tired.” Many women can say that in regard to the pay gap, unemployment, and still trying to break the glass ceiling. In the past year, we have seen the

greatest economic growth in decades. More and more women have been able to reenter the workforce, reducing the unemployment rate among women to a 6-year low.

Unfortunately, black women have yet to reap the benefits of the economic rebound. In fact, while the overall unemployment rate for women declined, the black female unemployment rate has increased over the past 2 months. According to a recent analysis by the National Women's Law Center, the black women's unemployment rate is more than twice the unemployment rate of white women. In February, the black women's unemployment rate was 8.9 percent, up from 8.7 percent in January and 8.2 percent in December.

By comparison, the unemployment rate for adult white women was 4.2 percent in February, down from 4.4 percent in January. Despite having comparable levels of education, black women have the highest unemployment rate of any other group. A possible factor in the stubborn unemployment rate for black women is that we are disproportionately employed in the public sector, which is experiencing a much slower recovery than the private sector.

The National Women's Law Center said the stagnant job situation for black women is a red flag in the employment landscape and urged lawmakers to act to promote a stronger, more widely shared recovery. I couldn't agree more. We need to invest more in job training and retraining programs that help black women adapt to the changing workforce and prepare for the careers of tomorrow. We must work to promote diversity in hiring and encourage employees to model their work forces on the communities in which they operate. As we look for ways to help women succeed, we must be mindful of the unique challenges black women face and develop targeted policies that help level the playing field for all women.

In closing, we have heard from many of my colleagues gathered here tonight, and they have mentioned, as we recognize Women's History Month, we are reminded that we are constantly in the midst of new history being made.

Tonight I had the privilege of being joined by my CBC colleagues. One, a member of the freshman class and another person who wasn't here tonight, she is the 100th woman ever elected to Congress, Congresswoman ALMA ADAMS of North Carolina. Jeannette Rankin of Montana was the first woman to serve in this esteemed body, and many more will join the ranks of women in Congress, women like the Honorable Barbara Jordan, Shirley Chisholm, the Honorable MARCIA L. FUDGE, our last Congressional Black Caucus chair and the future of the CBC; women like JOYCE BEATTY, Representative BRENDA LAWRENCE from Michigan, ALMA ADAMS from North Carolina, STACEY PLASKETT of the Virgin Islands, and BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN from New Jersey.

Despite our gains, though, there are only two black women who serve in statewide offices across the United States: Kamala Harris and Denise Nappier. There are veterans who have come to serve this Congress, like my good friends TULSI GABBARD of Hawaii and TAMMY DUCKWORTH from my home State of Illinois. Many diverse districts across this country are well served by the women they elect to Congress.

When women succeed, America truly does succeed. This is why we must continue to fight for equal pay for equal work. This week, paycheck fairness legislation will be introduced. I urge folks across the country to call their Representative to cosponsor this important legislation.

We must also fight for affordable child care and other economic policies that support working women, allowing us to continue shattering the glass ceiling and reach the greatest heights of all sectors of society.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for this wonderful hour of debate. I thank all of my colleagues for caring enough to get involved and participate.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus, to commemorate Women's History Month, and address some of the unique challenges black women face. This is an issue of great personal significance to me and many of my CBC colleagues.

It is hard to accept that in 2015, women still earn significantly less than men in the work place. The wage gap for black women is even greater. Black women earn sixty-four cents on the dollar compared to men, while white women earn seventy-seven cents on the dollar. These numbers are disheartening for all women, but illustrate the even greater challenge that black women face in the fight for equal pay. Moving forward, the discussion on equal pay in the workplace must move beyond talking points. We must act swiftly to decrease wage inequality. We must also ensure that the obstacles black women in the workplace are included in the national discourse.

While the phrase "women's issues" has become popular in academia and the media, it usually does not include many of the unique issues affecting black women. As poet and black feminist, Audre Lord, once said, "there is no such thing as a single-issue struggle, because we do not live single issue lives." Black women have never had the luxury of just being women; for black women, there is an intersection where race and gender meet, making our struggle so much more unique. Black women face a separate set of problems further alienating us from our male counterparts. We must consistently battle with the fact that we are black in a society that does not value black life, and women in a society that does not value the female contribution to society.

Though a lot of progress has been made for women in the workplace, we still face so many obstacles as we work to permanently establish ourselves as professionally equal to men. In an effort to change these human injustices, we must increase the discussion on these issues. The end goal is to ensure that all women earn

equal pay, regardless of race. Progress toward this goal is our responsibility and we must work tirelessly in achieving it.

THIS IS BUDGET WEEK

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I sure do appreciate that, and I appreciate you being down here with us. I enjoy this time of the evening. It is a little quieter on Capitol Hill. Folks are coming and going, but I always learn something that I wouldn't have learned otherwise. For all the differences that we have here, when you talk to each other 15, 20 seconds at a time, those differences get accented. When you listen to one another for an hour at a time, it is easier to find those strains that bind us together. I hope that I am able to touch on some of those topics tonight myself, Mr. Speaker.

I have got the House budget on my mind. It is budget week. I don't know if everybody else is as excited about it as I am. This is budget week in Washington, D.C.

I just finished a hearing in the Committee on Rules, and we had folks come up and testify about all of their different budget ideas. What it means for it to be budget week is that we just voted in the Committee on Rules to make every single budget that any Member of this body, whether they be the most liberal Democrat, the most conservative Republican, or anywhere in between, north, south, east, and west, youngest to oldest, any Member of this body that has an idea about how to grapple with the budgetary challenges that face this Nation, Mr. Speaker, their idea is going to get a vote on the floor of the House this week—this week.

Now, it is heavy duty writing a budget, Mr. Speaker. I serve on the House Committee on the Budget. One of the reasons it is so hard, and you can't see it, Mr. Speaker, but I have here a pie chart of the spending in the United States of America. Now, you and I go through bill after bill, day after day, month after month of talking about appropriations bills. But as you know, Mr. Speaker, appropriations bills, they just deal with what I have shown here in the blue areas, the kind of non-defense discretionary spending and defense spending.

Candidly, that is what everybody thinks of as being the budget. They think of transportation, roads, bridges; they think of the environment, parks; they think of the judiciary; they think of law enforcement; they think of all of these components of government. Well, the truth is, all of those things, Mr. Speaker, we have to jam into this little bitty piece of the pie, these two blue pieces of the pie, the things that Congress focuses on every year in the appropriations cycle.

□ 2000

This red piece of the pie is all of that spending that is on autopilot.

Now, I have read the Constitution, just as you have, Mr. Speaker. It says that all spending is going to originate in the U.S. House of Representatives. Well, you have been here 3 months already and you have not gotten a vote on this spending at all. I have been here 4 years, and I haven't gotten a vote on this spending at all.

This is spending—all of this that is represented in red—trillions of dollars a year, because some of our colleagues in the House 10 years ago, 20 years ago, 40 years ago, even 80 years ago, voted “yes” to turn on an autopilot spending bill. That bill is still on autopilot and still spending today. Our opportunity to grapple with this red area, Mr. Speaker—this that they call mandatory spending—is by outlining a strategy in a budget.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for 4 years, I have had the voting card of the Seventh District of Georgia. It is an honor to carry that card every day. And for 4 years, we have been doing Budget Committee work in this institution that should make every American proud. It should make every American proud.

But as you know, Mr. Speaker—as I think most Americans know—the Senate has not quite been as fortunate. They have been stymied over there, trying to pass a budget. Now we have a new American Senate that is working side-by-side with the House, because if the House can pass a budget and if the Senate can pass a budget and if we can come together and reconcile those differences, we will have a governing document that begins to allow us to deal not just with the small blue part of the budget, Mr. Speaker, but the entire budget—\$3.5 trillion in FY 2014.

Why is that so important? It is important, Mr. Speaker, because we have borrowed \$18 trillion from our children and our grandchildren. Now, I say it over and over and over again. I am going to say it again tonight. It is immoral. It is immoral, and it is not even intellectually defensible.

If you are from the part of the Congress that doesn't want to raise taxes—and I am in that part of the Congress—don't pretend that borrowing a dollar today so that you don't have to raise taxes is failing to raise taxes. It is not. If you borrow a dollar today, someone is going to have to raise taxes sometime in the future. They are going to have to pay that dollar back, plus interest. A vote to borrow money is a vote to raise taxes. It is just not a vote to raise taxes on you. It is a vote to raise taxes on the next generation.

Conversely, if you are in the part of this Congress that likes to spend money—I am not in the part of this Congress that likes to spend money—I want to shrink the size and scope of government, I want to make it more accountable, more effective, more efficient, but it is hard to do with \$3.5 trillion. I want to shrink the size and

scope of government, but if you are on the side of this Congress that wants to grow spending, a vote to grow spending without paying for it today—a vote to borrow—is a vote to cut spending on someone else years from now.

We have seen it in all of the countries around the planet, Mr. Speaker, that are struggling with economic collapse. When government has to shrink, when austerity measures kick in, the people that pay the price are not the wealthy in society. The people who pay the price are those who are most dependent on government benefits.

A vote to spend money today that we don't have—a vote to borrow today—is a vote to cut the benefits of our children and our grandchildren, who will need it more than we do today.

So, whether you are focusing on balanced budgets from a tax perspective or whether you are focusing on them from a spending perspective, Mr. Speaker, we should be able to come together and decide that grappling with those issues—putting forward a plan to deal with those issues—is better than hiding our head in the sand.

This is why. What I have graphed here, Mr. Speaker, with the red line is traditional revenues. It is tax revenues in this country—take all the taxes that we bring in together. I charted them as a percent of GDP, gross domestic product. What that means, Mr. Speaker, this looks like a level line but, of course, the economy continues to grow. And every time the economy grows, tax revenues grow. And so this is level as a percent of the size of our economy, but it is a growing number of taxes every year—again, up to \$3.5 trillion now and \$3.8 trillion for FY 2016.

Well, these blue lines represent spending on those mandatory spending programs I just talked about: those programs that are on autopilot, those programs that we don't deal with in this institution every year, those programs that escape the collaborative scrutiny of this body.

Here is what you see. This chart goes back to 1965, Mr. Speaker. Back in 1965, interest on the national debt was a small part of our economic pie. Social Security was a large part of our economic pie, but smaller than it is today. Medicare was a very small part. Medicaid was a very small part.

What you see on this chart, Mr. Speaker, is that they grow larger and larger and larger. Now, that is not larger and larger and larger in terms of actual dollars. They are growing larger and larger and larger in terms of actual dollars, but this chart is reflecting them growing larger and larger and larger as a percent of everything the United States produces.

And what you see, Mr. Speaker, is that even though all the tax revenue we have been able to squeeze out of this country, whether it was a Republican as President or a Democrat as President, whether it was Republicans running the country or Democrats running the country, America was unwill-

ing to contribute more than about 17 to 18 percent of GDP in tax revenues.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if you go out to the end of our budget window here, which is about 2025, you will see that, based on current law, current spending, spending just rising at that rate of inflation as required by current law, the combination of Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, and interest on the national debt will consume every penny that the Federal Government raises—every penny.

I showed you on this chart earlier, Mr. Speaker, what Congress deals with here in blue—defense and nondefense—which most people think of as the government. That is only about a third of the pie. Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, interest on the national debt—those mandatory spending programs—is where most of the money is being spent today. That wasn't true 30 years ago.

Back in the 1960s, 40 years ago, Mr. Speaker, I would say about a third of government spending was what we will call these income support programs—these direct spending programs on behalf of citizens. About two-thirds of what we spent was investment in America. We were building things: the Eisenhower Interstate Highway System, the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control. We were building things. We were defeating the evil empire.

National security was a larger piece of the pie in those days. Two-thirds of the budget was an investment in America. But today, Mr. Speaker, those numbers have exactly inverted. We spend about one-third on investment in national security and two-thirds on income support programs. By 2025, Mr. Speaker, those programs threaten to consume every penny the Federal Government has.

Look out there at the end of this window, Mr. Speaker. We are not talking about raising taxes a little. We are talking about just to fund these programs—no parks, no courts, no judges, no prisons, no roads, no environmental regulations; nothing except Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, interest on the national debt—we would have to increase taxes almost 50 percent just to pay for those programs.

That is not sustainable. Everyone in this Chamber knows it is not sustainable. And my frustration, Mr. Speaker—and I hope you haven't found the same one quite yet—is that we all know what the truth is, but we don't all want to admit what the truth is.

There is no question that we can't pay for these programs. There is no question that Social Security is headed towards bankruptcy. Who is doing anything to solve it? Social Security Disability is going to go bankrupt 18 months from now in the year 2016. Social Security Disability Insurance—that trust fund that is available for folks who have been stricken with disabilities and can no longer work—runs out of money.

Everyone in this Chamber knows it. That is not ROB WOODALL, conservative Republican, predicting that. That is the Social Security Disability Insurance trustees—the nonpartisan trustees—telling us that we are going to run out of money. The nonpartisan trustees of the Medicare Program are going to tell us it is going to run out of money. The nonpartisan trustees of the Social Security retirement program tell us it is going to run out of money.

Where are the reform proposals from this institution? It is hard, Mr. Speaker. We all know what the truth is, but folks don't want to admit it.

I am going to bring us back to budget week. What I love about this week, Mr. Speaker, is that we focus on those big problems, those big drivers of spending, those social safety net programs that are so essential to so many Americans. This is the week we lay out our plans to save them. This is the week where we talk about doing the heavy lifting that we don't talk about the rest of the year.

I want the courage that we show in this week, Mr. Speaker. I want the ideas that we discuss this week to be the outline by which we live the rest of the year. I always hope for that. I don't always get that. I am hoping for that again this year.

Let's talk about the plan, Mr. Speaker, that came out of the House Budget Committee. Now, the House Budget Committee is a fabulous group of people. If you have not gotten a chance, Mr. Speaker, it is budget.house.gov. It is completely transparent. You can see anything you want to see about the House-passed budget and our deliberations.

We just had a markup last week, Mr. Speaker. We started about 10:30 in the morning. We finished just a little after midnight that day. We came back the next day and went for about an hour more. We discussed every single amendment that anyone had to offer, Mr. Speaker. We talked about the big ideas. We talked about unemployment. We talked about job creation. We talked about job training. We talked about national security. We got deep into every single issue that matters to families back home in my district—every single one—and back home in your district, Mr. Speaker. And this is the plan we have laid out.

What I have charted here, Mr. Speaker, is the path of debt. The path of debt runs from back in World War II, where we had to borrow about 100 percent of the size of our economy. Granted, the economy was much smaller then, but as a percentage of the size of our economy—that is the way the economists take a look at what we do to make sure that we are still on good financial footing—100 percent of the size of our economy to defeat the Nazis to win World War II.

Mr. Speaker, we are almost back at those same high levels today. You see it represented here by the dark blue line. We are almost back there today.

Do we have severe economic challenges today? Of course, we do. Is the world a dangerous place today? Of course, it is. Are we united as a nation and fighting those challenges the way we were fighting World War II? Of course, we are not. Of course, we are not. But by engaging in this degree of borrowing when we are not facing an international challenge of the size of winning World War II, we are trading away our opportunities to face that challenge should it arise in the future.

We are borrowing today, Mr. Speaker, for consumption when we borrowed in 1945 for investment. We are borrowing today to pay the current bills of just running the Nation when we borrowed in 1945 to defeat evil. What are we going to do when we are forced to confront evil of that magnitude again? I am not sure, because we have traded away, through borrowing and spending on today's consumption, the opportunity to spend big to win those global challenges.

So look at beyond the dark blue line, Mr. Speaker. This is what you are going to see there. The red line of debt, which you see rises far above World War II level borrowing—in fact, double World War II level borrowing—that red line is what happens if we close the doors of the Congress today. If we turn out the lights and never pass a new law, if we turn out the lights and never make a new promise, if we turn out the lights and promise not to spend one more penny than that that is already required by the laws on the books—and the White House does the very same thing, turns out the lights—that red line represents the level of borrowing necessary simply to keep today's promises. No new promises. Today's promises.

I laid out the future that we are trading away. I laid out the opportunities to react to crises that we are trading away. I laid out the burden that this is putting on future generations. That is just where we are today. If we do nothing and let current law continue, the problem doesn't just get worse. It gets twice as bad.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am tired of hearing folks complain about what happens here and there. I am tired of hearing folks say, I know what all the problems are, but I don't have any solutions to offer. I just want to tell you who to blame for your woes. I don't want to be responsible for providing solutions.

□ 1915

Nonsense, nonsense—this body is not filled with men and women, Madam Speaker, who came here to find blame. This body is filled with people who came to solve problems.

Blue line, problem solved—that blue line, that light blue line, Madam Speaker, represents the House Budget Committee mark. If this institution passes the budget for FY16, for the next 10-year window, if they pass the budget that we worked out in that Budget Committee, we don't just avoid the

economic catastrophe that is represented by current law, we reverse the trend.

Madam Speaker, it is hard. Golly, I want to be able to tell children and grandchildren across this country that we are balancing the budget tomorrow. We are not. We are not. We can't.

Unless you want to raise taxes right through the roof and crush working American families, unless you want to cut spending right to the floor and crush our opportunities at national security, you can't balance the budget tomorrow. The problem is too big.

We laid out a 10-year glide path. It doesn't put the tough decisions off for 10 years, but it begins making the tough decisions today, begins bending that curve of borrowing today.

Madam Speaker, \$4.7 trillion in interest is what we are projecting to spend in the 10-year window—\$4.7 trillion on interest alone.

Madam Speaker, the budget for the entire United States of America last year was only \$3.5 trillion. We are only proposing, as a budget for next year, \$3.8 trillion. Our interest payments, borrowing at the record-low teaser rates that we are borrowing at today—record-low rates—are going to see us pay \$4.7 trillion in interest over the next 10 years.

It is like taking 18 months off. Think about that. If our budget is about \$3.8 trillion for FY16, \$4.7 trillion, that is about a year and a quarter off. Again, turn out the lights, send everybody home—no more national security, no more schools, no more roads. That is what debt is costing us, a year and a quarter of productivity out of the next 10, and that is when we take these important steps to begin to curb it.

Compare the difference in vision, Madam Speaker. This blue line represents our vision. The light blue line represents our solution to the red line, which represents current law.

Madam Speaker, why is this so hard to do? Because this chart represents the President's vision—leadership is a two-way street. We need folks leading on both sides of the aisle. We need folks leading on both sides of the Congress. We need folks leading on both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue. Leading often means taking something that you disagree on and selling the other guy on why you are right.

For us, Madam Speaker, we take our balanced budget proposal. We take it to the other side of the aisle. We take it on the other side of the Capitol. We take it on the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, and we try to sell it.

We believe that balancing the budget is the right thing to do. We believe that borrowing from our children and grandchildren is immoral. The President takes a different view, and I don't fault him for taking a different view. I question his math. I question the economic guidance that he is relying on. I don't question his motives.

His view—which is represented by the deficit here in blue, our annual deficits

are represented in red—represent the budget the President sent to Capitol Hill this year. Now, this budget is substantially similar to the budgets he has sent to Capitol Hill every year.

If the President was standing here tonight, Madam Speaker, I don't think I would be mischaracterizing him if I say what he would tell you is he wants to freeze our debt as a percent of the size of our economy, and as long as our economy is rising then, he believes we can continue to let our debt rise. He calls that primary balance, when you lock in your debt as a static percent of GDP but continue to borrow forever—forever.

What I am showing you here on this chart, Madam Speaker, is our budget alternative, produced by the Budget Committee, to be voted on in the House tomorrow. What our budget does is take deficits for about \$350 billion next year down to zero.

I don't even know if you know this word down on the end, Madam Speaker. It says "surplus"—no reason you should know it. We haven't seen one in your time on Capitol Hill. I would argue we haven't seen one in my lifetime.

We talked about them happening in the nineties, but as you know, that was a little funny math there, the Social Security trust fund and other issues. It has been a long time since we have seen a surplus in our budget, but that is what our ideas produce. That is what our tough choices produce. That is what our commitment to solving problems produces.

The President, on the other hand, raises taxes over \$1 trillion, new taxes over \$1 trillion, and continues to spend, so much so that in the years that we are balancing, Madam Speaker, the President is borrowing an additional \$1 trillion a year.

He would tell you that the reason he is borrowing it is because investment in America is important, and it is. He would tell you that the reason he is borrowing is because, if we don't invest in challenges today, we are not going to be able to reap the benefits of those challenges tomorrow, and he is right.

We are not arguing in this institution, Madam Speaker, we are not debating in this institution, we are not grappling in this institution about the merit of investing in America. We all believe that we should.

What we are talking about is whether or not we should pay for that investment. If we think it is a good idea, should we find the money for it today? Or do we just think it is enough of a good idea for our children to figure out how to pay for it or our grandchildren to figure out how to pay for it?

But it is not so much of a good idea that you and I would actually burden ourselves with making the tough decision today—nonsense. I reject that vision. I reject the President's growing deficits out. I reject the President's budget that says: Not only am I not going to balance tomorrow, not only

am I not going to balance in the next 10 years, I am not going to balance the budget ever.

Now, that is not a small thing we are arguing about. This isn't just some sort of partisan sniping that happens between Republicans and Democrats. There is a fundamental disagreement about who we are as Americans, about what the role of Federal Government is.

The House Budget Committee says: Let's try to balance this budget in the next 10 years. The time to stop burdening our children and our grandchildren with debt is now.

The President says: I have spending priorities for America. Let's grow the amount of money we are borrowing every single year. Let's balance the budget never.

I don't know if you get this in town-hall meetings back home like I do, Madam Speaker, but folks say: ROB, why can't you guys just work this out? Why can't you get together, close the doors, work this out? We have serious problems. You need to solve the serious problems.

Madam Speaker, I have got a President who is prioritizing balancing the budget never, and I have got a House Budget Committee that is prioritizing balancing the budget in the next 10 years. Those aren't small differences. The differences could not get much larger.

I don't expect to sell everyone in this institution on the Budget Committee's ideas for balancing this budget, Madam Speaker. I am not going to get every vote in this Chamber. I am going to keep selling it, but I am not going to get every vote in this Chamber. I recognize that.

What I am going to prioritize is selling folks in this Chamber on the fact that if we choose to borrow money, we are either taking it from the next generation's benefits, or we are taking it from the next generation's tax bill.

The bill is going to come due. These deficits that the President proposes are going to come due. These deficits that we have already run are going to come due. It's either a benefit cut for the next generation or a tax increase for the next generation. There is no free lunch.

Now, I don't purport to have all the answers, Madam Speaker, though we have got a pretty good blueprint here. What I do propose, though, is that we are going to be closer to finding the answers if we bring all of the ideas together.

I see my friends from the Rules Committee sitting here in the corner tonight, Madam Speaker. They have been upstairs grinding through the paperwork. It was a little more complicated rule tonight than it ordinarily is because we took every single idea that any Member of this Chamber had about balancing the budget. If you wanted to write your budget, it is made in order for debate this week, budget week.

I don't know which budget is going to win, Madam Speaker, though I have

my preferences. What I do know is that if you are in the solutions business, you had your shot this week. If you are in the solutions business, you had a chance to put your money where your mouth is, literally, your money, all of our money, all taxpayer money, these budgets together, in a document.

We are going to debate some doozies this week. We are going to debate some budgets that purport cutting spending virtually in half, and we are going to debate some budgets that virtually double taxation in this country. We will see where those chips fall.

Madam Speaker, that didn't sound like the exciting thing that it is. That is what is so interesting to me about the work that goes on. Everybody is out in front of the cameras all day long, every day, talking about the issues that the pundits want to talk about.

What our reading clerk just did here, in 15 uneventful seconds, is set into motion the most open, the most comprehensive, the most optimistic week of public policy debate this institution will see in 2015. I am honored to be just a small part of that.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 27, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

Mr. WOODALL (during the Special Order of Mr. WOODALL), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-49) on the resolution (H. Res. 163) providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 27) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCSALLY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, well, here we are, the fifth anniversary of—well, at least this weekend—what many affectionately or disaffectionately call ObamaCare.

It is kind of hard to call it the Affordable Care Act because we—many of us—know exactly how much jeopardy it has put finances for people all over the country. There are some people that are getting back enough in subsidies that they like it.

It is important, I think, as a great followup to my friend from Georgia talking about the budget, to follow up and look at the predictions that were made 5 years ago about the bill that passed without a single Republican

vote because we had done our homework.

I did read the bill before I voted against it. I didn't have time to enmesh all of the references, the other bills that were referenced in the changes that would be made in those bills, but I could certainly tell from what was there, what I was reading in the about 2,500-page bill, that it was going to be a disaster for health care.

□ 2030

In any event, here is an article from Sam Baker, "5 Years In, 5 Busted Predictions About Obamacare," March 22, 2015:

When President Obama signed the Affordable Care Act into law 5 years ago, many Republicans essentially predicted it would grow up to be a serial killer—that seniors, Medicare, private insurance companies, jobs, and the American Dream would die by its hand.

It has turned out to be far more well adjusted.

On the other hand, many Democrats thought the law would quickly make it through its awkward phase and turn into the most popular kid in school—liked by most, respected by all, a sophisticated winner, possessed of all the latest technology but also with unassailable principles.

It has turned out to be a much bigger screwup.

I might add parenthetically here—into the article—that, actually, there were Republicans like me that knew that it was not going to die. We knew that it was going to shrivel up the number of insurance companies, as it has.

We knew that Medicare was going to take a hit because ObamaCare cut \$716 billion from seniors' health care, and even though the President and all the king's horses and all the king's men were promising that, Gee, that \$716 billion in cuts to Medicare, it is not going to affect you seniors, they were told. No, no, that is only going to affect the health care providers.

Well, I don't know about the rest of the country, but the seniors I talked to around Texas figured out, Wait a minute, if you are not going to reimburse the people that provide us health care, we are going to have a hard time getting health care. They figured it out. That is exactly what has happened.

Mr. Baker, talking about, I guess, the worst of the projection by Republicans—were not what I projected, but there are people that have not gotten the care they need. They have been put in dire physical straits because of ObamaCare. Some have lost their insurance. I had insurance before. I liked my insurance. I liked my doctors. ObamaCare changed all of that.

This article, though, says, "Say what you will about Obamacare, but if nothing else, it's a survivor." That is the point, Madam Speaker, that is important to note; any kind of socialized medicine is always a survivor.

Some were saying, Oh, we don't have to worry about ObamaCare. It will go broke. It will die of its own accord—no, that is what happens to socialism.

But socialized health care, socialized medicine in any form—even in this beginning stage, as the President has once said on video, that he wanted a single payer—in other words, total socialized medicine, where the government gets to tell everybody what they get and pay for it and so people get rationed health care, is what it amounts to.

Socialism dies of its own accord. As Margaret Thatcher once said, it eventually runs out of other people's money. Socialized medicine in any form does not die of its own volition. It doesn't happen because what happens when you are dealing with government-run health care, it doesn't die of its own accord, no.

What happens is people have more and more health care rationed. More and more people have health care they don't get because they are put in line, like the young man from Canada in my district that said his father died of a heart attack because he had been on the list in Canada for 2 years and he never got the bypass he needed.

Until ObamaCare came along, basically, if you needed bypass surgery—whether it was in east Texas or elsewhere—if you needed it now, you were going to get it now; but over time, as the government takes over health care, now, you get on a list, like my constituent's father was put on a list.

I said: 2 years, that is incredible.

He said: Well, yes, people kept getting moved in front of him.

I said: Well, my understanding was that it was a crime to do anything to get yourself moved up the list.

He said: Well, that is true, but there is a board, a group that decides who gets moved up the list in priority.

They kept moving people in front of his father until he died.

Anyway, some critics of this article said they didn't even think they would need to kill it, just that they could help it along. The law's opponents argued for years that the law would never work, predictions that reached new intensity when www.healthcare.gov launched in 2013.

That is not true of all of us. Some of us knew it would not die of its own accord. We knew that it is like any government-run health care. You just ration it, and people get less of it.

There is a board—whether anybody wants to acknowledge that Sarah Palin had a great point, she did. Whether you want to call it a death panel or not, it is a panel that will get to decide the parameters for people getting, you know, pacemakers.

One of my staff had a parent who was told the year before ObamaCare kicked in that he could get a pacemaker; after it kicked in, he couldn't get a pacemaker. Well, that is the power of the government to tell you who lives, who dies.

ObamaCare is not going to die of its own accord. People may die because of the new healthcare laws and the decisions of the death panel—or whatever

you want to call the IPAB—but they will make decisions that will affect people's ability to live.

Anyway, the article further down talks about the prediction that it would get popular:

"I think as people learn about the bill and now that the bill is enacted, it's going to become more and more popular," Senator Chuck Schumer said in 2010, just a few days after Obama signed the law. "I predict...by November, those who voted for health care will find it an asset; those who voted against it will find it a liability."

Schumer was hardly the only one expressing this optimism. The process of getting ObamaCare passed was brutal for Democrats, but many in the party truly thought the heat would die down between 2010 and 2014 when the law's central provisions kicked in.

The debate got to a point where there was no way to win the rhetorical wars over health care, so Democrats' plan was largely to get it done, wait it out, and hope people warmed up to the law once it transitioned from a political abstraction to a set of real-world policies, most of which are pretty boring.

It didn't work.

The Kaiser Family Foundation has been measuring public approval of the healthcare law every month since it was signed, and the bottom line has stayed the same: people are closely divided over the law and lean against it.

This month, Kaiser's poll found 43 percent disapproval for the law, compared to 41 percent approval, which is within a few points of most months. There have been a few blips, where approval topped disapproval or where one side cleared 50 percent, but they never lasted.

Anyway, the article goes on. I will skip down to the part, "If you like your plan, you can keep it." It says:

Obama made some predictions he probably shouldn't have, including his promise that people wouldn't lose their coverage because of ObamaCare. For starters, policies sold in the individual insurance market were largely 1-year contracts before the Affordable Care Act. In other words, there was never a guarantee that consumers could keep their same policies.

Moreover, though, ObamaCare did cause insurers to cancel millions of individual policies, and it wasn't an accident or a side effect. The law set new standards for policies in the individual market. They have to cover a set of "essential" benefits, for example, and can't impose an annual or lifetime caps on benefits.

A lot of plans that existed before ObamaCare didn't meet those criteria, hence, passing a law to make them. Those policies could technically seek "grandfathered" status, but it was hard to get. They could barely make any changes in their plan designs without losing that status. And it was hard for a reason: the law set new standards for insurance, and it wanted to shift people into plans that met those standards.

All of this was entirely foreseeable in 2010 and was even spelled out in subsequent regulations. The political uproar might not have been as bad if www.healthcare.gov had been working when people started to receive their cancellation notices.

Well, I would submit that it would have been as bad because there were a lot of lies about ObamaCare. Yes, there were some dire predictions, but I knew that ObamaCare was not going to die of its own volition because, when government controls health care, it doesn't.

As an exchange student in the Soviet Union, when I saw their poor, pitiful health care system in the Soviet Union, I was literally thanking God that we had the health system we did in America.

My family didn't even have anything like insurance at the time growing up in east Texas. It was just that we knew that we had good doctors. We had a good system. If you got in a bind, you hoped and prayed neighbors would help out.

Then that is where insurance came along, that you could pay a very small monthly, quarterly, semiannually, annual premium to insure against something unforeseeable so that you could take care of the small things; but once the government gets into something, it doesn't work so well. The more government gets into it, the worse it is.

If we don't turn this thing around and get some free market competition back in place in health care, allow people to have their own relationship with their own doctor of their own choosing, where people can actually compare the prices and decide if this doctor or this hospital is worth it—one may cost more, one may cost less, but you compare the pros and cons. That is what competition is about. We haven't had it in health care in many, many years. Why? Because the government got involved.

Now, we do need a safety net, and that is a good thing. That is what caring people do, but when the government takes over everything, as ObamaCare will undoubtedly eventually do—why? Because if they get to dictate health care, then they are going to get to dictate your life.

An article from John Nolte today points out, number one, "Premiums are 24.4 percent higher than they would have been without ObamaCare."

I guess this comes from the New York Daily News: "In the Obama administration, candidate Obama boasted in 2008, 'we'll lower premiums by up to \$2,500 for a typical family in a year.'"

This article says, "Not quite. A recent report from the National Bureau of Economic Research examined the nongroup marketplace, where families and individuals who don't get coverage through work shop for insurance. The report concluded that 2014 premiums were 24.4 percent higher than they would have been without ObamaCare."

Completely wrong—ObamaCare sent the price of insurance dramatically up.

Madam Speaker, I have people ask regularly: Why is my health insurance so much more? My deductible is so high. I will never have enough money to pay my deductible, and I have got a copay on top of that. I don't have as much covered as I did before with my other policy. I don't get to choose my doctor—or the doctor I had before that I liked, I didn't get to keep him. So why is it costing so much more?

Well, the answer is very easily given. You are paying for lots more IRS

agents. We knew when ObamaCare passed that there would be 17,000, 18,000 new IRS agents that you would have to pay for.

□ 2045

They are not going to ever help you with a head injury or a skinned knee, nothing. No. No. They are going to come after you. They are going to give you stomachaches and headaches. They are not going to help you with health care. And what about all these navigators? They are never going to help you with a knee injury or a backache. No. They are going to give you backaches because they are going to make it harder and harder to figure out what to do, even though they say, oh, they are there to help you. When the government workers say they are there to help you, you grab your wallet and run for the door.

But you are paying for so many more government workers who will end up being government union workers, and you have to help pay the union wages. We always apparently do that, paying for part of the costs of the union. That is because Republicans are real good at allowing Democrats to have laws that help fund their campaigns. They have done it for years. Mallory Factor has a good book out called "Shadowbosses" that explains the concept.

Well, here is another point from John Nolte's article, number 2, "Less Choice for Patients: From 1,232 Private Market Insurers to 310." Rather dramatic, but that was very foreseeable. Many of us talked about it. We knew that this would eliminate many of the insurance companies. It would eliminate so much choice. The same way Dodd-Frank promises, gee, we are going to fix the banking industry. No, you are going to make it hard for small banks to compete; and the big banks chew them up, absorb them when they can't make it, and then you have fewer choices. That is what ObamaCare is doing.

This article says: "Prior to ObamaCare, the individual assurance market (non-group, non-employer) offered a wealth of choices in health care options. ObamaCare has devastated that market, and with it the quality of health care. Keep in mind, the cost of premiums and deductibles have increased as choice and competition collapsed."

"Patients may also have fewer doctors to pick from. More than 60 percent of doctors plan to retire earlier than anticipated—by 2016 or sooner, according to Deloitte. The Physicians Foundation reported in the fall that nearly half of the 20,000 doctors who responded to their survey—especially those with more experience—considered ObamaCare's reforms a failure."

Number 3, "Deficit Exploded to \$1.2 Trillion with a 'T'."

"Forget the original lies that ObamaCare would be a deficit neutral, or even cut the deficit. The ObamaCare deficit is now in the trillions."

"This month, CBO estimated the law's 10-year costs will reach \$1.2 tril-

lion—a far cry from the President's initial promise of \$940 billion."

Well, I have to point out, actually, in fairness to CBO, the Congressional Budget Office originally predicted it would be over \$1 trillion; but since the President promised it would be less than \$1 trillion, the Director of CBO was called to the White House and, magically, after he went back, he reformulated things. I know this offends him, but it is still the truth. It is what happened. He went back, recalculated, and it was less than \$1 trillion. The President said: See, there, I told you it would be less than \$1 trillion. Then it passes, and then we found out, oh, do you know what? It really is more than \$1 trillion. How about that?

That is why I think CBO needs competition, and the best thing that could happen is if we started encouraging and even gave rewards to any entity, whether it is universities or private groups that begin scoring bills, if they get within a certain margin. If a bill passes, if they get within a certain margin, it would sure beat the heck out of CBO, and then you pay them. We need competition scoring bills so that we don't have the disasters we had had in the predictions of the cost of ObamaCare.

Number 4, "Media and Government Lying About ObamaCare Expanding Coverage to Millions."

"You keep hearing about how ObamaCare is covering millions, when it really isn't. A huge majority of those in the White House and its media throne-sniffers are advertising as 'newly-insured' are in fact victims of canceled policies who were forced into the ObamaCare exchanges. They already had insurance and are therefore not 'newly insured.'"

"Even some of those 'newly insured' under ObamaCare's expansion of Medicaid were once paying for their own insurance. Now they are on the government dole."

"Further, as many as 89 percent of the Americans who signed up for ObamaCare when the exchanges opened in 2013 already had insurance. In other words, many exchange enrollees simply switched from one plan to another."

So we were told, gee, there are 30 or 40 million people without insurance. We have to insure them. That is why we have got to force so many tens of millions of Americans into losing their insurance because we have 30, 40 million we have to take care of. And what happened? We are told, well, maybe 7 million or so, 8 million, they got insurance when all these millions lost theirs. That was worth the damage that this administration has done and is doing to the best health care system in the world?

Number 5, "ObamaCare's Deductibles Are Killing Families."

"One of the great untold stories about ObamaCare is that while ObamaCare has skyrocketed premium costs in the individual market, deductibles have also increased.

ObamaCare is really nothing more than catastrophic insurance priced like regular insurance.

"This year, ObamaCare's lower priced bronze plans have a \$5,181 individual deductible and \$10,545 dollars family deductible. The more expensive silver plan has a \$2,927 individual deductible and \$6,010 family deductible.

"On top of your monthly premiums, the deductible is the amount you have to pay out of pocket before your insurance kicks in. The last time I looked, if I enrolled in ObamaCare, my out-of-pocket expenses (premiums plus deductible) would exceed \$8,000 before insurance started paying anything.

"One result of this has been an increase over the last 5 years of the percentage of people who put off treatment due to cost.

"Unless something catastrophic happens to you, in most cases, you are still paying out of pocket for all of your health care. On top of that, you are paying for premiums that are doing you absolutely no good. It is just free money for the insurance companies.

"Also, when you are insured, your out-of-pocket expenses are usually higher. Most health care outlets offer steep discounts for the uninsured.

"Basically, ObamaCare is nothing more than a massive tax increase disguised as insurance; a massive financial boon to the same big insurance companies Democrats have demonized for years; a massive redistribution of wealth that primarily soaks the middle class while diminishing their quality of health care.

"In summation: The ObamaCare victims vastly outweigh the beneficiaries. It is not even close."

John Nolte, for the Record.

Then from the Weekly Standard, the Feds say that the cost of healthcare.gov is estimated at \$1.7 billion.

Of course, when the disastrous rollout of this government Web site happened, we heard from people who really knew what they were doing that said: Gosh, we could have done this for just \$6 million or so. Well, not if you are close friends with the occupants of the White House. If you are close friends with the occupants of the White House, you are going to run up a billion-dollar bill for a \$6 million, \$7 million Web site that doesn't have the security that is required.

So we are in big trouble here. Health care has not been helped, and we have more and more government workers who are telling people who know how to provide health care what they can or can't do all to the detriment of the patient.

I think about one of my constituents. He is no longer practicing medicine. He was there to help my wife when she first went into labor 8 to 10 weeks prematurely. He was telling me that he had done a surgery, one of the best he had ever done. Because of all his training and his many years of experience, he was good at what he was doing. A

couple of days after the surgery, he got a call from somebody. I think he said in Pennsylvania. The guy had no kind of medical degree at all. He is a government worker.

He said: I was looking at your records of your surgery—it was one of the best he had ever done of this type. He said: Well, the average is over 3 hours, and you only took 59 minutes; and normally you lose over 3 to 4 pints of blood, and you only lost 10 CCs, so you are going to either have to change the records or we can't reimburse you.

As this honest, experienced, and excellent physician said: I am not going to change my records for anybody. He said: Well, then we can only reimburse you about one-quarter of what you should have gotten otherwise.

He said: I am not practicing medicine like this. Some idiot doesn't even know what he is doing is going to tell me, one of the best surgeries I have ever done, that I can't be reimbursed—and he is retired. He gave it up. He said: I planned to practice a lot longer, but I am not practicing medicine like this.

So who is hurt? His patients.

So what happens when you socialize medicine, as we are moving into here, well, you have fewer doctors that are as well trained. The best and brightest don't apply. We have already seen a drop in the quality of people and the numbers of people, I am told, for medical school. Good people are still applying, but eventually, as I saw in the Soviet Union when I was there, you have people who are physicians. Some are like Florence Nightingale, they do it out of a sense of service and dedication; but some just because, you know, hey, it is a job.

As people are finding out, if you are not going to get reimbursed, then you are not going to be able to pay back a quarter-million dollars of loans for college, medical school, and getting you through the internship and residency until you are actually out making good money because you are not going to make it as good; therefore, you can't afford to go through as many years. So you end up, over the years you see the college, the medical school, all these years of training and experience squished together.

What is the result? Well, you don't have as good physicians. But you also have wonderful nurse practitioners. You have physician assistants that start taking up the jobs that people went through college and medical school, internship, and residency, they start picking up the slack that you used to have quality, well-trained doctors to do. And they are doing a good job, but it lowers further and further the quality of care any time the government gets involved to the extent that it is now.

It is not too late. It is 5 years in. It has been a disaster. One broken promise after another, after another, after another. I hope and pray that people don't have to continue to suffer the indignity of much too high health insur-

ance and not near the quality they were getting until we get a new President and can finally get a new health care system and have true reform. I hope and pray that this President does not end up being so stubborn that he will not hear the cries of the people across America who are saying: Please, let us have back our cheaper health care, our own doctors, and our better policies. That should be the conclusion after 5 years of this disaster.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2205

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) at 10 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.

HOURLY MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. GRANGER (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a prior commitment in the district.

Mr. HULTGREN (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of flight cancellations due to the weather.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. PAYNE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for March 16 through 19 on account of foot surgery.

Mr. PAYNE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of foot surgery.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 24, 2015, at 9 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:

825. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Rural Business Development Grant (RIN: 0570-AA92) received March 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

826. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Special Operations/Low Intensity Conflict, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter regarding the Department's report on the activities of the National Guard Counterdrug Schools for the preceding year, pursuant to Public Law 109-469, section 901(f); to the Committee on Armed Services.

827. A letter from the Director, Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting the Agency's Biennial Report to Congress for March 2015, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2352, and the DARPA "Breakthrough Technologies for National Security" compilation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

828. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to Expected Benefits (RIN: 1210-AB70) received March 18, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

829. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Fiduciary Requirements for Disclosure in Participant-Directed Individual Account Plans--Timing of Annual Disclosure (RIN: 1210-AB68) received March 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

830. 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; District of Columbia; Preconstruction Requirements — Nonattainment New Source Review [EPA-R03-OAR-2014-0186; FRL-9924-57-Region 3] received March 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

831. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Reporting Emission Data, Emission Fees and Process Information [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0134; FRL-9924-44-Region 7] received March 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

832. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rule for Pentane, 1,1,1,2,3,3-hexafluoro-4-(1,1,2,3,3,3-hexafluoropropoxy)— [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2011-0941; FRL-9922-30] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received March 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

833. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Mississippi Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2013-0270; FRL-9924-99-Region 4] re-

ceived March 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

834. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; California; Regional Haze Progress Report [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0586; FRL-9924-64-Region 9] received March 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

835. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 2-Propenoic acid, polymer with ethenyl acetate, ethenylbenzene, 2-ethylhexyl 2-propenoate and ethyl 2-propenoate; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0847; FRL-9923-63] received March 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

836. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revocation of Significant New Uses of Metal Salts of Complex Inorganic Oxyacids [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2014-0702; FRL-9924-09] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received March 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

837. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Sodium L-lactate and Sodium DL-lactate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0326; FRL-9924-24] received March 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

838. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to Existing Validated End-User Authorization in the People's Republic of China: Samsung China Semiconductor Co. Ltd. [Docket No.: 150206120-5120-01] (RIN: 0694-AG50) received March 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

839. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance to the Netherlands, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act as amended (Transmittal No.: 15-06); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

840. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report by the Department on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period October 1, 2014, through November 30, 2014, pursuant to Sec. 620(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and in accordance with Sec. 1(a)(6) of Executive Order 13313; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

841. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's determination and certification, pursuant to Sec. 490(b)(1)(A) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, that the top five exporting and importing countries of ephedrine and pseudoephedrine have cooperated fully with the United States or have taken adequate steps on their own to achieve full compliance with the goals established by the 1988 United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

842. A letter from the Associate General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal

Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

843. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting eleven reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

844. A letter from the Director, Equal Employment Opportunity and Inclusion, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's annual report for FY 2014, prepared in accordance with Sec. 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

845. A letter from the Director, Equal Employment Opportunity and Inclusion, Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's annual report for FY 2014, prepared in accordance with Sec. 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

846. A letter from the General Counsel, Institute of Museum and Library Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

847. A letter from the President, Inter-American Foundation, transmitting the Foundation's annual report for FY 2014 prepared in accordance with Title II, Sec. 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

848. A letter from the Secretary and Chief Administrative Officer, Postal Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report to Congress Fiscal Year 2014, prepared in accordance with Title II, Sec. 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

849. A letter from the Chair, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's inventories of commercial and inherently governmental activities performed for fiscal years 2012 and 2013, pursuant to Public Law 105-270, section 2(c)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

850. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Chesapeake Bay Office Biennial Report to Congress for Fiscal Years 2013-2014, as required by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1992, as amended by Sec. 401 of Pub. L. 107-372; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

851. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Herring Fishery; Adjustments to 2015 Annual Catch Limits [Docket No.: 141002820-5113-01] (RIN: 0648-XD536) received March 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

852. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, Contract Management Division, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — NASA FAR Supplement, Contractor Whistleblower Protections (RIN: 2700-AE08) received March 19,

2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

853. A letter from the Chief, Impact Analyst, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel (O2REG), Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedule for Rating Disabilities — Mental Disorders and Definition of Psychosis for Certain VA Purposes (RIN: 2900-A096) received March 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

854. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 2014 report of the Federal Coordinated Health Care Office (Medicare-Medicaid Coordination Office), pursuant to Sec. 2602(e) of the Affordable Care Act; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

855. A letter from the Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting the Commission's March 2015 "Report to the Congress: Medicare Payment Policy"; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Following action occurred on March 20, 2015]

Mr. PRICE of Georgia: Committee on the Budget. House Concurrent Resolution 27. Resolution establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025 (Rept. 114-47). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

[Submitted March 23, 2015]

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 216. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a Future-Years Veterans Program and a quadrennial veterans review, to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a Chief Strategy Officer, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-48). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WOODALL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 163. Resolution providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 27) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025 (Rept. 114-49). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 1523. A bill to provide relief to community banks and promote their access to capital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LANCE, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SIREN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 1524. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1 Walter Hammond Place in Waldwick, New Jersey, as the "Staff Sergeant Joseph D'Augustine Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 1525. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to make certain improvements to form 10-K and regulation S-K, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 1526. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modify policies relating to payment under the Medicare program for durable medical equipment, orthotics and prosthetics, and prosthetic devices, 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 Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 1527. A bill to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of the families of New York Police Department Detectives Wenjian Liu and Rafael Ramos, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Ms. MENG, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ISSA, Ms. ESTY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. LONG, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FARR, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 1528. A bill to protect consumers from discriminatory State taxes on motor vehicle rentals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHERMAN (for himself and Mr. LUETKEMEYER):

H.R. 1529. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 to modify the requirements for community financial institutions with respect to certain rules relating to mortgage loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 1530. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to refine how Medicare pays for orthotics and prosthetics, to improve beneficiary experience and outcomes with orthotic and prosthetic care, and to streamline the Medicare administrative appeals process, 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. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 1531. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide a pathway for temporary seasonal employees in Federal land management agencies to compete for vacant permanent positions under internal merit promotion procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. EMMER of Minnesota (for himself, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. HURD of Texas):

H.R. 1532. A bill to amend the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014

to modify the distance requirements regarding the eligibility of certain veterans to receive medical care and services from non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 1533. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. LEE, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. FARR, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1534. A bill to reduce the number of nuclear-armed submarines operated by the Navy, to prohibit the development of a new long-range penetrating bomber aircraft, to prohibit the procurement of new intercontinental ballistic missiles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mrs. LUMMIS):

H.R. 1535. A bill to terminate any Federal employee who refuses to answer questions or gives false testimony in a congressional hearing; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 1536. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and make permanent the research credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 1537. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to reauthorize a program of priority review to encourage treatments for rare pediatric diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1538. A bill to extend the principle of federalism to State drug policy, provide access to medical marijuana, and enable research into the medicinal properties of marijuana; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Financial Services, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself and Mr. RENACCI):

H.R. 1539. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Labor from enforcing any requirement that consumer reporting agencies that serve only as a secure conduit to data from State unemployment compensation agencies obtain and maintain an individual's informed consent agreement when verifying income and employment with such agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 1540. A bill to terminate the authority to waive certain provisions of law requiring the imposition of sanctions with respect to Iran, to codify certain sanctions imposed by executive order, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Oversight and Government Reform, the Judiciary, 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. GRIJALVA (for himself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 1541. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to make Hispanic-serving institutions eligible for technical and financial assistance for the establishment of preservation training and degree programs; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 1542. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to recognize Indian tribal governments for purposes of determining under the adoption credit whether a child has special needs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. HAHN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 1543. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out certain major medical facility projects for which appropriations were made for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 1544. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the estate and gift tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NUGENT (for himself, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. COOK, and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 1545. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to require that the Director of the Bureau of Prisons ensure that each chief executive officer of a Federal penal or correctional institution provides a secure storage area located outside of the secure perimeter of the Federal penal or correctional institution for firearms carried by certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PALAZZO (for himself, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HANNA, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. BYRNE):

H.R. 1546. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide eligibility for public broadcasting facilities to receive certain disaster assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. JONES, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. HARPER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. YODER, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 1547. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal certain limitations on health care benefits enacted as part of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGRETTE, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS, Ms.

PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 1548. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to eliminate the exemption for aggregation of emissions from oil and gas sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MICA, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. POSEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. TITUS, Mr. YODER, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 1549. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the 7-year recovery period for motorsports entertainment complexes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSS (for himself and Mr. DELANEY):

H.R. 1550. A bill to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to improve the transparency of the Financial Stability Oversight Council, to improve the SIFI designation process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SANFORD (for himself, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. AMASH, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. MASSIE):

H.R. 1551. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to phaseout the Mass Transit Account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MOORE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1552. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to preserve the effectiveness of medically important antimicrobials used in the treatment of human and animal diseases; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. BARR):

H.R. 1553. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to specify which smaller institutions may qualify for an 18-month examination cycle; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 1554. A bill to require a land conveyance involving the Elkhorn Ranch and the White River National Forest in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 1555. A bill to stop implementation and enforcement of the Forest Service travel management rule and require the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to incorporate the needs, uses, and input of affected communities, and to obtain their consent, before taking any travel management action affecting access to National Forest System lands derived from the public domain or public lands, and for other pur-

poses; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 1556. A bill to secure the Federal voting rights of non-violent persons when released from incarceration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULVANEY:

H. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President's executive amnesty is illegal notwithstanding passage of H.R. 240, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act of 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. NUNES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. KEATING):

H. Res. 162. A resolution calling on the President to provide Ukraine with military assistance to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MICA, Mr. NUGENT, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H. Res. 164. A resolution recognizing Dr. Elmira Mangum as the first female president of Florida Agricultural & Mechanical University; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 1523.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 (“The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States”), 3 (“To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes”), and 18 (“To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof”).

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 1524.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 (“To establish Post Offices and post Roads”), Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 (“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. GARRETT:

H.R. 1525.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 (“The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States”), 3 (“To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes”), and 18 (“To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof”).

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 1526.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 1527.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I and the Sixteenth Amendment of the Constitution.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 1528.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which grants Congress the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

H.R. 1529.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3, further, Article 1, Section 7, clause 2.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1530.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; and including, but not solely limited to Article I, Section 8, Clause 14.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 1531.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. EMMER of Minnesota:

H.R. 1532.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution: 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 Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 1533.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, which gives Congress the power “to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with Indian Tribes.”

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1534.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama:

H.R. 1535.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8. To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 1536.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 and the XVI amendment to the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 1537.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation is authorized by the United States Constitution under Article I, Section 8, “Congress shall have the power To... provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States” and “To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the forgoing Powers.”

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 1538.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 1539.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 1540.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1541.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. KILLMER:

H.R. 1542.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 1543.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 3: To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;

Article I, §8 Clause 11: To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years;

Article I, §8 Clause 12: To provide and maintain a navy;

Article I, §8 Clause 13: To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;

Article I, §8 Clause 14: To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions;

Article I, §8 Clause 15: To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the states respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 1544.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. NUGENT:

H.R. 1545.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.R. 1546.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which states that Congress has the 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. PAULSEN:

H.R. 1547.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 1548.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes).

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 1549.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 1550.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (The Congress shall have the Power “to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States and with the Indian Tribes”

By Mr. SANFORD:

H.R. 1551.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

“To regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with Indian Tribes.”

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 1552.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 1553.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: “The Congress shall have power . . . To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.”

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 1554.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution: to make rules for the government and regulation of the land.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 1555.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 1556.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I section 4 clause 1 of The Constitution of the United States

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 93: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
 H.R. 140: Mr. BABIN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
 H.R. 146: Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 148: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 154: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 160: Mr. MOULTON.
 H.R. 167: Mr. WALZ.
 H.R. 169: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Mr. BOST.
 H.R. 216: Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 224: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
 H.R. 232: Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. WALDEN.
 H.R. 244: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
 H.R. 263: Mr. LEVIN.
 H.R. 282: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
 H.R. 308: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 333: Mr. WALZ.
 H.R. 348: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. TROTT.
 H.R. 360: Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H.R. 381: Mr. WALZ and Mr. SCHRADER.
 H.R. 402: Mrs. NOEM.
 H.R. 426: Mr. RUSSELL.
 H.R. 427: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
 H.R. 430: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 474: Miss RICE of New York and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 511: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. PAULSEN.
 H.R. 531: Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 540: Mr. TROTT.
 H.R. 546: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
 H.R. 572: Mr. POLIQUIN and Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 578: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
 H.R. 592: Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
 H.R. 595: Mr. FORBES and Mr. KATKO.
 H.R. 601: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. TIBERI.
 H.R. 602: Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 606: Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 610: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 624: Mr. TROTT.
 H.R. 625: Mr. YOHO.
 H.R. 642: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. ZINKE.
 H.R. 650: Mr. HILL, Mr. BUCK, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
 H.R. 662: Mr. CHABOT and Ms. BORDALLO.
 H.R. 663: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mr. THORNBERRY.
 H.R. 672: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
 H.R. 695: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
 H.R. 696: Mr. BUCHANAN.
 H.R. 702: Mr. MARCHANT.
 H.R. 709: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
 H.R. 721: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
 H.R. 733: Mr. HENSARLING.
 H.R. 766: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 767: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H.R. 784: Mr. PIERLUISI.
 H.R. 793: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
 H.R. 800: Mr. LOEBSACK.
 H.R. 824: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 835: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 840: Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico and Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 842: Ms. KUSTER.
 H.R. 863: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
 H.R. 882: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 884: Mr. UPTON.
 H.R. 886: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
 H.R. 915: Mr. HIGGINS.
 H.R. 920: Mrs. LUMMIS.
 H.R. 921: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
 H.R. 927: Mr. HASTINGS.
 H.R. 969: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. UPTON, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. VALADAO.
 H.R. 970: Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.
 H.R. 985: Mr. LOEBSACK.
 H.R. 990: Mr. NADLER, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. SIRES.
 H.R. 997: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. POSEY, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mrs. BLACK.
 H.R. 1019: Mr. NUNES and Mr. WOODALL.
 H.R. 1037: Mr. SALMON, Mr. BRAT, Mr. BEYER, Ms. ESTY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Ms. SPEIER.
 H.R. 1089: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
 H.R. 1092: Mr. DEUTCH and Ms. ROSLEHTINEN.
 H.R. 1094: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
 H.R. 1104: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1105: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. TROTT, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. HILL, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. PERRY, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. BARR, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. BOUTSTANY, Mr. LONG, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. YODER, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. LANCE, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KLINE.
 H.R. 1111: Ms. MOORE and Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 1131: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
 H.R. 1133: Mr. POSEY.
 H.R. 1147: Mr. FLEMING, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. MCCAUL.
 H.R. 1149: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mr. MCCAUL.
 H.R. 1150: Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. PITTINGER, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. TROTT, Mr. POMPEO, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
 H.R. 1170: Mr. LOEBSACK.
 H.R. 1172: Mr. NOLAN and Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 1174: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
 H.R. 1198: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 1199: Mr. CHABOT.
 H.R. 1202: Mr. LOEBSACK.
 H.R. 1206: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 1214: Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 1215: Mr. ABRAHAM and Mr. GOHMERT.
 H.R. 1222: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
 H.R. 1233: Mr. ZINKE.
 H.R. 1247: Ms. STEFANIK.
 H.R. 1249: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. WALKER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
 H.R. 1258: Mr. SHUSTER and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H.R. 1265: Mr. FINCHER.
 H.R. 1267: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. LATTA, and Mrs. HARTZLER.
 H.R. 1269: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 1270: Mr. DEFAZIO.
 H.R. 1271: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Ms. LEE.
 H.R. 1282: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H.R. 1298: Mr. MARCHANT and Mrs. HARTZLER.
 H.R. 1299: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. CHABOT.
 H.R. 1300: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 1309: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. FINCHER.
 H.R. 1323: Mrs. HARTZLER.
 H.R. 1324: Mr. TIPTON.
 H.R. 1336: Mr. ROSS and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 1343: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.
 H.R. 1346: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. DOLD.
 H.R. 1347: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. DOLD.
 H.R. 1350: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. REED.
 H.R. 1358: Mr. MEEKS.
 H.R. 1365: Mr. ZINKE, Mr. HILL, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HURT of Virginia, and Mr. CRAMER.
 H.R. 1369: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
 H.R. 1382: Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 1384: Mr. ZINKE, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
 H.R. 1386: Mr. BOST.
 H.R. 1388: Mr. MARCHANT.
 H.R. 1411: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 1421: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1427: Mr. FLORES.
 H.R. 1429: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mr. HANNA.
 H.R. 1434: Ms. PELOSI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 1441: Mr. HANNA.
 H.R. 1444: Mr. KNIGHT.
 H.R. 1459: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. VARGAS.
 H.R. 1460: Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 1470: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SCHRADER, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. BARR, Mr. REED, and Mr. HARPER.
 H.R. 1480: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
 H.R. 1482: Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KEATING, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 1487: Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. GOHMERT.
 H.R. 1500: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
 H.R. 1508: Mr. KATKO, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. MICA, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. BYRNE.
 H.R. 1519: Mr. LOEBSACK and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mrs. WALORSKI.
 H. Con. Res. 19: Mrs. NOEM, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
 H. Res. 53: Mr. ROYCE and Mr. COHEN.
 H. Res. 154: Mr. COFFMAN and Ms. HAHN.
 H. Res. 161: Ms. BORDALLO.