



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 17, 2015

No. 97

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 17, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BLAKE FARENTHOLD 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 11:50 a.m.

END IMMIGRANT FAMILY DETENTION

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, you are in the presence of greatness. No, not me, but I am flattered if that was your first thought. Rather, I speak of my excellent grandson, who has come to Washington and to the floor of the House of Representatives to see his grandpa at work.

Tonight, Luisito, who is 12, will be my escort, along with his grandma, at the annual White House picnic for

Members of Congress and their families. It would take way more than the allotted 5 minutes to enumerate all of the reasons for this grandfather's pride, so let me just say I am looking forward to showing him off at tonight's gathering.

But more than tonight's picnic, what I am really looking forward to is Father's Day. This Sunday, in Chicago, along with Luisito, my grandson, I will be with his dad and my daughters, who always make the old man feel loved.

And this Father's Day, I will be especially thankful for being allowed to have my family around me, because on Monday, I will be visiting with hundreds of children who cannot be with their dads.

On Monday, I will be joining seven of my colleagues in San Antonio to visit the two largest family detention facilities in the country. Karnes and Dilley are where moms and their children are being kept behind bars awaiting resolution of their immigration cases seeking asylum.

Remember a year ago when tens of thousands of children and young people were fleeing violence in three countries in Central America? The Republicans thought that these children would bring this country to its knees, and anti-immigration groups organized mobs to protest and keep children out of detention facilities in their communities. Do you remember that?

Well, many mothers with small children were also fleeing to the U.S. last year, and they are still being held in detention facilities, which are operated by private prison companies in Texas and Pennsylvania. They are detained for the completely lawful act of seeking asylum. My colleagues and I are going to see firsthand what is going on.

The minority whip, Mr. HOYER, and two of my closest allies on the family detention issue, Ms. LOFGREN and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, both of California, are going, and we will be hosted by our col-

league from Texas, Mr. CASTRO, as we visit the two facilities.

I am sure that Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel, and even private companies who are contracted to run the facilities and profit from the incarceration of other people, are trying their best to make the conditions of detention for these moms and kids as humane as they can.

But, you see, that misses the point. We shouldn't be holding vulnerable women and children in detention. We have mothers and small children living in jail-like facilities with uncertain futures, limited access to legal counsel, and this has been going on for some time, for almost a year for some of them. Even with schools and laundry and TVs, they are still being held behind fences.

Moms still have to explain to the youngest children that, no, in fact, they do not know when they can leave or whether they will be deported back to the violent countries they fled after months in detention.

Children who face trauma, gangs, murder, and sexual assault in their neighborhoods were forced to leave alone or in groups or with a parent. They faced all sorts of dangers—smugglers and predators—on the journey to northern Mexico, where we know assault, robbery, and rape are commonplace. Then they crossed the U.S. border, often with the guidance of additional smugglers and criminals, and, following the process in the U.S. law, presented themselves to authorities to request asylum.

Now, because we have not put money into our immigration court system and, by the way, because we have not created ways for people to come here with visas instead of smugglers, we are all paying a higher price to house and feed moms and kids when much cheaper monitoring and supervision options are available. Why? The government feels that imprisoning these children

□ 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.

H4435

and moms, even in relatively humane conditions, will be a deterrent to others.

But 136 House Democrats, including all 8 Members traveling to Texas on Monday, have asked the Secretary of Homeland Security to end the practice of holding moms and children in detention when there are other ways to get the job done.

The children are paying the highest cost. It doesn't take a developmental expert to know that weeks and months in detention in prison-like conditions, having already lived through weeks and months and years of desperation, are not conducive to good child development.

But with my Republican friends, it is usually not the human cost that matters. So let me break it down another way.

At \$343 per person per day, we are spending \$125,000 per detainee per year—\$125,000. But the alternatives to detention we could be using cost about \$5.50 a day, or about \$2,000 a year. That is cost savings logic that even in Washington we can understand.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of how you feel about the funding and regardless of how you feel about immigration or policy issues, Central America, or any other issues, you cannot lose sight of the fact that we are talking about children.

As a father, I will not be able to look at those children without seeing my grandson, and they are probably a lot like your children and grandchildren, too. I am going to Texas for myself to see these women and children we are holding, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

PAHRUMP VA CLINIC

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

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, we live in America, a nation conceived in liberty and consecrated by the service and sacrifice of our military men and women.

Veterans throughout the country depend on our integrity to keep our promises. We promise to care for their health after they come home from battle; and yet, too often, we delay making good on the promise.

Specifically, why have veterans of Pahrump, Nevada, had the promise of a new clinic dangled over their heads for years? Construction was finally approved nearly 1 year ago, and the ground remains unbroken.

Later today, the VA is holding a town hall in Pahrump. My staff will be there to hear the latest updates. I hope they will finally have something to tell the veterans there other than what they have shared with me.

Something is very wrong with the VA right now. My advocacy for the veterans of my district, especially those who need better and more accessible health care now, will not cease.

Let's not leave our veterans with more unmet promises. We can do better

for the more than 8,000 veterans of Nye County, Nevada.

STOP MESSING AROUND WITH FAILED TRADE AGREEMENTS

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, 44 days—44 days—that is when the highway trust fund runs dry.

Now, this isn't a surprise. We have been kicking the can down the road for awhile. The Republicans have been in charge for 4½ years. And today, the Ways and Means Committee is, rather begrudgingly, holding its first hearing on the issue of the highway trust fund. However, they have already foreclosed the options.

The chairman and the Republican leadership have said: We can't do user fees the way Dwight David Eisenhower and Ronald Reagan did. That is off the table. We are going to come up with some other creative or phony way to pay for these investments.

And they pretty much have said they are going to try to kick the can down the road until the end of December.

Well, those sorts of patches won't deal with the massive pothole that we have with our infrastructure in this country: 140,000 bridges need repair or replacement; 40 percent of the service of the National Highway System is degraded to the point where you have to dig it up and put in a new roadbed, not just pave it over a little bit; \$86 billion backlog to bring our transit system just up to a state of good repair—not to build out more options to get people out of congestion and traffic, just to bring the existing system up to a state of repair. It is so bad that in the Nation's Capital they are unnecessarily killing people because of a system that is outmoded, obsolete, and defective.

But we are the United States of America. We can't afford to invest, according to Republicans. They don't distinguish between investment and spending, unless it is the Pentagon, where spending is good. But rebuilding American infrastructure, they can't find the money for that.

Luckily, there is furious, furious activity going on now. The President went to the baseball game last week for the first time in 7 years. He showed up at the House baseball game. He came to the Democratic Caucus last week. He sent three secretaries here. He is inviting groups down to the White House, bringing them down by motorcade. He is on the phone with JOHN BOEHNER, his former archenemy. They are furiously, furiously at work.

Unfortunately, what they are scheming over is how to undo what we did last week, blocking the last worst trade agreement that America will ever have, saying: We want a new paradigm on trade. No more failed trade policies for this country. It is not working, to just rebuild or build upon the massive profits of multinational

corporations, hoping some of it might trickle down.

Actually, it has just led to job exports because they can get 30-cent-an-hour labor in Vietnam. They desperately want this agreement. And Malaysia, hey, the House stripped out the minor restrictions on human trafficking so that U.S. companies could feel free to go to Malaysia.

So they are furiously plotting what way they can trick us or somehow overcome 85 percent of the Democrats in the House caucus here and a number of Republicans who have concerns about these failed trade deals.

Now, just think—just think—if Speaker BOEHNER, President Obama, and corporate America assembled, were just working to help us find a solution to our crumbling infrastructure, because it is certainly important to everybody in this country. If we found that solution, if we moved forward with a long-term bill, we could, instead of having to argue over assistance for workers who are going to lose their jobs because of this trade agreement, we could be hiring hundreds of thousands of Americans, and not just construction workers. This would involve manufacturing. For transit, it involves high tech. It involves small business. It involves minority business enterprises. It involves family-wage jobs where people can make a living, not getting retrained to go to McDonald's because their job was sent to Asia or Mexico or someplace else.

We have a tremendous opportunity. Stop messing around with these failed trade agreements, and let's put our heads together and figure out how to pay for a long-term transportation bill and get this country moving again.

LGBT PRIDE MONTH

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

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, June is national LGBT Pride Month, and so I rise today to honor and recognize the determination, advocacy, contributions, and talents of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender Americans.

I was 15 years old, a high school student in a small town, when I gave my first gay rights speech. I did not know in 1975 that I would one day have the opportunity to be here on the floor of the House of Representatives to support equal rights, but I did know that it is wrong to discriminate against fellow Americans because of who they love.

And I think I knew on some level that my brother Jamie was gay. I was, and still remain, committed to stand with those who fight bigotry, discrimination, and violence against those who love another.

And looking back, I am so deeply thankful to stand here today and to celebrate the remarkable progress we have made in recent years. That progress is due to the tireless determination and enduring struggle of

LGBT Americans and allies, like my brother Jamie and my mother, Mitzi Henderson.

□ 1015

Don't Ask, Don't Tell is a thing of the past, and it no longer forces our men and women in uniform to choose between serving this Nation and being open about who they are and who they love. Marriage equality is now a reality in 37 States and in Washington, D.C. That covers 70 percent of all Americans. During LGBT Pride Month, we celebrate the progress we have made, but we also recommit to the continued fight for full equality.

Congress needs to pass the Employment Non-Discrimination Act, ENDA, to ensure that no one is fired because of one's gender identity or sexual orientation. Congress needs to pass the SAME Act, which I had the honor of helping to introduce, to ensure that all couples can receive the Social Security benefits that they have earned. Congress needs to pass the Respect for Marriage Act so that all couples are treated with equality and fairness no matter where they live or who they love.

At this very moment, the pursuit of national marriage equality continues. The Supreme Court is currently considering a case that affords the Court a rare opportunity, the opportunity to make history while advancing justice. The Court may and—I hope—will rule that the Constitution's guarantee of the right to marry extends to same-sex couples throughout the United States.

No matter how the Court rules in the days ahead, I know we still have a long road ahead to advance equal rights for all Americans, but I also know we will prevail. We will prevail because we will continue to have those courageous conversations one at a time. We will prevail because we advocate for something far more powerful than politics; we advocate for love.

I am honored to join with Americans across this great country to celebrate national LGBT Pride Month and to stand with those who stand up every day to defend the right of all Americans to be proud of who they are, to be proud of who they love, and to proudly work together for the ongoing cause of true equality under the law.

KIPP GENERATIONS COLLEGIATE GRADUATION

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise today in honor of the graduates from the KIPP Generations Collegiate High School, KGC, in Houston, Texas. KIPP is a charter school that partners with our Houston area public school system.

Last Sunday, I was honored to speak at their commencement ceremony. I have followed the success of KIPP students for 20 years. From their begin-

nings in elementary school, Mike Feinberg and his excellent staff have taught thousands of children in Texas. KGC's main focus is to build a rigorous learning environment to better equip its students for college.

This school has upheld its mission by empowering its graduates to take ownership of their education by approaching learning with curiosity, with a sense of responsibility, and by putting their knowledge into action in the service of others. Hailing under the motto of "We Lift as We Climb," KGC is truly a model of success for the entire country.

KGC's values of hope, empowerment, grit, and citizenship are tools that every student needs to succeed in the 21st century. Because of this learning environment, every graduate from this program has been accepted into a college or a university. KGC continues to perform well above the State in district averages.

I would like to congratulate the students, the parents, the teachers, and the administrators for their success now and in the future.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 19 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

The following proceedings were held before the House convened for morning-hour debate:

UNITED STATES ASSOCIATION OF FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS 2015 ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS

The meeting was called to order by the Honorable Jim Walsh, vice president of Former Members of Congress Association, at 8:06 a.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Lord God of history, we thank You for this day when former Members return to Congress to continue, in a less official manner, their service to our Nation and to this noble institution.

May their presence here bring a moment of pause where current Members consider the profiles they now form for future generations of Americans.

May all former Members be rewarded for their contributions to this constitutional Republic and continue to work and pray that the goodness and justice of this beloved country be proclaimed to the nations.

Bless all former Members who have died since last year's meeting, 30 in all. May their families and their constituents be comforted during a time of mourning and forever know our gratitude for the sacrifices made in service to the House.

Finally, bless those here gathered that they might bring joy and hope to the present age in supportive compan-

ionship to one another. Together, we call upon Your holy name now and forever.

Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable Jim Walsh led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Mr. WALSH. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. I was glad to be here with Jim Walsh.

I looked at the list. As I look around—I am not sure this is accurate—but I saw in the list there are about, I would say, 30 names on this list, and I think there are only two on the list, although that may be not accurate, with whom I have not served. Ron, you are one of them, and I think Lou Frey. Where is Lou?

Mr. FREY. Over here.

Mr. HOYER. The two of you, I think, are the only two former Members with whom I have not served.

And, unfortunately, I never served with Speaker Michel. I served with Minority Leader Michel, but I wish I had served with Speaker Michel, one of the great Americans with whom I have served.

I think Bob Michel is the quintessential example of what a Member of Congress ought to be: civil, committed to his party and to his principles, but committed above all to his country and to his family.

Bob, it was an honor to serve with you, and it is an honor to be your friend. Thank you very much for your service.

To all of you who made this institution what it is today and those of us who are continuing to make it what it ought to be, we are not doing that job very well, for the most part. Although, I will say this, that Speaker BOEHNER is trying to make that happen and, to the extent that we work together, we do. But it is harder and harder, as you know, because the ideological differences between the parties have become more substantial than they were, certainly when I came here in 1981.

Jim Blanchard and I served on the Financial Services Committee together. It was then the Banking Committee. But we are trying to work together to do what is best for our country. I think the country believes its board of directors is not working nearly as well as it ought to.

I want to thank all of you for staying engaged and for continuing to send the message to your colleagues, your friends, your neighbors who have great respect for you. And you have something that very few people have. You know, there are only about a little short of 11,000 of us who have served in this House of Representatives since the founding of the Republic, which is an

amazingly small number in a country that is now 320 million, give or take, people.

So it was a wonderful, wonderful honor for us to be elected here. As you know, we can't be appointed to the House of Representatives.

And as I look around this room on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, so many people with whom I worked very, very closely, positively and productively in the Congress of the United States, it is always a privilege to welcome you back. And, of course, so many of you—Ron Sarasin is a permanent fixture, of course. We see Ron through his activity on the historic society working here on a very regular basis to make sure that Americans understand the history and the importance of their Capitol. Ron, thank you very much for that service and that leadership.

Mr. Chris Shays is coming into the Chamber. Hi, Chris. Good to see you.

Mr. SHAYS. We haven't voted yet, have we?

Mr. HOYER. Now, there are some of you I need—and I am not sure that I would get all of you—but we haven't voted yet.

I want to thank all of you for staying involved, staying true to the responsibility the people gave you; and when you no longer had that responsibility, in terms of being an elected Member of this body, you continued your fidelity to what this body means, particularly this body. I think all of us are very proud that we served, as we all say, in the people's House.

This was the House that was designed to be most responsive to the passions and the fears and the aspirations and the hopes, the good and the bad, of the American people, where every 2 years we had to re-up. And I think that will never change. It will never change, first of all, because it was a good theory. And, secondly, it will never change because the Senators don't want to give us a free shot at them. So, you know, you have got the principle and then the practical combined in that way.

But I always enjoy being with you, saying hello to you. Certainly my office, which is, as you know, just one floor down here in the Capitol, if we can do anything for any of you at any point of time, if you need a place to hang your jacket or make a telephone call or we have got a conference room that is vacant from time to time, you can use that. It was a privilege and an honor to serve with all of you and to continue to be your friends. God bless you. Thank you very much.

Let me pay special honor to my Maryland colleague, Bev Byron. Jim Moran, I think, and John may be the most recent new Members of the former Members. Maybe some of the rest of you, I think. But Bev Byron and Mike McIntyre.

Bev Byron and I started out—well, she may have been there 1 or 2 years before I was there. But in 1962, we

started in the Young Democrats together. Now, she wants me to sit down. She is saying “now you are going to meddling.” We love you, Bev. I love you. Thank you.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Whip, on behalf of all of my colleagues here in the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress, let me say thank you for your loyalty to this group. You always come year after year. You share your wisdom. You give us a sense of what is happening, and you connect we, the former Members, with the current. And it is a great value to all of us. Thank you.

I now call upon the distinguished president of the association, Barbara Kennelly, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. KENNELLY. Thank you, Jim.

I was pleased to represent Connecticut for 17 years.

Mr. WALSH. Pardon me.

Ms. KENNELLY. All those little States up there.

And thank you, Leader HOYER, for being with us this morning. I can always know where your seniority is because I was one behind you, and you were fortunate and you stayed.

Anyway, we begin this meeting, and I thank everybody who is here with us this morning as we begin this wonderful day of former Members.

We are back in this revered Chamber, which we all loved and worked in and had really such an honor to be here, and it is an honor to be here again today to present the 45th annual report of the United States Association of Former Members of Congress.

I will be joined by some of our colleagues in reporting on the activities and projects of our organization since our last report, which was last July. Wait until you see how far we have come even since last year.

I first would like the Clerk to call the roll.

Mr. Blanchard of Michigan
 Ms. Buerkle of New York
 Mr. Bustamante of Texas
 Ms. Byron of Maryland
 Mr. Carnahan of Missouri
 Mr. Carr of Michigan
 Mr. Clement of Tennessee
 Ms. Dahlkemper of Pennsylvania
 Mr. Edwards of Texas
 Mr. Frey of Florida
 Mr. Frost of Texas
 Mr. Gingrey of Georgia
 Mr. Hertel of Michigan
 Mr. Hughes of New Jersey
 Ms. Kennelly of Connecticut
 Mr. Kolbe of Arizona
 Mr. Konnyu of California
 Mr. Lancaster of North Carolina
 Mr. Lungren of California
 Mr. McIntyre of North Carolina
 Mr. Mezvinsky of Iowa
 Mr. Moore of Kansas
 Mr. Moran of Virginia
 Ms. Morella of Maryland
 Mr. Sarasin of Connecticut
 Mr. Sarpalius of Texas
 Mr. Shays of Connecticut
 Mr. Skaggs of Colorado

Mr. Stearns of Florida
 Mr. Sundquist of Tennessee
 Mr. Tanner of Tennessee
 Mr. Tierney of Massachusetts
 Mr. Turner of Texas
 Mr. Walsh of New York.

Mr. WALSH. The Chair announces that 34 former Members of Congress have responded to their names.

Ms. KENNELLY. Thank you all for joining us today.

Our association was chartered by Congress, and one requirement of that charter is for us to report once a year to Congress about our activities. Wait until you see how many activities that we have.

Many of you have joined us for several years on this occasion, and there will be numerous programs and projects with which by now many of you have become very familiar. This is a sign of our association's stability and purpose.

We are extremely proud of our 45-year history, of creating lasting and purposeful programs to teach about Congress and representative government, and of our ability to take long-standing projects and to expand them and to improve them. We will report on our program in just a minute.

During our annual meeting today, we will honor two of our colleagues with well-deserved recognition. In a few minutes, we will celebrate Lou Frey's accomplishments with our Lifetime Achievement Award. And later today, during a luncheon in his honor, we will bestow the 2015 Distinguished Service Award to our dear friend, Amo Houghton. I certainly hope all of you in attendance and those coming later can join us for the luncheon since Amo has been an inspiration and a mentor to so many of us.

While the ceremony is not going to take place right now, I do want to read into the RECORD the inscription of the plaque Amo Houghton will receive today:

The 2015 Distinguished Service Award is presented by the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress to Congressman Amo Houghton.

Congressman Houghton of New York is known for his civility, intellect, and compassion. Amo valiantly served our country as a United States Marine and for 18 years as a Member of Congress. While serving in Congress, Amo was relied upon by both Republican and Democratic Members for his keen mind, unassuming nature, and unquestioned integrity to help find solutions when others only saw impasse.

He set the standard for good citizenship and a commitment to the common good and continues to do so in his support of educational and philanthropic endeavors. He is a voice of reason that continues to resonate with all of those who care deeply about Congress and the ideals of representative democracy. His colleagues from both sides of the aisle salute him as a distinguished and dedicated public servant.

Washington, D.C.

Please do join us this afternoon because I think the luncheon is going to be absolutely wonderful, and I hope you all can attend. I know there are

others that couldn't be with us this morning that will be with us this noon-time.

Now, back to our report. Our association is bipartisan. It was founded in 1970 and chartered by Congress in 1983. The purpose of the United States Association of Former Members of Congress is to promote public service and strengthen democracy, abroad and in the United States.

About 600 former Members, Senators and Representatives, belong to this association. Republicans, Democrats, and Independents are united in this organization in their desire to teach about Congress and the importance of representative democracy.

We are proud to have been chartered by Congress, and we are just as proud to take no funding from Congress. All the activities which we are about to describe are financed via membership dues, program-specific grants, sponsors, or via our fundraising dinner that you are going to hear about very shortly.

Our finances are sound, our projects fully funded, and our most recent audit by an outside accountant confirmed that we are running our association in a fiscally sound, responsible, and transparent manner.

It has been another successful, active, and rewarding year. We have continued our work of serving as a liaison between the current Congress and legislatures overseas. We have created partnerships with highly respected institutions in the area of democracy building and election monitoring. We have developed new projects and are expanding others. We, again, have sent dozens of bipartisan teams of former Members of Congress to teach about public service and representative democracy at universities and high schools both in the United States and abroad.

Our most important domestic undertaking is teaching America's next generation about their government and responsibility of citizenship. After our report here in the Chamber this morning, we will inaugurate a new association project aimed at bringing civic education back to public school classrooms. The focus on civics has been ingrained in our association's DNA for over 30 years, most prominently as a part of our Congress to Campus program.

I will yield to my good friend, David Skaggs of Colorado, who for a number of years, when our association was not able to administer this program on its own, stepped up to the plate and not only kept Congress to Campus going, but expanded it significantly.

David.

Mr. SKAGGS. Thank you very much, Barbara.

I appreciate the opportunity to report on the Congress to Campus program. Although I have been affiliated with it for a long time, I want to recognize the co-chairs of the program who couldn't be with us this morning, Larry

LaRocco of Idaho and Jack Buechner of Missouri. They have done a terrific job over the years in moving this program along.

This program, as many of us have participated in it well know, sends bipartisan teams of former Members to colleges and universities across the country and around the world. It engages our Members from all over the country in educating the next generation of leaders about the institution of Congress, the duties and responsibilities that we have as Members, and most importantly, the value of public service.

Since our visits always involve a bipartisan team, they demonstrate, I think, pretty well that political debate can and should be respectful, dynamic, and courteous.

Former Members volunteer their time leading classes, meeting with student leaders, meeting with community organizations, joining with student government meetings—all manner of activities on campus. The schools are encouraged to offer the program to the entire campus community to demonstrate how we do our work in the Congress.

I have gone on many of these trips, most recently this spring with our former colleague Pete Smith of Vermont, on a visit to Evergreen State College in Washington State. I was again reminded of how valuable these programs are, and I learned a great deal from exchanges with Pete during the course of that visit.

Speaking to the students renews our hope, I think, in the future of our country, and I hope and believe that Members will get as much out of this as the students do.

We are delighted to report this year that we added some new schools to the program, as well as returning to many of our old favorites. During the last academic year, we visited over 25 schools, including Abilene Christian, Boston University, Palm Beach State, Tufts University, the U.S. Naval Academy, and Washington State University, to name just a few. Over 40 former Members participated, including several former Members who just left office last January, so it is great to get them involved very quickly.

I want to thank everyone who made a visit and, most of all, those that have donated their time pro bono to this very important program of the association. I think Members will tell you that it gives them an opportunity in a very meaningful way to continue their public service.

I hope all our colleagues, particularly those who may not yet have participated in the program, will consider making a visit. It is an opportunity to renew old friendships or make new ones. Maybe, if you can't make a visit yourself, you can put us in touch with your former alma mater or a school in your old district so that we can take the program there. Sharon Witiw, who is seated to my left, runs the program

for the association and can provide all the information you may need.

We especially want to recognize our continued relationship with the Stennis Center for Public Service and its associate director, Brother Roger. The folks at the Stennis Center have been a fantastic partner in keeping the program on track, both logistically and financially.

We have expanded the program internationally. There were two delegations to the U.K. in the past year for weeklong visits with hundreds of British students. Members participated even in townhall meetings in Britain. I hate to think of how much more fun that is than townhall meetings here.

It is reported that these visits have been one of the highlights of the students' semesters, and we want to thank Philip Davies with the British Library in London for all he does to make the program work over there.

We have also incorporated Congress-to-Campus-like activities in a number of other international programs, including the Congressional Study Group on Germany. With the support of the German Embassy here in Washington, we were able to have a weeklong Congress and Bundestag to Campus program where former Members joined with members of the Bundestag and met with students from dozens of universities in the northeast.

Last fall, a new program was piloted using technology to reach a new constituency. Thanks to an in-kind grant from iCoHere, we had three 90-minute Congress to Campus webinar sessions to an audience of community colleges across the Nation.

The webinar platform allowed students from all over the country to participate and ask questions of the bipartisan panels of former Members. We are currently adapting the webinar platform to also serve high school government classes around the country and hope to have that program up and running this fall. Please consider participating in one of these programs that do not necessarily involve the 3-day commitment of a campus visit.

The association has also continued to support the People to People program, which brings hundreds of high school students to the Capitol to learn about leadership and American Government. Several times over the past year, former Members have keynoted those sessions, and we have heard that many staffers on the Hill were first inspired into public service through their People to People experience.

Thanks to everyone who has helped make this program the hallmark program of the association. An informed and engaged citizenry is absolutely essential if our democracy is going to work, and this program really contributes to that end.

Thank you very much.

Ms. KENNELLY. Thank you, David. Thank you for all you have done for one of our most successful programs.

I can remember I got excited when I heard about these programs, and I really wanted to be part of it. At one time,

Nancy Johnson and I went to Annapolis, and I wondered if Annapolis students would be so interested in two women of age spending 2½ days with them.

We had the best times, absolutely; and I really urge you to go. Nancy and I were always friendly, but it really gives you a chance to spend 2½ days with someone from the other party who you might have known or you might not have known, and you will enjoy it.

We have another new project, and the purpose of the Common Ground Project is to involve citizens in a dialogue about the issues of the day and have a vigorous debate that doesn't shy away from being partisan but, at the same time, manages to be productive.

To give you more background on this Common Ground Project, I invite my colleague from New York, former Member Ann Marie Buerkle, to share her report.

Ann Marie.

Ms. BUERKLE. Thank you very much, Barbara, Mr. Speaker.

One of the many joys of being active with this remarkable, effective association is that it brings together Republicans and Democrats in our many programs, whether it is a part of our board of directors, during our annual meeting and charitable government tournament, for panel discussions, as well as other presentations. All that this association does is bipartisan. Our board is divided evenly between Republicans and Democrats, and our leadership rotates between the two parties.

Currently, our Congress, indeed, our country, is going through a period of polarization and partisanship. While we don't leave our political beliefs at the door when participating in association activities, we pride ourselves in creating an environment where an across-the-aisle dialogue is not only possible, but also the norm. We have institutionalized this approach in a program that we call the Common Ground Project.

The purpose of the Common Ground Project is to create venues and events where a bipartisan approach can involve the public in a dialogue on the issues of the day. Some of our long-standing programs, most importantly the Congress to Campus program we just heard about, already fit neatly into the goals of the Common Ground Project. There are other additional undertakings that were specifically created to further this project.

We are extremely proud of our partnership with the National Archives, which, since 2010, has brought dozens of former Members—again, from both sides of the aisle—together with the public for panel discussions for a productive as well as a respectful dialogue. I have been privileged to participate in a number of our Common Ground Project activities, including Congress to Campus, as well as the National Archives panel series. I believe these dialogues are incredibly important.

Since our last report to Congress, we continue to offer the public a number of opportunities to participate in conversations about the issues that concern our Nation. At the National Archives, former Members held discussions about the midterm elections, our current electoral system, and some of the issues that have caused this current partisan divide. Other public forums included presentations on money in politics, foreign affairs and international trade issues, the U.S. Constitution, and the accomplishments of women in leadership.

As David Skaggs reported earlier, the Congress to Campus program included, for the first time, a number of webinars that reached a very specific audience, in this case, community college students, and gave them an opportunity to interact online with our bipartisan panels of former Members of Congress. After some introductory remarks, most of the webinar time was committed to giving the students an opportunity to ask questions online. We were thrilled with the positive response to this new initiative and believe that this concept will translate into furthering the goals of the Common Ground Project.

Using modern technology, we can effectively reach audiences all across the United States of America to engage with them in a meaningful dialogue. This is a wonderful opportunity to demonstrate the great benefit that comes from differing opinions being aired, discussed, and dissected in order to find that common ground.

We will explore, over the next year, additional ways to make use of webinars as a means of bringing the public together with our former Member teams. Our initial plan includes reaching out to high school audiences, in addition to college students. The program could then be expanded to include other constituencies who would be gathered in front of the computer, again, to participate in a webinar. This would allow us to include, among others, the VFW, chambers of commerce, and many groups who may not have access to an in-person discussion.

There are quite a number of other activities that contribute to our Common Ground Project. Unfortunately, the list is too long this morning to include them all here. It is our association's most important undertaking to re-engage the public in a political discourse that is productive, respectful, and yields solutions rather than sound bites.

We, as former Members, can contribute greatly towards a better understanding of how the important issues of our day play out on Capitol Hill, and I view it as one of the responsibilities that comes with the privilege of having served in Congress. We have an opportunity to bridge the political gap and show the American people that we can have deeply held convictions and still have discussions and debates that find not only the common ground, but also seek solutions.

Thank you so much.

Ms. KENNELLY. Thank you, Ann Marie. And thank you very much for being willing to be active in our association and do a number of things for us.

Ann Marie was on the panel. As you know, we have a very close relationship with the Archives. And we, our organization and the Archives, had a panel 2 days after election. And this shows that we really can be bipartisan. There were various views that came forth in that discussion, but it was absolutely wonderful. We had a full audience. And it just shows that bipartisanship can work, even 2 days after election. Some of us were happy, and some of us weren't.

Another example of how powerful and productive bipartisanship can be is our annual Congressional Golf Tournament. It is chaired by our past president, Dennis Hertel of Michigan, and by fellow board member Ken Kramer of Colorado.

I will now yield the floor to Dennis Hertel to give us a brief report about our charitable golf tournament.

Dennis.

Mr. HERTEL. Thank you, Barbara. I am still more comfortable over here.

Congratulations, Barbara, on this great turnout today. And the annual dinner, what a great success it was, better than ever. You and Jim Walsh have done just fantastic and what you have accomplished for the association.

Eight years ago, we took a 35-year-old tradition, our annual golf tournament, which pits Republicans against Democrats, and gave it a new and much bigger mission. We converted it into a charitable golf tournament to aid severely wounded vets returning from the battlefields of Iraq and Afghanistan. Our beneficiaries—Warfighter Sports, a program of Disabled Sports USA, and Tee It Up for the Troops—use golf and other sports to help our wounded veterans readjust to life after sustaining severe injuries. They involve the entire family in the sport, and they provide equipment and training.

Our seventh annual event was held last year on July 28 at the Army Navy Country Club. And we have had more Congressmen, active Members, attend our tournament than all of these other golf tournaments that you hear about in Washington, D.C. There might be more in Washington, D.C., than any other place in the country as far as fundraisers, but we have more Members turn out for our cause.

All together, these tournaments have raised over a half million dollars for these outstanding programs. During each of our past tournaments, we have had several dozen current and former Members from both sides of the aisle come together to support our wounded troops that day and throughout the year; and they have met with dozens of wounded warriors, many of whom play in our foursomes. Some double amputees included in their numbers have hit

further and straighter than a lot of our members—certainly me. It is an incredibly humbling, rewarding, and memorable experience to spend a day in the presence of these inspiring men and women.

I want to thank everyone in the association, particularly Sharon Witiw, as well as Ken Kramer, our tournament's co-chair. Sharon just does a tremendous job week in and week out working on this all year long, and Ken has just been the mainstay of the program.

Equally important, I am happy to report we have again secured the leadership of two of our most outstanding current Members who are co-chairs to help us lead this effort: Congressman JIMMY DUNCAN of Tennessee and Congressman GENE GREEN of Texas. So some co-chairmen that many of us have served with have just been tremendous in opening up their offices and staff and working with us all the time.

GENE replaces our past Democratic co-chair, Mike McIntyre of North Carolina.

Mike, please stand up. We want to thank you so much for your hard work as co-chair.

Mike really put us up on the map and got us higher as far as Members' participation, and it has really made a great difference. And JIMMY DUNCAN and GENE GREEN, we just can't thank them enough for what they have been doing and their constant encouragement of Members to come and play with us.

That brings me to the point of our former Members. We are having, for the first time in the last few tournaments, more current Members play in the golf tournament than former Members when we are sponsoring it. So I hope that the great turnout today is an indication of having more people come to our golf tournament. Even if you don't want to play golf, just come and enjoy the day with our veterans. It is so convenient. It is right here at Army Navy. Don't worry about your skill level, you know. It is an honor for us to help such an incredibly deserving group in this small way.

The next tournament will be July 27. We call it "The Members" tournament. But unlike the Masters, you don't need to play at the pro level to have a successful and enjoyable day. All you have to do is show up and help raise some money. I want to stress that, while this event is called a tournament, no one should be worried about their score or their skill level to participate. I am certainly an example of that.

This event is 100 percent about helping wounded warriors. Nobody cares what your handicap is. Your individual score is not kept because we have a scramble format, which I am very much in favor of; so, you know, they don't really know how you did. But if you hit one good, they can use it, including a putt.

So both current and former Members give it their time and attention. If you

only play golf once a year, this should be the day you do it.

So I want to thank all of you so much for all the help. And if you can play or if you can bring us a new sponsor, please let us know.

Thanks very much.

Ms. KENNELLY. Thank you, Dennis, for this report.

We are so honored that we can play a small role in the rehabilitation of these amazing men and women. And as a golfer, I can tell you it doesn't matter if your handicap is 10 or if your handicap is 27; and I have been both places. And I promise you, in a scramble, no matter what Marty Russo does, he doesn't always win.

In addition to the domestic programs we have just described, our association also has a very active and far-reaching international focus. We conduct programs focused on Europe and Asia; we bring current Members of Congress together with their peers in legislatures overseas; and we work with the Department of State to talk about representative democracy in our office with audiences abroad. To me, this is becoming one of the most important programs.

As I remember, when I first became active in Association of Former Members, you really did not see many sitting Members of Congress. It was our association. We have expanded this, and as a result, a number of Members take part in our organizations that do go abroad and do study things abroad.

The other day, the German Marshall Fund had put out a new report, and Pete put together a get-together. I was so impressed. We had scholars about Germany. We had a very interesting audience as well as the German Marshall Fund there.

But what really impressed me was the number of Members—and this was one of the busiest days when they were doing the trade legislation—the Members that were attending; and even when they had to go out, they came back. My feeling is, if we get this new business of having present Members be active in our association, that means they will know our association before they are former Members.

Psychologically, this is very good because they bring very new information, but not only that, we are not trying to get them to be Members. After they have left or lost, they know about us. I think this will be very healthy for the organization.

One of our most valued partners in these undertakings is the Canadian Association of Former Parliamentarians. Our friendship with our colleagues in Ottawa goes back to 1987 when a group of former parliamentarians came and visited with us to learn about our association and our projects and used the lessons learned to create their own association in Canada.

For almost 30 years, we have been friends and partners and we are honored to have as our guest today David Daubney, a former member of the Canadian Parliament and an officer of our sister organization.

Welcome, David, if you are here this morning. Thank you, David. We are so pleased you can be with us.

I have not had the opportunity, and former Members have asked me to go up to Ottawa to join in their big event, like our dinner, and I got into the airport in Ottawa, and that is the day that they had a very sad bomb scare.

Very fortunately, I didn't get out of the airport because if I had, I wouldn't have gotten home for a couple of days because the airport was locked down. I was sorry I couldn't be there. I thank you for the good times we have had in the past year with the Canadian delegation. You are going to hear more about that.

Via the former Members association, I have met with numerous groups of legislators from emerging democracies who have come to Washington for a better understanding of our representative government and our form of democracy. These conversations and meetings are always two-way streets. I have to say that I learn as much, if not more, from our visitors than they do from me.

Just last month, our association hosted at our offices a large group of young professionals from ASEAN, countries including Vietnam and Indonesia, and we had a great dialogue about running for office and serving our constituency.

Our association also has a long-standing partnership with a great NGO Legacy International, bringing young professionals from the Middle East and north Africa to the United States. Our most recent group just completed their 6 weeks in Washington. They stay 6 weeks.

The group is composed of young professionals from Morocco and Tunisia. Most of these visitors work in the NGO sector in their countries, and they come to the United States to learn about the interaction between government and nongovernmental sectors.

I would like to take this moment to thank former Congresswoman Bev Byron because she has been very, very generous in opening up her house to students for dinner, and it is much appreciated by the association.

The goal of this program is to seek a better understanding between cultures and establish an avenue of dialogue between nations. It is a unique opportunity to create a constructive political and cultural discourse between the United States and north Africa. I am very proud that our association is part of this vital dialogue.

In addition to hosting visiting delegations, our association organizes former Member delegations to travel overseas and engage students, government officials, NGOs, and corporate representatives. You have already heard about the Congress to Campus programs and the very international component that it has.

We brought the program to numerous universities in countries such as Turkey, the United Kingdom, other overseas delegations; we call them ExDELS.

We have traveled to countries where a dialogue is often difficult, but nonetheless incredibly important—for example, China, a country to which we have now sent seven ExDELS over the past 4 years.

In addition to these former Member international programs, our association supports Congress' international outreach in a meaningful, productive, and bipartisan way via our congressional study groups. These are all programs that involve current Members of Congress, and I now invite my good friend and my predecessor, and I thank Connie for helping me begin my presidency, and I enjoyed her presidency, Connie Morella.

Ms. MORELLA. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you very much, Barbara. I just want to say it has been great working side by side with you for the 2 years when you were vice president, and you are doing a great job. It is nice to continue to be involved with all the wonderful programs that the former Members offer.

I appreciate the opportunity to briefly speak to you about the work of Congressional Study Groups on Germany, Japan, Turkey, and Europe. They are flagship international programs of the former Members of Congress for over three decades. The study groups are independent, bipartisan legislative exchanges for current Members of Congress and their senior staff, and they serve as educational forums and invaluable tools for international dialogue with the goal of creating better understanding and cooperation between the United States and its most important strategic and economic partners.

Each study group has a membership roster of between 75 and 125 Members of Congress, current Members of Congress, and is led by a bipartisan, bicameral pair of co-chairs. I want to acknowledge the service of all of our co-chairs for their hard work and dedication to these critical programs, and I hope they are watching.

The Congressional Study Group on Germany is led by Senator JEFF SESSIONS, Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN, Representative CHARLIE DENT, and Representative TED DEUTCH.

The Congressional Study Group on Japan is led by Senator MAZIE HIRONO, Senator LISA MURKOWSKI, Representative DIANA DEGETTE, and Representative BILLY LONG.

The Congressional Study Group on Turkey is led by Representative GERRY CONNOLLY and Representative ED WHITFIELD.

The Congressional Study Group on Europe is led by Senator JOHN BOOZMAN, Senator CHRIS MURPHY, Representative JEFF FORTENBERRY, and Representative PETER WELCH.

Our co-chairs are true leaders, who not only serve in their role at official study group events, but are also called on by various embassies and countless outside organizations to speak on panels, attend roundtables, and meet with visiting delegations.

The study group model focuses on high-level dialogue on pressing issues surrounding security, energy, trade questions, and financial questions that affect our key bilateral and multilateral relationships with our partners abroad.

Programming celebrates active discussion among all participants, avoiding lengthy speeches or formal presentations, in order to create the kind of atmosphere that promotes personal connections. We believe that the network of peers created via our programs have acted to renew and expand areas of mutual cooperation.

The congressional study groups are not the only program dedicated to this mission, but they are unique in their year-round outreach to Capitol Hill. Unlike other formats, we provide long-lasting staff support and maintain a well-respected reputation as independent and nonadvocacy.

As a result, our network attracts a large, diverse groups of legislators and policymakers who are committed to international dialogue more broadly and don't have to shy away from our programming lest they be asked to support a particular policy position. What is most important for us is that they join the discussion.

A few highlights from the discussion in the last 12 months include the 31st Annual Congress-Bundestag Seminar hosted by Representative CHARLIE DENT in Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District in September 2014; the 32nd Annual Congress-Bundestag Seminar hosted by our German counterparts in Berlin, Dresden, and Leipzig in May 2015; the 2nd Annual Congressional Member Study Group tour to Japan in February 2015; three senior congressional staff study tours to Germany in partnership with the Embassy of Germany; one senior congressional staff study tour to Japan, which visited Tokyo, Fukushima, and Hiroshima; and 21 high-level roundtables here in Washington, D.C.

That is quite a list of very important meetings and study groups and trips. The work of the congressional study groups is complemented by our diplomatic advisory council. Initially focused on European nations, the diplomatic advisory council is now comprised of four dozen ambassadors from six continents who advise and participate in our programming.

Their interest and commitment to multilateral dialogue is a valued addition to the congressional study groups and provides a valuable outreach beyond our four core study groups.

In the past year, we have also formed the congressional staff advisory council. As former Members of Congress, we know the value of good staff. I always say my rod and my staff, they comforted me and prepared the papers for me in the presence of my constituents.

The staff advisory council formally recognizes the mutually beneficial relationships we have in offices across Capitol Hill. We are very grateful for

the staff who participate in and support our programming, as we are for the Members of Congress.

Finally, I want to thank the institutions, foundations, and companies which support our mission. We would like to give particular thanks to Admiral Dennis Blair, Ms. Junko Chano of Sasakawa Peace Foundation USA, and Dr. Karen Donfried and Ms. Maia Comeau of the German Marshall Fund for their support as our international funders of the congressional study groups in 2015.

The congressional study groups are also grateful for the support of the international business community here in Washington, D.C., represented by each study group's business advisory council. I am going to briefly mention the companies of the 2015 business advisory council because they are the supporters. We do not get any money from Congress, and so it is those people who care very much about the work of the former Members' international programs.

They are Allianz, All Nippon Airways, Airbus Group, B. Braun Medical, Central Japan Railway Company, Cheniere Energy, Daimler, Deutsche Telekom, DHL, Fresenius, Hitachi, Honda, Lufthansa German Airlines, Marubeni America Corporation, Mitsubishi Corporation, Mitsui, Representative of German Industry and Trade, Sojitz, Toyota Motor North America, United Parcel Service, and Volkswagen of America.

Because of their support, our activities not only help to build vital bilateral relationships between legislatures, but also build bipartisan relationships within our own Congress. Mutual understanding and shared experiences among legislators are crucial to solving pressing problems, whether at home or abroad.

As former Members of Congress, we are proud to bring the important services provided by the congressional study groups to our colleagues still in office, and we are very proud to play an active role in our continued international outreach.

Thank you very much.

Ms. KENNELLY. Thank you, Connie.

In addition to these substantive and issue-specific international projects, our association also offers its members the opportunity to participate in group travel where our staff puts together the logistics and participating members assume all the costs. These trips are unique because they combine a tourist experience with more formal meetings that involve current and former government officials in the country we are visiting.

I will now yield to my good friend from North Carolina, Martin Lancaster, to report on his combined delegation.

Mr. LANCASTER. Thank you, Barbara.

For the 2014 fall study group, a contingent of former Members visited the beaches of Normandy, as well as World

War I battlefields in northern France and Belgium. The trip was to commemorate those troops who gave their lives during World War I and World War II on the 100th and 70th anniversaries of those horrible wars. The group of former Members and their spouses were privileged to share this moving experience with a group of former members from the Canadian Parliament and their spouses. This was our first and what we hope will be many joint study tours with our friends to the north.

At the opening reception in Paris, the two groups of former legislators first learned how their nations' sacrifices had a direct impact on the lives of Europeans when a friend of a former Member recounted her story of how her family was liberated by the Allies during the war.

After gathering in Paris, the group traveled to Normandy, first to Juno Beach, where the Canadian military landed for the D-Day invasion. It was an incredible experience to explore a German bunker and to walk the beaches where young Canadian soldiers landed 70 years ago. The following day the group spent a day on the Utah and Omaha beaches in the sands where the U.S. military landed, and we were humbled by the staggering number of losses reflected in the cemetery for the American soldiers.

The former Members held a moving wreath-laying ceremony at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and spent quite some time walking around the grounds and reflecting on the sacrifices made by so many.

While in the Normandy region, our group was treated to the hospitality of Count Denis de Kergorlay of Canisy at his chateau, which has been in his family's possession since the 11th century. The Count has been a friend and partner of our association for over 10 years, and many of you have had a chance to meet him during our Statesmanship Awards Dinners where, since 2004, he so generously has offered a four-night stay at this magnificent chateau at auction for our fundraising. I certainly want to thank him on behalf of the association for his many years of support and friendship.

Staying at Chateau de Canisy is like stepping back in time. This welcoming and memorable location provided a warm atmosphere for the national borders and the party affiliations within our international group to completely fade away. Each evening during dinner, conversations revealed our shared experiences as legislators and the moving common history of World War I and World War II. One special night, Count de Kergorlay treated us to a musical performance at the chateau thoroughly enjoyed by all who attended and hailed as one of the highlights of the trip.

The final two days of the trip were spent in northern France and Belgium, and the focus pivoted toward World War I. En route, we stopped briefly at the Normandy Museum in Cannes. A

brief detour was made to Hallu, a small village in northern France where the recent discovery of the identity of several World War I soldiers in the backyard of a home there revealed they were from the same regiment as the president of the Canadian Association of Former Parliamentarians, Leo Duguay, who was traveling with us. The group gathered in the home's backyard for a moving wreath-laying ceremony and flag presentation. Afterwards, the group was entertained at the mayor's office in Hallu.

Upon arriving in northern France, the group visited Vimy Ridge and the Canadian National Vimy Ridge Memorial, where we toured the trenches and learned about the pivotal battle that occurred in 1917 when the Canadians lost more soldiers than any battle in their history.

We also spent a few hours visiting the interactive Flanders Field Museum in Ypres, Belgium, which is an incredibly marvelous educational experience. The last event of the trip was participating in a ceremony in the town of Ypres at the Menin Memorial Gate to the Missing, where every night at 8 p.m. for the last 100 years, the road is closed and buglers sound "The Last Post" in memory of those whose graves are unknown. This was followed by a wreath-laying ceremony by a number of organizations, including our own. What a breathtaking way to conclude our travels.

This fall we are planning to travel to Havana, Cuba, for our study tour. There is such interest by our membership in this destination that we will offer a second trip in January. While our Canadian friends cannot join us in October, we would love to partner with them again maybe for the one in January because it was a great pleasure to get to know them and to form these friendships across the border.

Thank you, Barbara.

Ms. KENNELLY. Thank you, Martin.

The experience you had in Normandy with our friends from Canada certainly was extraordinary, and I have heard all about it. I am sorry I had to miss it, but I am signed up for the Cuba trip.

All of the programs you have heard about clearly require funding, and we have been very successful in growing our fundraising capabilities along with our programming. The most impactful single fundraising mechanism we have created is the Annual Statesmanship Awards Dinner. In March of this year, we hosted our 18th dinner. And just like the preceding 17, it was chaired by our good friend, Lou Frey of Florida. Lou was supported by a number of other co-chairs, including me, former Members Dennis Hertel, Martin Frost, and our association CEO, Pete Weichlein. I would like to invite Lou Frey to report on the highly successful 18th Statesmanship Awards Dinner, and I think you realize that Lou has been chairman of all of the 18 dinners we have had.

Lou Frey.

Mr. FREY. Barbara, thank you for all of the hard work you have put in. We have had many, many people working on this. This is an absolute great way to explain to your kids in terms of doing something. If you are going to do it, make sure you are going to be able to carry it through because this started with an idea of raising maybe \$100,000, if that. We had no other source, we were going basically broke over a period of time. The idea, though, grew on its own. Not because of me. It didn't grow because of me, but it grew because each and every one of you, we are all winners. We are all people who succeeded in the toughest market going, and it has been just a wonderful thing to see how it has grown and how many people are now involved in it.

I just messed up someone's long, hard work in terms of what I said. But, Pete, you never thought I would stick to the script. No, I knew you wouldn't think that.

The last dinner, we had over 500 tickets sold. We raised more money than any of the preceding 17 dinners. It was just incredible. We had wonderful people up on the stage. We have decided to go ahead and present the next dinner under a theme of Salute to Service where we have different people involved in this process like we did the last time, like with Bob Dole's, and that will be the next one.

The highlight of the evening, I think, came when they had the debate or discussion, but the evening is a wonderful way to showcase our association and recognize outstanding public service. That is the whole basis of the dinner. If it makes it, we are in great shape. If it blows it, we are in bad shape. It is pretty black and white. We have a good base. I am looking forward to doing it. I would like to say and put it on the record, this is not Federal money. This is not government money. This is our money that we are using. It is money that is reaching out where nobody can criticize it. It came admittedly from an idea that I had to start with, and it is an idea that has really worked.

I think I ought to give you a little information about next year's dinner. I know we are looking at the clock, but I have more information about next year's dinner that you ought to know about. Again, it will be at the Mellon Auditorium on Constitution Avenue. What a great place to have a meeting, and we are going to do it there again. The theme of the 2016 dinner will be to honor individuals and entities who are actively supporting our men and women in uniform. Most all of us are involved in that. I am involved in Florida with a particular golf tournament that puts money back in through the program by playing golf. Dennis Hertel was here and talked about the tremendous job he is doing. Remember, we are raising this money. It is our money. That is the money that is going in.

The 19th dinner will be a different experience for me because it will be the first one in 19 years where I can actually sit back and relax. It has been my

special pleasure to work for the last 18 years to make this annual dinner the great success it has become. I have been able to enjoy a recent event, taking the family to Montana for awhile and spending time with kids whose names I now recognize, and one of them is here today. The dinner is an important event, and obviously we are not going to let the association down. I am not walking away, but 18 years, in all fairness, I have put some time in.

What we are doing in the event, and part of the event, is allowing the association to get the money we need so the association can fill all these great programs. But again, let me say again just in case you haven't heard me, if we don't raise the money with nongovernmental money, we are broke. Okay, just so we are all on the same page. Moving forward, I am going to do what I can while I am still able to do, and we have a great team. We have a great bunch of people working on it. It is nice to think they need me, but they really don't need me. In one sense, we're all part of it, however. We are turning over a machine that is really well oiled and can work well, a machine that knows how to do it, and it knows when to call out to people when something isn't going quite as well as it should. But that never happens with this.

Basically, I just want to also say that I can't tell you what an incredible feeling of involvement, of joy, of sorrow, continuing feeling that my life is better because of each and every one of you who I have been able to work with and we all have been trying to work with. We are doing God's work. We are putting back into what we have in this country. We will never put back 100 percent, but it really is part of it. So when we come to the 19th dinner, we have somebody rooting like heck for you on the sideline. But it is going to take people continuing to be involved. Thank you, thank you, thank you again.

Ms. KENNELLY. Thank you, Lou.

I can't even imagine chairing 18 dinners. But I will say I might not miss Lou Frey's calls when he tells me I haven't done a good enough job.

But Lou, you are not leaving us. In recognition of your 18 years chairing the Statesmanship Awards Dinner, and in recognition of your service on our board of directors for almost two decades, and in recognition of the great contributions you made to the organization as its president, the board of directors and the members of the United States Association of Former Members of Congress wish to bestow upon you our Lifetime Achievement Award.

There is no plaque large enough to hold all of the accolades you deserve based upon your service to this country, first in our military, then in Congress, and currently leading the charge to restore civic education in our Nation's classrooms. Your initiative on behalf of civic education is the foundation upon which we are basing a new

association program, the Lou Frey Forum on Civic Engagement, which will translate the tremendous strides you have achieved in Florida into a nationwide effort utilizing our former Members network across the country.

I, therefore, cannot overstate how appreciative the leadership and membership of our organization are for all you have done for us, particularly as chairman of the Statesmanship Awards Dinner for 18 years. This Lifetime Achievement Award is one way we wish to recognize your tremendous service.

Also, we want to tell you there is going to be a Lou Frey Civics Scholarship, which will benefit a student at Winter Park High School, just a couple miles from your home. For the next 3 years, a graduating student who has taken AP civics and is accepted at a community college or university will receive a \$1,000 scholarship in your name to help defray his or her college costs.

Lou, this Lifetime Achievement Award is highly deserved, and the plaque reads as follows:

This Lifetime Achievement Award is bestowed upon the Honorable Lou Frey, Jr., for his exemplary and inspiring service to his country as well as to the United States Association of Former Members of Congress. Lou Frey's public service began in the United States Navy in 1955 and culminated in a political career that spanned over three decades. He represented his Florida constituents with dedication, integrity, and dynamism. His optimism and can-do attitude never diminished in his post-congressional career, and transformed our association during his years as president, board member, and Statesmanship Awards Dinner chairman. For his lifetime of bringing about positive change, his friends and colleagues from both sides of the political aisle salute him.

Thank you, Lou.

Mr. FREY. Some of my family is here, and I want to thank them.

I am especially pleased to have my good friend and former chief of staff, Oscar Juarez, and his wife, Nancy, here representing those who made our congressional office a happy and productive place to work.

It really was. What a great opportunity.

Ms. KENNELLY. I also want to thank the many partners and supporters that made this possible. We are truly lucky to have this assembled group of corporations and foundations that believe in our work.

Also, I would be remiss if I did not thank the other members of our association's executive board: our vice president, Jim Walsh; treasurer, Martin Frost; secretary, Mary Bono; and our past president, Connie Morella. You have all made this association a stronger and better organization than it was ever before. I thank you for your time and energy. To administer all of these programs takes a staff of dedicated and enthusiastic professionals.

I am going to quickly mention them. They are wonderful.

Sean Pavlik is part of the international team and runs our Congressional Study Group on Japan. Unfortu-

nately, we are losing Sean. He is pursuing an MBA at the University of Michigan, and we wish him the best.

Rachel Haas is our CEO's right-hand person, runs the entire office, makes sure that our money is spent appropriately and wisely, and played a huge role in making our Statesmanship Awards Dinner such a beautiful and memorable event.

Andrew Shoenig, our associate director of international programs, started out as an intern with us about 4 years ago and now is the linchpin in our incredibly successful program focusing on Germany, the EU, and all of the Ambassadors who participate in our Diplomatic Advisory Council.

Sharon Witiw, our domestic program director, oversees the smooth operations of projects such as the Congress to Campus program. She also is the one who keeps our membership updated through our Web site, email notifications, and the year-end newsletter.

Sabine Schleidt is our managing director, who spends most of her time on the current Member international programs, but also a lot of hours on implementing the strategic vision and fundraising goals.

And Peter Weichlein.

Peter, you are, to me, the most outstanding chief executive officer.

Peter has been with our association for 16 years. I am old enough for anything, but I am old enough to remember before Peter, and this organization has come so, so far. He keeps his enthusiasm. His staff is not that large. It is amazing that they can have all these programs and all these success. Peter is wonderful to work with.

Like many of you, I have been on many boards. In fact, for the last 9 years, I ran a board and had to report to a board of directors. Peter is exceptional. He keeps the board happy; he keeps the staff happy; and he never stops working. We are, indeed, fortunate to have Peter as our chief executive officer.

Also, every year at our annual meeting, we ask the membership to elect new officers and board members. I therefore will now read the names of the candidates for board members and officers. They are all running unopposed. I ask for a single "yea" or "nay" as I present to you the list of candidates as a slate.

For the association's board of directors:

Dave Camp of Michigan
Jim Coyne of Pennsylvania
Barbara Kennelly of Connecticut
Ken Kramer of Colorado
Ray LaHood of Illinois
Jim Matheson of Utah
Jim Moran of Virginia
Jim Slattery of Kansas
Karen Thurman of Florida.

All in favor of electing these former Members to our board of directors, please say, "aye." Any opposed? Hearing none, the board has been elected.

Next, we will elect our executive committee. As president, I serve 2

years. I have already done 1 and will end my term in 2016. However, the other three elected members of the executive board are up for reelection for a 1-year term.

The candidates are:

Jim Walsh of New York for vice president

Martin Frost of Texas for treasurer

Mary Bono of California for secretary.

All in favor of electing these three former Members of our executive committee, please say, "yea." Any opposed? Hearing no opposition, the slate has been elected by this membership.

The executive board is completed by Connie Morella, who is an unelected officer in her capacity as immediate past president.

Now it is my sad duty to inform the Congress of those former and current Members who have passed away since our last report in July. I ask all of you, including the visitors in the gallery, to rise as I read the names. At the end of the list, we will pay our respect to their memory with a moment of silence. We honor these men and women for their service to our country. They are:

Donald Albosta of Michigan

Bruce Alger of Texas

Herman Badillo of New York

Edward Brooke of Massachusetts

M. Caldwell Butler of Virginia

Thomas Cass Ballenger of North Carolina

Don H. Clausen of California

Phil Crane of Illinois

Lane Evans of Illinois

Bill Frenzel of Minnesota

Robert Griffin of Michigan

George Hansen of Idaho

Herbert Harris of Virginia

Jim Jeffords of Vermont

Robert W. Kastenmeier of Wisconsin

John Krebs of California

Arch A. Moore, Jr., of West Virginia

John M. Murphy of New York

John T. Myers of Indiana

Alan Nunnelee of Mississippi

Peter Peyser of New York

Marge Roukema of New Jersey

Fernando J. St. Germain of Rhode Island

Robert Tiernan of Rhode Island

James A. Traficant of Ohio

Jim Wright of Texas

C.W. Bill Young of Florida

Please observe a moment of silence.

That concludes the 45th report to Congress by the United States Association of Former Members of Congress. We thank the Congress, the Speaker, and the minority leader for giving us the opportunity to return to this revered Chamber and to report on our association's activities. We look forward to another active and productive year. Thank you.

Mr. WALSH. The Chair again wishes to thank all former Members of the House for their presence and this continuing commitment to this high calling of public service.

Before terminating the proceedings, the Chair would like to invite those

former Members who did not respond when the roll was called to give their names to the Reading Clerk for inclusion on the roll.

This concludes our meeting today. We stand adjourned.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We strive to be one Nation, indivisible, constant in vigilance, and seeking liberty and justice for all. Because we are too weak to find total accomplishment in these things, we place our trust in You. Help us to be a virtuous people, responsible for upholding the sound principles that brought our country into being.

May law and order not only be words echoing in the halls of government and the courts of this land but words describing how all Americans live out their citizenship and ownership of the commonwealth of our great Nation.

Bless the Members of this people's House, who have been entrusted by their constituents to usher an ever greater future into existence in our land. May they model for all Americans class, openness, and honesty in the work they do.

May everything done here this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. HAHN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

REPEAL MEDICAL DEVICE TAX

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

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for bipartisan legislation before the House, the Protect Medical Innovation Act of 2015, to permanently repeal the onerous medical device tax.

This medical device tax has condemned our manufacturers of medical devices in the United States to less competition and being less competitive throughout the world. These manufacturers are now competing with one arm tied behind their backs because of this onerous tax. It has had serious consequences across this great land for companies—job losses, jobs moving overseas, less innovation, and fewer products coming to market.

This morning was another great example of that because I got word that the largest medical manufacturer in my district, Welch Allyn, was just bought out. Those jobs are now in jeopardy, hundreds and hundreds of well-paying jobs. They did this strictly because they couldn't compete at their size because of all of the things that were against them, including the medical device tax.

There is no question that the medical device tax played a role in their having to sell, and there is no question that the medical device tax has now put hundreds of well-paying jobs in jeopardy in central New York.

I ask my colleagues to join me in repealing this onerous tax.

SONS AND DAUGHTERS IN TOUCH

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Sons and Daughters In Touch, an organization which supports and connects children whose parents were killed in battle, called Gold Star Children.

Sons and Daughters In Touch was founded by my friend Tony Cordero, who lost his father in Vietnam when he was just 2 years old. This past Monday, I laid a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington Cemetery and visited the grave of Tony's father, William.

Thousands of families rely on Sons and Daughters In Touch to help them through the process of healing and to honor the memory of their moms and dads. Sons and Daughters In Touch will celebrate its 25th anniversary this Father's Day, with a remembrance at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

We have a shared responsibility to care for the children whose parents have made the ultimate sacrifice for our country. I have introduced a resolution in honor of Sons and Daughters In Touch, recognizing the importance of this organization and the strength of the families it represents.

MARRIAGE

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, with the Supreme Court about to rule on the legal definition of marriage, I rise in support of States like Pennsylvania that have defined marriage as between a man and a woman.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania was founded on religious tolerance by William Penn. In Europe, whoever was most popular and powerful in a given place and time tried to force minorities to violate their beliefs, and that was why so many different groups of people came to America and particularly to Pennsylvania, religious minorities such as the Quakers, the Amish, the Mennonites, the Moravians, and others.

Philadelphia has the most synagogues per capita of any city in the United States. Pittsburgh and Harrisburg also have significant Jewish populations. Pennsylvania continues the tradition of respecting each other, even when they disagree.

We hear a lot of talk about diversity these days, but many of those same people who tell us they want diversity are also trying to force their views on others by law. States that, through the democratic process, have defined marriage should not be overridden by five Federal unelected judges.

FUND THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, globally, the National Institutes of Health works to protect against bioterrorist attacks and disease outbreaks. Domestically, its groundbreaking research provides treatments and cures for devastating diseases, such as Alzheimer's and cancer; and the more than 400,000 jobs provided through the National Institutes of Health bolster our economy.

However, when we account for inflation, funding for the National Institutes of Health peaked in 2003. This budgetary reality has forced the NIH to administer fewer competitive research grants, to admit fewer new patients to its clinical trials, and to ultimately fall behind in scientific discoveries.

Mr. Speaker, America cannot afford to continue to underfund the National Institutes of Health. This is why I started the House NIH Caucus with Representatives ROSA DELAURO and PETER KING. I urge my colleagues to join us as we work together to develop a plan to increase the purchasing power of the National Institutes of Health. The time to act is now.

MEN'S HEALTH WEEK

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, men don't usually like to talk about their health, but the well-being of every man in the United States is an important topic.

Mr. Speaker, this week is National Men's Health Week, a time when we have the opportunity to have a serious conversation about our health.

Despite advances in medical technology and research, men continue to live an average of 5 years less than women. Even more, men are less likely than women to seek preventative care. As a co-chair of the bipartisan Congressional Men's Health Caucus, I am also committed to teaching our youth the importance of eating right and getting exercise.

As we celebrate this week, Mr. Speaker, I encourage all husbands, brothers, fathers, sons, uncles—and we may even need to have a talk with ourselves—to make sure that we are taking the steps to stay healthy.

IRAN SANCTIONS

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about one of the greatest security threats that our Nation and world face today, the threat of a nuclear Iran.

I greatly respect all of the hard work that the White House, the State Department, and the Department of Energy have put forth in developing the framework for a Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action on Iran's nuclear program, and I strongly urge them to continue these negotiations over the coming weeks. It is vitally important that the U.S. employ every means of diplomatic persuasion at their disposal in order to reach a peaceful resolution that prevents Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

I would also like to encourage all of the negotiating partners to ensure that a final agreement includes the following: unfettered inspections and a verification system, the disclosure of Iran's past military actions in pursuing a nuclear weapon, gradual sanctions relief that progresses only as Iran meets its obligations under the agreement, long-term nuclear weapons prevention, and the dismantlement of current nuclear infrastructure.

This agreement represents a turning point towards peace in the security of Israel, of the U.S., and of the world. Let's make sure we seize this historic opportunity.

LACROIX: FRANCO AMERICAN OF THE YEAR

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

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an individual from Manchester, New Hampshire, who has been named Franco American of the Year.

Gerald Cardinal Lacroix was born in Quebec but moved to New Hampshire while still a young boy. Lacroix at-

tended Catholic schools in Manchester, and he continued his studies at Saint Anselm College before receiving degrees in theology from Laval University in Quebec.

In 1975, he entered religious life by joining the Pius X Secular Institute. Ordained a priest in 1988, Father Lacroix served as a missionary in Colombia. He then returned to North America and was elected as director general of the institute.

Consecrated as a bishop in 2009, Lacroix began his service as an auxiliary bishop of the Archdiocese of Quebec. Two years later, he succeeded as archbishop of Quebec and primate of Canada, receiving his pallium from Pope Benedict XVI. Most recently, Pope Francis elevated Lacroix to the College of Cardinals, appointing him a cardinal-priest in Rome.

This is a tremendous accomplishment. On behalf of the Granite State, we are all proud of Cardinal Lacroix's accomplishments. He is truly worthy of the title "Franco American of the Year."

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, in 2 weeks, at a time when every American has anxiety about the economy and is wondering how he is going to make ends meet, in 2 weeks, the Export-Import Bank, absent action by this Congress, will be allowed to expire and cost this country and our economy hundreds of thousands of jobs.

For the RECORD, let me read a comment by the President:

Exports create and sustain jobs for millions of American workers and contribute to the growth and strength of the United States' economy. The Export-Import Bank contributes in a significant way to our Nation's export sales.

That is a comment from the President, President Ronald Reagan.

This is not an ideological debate between thoughtful participants in the legislative process. There are extreme voices for ideological purposes on the far right that oppose the Export-Import Bank and its work, but a majority of this Congress and a majority of the American people would like to see it reauthorized.

We were sent here to do the people's work, and I think it is long past time for the majority of Congress to have its voice heard and for the majority of the American people to have its interests represented.

We should reauthorize the Export-Import Bank and save hundreds of thousands of American jobs.

REPEAL THE INDEPENDENT PAYMENT ADVISORY BOARD

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

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, this week, the House will consider legislation to repeal another burdensome part of ObamaCare, the Independent Payment Advisory Board, also known as IPAB.

IPAB is tasked with finding ways to curb spending in Medicare, but in reality, it will ration care and cut services. While Medicare continues to eat up more of the budget and is in need of commonsense reforms, relying on a group of unelected bureaucrats is the absolute wrong thing to do.

Any reforms we make to health care should focus on three core ideas. One, strengthen the relationship between the doctor and the patient so they can work together to make healthcare decisions—what we don't need is a bureaucrat from Washington creating a wall between a patient and his physician; two, to drive down costs, we have to focus on market-oriented reforms, like making coverage portable across State lines and removing the individual and employer mandates; three, finally, we have to incentivize the use of health savings accounts to pay for routine and preventative care.

Repealing the IPAB is an important step in reining in an out-of-control bureaucracy, controlling the ballooning costs of health care, and returning healthcare decisions to patients and their doctors.

□ 1215

JUNE IS ALZHEIMER'S AND BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. GALLEGRO. Mr. Speaker, the strength of our communities depends on the health and well-being of our families. Unfortunately, millions of families across our Nation, including thousands in Arizona, are impacted by Alzheimer's and dementia.

June is Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month. It is my hope that we can come together—Republicans and Democrats—and commit to give researchers the resources they need to combat Alzheimer's and other diseases, but also to make sure patients and families have the care and support they need.

Policies like paid leave, caregiver support, workforce training, and long-term care options must be expanded if we truly want to make a difference in the fight against Alzheimer's. These policies are especially important for women and communities of color. Hispanics are 1.5 times as likely to have Alzheimer's as their White counterparts, and African Americans are twice as likely.

Studies have also demonstrated that socioeconomic factors play a role in the disparities of Alzheimer's. This is completely unacceptable. Mr. Speaker, in America your health and the health of your family should not depend on your income or your ZIP Code.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to ensure all American fam-

ilies—including those affected by Alzheimer's and dementia—have access to the support and care they deserve.

PROTECT MEDICAL INNOVATION ACT OF 2015

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am rising today in support of H.R. 160, the Protect Medical Innovation Act of 2015. What this will do is repeal the device tax.

Now, the device tax, the medical device tax, was a misplaced and disastrous tax that was put in as an ObamaCare mandate. What it will do is tax the medical device industry and those who utilize those components.

This is an industry that doesn't need to be taxed. It employs more than 400,000 workers nationwide and generates \$25 billion in payroll. In my State of Tennessee, there are 10,000 individuals who work in this industry, and the Manhattan Institute estimates that unless we repeal this tax and get it off the books now, we will lose 1,000 of those jobs. That is a 10 percent reduction in a component, a part of the economy that generates good paying jobs, 40 percent higher than other manufacturing jobs.

I ask my colleagues to join me. Let's repeal the medical device tax.

NOW IS THE TIME FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the importance of continuing the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, otherwise known as DACA. This week marks the third anniversary of this action, DACA, an initiative that brings hundreds of thousands of aspiring, young Americans who were brought to the U.S. as children, through no fault of their own, out of the shadows.

These individuals want to work hard for a chance at the American Dream without fear of being torn away from their families. They want to be productive and contributing members of society. This program has allowed a segment of our population who are already a part of the American fabric to keep using their talents to move our country forward. They are an integral part of our society already.

The bottom line is: we need a long-term fix for our broken immigration system. We need comprehensive immigration reform and an act of Congress, which is the only way we can currently fix this failing system.

Now is the time for bipartisan, humane, permanent, comprehensive immigration reform. It is time we take action.

MEDICARE ADVANTAGE IS A VITAL PROGRAM

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for Medicare Advantage. Fifteen million Americans choose Medicare Advantage. Medicare Advantage has been successful for its enrollees. I stand with those seniors, including many in my district, who support this program. Medicare Advantage ought to be touted. Its focus on preventative medicine means healthier seniors and less healthcare spending.

Today and tomorrow, the House will consider a number of bills to strengthen Medicare, and in particular Medicare Advantage. I have 180,000 seniors in my district, and I know these pieces of legislation are important to them.

Traditional Medicare and Medicare Advantage are vital programs for our seniors, and I am hopeful we will see a strong bipartisan vote on all these bills. It is time to come together and support successful programs that harness the power of the free market.

DACA HAS GIVEN A LIFELINE TO DREAMERS

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 3-year anniversary of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, also called DACA. Roughly 800,000 DREAMers across the country are able to work and go to school because of DACA. All these aspiring Americans want is to be able to contribute meaningfully to our society, and DACA has given them a lifeline to do that.

I want to mark this occasion by sharing two stories of DREAMers in my district whose lives DACA has transformed. Johana Mejias is a young woman who came to the U.S. from Venezuela. She grew up in Boulder and attended CU, where she was an exceptional student. During high school, she wasn't able to participate in leadership conferences because of difficulty traveling within the U.S., and after college her lack of status initially prevented her from sitting for the medical school exam and participating in medical internships. Luckily DACA provided relief for Johana, and I am proud to say that she is currently in medical school.

Marco Dorado is another young man in my district who attended CU. Marco came to the U.S. when he was 2 years old. DACA has provided a lifeline to Marco, enabling him to attend college and earn a degree in finance. He also served in student government as a tri-executive and president of external affairs.

DACA has been a catalyst for so many aspiring Americans, but only

Congress can fix our broken immigration system. I call on us to do so.

JUNE IS NATIONAL GREAT OUTDOORS MONTH

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize June as National Great Outdoors Month. As an Eagle Scout and a scoutmaster, I know firsthand why we must all work to strengthen conservation programs and other policies to protect our environment.

As a scoutmaster, I teach Boy Scouts the principle of leaving areas better than when we found them. That is why this week I will be introducing the Great Lakes Water Protection Act to ban sewage dumping in the Great Lakes. The Great Lakes Water Protection Act is a commonsense, bipartisan solution to fulfill this pledge with one of our country's greatest natural resources. This resource holds 95 percent of the country's fresh surface water and provides drinking water to over 30 million people.

Mr. Speaker, I care deeply about protecting our environment and ensuring the well-being of our Great Lakes and its ecosystem. Preserving our environment should not be a partisan issue. In fact, it is not a partisan issue.

I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in this important initiative that is already endorsed by the Sierra Club, the National Wildlife Federation, and more, so that we can preserve our outdoors for generations to come.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF LEROY KING

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great personal sadness that I rise today to pay my final tribute to San Francisco's much beloved LeRoy King, who died on June 12 at the age of 91. A distinguished labor and civil rights African American leader, King's passion for justice and commitment to equality improved the lives of working men and women in San Francisco and throughout the country. From inviting Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. to speak in San Francisco in 1967 to his casting my electoral college vote in 2008 for President Barack Obama as the first African American President of the United States, LeRoy King was more than a witness to historic progress; he made history.

During World War II, King served with courage and honor in the Army and dedicated his entire life to preserving and strengthening the great democracy he fought to protect. Even in his 80s, in the tradition of great American leaders, he was arrested for an act

of civil disobedience on behalf of hotel and restaurant workers.

King served as northern regional director of the International Longshore and Warehouse Union, ILWU, for more than 30 years. It was important to him to overturn a discriminatory system that elected only Whites to union office, and he helped create a fully inclusive, integrated workforce. King organized with legendary labor leader Harry Bridges, was a staunch supporter of civil rights champion Cesar Chavez, was a supporter of Reverend Martin Luther King, and in 2009 he was honored with the Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Award for promoting peace and advancing social and economic justice by embodying Dr. King's inclusive leadership and nonviolent participation.

Mr. King, whether it was for ending discrimination and promoting affordable housing to community development to jazz, he has been honored. His accomplishments are memorialized in locations throughout San Francisco. My revised remarks, for the RECORD, will go more into that.

It has been a great privilege for me to know such a deeply principled and exemplary human being and to call him friend. I will miss him. My family, my husband and my daughter Christine, my entire family will miss him terribly.

I hope it is a comfort to his daughters, Rebecca King Morrow and Carolyn King Samoa; his son, LeRoy King Jr.; his grandchildren, and great grandchildren that so many San Franciscans, indeed beyond San Francisco, and other people loved and admired LeRoy King, and they share their tremendous loss.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great personal sadness that I rise to pay final tribute to San Francisco's much beloved LeRoy King, who died on June 12th at the age of 91. A distinguished labor and civil rights leader, King's passion for justice and commitment to equality improved the lives of working women and men in San Francisco and throughout the country. From inviting Dr. Martin L. King, Jr. to speak in San Francisco in 1967 to his casting my electoral college vote in 2008 for Barack Obama as the first African American President of the United States, LeRoy King was more than a witness to historic progress, he made history.

During World War II, King served with courage and honor in the Army—and dedicated his entire life to preserving and strengthening the great democracy he fought to protect. Even in his 80s, in the tradition of great American leaders, he was arrested for an act of civil disobedience on behalf of hotel and restaurant workers.

King served as Northern Regional Director of the International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU) for more than 30 years. King became a member of ILWU Local 6 in 1946, one of the first African Americans to serve in the local leadership. In the 1950s he led a coalition of members to overturn a discriminatory system that elected only whites to union office and helped create a fully inclusive, integrated workforce. Mr. King sought to create a world

where others could live free of discrimination, bigotry and injustice.

King organized with legendary labor leader Harry Bridges and was a staunch supporter of civil rights champion Cesar Chavez. In 2009 the National Education Association honored King with the Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Award for promoting peace and advancing social and economic justice by embodying King's inclusive leadership and nonviolent philosophy.

Mr. King served on the San Francisco Redevelopment Commission for more than 30 years where he fought to preserve the African American and Japanese American heritage of the Fillmore District. His efforts helped lay a foundation for a more inclusive, more welcoming home for all San Franciscans.

King was instrumental in the creation of the St. Francis Square Cooperative Housing development, which opened in 1963 in the Fillmore District and was a national model of racially integrated housing for working families. King and his family lived there from the time it opened until he died.

King's accomplishments are memorialized in locations around San Francisco. The City's 108-year old carousel at Yerba Buena Gardens was renamed the LeRoy King Carousel, an homage to one of the many sites King helped shape while serving on the Redevelopment Commission. A bronze bust of King at the Jazz Heritage Center in San Francisco's Fillmore District honors his work preserving the neighborhood's African American and Japanese American heritage.

It has been a great privilege for me to know such a deeply principled and exemplary human being and to call him my friend.

I hope it is a comfort to his daughters Rebecca King Morrow and Carolyn King Samoa, his son LeRoy King Jr. and his grandchildren and great grandchildren, that so many San Franciscans who loved and admired LeRoy share their tremendous loss.

WE MUST DEFEAT BOKO HARAM

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the threat of Boko Haram and ISIS is real. Remember, they are now one. The threat is great; the threat is imminent.

Just yesterday, a New York City college student was arrested for plotting to attack the city in the name of the Islamic State. Last week, a high school student from suburban Virginia pled guilty to conspiring to provide material support to the Islamic State. Federal authorities said the Virginia case was a chilling reminder of Islamic State's pervasive online presence and ability to woo American youth.

How long before we hear headlines about American teenagers pledging allegiance to Boko Haram? Remember, they are now one. How long before we hear about attacks on American soil made in the name of Boko Haram?

We must do all that we can to defeat Boko Haram and break its unholy alliance with ISIS. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor H. Res. 147, as amended, to defeat Boko Haram, and remember to tweet, tweet, tweet #bringbackourgirls, #joinrepwilson.

WE MUST REAUTHORIZE THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK NOW

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank. Since 2009, the Export-Import Bank has created or sustained 1.3 million private sector jobs, many of which are small businesses. In my district alone, from 2007 to 2014, more than 28 companies, 800 jobs, and more than \$123 million in exports were supported by the Export-Import Bank. In addition to creating jobs, the Export-Import Bank is self-sustaining. At the end of this month, the Bank's charter will expire, hampering growth of small business exports.

Foreign companies are supporting their own like never before, Mr. Speaker. In stores across America, that is evident. It is time for our foreign competitors to see more "made in America." Our American companies deserve a fair chance at success. We must reauthorize the Export-Import Bank now.

CELEBRATING THE THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF DACA

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the third anniversary of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, otherwise known as the DACA program. Today is also another day of mourning Congress' failure to pass comprehensive immigration reform. DACA is working; 640,000 DREAMers are already part of our American fabric and are contributing to our economy every day thanks to DACA.

In fact, this summer two DACA beneficiaries are interning in my office—Monica moved from Jalisco, Mexico, when she was 7. Her father was deported, but she worked hard and will graduate this fall from Cal State University Northridge with a degree in political science. DACA allowed her to get her driver's license so she could work to pay for her education.

Stephanie was born in Mexico City, moved to Santa Barbara when she was 10, and is pursuing a degree in political science at the University of California Los Angeles, UCLA, and is researching the economic impact of DACA. Thanks to DACA, every day DREAMers like Monica and Stephanie help drive our Nation's economy forward.

□ 1230

CONGRATULATIONS TO VIRGIN ISLAND GRADUATES

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate not only the students, but the community of the Virgin Islands on so many graduates of our

high schools these last weeks. While I have not been able to be there in body for some of the graduations, I am there in spirit and in heart.

The Giff Hill School, AZ Academy, Good Hope Country Day, St. Croix Central High School, St. Croix Educational Complex, St. Croix Seventh-day Adventist School, St. Joseph High School, Antilles School, All Saints Cathedral School, Charlotte Amalie High School, Church of God Academy, Ivanna Eudora Kean High School, Sts. Peter and Paul Cathedral School, Seventh-day Adventist High School, the Virgin Island Montessori School and Peter Gruber International Academy, and the Wesleyan Academy.

Students, you know that you are our future, we love you, that you represent the best of us all as a community, and that we expect great things for you. You are entering a world at war, a nation with challenges and conflicts, and our islands in crisis. But we know that, with your passion for learning, discipline, and an ability take risks, we are in great hands.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS OF FORMER MEMBERS PROGRAM

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings during the former Members program be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that all Members and former Members who spoke during the proceedings have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 160, PROTECT MEDICAL INNOVATION ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1190, PROTECTING SENIORS' ACCESS TO MEDICARE ACT OF 2015

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 319 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 319

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 160) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto,

to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1190) to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 319 provides for a rule to consider two separate bills, which will address two of the most flawed and ill-conceived provisions contained within the so-called Affordable Care Act.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate on H.R. 160 dealing with the repeal of the medical device tax, equally divided between the majority and minority on the Committee on Ways and Means, as well as the standard motion to recommit provided for the minority.

The rule further provides for 1 hour of debate on H.R. 1190, which would repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board. This is equally divided between the majority and minority of both the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Energy and Commerce. Further, the rule provides that the Pitts amendment, which will cover the cost of repealing the Independent Payment Advisory Board by using the Affordable Care Act's prevention fund, a slush fund for the Secretary, which has been used to pay for everything from urban gardening to lobbying for higher cigarette taxes, be added to the bill. As with H.R. 160, the standard motion to recommit is also provided to the minority on H.R. 1190.

It is well documented that many provisions contained within the Affordable Care Act will have negative consequences on patients, both in access to care and in affordability. Yet two provisions have been so universally criticized that, on a large bipartisan nature, their repeal was called for almost immediately after the passage of the Affordable Care Act in 2010. One such provision was the tax contained within the bill on medical device manufacturers.

It seems illogical that within a piece of legislation that was purported to make medical care more accessible to all Americans, the Federal Government would want to tax the very providers of medical innovation that creates the devices to improve the delivery of health care. Nevertheless, the President and then-Majority Leader HARRY REID in the Senate included this provision in order to pay for part of the astronomical price tag that accompanied this massive bill.

This tax is an unfair burden that actually increases the cost that consumers will pay at the doctor's office. The tax has also been cited by dozens of medical device manufacturers who have or are considering moving their operations overseas so that they can continue to innovate without the heavy burden of the Internal Revenue Service stifling their growth. This tax slows the creation of new techniques, slows the creation of new devices, all of which could make the delivery of medicine more efficient. It also puts at risk the jobs associated with the creation of those devices.

And lest anyone think that we are merely talking about the largest and most expensive pieces of technology found within a hospital, such as the MRI or the CAT scanner and surgical equipment, let's be clear that this tax covers every piece of medical equipment from those large machines to the smallest of items, including the syringes that are used to deliver life-saving antibiotics and vaccines. In my own district, I have met with a number of constituents, including the owner of Retractable Technologies, which makes those very syringes, and have been shown firsthand how this tax is creating a burden on the growth of his company.

The medical device tax has led to the elimination of thousands of good-paying jobs, and repealing it would be the first step in bringing those jobs back to stem the loss of future jobs within an industry that is vital to the country in helping to mitigate the rising cost of health care due to other burdensome provisions within the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, plain and simple, this is a tax on business, a tax on small business, a tax on consumers, a tax on innovation. To date, 33,000 jobs have been lost in the medical device industry since the passage of the Affordable Care Act, and it is projected that well over 100,000 additional jobs are on the chopping block.

Actually, who could be surprised about this? Excise taxes, which this tax is, are meant to lead to a reduction in the consumption of the good being taxed. We place an excise tax on cigarettes to discourage their use, making it burdensome to afford a smoking habit. Did the President and HARRY REID intend to make it more burdensome to use more efficient medical devices?

Of course, not only is this burdensome tax ill-conceived as a concept, it was ill-conceived in a practical sense as well. Last year, a Treasury inspector general audit found that the Internal Revenue Service issued 217 erroneous penalties to device companies in a 6-month period. We have all seen how poorly much of the Affordable Care Act was written. One need only to look at the most recent Supreme Court cases for that determination. But how difficult is it to write a clear-cut tax provision? Apparently, for HARRY REID, it is quite difficult.

H.R. 160 has bipartisan and bicameral support and currently has 282 cosponsors. In fact, 18 Democrats in this body sent a letter to Speaker JOHN BOEHNER and Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI calling for the timely passage of this bill. Republican leadership in the House heard their requests and the calls from many other Members of this body and is moving this bill in a responsible way to put Americans back to work and lower the cost of health care for all.

The second bill contained in today's rule, H.R. 1190, repeals one of the most poorly thought-out ideas ever to come out of Congress, and that is really quite impressive considering the many disquieting ideas that have originated in the Pelosi-led House of Representatives. The Independent Payment Advisory Board is an unelected, unaccountable board dedicated to set up within the Affordable Care Act for the sole purpose to cut Medicare payments to providers if Medicare targets within the bill are not met.

Let's be very clear about this. President Obama, Majority Leader HARRY REID, Speaker NANCY PELOSI created a board of unelected officials in order to ration Medicare, to cut Medicare, and every Democrat who supported the Affordable Care Act voted in favor of this Board.

The Independent Payment Advisory Board is a regulatory board composed of 15 health professionals appointed by the President. There is no requirement that any of these professionals have ever actually practiced medicine a day in their lives, and we are well aware that this President prefers academics to those who have real-world experience.

The Board's stated responsibility is to develop proposals to reduce the growth of Medicare spending. What does that mean? It means seniors will face cuts to their health care with no recourse if they don't agree with what the Board proposes.

Former Office of Management and Budget Director Peter Orszag, the President's top budget adviser, called the Independent Payment Advisory Board the single biggest yielding of power to an independent entity since the creation of the Federal Reserve. Think about that. Let that sink in. The Independent Payment Advisory Board has been given the authority to do for Medicare policy what the Fed is able to do with monetary policy. That should be terrifying to every American.

The Independent Payment Advisory Board is set to recommend cuts, amounting to one-half of 1 percent of Medicare spending, and then the number rises until it hits 1½ percent. It makes these cuts by reducing the rates that Medicare pays for medical procedures and drugs, which means the Independent Payment Advisory Board can only make cuts to providers' reimbursements. Instead of being allowed to make real lasting structural reforms that could actually help the solvency of Medicare, this Board's approach to saving money is one of the clumsiest, most bureaucratic ways of achieving this goal.

The Independent Payment Advisory Board has massive structural and constitutional defects in its design. If Congress fails to act on the Board's recommendations, they automatically go into effect. And even if the Congress did pass a bill countering the Board's cuts to Medicare, the President can simply veto the bill. And the judiciary—and how this passes constitutional muster, I seriously question—specifically the judiciary, is forbidden to review the Independent Payment Advisory Board's recommendations.

For these and many other reasons, over 500 organizations have urged Congress to get rid of this thing—repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board—including the American Medical Association, the American College of Surgeons, and the Veterans Health Council.

Repealing the Independent Payment Advisory Board would protect seniors' access to Medicare, encourage us to do real Medicare reforms, and put an end to the constitutionally questionable Board of unelected bureaucrats—right now under the President's healthcare law—the very decisions that they are empowered to make changes to Medicare.

All Americans will benefit from the repeal of this draconian idea. It is a clumsy way that then-majority Democrats were able to buck their responsibility at addressing cost concerns over entitlements. Government by bureaucrats instead of government by the people, government by bureaucrats instead of government by representatives, it is no way to run this country. And yet that is how then-Majority Leader HARRY REID and then-Speaker NANCY PELOSI preferred that we operate.

□ 1245

The Independent Payment Advisory Board's design undermines seniors' access to Medicare and the health care that they need and have paid for throughout their working lives.

This Board should have been repealed years ago, but so long as HARRY REID was majority leader in the Senate, the Independent Payment Advisory Board continued to live. Last year's election created a sea change over in the other body, changed the majority leader in the Senate, and now, the American people may finally see their government begin to work for them yet once again.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in opposition to the rule which, once again, deprives Members of this body the opportunity to debate amendments that will improve the underlying legislation.

I rise in opposition to this body's misguided priorities. Again, the American people are seeing Congress rehash the same tired debates. How many references were there to people that were Speakers of this House, that were Senate majority leaders, to healthcare reform, which has already withstood several elections and is the law of the land?

What we have before us today are two more bills that repeal part of the Affordable Care Act. We have now considered over 60 bills to repeal, defund, or dismantle the Affordable Care Act, rather than improve and build upon it.

With all the work that remains to be done, we could be debating legislation to renew our expiring highway trust fund and repair our crumbling roads and bridges.

We could take up legislation to renew the charter of the Import-Export Bank, and we will be offering that soon on the previous question.

We could consider a bill to repair our broken immigration system or help the millions of Americans who are living below the poverty line, even though they work two jobs and it is increasingly hard to support their families; or we could take on the critical matter of climate change and confront the fact that it has contributed to one of the worst droughts in our Nation's history.

But, oh, no, it is more important to have the 61st and 62nd repeal of parts of the Affordable Care Act, rather than move forward with a future-oriented agenda for the American people.

Now, let's get into some of the specifics of the underlying legislation. The most recent estimate by the Congressional Budget Office found that a total of 27 million people will gain access to healthcare coverage through the Affordable Care Act over the next 10 years, who otherwise would not have had coverage.

That is to say nothing of the additional millions of Americans who ben-

efit from the Affordable Care Act by having coverage for preexisting conditions for the first time in their lives, are no longer subject to lifetime caps that could leave them bankrupt if they get a serious illness, or people that are able to stay as young adults up to age 26 on their parents' plan.

Constituents from all areas of my district have shared stories of their success using our State's health exchange, Connect for Health Colorado, and described how the Affordable Care Act's coverage provided by the ACA has improved their lives.

I have heard from constituents like Morgan, from Nederland, Colorado, who used the exchange to enroll in the exact same plan she had before the Affordable Care Act, but her premiums decreased, and the services that were covered expanded—more value for her money.

Or Donna, who recently moved to Boulder, Colorado—Donna is an outdoor enthusiast, like so many in my district, but was afraid to make her way to the mountains until she had secured healthcare coverage.

Through Connect for Health Colorado and the premium tax credits she has access to under the Affordable Care Act, she is now enrolled in a comprehensive medical and dental plan that ensures she won't become bankrupt if she sustains an injury.

These are far from isolated cases. In my home State of Colorado, 16.5 percent of people lacked health insurance before ACA. According to a recent study of the Kaiser Family Foundation, that figure has dropped to 9 percent by last year.

The success is not limited to my State. According to a Gallup poll released in April, the percentage of Americans lacking health care nationwide has dropped by more than a third since the marketplace opened at the end of 2013, from 18 percent to under 12 percent.

The Affordable Care Act is working; instead of continuing in that vein, once again, the Republican Congress is seeking to repeal various parts of that law, rather than move forward and improve it.

The first of today's two bills, the so-called Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act, doesn't protect anyone's access to anything. The Advisory Board it seeks to repeal, which has been vilified and completely mischaracterized in the past, is actually something far more mundane and important to the processes of Medicare.

It is a board of advisers who make nonbinding recommendations to Congress about how we can reduce healthcare costs and strengthen Medicare solvency over the long term, without sacrificing the quality of care, something that all of us, as cost-conscious Members of Congress, should be interested in seeing.

Now, we can debate all day the exact composition of the Board or which committees in Congress should have ju-

risdiction over its recommendations. Those are valid considerations—or, instead, we can discuss repealing the Board in its entirety, which is what we are talking about here today. This Advisory Board will provide critical advice to help Congress reduce the cost of providing health care.

Now, interestingly enough, this amendment pays for the \$7 billion cost of eliminating this Board by slashing nearly \$9 billion in funding from the prevention and public health fund. This fund is used for vital preventative health programs, like childhood vaccines, helping people quit smoking, stroke prevention, and maternal wellness. The cornerstone of health savings is preventative medicine.

In fact, I cosponsor a bill with my friend, Mr. BURGESS, who is managing the bill on the other side, that would allow the Congressional Budget Office to account for the long-term savings of preventative health initiatives when it scores legislation.

If Mr. BURGESS' own bill were to become law, and I hope it does, it would show that the so-called way that we are paying for this repeal is illusory. Eliminating the preventative healthcare program actually can cost money in the long run. Under the congressional scoring model that we both support, it would likely not even register as a cost saving, or if it did, it would be much less than the \$9 billion.

The second bill being considered, the Protect Medical Innovation Act, aims to do something that many of us on both sides support, repealing the Affordable Care Act's excise tax on medical devices. The medical device tax is one of the measures originally included by the Senate in the Affordable Care Act to fund the badly needed consumer protections and benefits that form the core of the bill.

Now, again, it is easy to support tax cuts. This body has put before us many, tax cut after tax cut after tax cut that are unfunded. The whole discussion about how you can afford to cut taxes is how you pay for it. What government waste do you cut? What other taxes or income do you use to offset the cost of these tax cuts?

Of course, we don't want to slow the pace of progress with unnecessary costs and burdens, and we want to make sure that medical device manufacturers have every incentive to increase their research and development and not pass these costs along to consumers.

Unfortunately, even though I, along with ALMA ADAMS from North Carolina and MATT CARTWRIGHT from Pennsylvania, offered an amendment in the Rules Committee that would have paid for repealing the medical device tax using a commonsense approach that wouldn't suppress economic growth, our amendment was not allowed to even be discussed here on the floor of the House.

Not only would our amendment to pay for the medical device repeal have avoided adding nearly \$30 billion to our

deficit, as this bill would do before us today, but it also would have helped bring balance to our Nation's energy sector by stopping the government from choosing winners and losers in energy and lessen our dependence on fossil fuels.

Unfortunately, under this rule, we don't get a vote or debate on the floor. We are left with two bad choices. We can, of course, leave in place a tax that many of us want to remove; or we can add \$25 billion to our deficit. Neither of those are the right answers for the American people or for medical device companies or the consumers who use medical device products.

The American people deserve better. If we defeat this rule, an open process will allow Republicans and Democrats to offer real, constructive, better ideas of how to improve upon these two pieces of legislation.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), a member of our Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, in Indiana, the medical device industry employs over 20,000 Hoosiers in over 300 medical device companies. These are good-paying jobs that pay 56 percent more than the average wage.

As Indiana Governor Mike Pence recently put it in a letter to our delegation: "This industry is vital to Indiana's economy and the health and well-being of people across the Nation and the world."

Unfortunately, this critical industry is living under the shadow of a job-killing tax put in place to pay for the Affordable Care Act. In fact, companies in Indiana have already halted research projects and plans for expansion.

The medical device tax is crippling innovation of lifesaving products like the ones I used as a surgeon, and it is putting patients and jobs at risk. This is about patients, at the end of the day, and their access to health care.

We have had broad bipartisan support for repeal of the medical device tax in both Chambers before. It is time to put an end to this onerous tax once and for all.

I also support an IPAB repeal. As a physician, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bills.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to allow for the consideration of legislation that would reauthorize the Export-Import Bank for 7 years.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the distinguished ranking member on the Committee on Financial Services.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado, as well as Leader PELOSI and Whip HOYER, for their unyielding support for thousands of American jobs and businesses.

I rise to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question in order to force a vote on legislation sponsored by myself, Mr. HECK, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HOYER, and 186 other Democrats that will renew and reform the Export-Import Bank's charter for the long term.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has just 5 days to act before the Export-Import Bank shuts down. We are in the eleventh hour, and despite a recent bipartisan vote in the Senate and broad support across the aisle in this House, we are still fighting to keep this engine of job creation and economic growth alive.

It is interesting to note that, contrary to most of the disagreements that take place in this Chamber, in the debate over the Export-Import Bank, the facts remain undisputed.

Over the past 5 years, it is estimated that the Bank has created or sustained more than 1.3 million private sector jobs, 164,000 in the past year alone. In 2014, the Bank returned more than \$674 million back to the American taxpayers, an amount totaling \$6.9 billion over the past two decades.

Democrats, Republicans, business, and labor all understand the important role that the Export-Import Bank plays in our economy. Presidents, ranging from Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush to Bill Clinton, have been outspoken in their support for the Bank's ability to create and sustain American jobs and keep our businesses competitive.

Ex-Im levels the playing field with countries like China, Russia, and countless others, all of which have their own version of the Bank supporting American competitors.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats are coming to the floor today to implore our numerous Republican colleagues who support the Export-Import Bank, starting with Speaker BOEHNER, to stand up for jobs, businesses, and American competitiveness by standing up to the extremists who want to close the Bank.

Let's send a strong message to America's manufacturers, businesses, and workers, that we are committed to preserving an institution that, for decades, has helped this Nation create jobs and grow the economy.

I would urge a "no" vote on the previous question.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), a valued member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule for H.R. 160, the Protect Medical Innovation Act. Last August, I held two 21st Century Cures roundtables in my district in the Tampa Bay area.

The second roundtable featured healthcare providers. One participant was Lisa Novorska, CFO of Rochester Electro-Medical. Rochester Electro-Medical is a medical device manufacturer in my district, and it is a small business.

The medical device tax, originally included in the President's healthcare law, is devastating to these small businesses. Eighty percent of the device manufacturers in Florida have less than 25 employees. In total, Florida has 662 device manufacturers, and one-third of them are in the Tampa Bay area, as I said, in the area that I represent in the Congress.

This bill has over 280 bipartisan co-sponsors. Voting for this rule and bill should be easy, despite the administration's veto threat. Let's support device manufacturers and give them the flexibility to innovate and help our constituents.

□ 1300

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), a leader in the effort to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so that we might, indeed, get to H.R. 1031, the Promoting U.S. Jobs through Exports Act of 2015.

H.R. 1031—which, as it has been indicated, reauthorizes the Export-Import Bank—is a deficit-cutting, job-creating machine. And why is it important that we get to it? Because, indeed, the charter of the Bank expires in 5 legislative days.

Last week, I was at home and had occasion to be channel surfing, and I came across, inarguably, one of the top 10 movies in all of the history of American cinema, "Blazing Saddles." And there is this wonderful scene where the actor, Cleavon Little, rides into town, and he is not met very favorably by the townsfolks. They all pull their guns on him. And in response, he pulls his revolver, and he puts it to his head, and he says, Stop, stop, or I will shoot myself.

Well, of course, what he was doing, given the situation, was completely turning logic on its ear and confusing everybody in his presence. And that is how I feel about this.

Those who want to end the Export-Import Bank purport to be in favor of cutting the deficit. But the Export-Import Bank has reduced the Federal deficit by \$6 billion over the last 20 years. Those who want to terminate the Export-Import Bank say they are in favor of faster economic growth. But the Export-Import Bank supported 164,000 jobs just last year alone in virtually every congressional district in this great land.

Make no mistake, if the Bank expires, we will lose jobs; and we will lose jobs immediately here and there and everywhere.

And stop and think about that. What is more important than a job? It is the means by which we provide for ourselves. We are self-sufficient.

Is anyone suggesting we have too many jobs? Is anybody suggesting that work isn't worthwhile?

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

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

Mr. HECK of Washington. I will never forget when former Vice President Mondale once said, You want to know how important work is in this society? Stop, ask yourself what is the first thing you ask somebody when you meet them. "What do you do?"

Work is important. Jobs are important. The Export-Import Bank creates jobs. Vote "no" on the previous question. Reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. We have 5 legislative days to go.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the vice chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague on the Rules Committee, who handles our rules and legislation so effectively on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying bills. When the Democrat-controlled Congress rammed the so-called Affordable Care Act through this Chamber, I joined my Republican colleagues in expressing our grave concerns over the effects of the law's tax increases. Specifically, we warned that the excise tax on medical devices would hinder innovation as well as restrict growth and job creation in an industry that has improved the quality of life for millions around the world.

And just as we cautioned, this tax on devices that restore mobility, keep hearts in rhythm, and help doctors diagnose life-threatening diseases earlier than ever before has cost us local jobs and reduced research capabilities.

Cook Medical is a privately owned company, with facilities around the world. It employs about 500 people in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, where the company focuses on endoscopic and urological medicine.

Since the medical device tax was levied in 2013, Cook Medical has paid roughly \$13 million annually. As a result, the company has pulled back on capital improvements as well as research and development investments. They have also considered moving manufacturing capacity outside the United States.

Scott Sewell, vice president of technology acquisition and development for the company's Winston-Salem office, recently told the Triad Business Journal that if the medical tax device is repealed, they would look at expanding operations in North Carolina with a new plant in Winston-Salem.

I would like to submit for the RECORD this May 1 article from the Triad Business Journal.

[From Triad Business Journal, May 1, 2015]
DEVICE TAX THWARTS EXPANSION IN WINSTON-SALEM

(By Owen Covington)

The push to repeal an Affordable Care Act tax on the sale of medical devices appears to be gaining steam with a prominent device manufacturer with a strong Triad presence recently lobbying Congress for action.

In written testimony to a Senate committee this month, Cook Medical Board

Chairman Stephen Ferguson said the company has had to pull back on capital improvements and R&D investments because of the tax. Cook is also considering moving manufacturing capacity outside the country.

"Make no mistake about it: We want to develop and manufacture our devices in the U.S., but this tax is preventing this growth in this country," Ferguson wrote.

I caught up with Scott Sewell, vice president of technology acquisition and development at Cook Medical's Winston-Salem operation, where the focus is on endoscopy and urological medicine.

Just for further explanation, the tax is a 2.3 percent levy on the sale of many medical devices that's expected to generate \$29 billion during its first 10 years.

Proponents have argued that increased health insurance coverage will mean more sales for these companies, which also have the option of passing that increase along to consumers rather than absorbing it themselves.

Sewell said that since the tax was levied in 2013, Cook Medical has paid roughly \$13 million annually. That accounts for only a portion of Cook's overall sales, since it isn't paid on the roughly 60 percent of Cook's products that are sold abroad.

Both Sewell and Ferguson said that uptick in sales hasn't occurred, and the company has generally been unable to pass along the cost of the tax to consumers, which are typically very cost-conscious hospitals. That's meant pulling back on plans to expand in Winston-Salem and elsewhere, Sewell said.

"I think if the device tax were repealed, in the next couple of years, we would probably be looking at a new plant in Winston-Salem," he said.

Cook's arguments are grabbing the attention of more in Congress. That said, advocates of the tax say claims like those of Cook are overblown.

"A manufacturer can't avoid the tax by shifting production abroad, doesn't pay the tax for devices it produces here but sells abroad, and suffers no competitive disadvantage from foreign producers, who also have to pay the tax for devices that they sell here," wrote Chad Stone, chief economist of the left-leaning Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, in U.S. News & World Report.

Ms. FOXX. It is clear that ObamaCare's medical device tax has directly and negatively impacted the people who live in North Carolina's Fifth District, as well as people around the country and around the world.

Mr. Speaker, this tax must be repealed, and its harmful effects undone.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. I thank my friend from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in opposition to the previous question in order to make in order a vote to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

For Americans, the Export-Import Bank means jobs. It means economic growth. Failing to reauthorize Ex-Im threatens American jobs, threatens American businesses, threatens our economy.

Supporting Ex-Im used to be a bipartisan issue. Just read a little history: Dwight Eisenhower supported it. Ronald Reagan supported it. If you want a more recent example, George W. Bush supported it.

This never has been a partisan issue until just recently, where even the

House leadership—the Speaker, I think, supports it—has now been captured by a small group of very far right-leaning ideologues to whom, apparently, much is owed because we can't get a floor vote on a piece of legislation supported by a majority of the House of Representatives that helps American business and helps American workers. What is wrong with this picture? This makes no sense whatsoever.

The Export-Import Bank is an essential part of a growing economy, and particularly in supporting American businesses to grow their exports and put Americans to work.

In my home State alone, 228 companies, \$11 billion in export value, are at risk if we don't reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, and we have 5 days to do it. But we could do it in 5 minutes if we defeat the previous question, bring to the floor of the House legislation, H.R. 1031, that would reauthorize the Export-Import Bank through 2022.

Let's let the will of the American people and, frankly, the will of a majority of the United States Congress, be manifest in our policy. A majority of Congress supports the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. Bring a vote to the floor of the House. Let's put America to work, support American business, support American workers, and support the Export-Import Bank.

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

Mr. Speaker, previously it was brought up about the prevention fund, which was being used as one of the offsets for the repeal of the Independent Payment Advisory Board. And I just wanted to give the Congress a sense of some of the activities that have been funded under the Secretary's so-called prevention fund.

How about pickle ball? I didn't even know what that was. I had to Google it after that came to light in our committee. Massage therapy, kickboxing, kayaking, and Zumba—a separate grant was given for that. A grant for signage for bike lanes. A grant to promote free pet neutering. A grant for urban gardening. A grant to lobby for a soda tax in New York, block construction of job-creating fast food small businesses, and another grant to boost bike clubs.

These are the types of activities that are being funded in the prevention fund, not actual activities that would result in the prevention of disease. This is a good use of these dollars, and I urge adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), the ranking member on the Financial Services Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the clock is ticking on the global competitiveness of U.S. workers, and the GOP has yet—has yet—has yet to put to a vote the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

The Export-Import Bank levels the playing field globally for U.S. businesses to compete with subsidized foreign competitors. Our U.S. exporters and workers will pay the price if this majority, this Republican Congress fails to reauthorize the Bank. My Milwaukee exporters will pay the price if this Republican Congress fails to reauthorize the Bank.

Yes, deals will still be made with the other 60 or so credit agencies around the world, but they will be done without U.S.-made goods and services.

You know, it is so ironic that we have all kinds of deals being cut to get partnership trade agreements with these 12 different Pacific countries so we could export jobs to other places in the world. But there are no deals being made so that we can export U.S.-made goods and services to other parts of the world. That is probably why we have such a huge trade deficit.

With the leadership of Ranking Member WATERS, Representatives HECK of Washington, HOYER, and I, we have introduced H.R. 1031, the Promoting U.S. Jobs Through Exports Act. It makes targeted and prudent reforms to the Bank that enhance its mission, including promoting additional small business participation, greater transparency, and improved governance.

Defeat the previous question. Bring the Export-Import Bank deal to the floor. The American people deserve an opportunity to work.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 13 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Colorado has 12 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

First, with regard to the comments of the gentleman from Texas on the preventative health fund, I want to give a few examples of the important ways that fund helps reduce health care costs. For instance, expenditures on hospitals promoting breast-feeding, on breast and cervical cancer early awareness and diagnosis.

So, I mean, again, the fund community initiative that support breast-feeding mothers has a demonstrable effect in reducing the incidence of disease in infants and promotes better health.

With regard to early identification: breast cancer screenings, outreach through State, territorial, and tribal health organizations, chronic disease self-management—again, making sure that people have better compliance with their regime that can reduce health care costs.

So there are a lot of items in there that I am confident, if our bill were to pass—the bill that I cosponsor with the gentleman from Texas—clearly that \$9 billion in savings is illusory. Now whether that will come back as a net-positive program or not, under the new

CBO scoring, we will just need to pass our bill to see. But it wouldn't be \$9 billion. Again, maybe it would be \$3 billion in savings. Maybe it would be \$1 billion. Again, maybe it would be a negative amount because these preventative expenditures could very well save more than they cost because if you can get an early diagnosis around breast and cervical cancer, not only does it lead to a better outcome for the patient but saves a lot more money, as does making sure that people are able to successfully manage their chronic diseases and not wind up in emergency rooms at a very high cost.

We have before us—no bones about it—two more partial repeals of the Affordable Care Act.

So far this year, the Republicans have brought to the floor \$586 billion in unpaid-for tax extenders and special interest tax expenditures. Those bills have blown through the sequestration caps, all while continuing to cut funding for education programs, violence prevention initiatives, and medical research.

This bill adds another \$25 billion to that \$586 billion. Again, everybody likes to have their cake and eat it too. But unfortunately budgets have to work, and numbers have to add up.

□ 1315

That is why I was particularly disappointed that the Rules Committee didn't allow my amendment that would have simply paid for the medical device tax repeal to come forward. Instead, the Republicans are insisting on adding \$25 billion on top of the \$586 billion in expenditures that they are blowing through the deficit with and increasing the size of the deficit by half a trillion dollars.

This bill also provides for consideration of a bill that cuts \$9 billion from the preventative health initiatives to repeal an advisory board. Again, I would argue that we won't know if that is truly paid for or not until our other bill passes, and I hope that we can bring forward the bill I share with Mr. BURGESS to allow for the proper scoring of that.

So I am ready to say that I don't know if it is paid for or not. I suspect it is not. I suspect that it might cost us more money in the long run to repeal the important expenditures around breast and cervical cancer early diagnosis and chronic disease self-management, but the only way to know that for sure would be to change the way that the CBO scores the bills to allow for preventative measures to show the savings that are reasonably estimated by experts absent any particular bias.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is a lot of interest in reforming the Advisory Board, and I think that is a valid conversation to have: What should its priorities be? What should the reporting process be? What should the membership be composed of? But repealing it and adding costs and preventing simple, cost-saving recommendations from

even coming to Congress, how does that make sense? And how does that further the goal of providing high-quality health care to the American people at the lowest cost possible?

We also shouldn't be taking funding away for programs that help Americans prevent injuries or illness in order to pay for the repeal of an advisory board that makes nonbinding recommendations to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, a vote for this rule is yet another vote for misplaced priorities, for increasing the Federal deficit, and for passing policies that are at odds with the needs of the American people and constitute the 62nd time that this body has chosen to repeal part of the Affordable Care Act rather than move forward with a future-oriented agenda to help the American people. This is a vote to add billions of dollars to our deficit at the expense of the basic healthcare needs of the American people.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, this body can do better. If we defeat this rule, we might have an opportunity to do something about the deficit, to do something about it by going back and getting a rule that if this body chooses to proceed with repealing the medical device tax allows a commonsense way for that to be paid for. If we repeal this rule, we can go back and look at improving the advisory panel rather than repealing it in its entirety, making sure that, if there are costs associated with that, that they are paid for in a real way rather than a way that is illusory.

Mr. Speaker, if we repeal this rule, we can go back and bring forward Mr. BURGESS' and my bill that would allow proper scoring around preventative health care. That would allow a proper discussion on whether this way of paying for a repeal of the advisory panel is even a real way of paying for anything or not.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, we have talked a lot about the Affordable Care Act here on the floor of this House, and one of the reasons we have talked a lot about it is because, very famously, it was passed before we read it. We had to pass it to find out what was in it. Let me just talk about a couple of those things because I think they are germane to our discussion today.

This is June 17. Around the country, many Members' offices are being contacted by groups asking why Congress

itself isn't following the law that Congress passed. I am referring specifically to section 1312(d) in the bill. It says:

Members of Congress in the exchange requirement notwithstanding any other provision in law, after the effective date of this subtitle, the only health plans that the Federal Government may make available to Members of Congress shall be health plans that are, number one, created under this act, or two, offered through an exchange established unto this act. The term "Member of Congress" means any Member of the House of Representatives or the Senate.

The fact of the matter is most people don't follow the law. I did, Mr. Speaker, and I think it was important to follow the law. I bought my health care in the individual market, in healthcare.gov, started October 1 of 2013. You may remember that night. That was the night the fiscal year ended and the famous government shutdown began. I began early that morning in trying to sign up for the Affordable Care Act because I knew, as a Member of Congress, we were supposed to sign up through healthcare.gov, an unsubsidized policy in the individual market. So I performed as indicated.

It took 3½ months for the check to clear the bank. It was one of the most uncomfortable, god-awful experiences I have ever been through in my life. What is the final result? I have a bronze plan in the individual market in healthcare.gov, the Federal fallback provision in the State of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, that plan cost \$560 a month the first year that I was enrolled, and then it went up 24 percent the next year. It is now up to \$700 a month for me for an individual. These are after-tax dollars. Do you know the worst part, Mr. Speaker? The worst part is that the deductible is \$6,000.

Now, some people have asked me, they say: Well, gee, are you worried about the fact that the networks are so narrow on these plans that you can't see your doctor?

I honestly don't know. I don't know if my doctor is included on the plan. I haven't looked because I ain't going. At a \$6,000 deductible, someone will have to drag me in the backdoor by the time I am dying.

What has happened, Mr. Speaker, is we have created a whole subset of individuals in this country who are functionally uninsured because the cost of their care is so high. Had Members of Congress followed the law, they would be as aware of that as our constituents are.

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for the consideration of two bills that begin to right some of the many wrongs included in the Affordable Care Act: H.R. 160, repealing the Independent Payment Advisory Board charged with cutting Medicare; and H.R. 1190, repealing the medical device tax. These are two steps that the House can take this week to help lower the rising costs of health care created under the President's healthcare law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule before us and the passage of the two important pieces of legislation.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 319 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1031) to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1031.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous

question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

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

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

Mr. POLIS. 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 question will be postponed.

REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM IRAQ AND SYRIA

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 16, 2015, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 55) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove United States Armed Forces deployed to Iraq or Syria on or after August 7, 2014, other than Armed Forces required to protect United States diplomatic facilities and personnel, from Iraq and Syria, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 16, 2015, the concurrent resolution is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 55

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM IRAQ AND SYRIA.

Pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(c)), Congress directs the President to remove United States Armed Forces deployed to Iraq or Syria on or after August 7, 2014, other than Armed Forces required to protect United States diplomatic facilities and personnel, from Iraq and Syria—

(1) by no later than the end of the period of 30 days beginning on the day on which this concurrent resolution is adopted; or

(2) if the President determines that it is not safe to remove such United States Armed Forces before the end of that period, by no later than December 31, 2015, or such earlier date as the President determines that the Armed Forces can safely be removed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The concurrent resolution shall be debatable for 2 hours equally divided among and controlled by Representative ROYCE of California, Representative ENGEL of New York, and Representative MCGOVERN of Massachusetts or their respective designees.

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) each will control 40 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 submit statements or extraneous materials for the RECORD on this measure.

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, I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 55. But while I am opposed to this resolution, I do want to commend its author, Mr. MCGOVERN, for his constant and principled attention to the issue of U.S. military engagement in Iraq and Syria and the role of Congress in making this decision. These are some of the most important and challenging issues that we face and that we struggle with as an institution.

I know the gentleman from Massachusetts is frustrated. I have listened to him on the floor of the House. In many ways, I share his frustrations. ISIS is making too many gains. Critical cities have fallen. But this resolution, I believe, would take us in the opposite direction of where U.S. policy should be.

If the United States were to remove all of our forces from the theater, as this resolution calls for, ISIS would surely grow stronger. ISIS would surely accelerate on a process of decimating all in its path, placing women under brutal oppression and, I have no doubt, further strengthening their position and further threatening our European allies and even the U.S. homeland. More battlefield victories would support ISIS propaganda, which would support its recruitment, which would make it more deadly by the day.

Mr. Speaker, no one is eager for this commitment, but ISIS is on the march; and this radical jihadist group is taking more territory, more weapons, and more resources, threatening the government in Baghdad and, indeed, threatening to destabilize this entire critical region.

Now, H. Con. Res. 55 calls for the unilateral withdrawal of U.S. forces from the fight against ISIS, halting all U.S. strikes against the terrorist group in Iraq and Syria. It would also leave ISIS unchecked—not only unchecked by U.S. airpower, but it would allow this brutal terrorist group, as I say, to gain strength, to destabilize the critical region, and to create a safe haven from which ISIS can plot attacks against the United States.

□ 1330

H. Con. Res. 55 has nothing to do with authorizing the use of military force against ISIS but would unilaterally withdraw U.S. forces from the fight.

Last year, debating another Iraq measure offered by Mr. MCGOVERN, I said: “Never has a terrorist organization itself controlled such a large, resource-rich safe haven as ISIS does today. Never has a terrorist organization possessed the heavy weaponry, the cash, the personnel that ISIS does today, which includes thousands of Western passport holders.”

Well, unfortunately, it is worse today. Just weeks ago, Ramadi, a city only 75 miles from Iraq’s capital, was overrun by ISIS and by its suicide bombers who led that first wave.

ISIS’s goals are very clear: wreck every person opposing it, establish a caliphate, and then fight to expand it. ISIS has unleashed a campaign of brutal and depraved violence, not only against Shia Muslims and fellow Sunnis who do not share their radical beliefs, but against vulnerable religious and ethnic minorities. As one witness testified to the Foreign Affairs Committee the other day: “We cherish ethnic and religious diversity. ISIS hates it.” And they hate in some of the most brutal ways possible.

Mr. Speaker, many Americans may not realize that Iraq and Syria are home to dozens of ethnic and religious minorities, with ancient cultures with very deep roots. These communities—Assyrian and Chaldean Christians, Yazidis, Alawites, and many others—are under mortal threat in their ancestral homelands.

The mass execution of men, the enslavement of women and young girls as concubines, and the destruction of religious sites is part of the ISIS effort to destroy these communities. Their plan is to make it as if those societies never existed, those religions in that area never existed. In fact, ISIS maintains a special battalion—they call it the “demolition battalion”—charged with obliterating religious and historic sites and artifacts that it considers heretical.

And ISIS has used the “virtual caliphate” on the Internet to recruit foreign fighters at an unprecedented rate. Some 20,000 of their fighters are, in fact, from offshore, are foreign fighters drawn to the area from some 90 countries. Those are the numbers that now are swelling its ranks. According to intelligence estimates, this includes at least 150 Americans that we know of.

Yet over the last 10 or so months, the administration has put forth a reluctant and half-hearted and ineffective effort to assist our partners there on the ground. I think we all recognize that this is up to the Iraqi Government to fight to win this. We understand that. They are in the lead. But they desperately need help. And I am not prepared to say that we shouldn’t be providing any military support to the Kurds strung along a 180-mile, or several hundred mile, front, with 180,000 soldiers. Thirty percent of those Kurdish soldiers are female. And those young women are down there with small arms trying to hold off ISIS fighters along that line. I am not prepared to say that we should not be providing any military support for those Kurds or for the Iraqi forces and any air support whatsoever. That is what this resolution does.

It didn’t have to be this dire. Well over a year ago, when ISIS was building its force in the desert in Syria, it wasn’t bombed and devastated when it could have been. It should have been. Many called for an effort at that point to have an air campaign by the U.S. and our partners to pummel ISIS as it moved across the desert in these long columns and begin the process to take city after city. It came out of Syria. First it headed to Fallujah, and there was a call to use air power to suppress and use ISIS then. That step was not taken. And for 14 separate cities, city after city, all the way to Mosul, we watched every time the request be made for air power, and that was turned down.

Well, we are where we are now. And, frankly, the air campaign by the U.S. and our partners isn’t pummeling the enemy now, as it should. Daily airstrikes against the Islamic State are one-sixth of what they were in the first campaign against the Taliban back in 2001. U.S. Special Forces should be authorized to call in airstrikes. Most Americans would be puzzled to learn that Canadian Special Forces are doing this, but we are not.

Pilots complain of having their hands tied. It has been estimated that three-quarters of U.S. aircraft return to base without discharging their weapons because of overly restrictive rules of engagement that don’t allow them to engage ISIS. As one observer notes, with just “piecemeal attacks, the Obama administration has been systematically squandering our air power advantage.” I think that is right.

Adding to the problem, the regional forces on the ground that these airstrikes are supposed to be supporting

are badly undersupplied. After 10 months of fighting, there are still too many reports that the Kurdish Peshmerga, our allies, are outgunned on the front lines against ISIS. I have met with their foreign minister three times now as he has made this case. Again, 30 percent of his battalions, Kurdish battalions, are female battalions, and they can't obtain the anti-tank weapons, the artillery, the mortars to use against ISIS in this battle.

While U.S. forces have been training some Iraqis, that has been done way behind the front lines. Rather than pairing up with smaller units and deploying with them to push them to the front—and that is, by the way, a technique that has proven effective in Afghanistan and Iraq in the past—this has not been done. U.S. advisers are unable to bolster Iraqi units when they come under attack or to call in airstrikes by U.S. planes. We don't have the capacity to do that. And that limitation tragically helped Ramadi fall.

Mr. Speaker, our friends and allies and partners in this region of the world are in serious trouble from the threat of ISIS. They need our help. Employing our air power like we should, getting those weapons to the front lines that are needed by the Kurds, putting more U.S. Special Forces into place, would help turn this around.

But that is not at all what this measure calls for. As I say, it is quite the opposite. It calls for the President to remove United States Armed Forces deployed to Iraq or Syria on August 7 or after.

The Foreign Affairs Committee has held many hearings on ISIS and instability in the region. We haven't heard any witnesses make the case that complete withdrawal is what is needed.

What would happen to Iraq, what would happen to Jordan, what would happen to civilians in the theater? I think we can all agree that situation would compound.

This is the question in front of us today: Do we pull the modest number of our modest presence out of this theater and see ISIS run wild across the Iraqi desert with no help from the United States? I don't think so.

There is no military-only answer to the ISIS challenge. The Iraqi Government must do far more to reconcile with Sunnis, building confidence and empowering them to take on ISIS. ISIS must be attacked financially, and its propaganda must be relentlessly challenged. And Arab leaders need to lead. But just as there is no military-only answer, there is no answer without a military component of helping the Kurds and helping those who are fighting ISIS. And, right now, the U.S. role, as much as we may regret it, is needed desperately.

Mr. Speaker, in the national security interest of the United States, I ask all Members to oppose H. Con. Res. 55.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 55.

Let me first say that I believe Congress needs to do its job and pass an AUMF, which is the Authorization for Use of Military Force. We should have acted on this months ago. So this is the right message. But, with only the highest respect to my colleague from Massachusetts, I believe that withdrawal by a date certain at this time is the wrong policy.

This measure would direct the President to remove all U.S. Armed Forces deployed to Iraq or Syria since August 7, 2014, except those needed to protect American diplomatic facilities and personnel. That is no way to defeat ISIS or to help the people of Iraq and Syria. I cannot vote for a policy I do not support. However, I share the frustration voiced by Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEE, and many others.

I have said time and time again that Congress should pass a new AUMF. We owe it to the American people, we should do our job, and we owe it to our men and women in uniform. Congressional inaction on an AUMF is inexcusable. Congress has had months to consider the President's language, and it is well past time we act.

Right now, the administration is using the resolution we passed after September 11, 2001, as the legal justification to fight ISIS. This is deeply problematic.

First of all, the 2001 AUMF has none of the limits many of us are seeking. The American people have no stomach for another large-scale, open-ended commitment of American troops in the Middle East. It was our disastrous intervention in Iraq last decade that set the stage for the rise of ISIS in the first place. This is a new challenge, and we need new parameters to define our mission and our goals.

At the same time, using a 2001 authorization for a 2015 conflict sets a terrible precedent. What happens in 5 years when the next administration does the same thing and 5 years after that and 5 years after that? We didn't vote for perpetual war, and we need a new AUMF.

We cannot allow that outcome. With a new AUMF, I hope it will be a bipartisan effort. I hope it will be the hallmark of our work on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I commend my friend, Mr. MCGOVERN, for taking a stand on this issue, and we are in agreement that the United States must avoid another failed open-ended war in the Middle East. But there is a role for the United States in this region, and we should not just vote to withdraw. I believe that would be cutting off our nose to spite our face.

The United States has already made a difference by supporting the Iraqis and the Syrians who are fighting ISIS. It is a difficult fight, but I don't think we can walk away.

With American leadership, we were able to prevent a wholesale slaughter of Yazidi people. With American help,

our Iraqi partners were able to maintain control of the Mosul Dam, which, if breached by ISIS, could have resulted in the death and displacement of up to 2 million people. With American assistance, the Iraqi Security Forces and the moderate Syrian opposition are taking back territory, too slowly, but they are taking back territory, particularly in the south.

The Foreign Affairs Committee just had a hearing earlier this morning and we saw horrific situations of children being gassed in Syria. There is no good side in Syria. We have got to somehow let the Free Syrian Army or the rebels, the well-vetted moderate rebels, we have got to help them, and that is why I believe there is still a role for us to play. A precipitous withdrawal by turning our heads away because we are fed up and disgusted, I think, is not the right move.

So this fight is far from over, and the United States has a critical role to play. We need an authorization that defines a role for the United States, a limited role, and that is the measure I will support.

I, again, do want to thank Mr. MCGOVERN for bringing this issue to the floor. He is a thoughtful, effective colleague. And while I appreciate his resolution, I commend him for focusing this Congress on this important issue.

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

□ 1345

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

I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 55, which comes before the House today under the provisions of the War Powers resolution. Along with my colleagues WALTER JONES and BARBARA LEE, we introduced this bipartisan bill to force a debate on how Congress has failed to carry out its constitutional duty to authorize our military engagement in Iraq and Syria.

Last August, the President authorized airstrikes against the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria. For over 10 months, the United States has been engaged in hostilities in Iraq and Syria without debating an authorization for this war.

On February 11 of this year, over 4 months ago, the President sent to Congress the text for an Authorization for Use of Military Force on combating the Islamic State in Iraq, Syria, and elsewhere; yet Congress has failed to act on that AUMF or to bring an alternative to the House floor, even though we continue to authorize and appropriate money for sustained military operations in those countries.

This is unacceptable. This House appears to have no problem sending our uniformed men and women into harm's way. It appears to have no problem spending billions of dollars for the arms, equipment, and airpower to carry out these wars, but it just can't bring itself to step up to the plate and take responsibility for these wars.

Our servicemen and -women are brave and dedicated. Congress, however, is guilty of moral cowardice. The Republican leadership of this House whines and complains from the sidelines, and all the while, it shirks its constitutional duties to bring an AUMF to the floor of this House, debate it, and vote on it.

This resolution requires the President to withdraw U.S. troops from Iraq and Syria within 30 days or no later than the end of this year, December 31, 2015. If this House approves this resolution, Congress would still have 6 months in which to do the right thing and bring an AUMF before the House and Senate for debate and action—6 months.

Either Congress needs to live up to its responsibilities and authorize this war, or by its continuing neglect and indifference, our troops should be withdrawn and should come home. It is that simple.

Two weeks ago, General John Allen, the U.S. envoy for the U.S.-led coalition that is fighting ISIL, said that this fight may take “a generation or more.” According to the Pentagon, we have spent more than \$2.74 billion in the fight against the Islamic State. That is roughly \$9.1 million each and every day. We have approximately 3,500 boots on the ground, and that number is rising.

If we are going to invest a generation or more of our blood and our treasure in this war and if we are going to continue to tell our Armed Forces that we expect them to fight and die in these wars, it seems to me the least we can do is stand up and vote to authorize these wars or we should end them.

We owe that to the American people. We owe that to our troops and their families. We owe that to the oath of office that each of us took to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to hear all kinds of crazy today about this resolution. Some Members will say that it demands the withdrawal of our troops in 30 days. That is true if you only read half of a sentence in the bill. The other half makes clear that the President has until the end of the year to withdraw our troops.

Some Members will claim that this resolution will undercut our troops while they are carrying out bombing campaigns and training Iraqi and Syrian soldiers under dangerous conditions. They will claim it will deny the Iraqis and the Kurds our critical support in the fight against the brutal terror and threat of ISIS. They will claim that it will leave ISIS unchecked by U.S. airpower and allow them to overrun the region.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is that it is precisely these threats and these challenges that make this debate so urgent. With such compelling issues at hand, how can Congress stand by and do nothing? How can Congress not have this debate and vote on an authorization for this war?

By setting a clear deadline Congress cannot ignore, this resolution provides a strong guarantee that Congress will finally do its job, that Congress will honor its duty to our troops and to all Americans by debating and voting on an authorization for this war. Our troops deserve a Congress that has the courage to stand with them.

I see the courage and sacrifice of our uniformed men and women, but I see nothing but cowardice from the leadership in this House. If they believe we should send our military forces to Iraq and Syria to fight ISIS and possibly die over there, then, for heaven's sake, we should do our duty—we should do our job—and bring an AUMF to the House floor, debate it, and take some responsibility for this war.

That is all this resolution is trying to do. Give the leadership of this House a deadline that even it can't ignore. Either enact an AUMF over the next 6 months or withdraw our forces from Iraq and Syria, one or the other.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Again, the resolution before us today has nothing to do with an Authorization for Use of Military Force; it is a withdrawal resolution. I don't want to leave some of the oversimplified Authorization for Use of Military Force rhetoric here unaddressed.

The real question that the proponents are begging is: What should the United States be doing to combat ISIS? The answer with regard to today's resolution would be nothing and that we should withdraw from combating the ISIS threat. That would be irresponsible and dangerous.

I don't disagree that the current state of the legal authorities the President is using against ISIS is less than ideal from our institution's perspective, but that does not equal illegal and unconstitutional. I say this as someone who is deeply concerned about the President's weak and unstrategic response to the ISIS threat.

The President has short-circuited this debate by claiming complete authority under prior statutes to use our Armed Forces against ISIS. His administration has made the case that ISIS, which was previously known as al Qaeda in Iraq, “has been an enemy of the United States within the scope of the 2001 authorization—continuously—since at least 2004.” He has made the case that ISIS grew out of al Qaeda in Iraq and, in point of fact, that that is where ISIS came from.

No AUMF we could draft could give the President more operational authority than he already claims. Indeed, the draft text he sent asks us to constrain the authority that he already has and complicating, by the way, the effort to reach consensus.

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

Mr. ROYCE. I yield myself an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, just last week, this body considered a Defense Appropria-

tions amendment that would have used Congress' constitutional power of the purse to force the AUMF issue, cutting off funding if Congress does not enact an ISIS-specific AUMF within the next year. That proposal failed in this institution.

The reality is that Congress has made decisions that amount to, in a practical view, disagreeing with the authors of this resolution. Allowing the President to use current force authorities against ISIS is preferable to refusing to confront the threat ISIS poses to our national security altogether.

Now, I will continue to work with Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL and all of our colleagues to see if we can find a way forward on a revised and updated authorization that is focused on the vicious and growing threat posed by ISIS. That is what we need to be working on together.

Merely acting without a credible way forward is foolhardy. It is not brave. A divisive and unsuccessful AUMF process would be perceived by our allies, our partners, and our enemies as a vote of no confidence in the fight against ISIS, resulting in a significant blow to the national security of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), who chairs the Armed Services Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, while I respect my colleague who offered this amendment, I oppose this resolution and urge my colleagues to vote in opposition.

This unwise resolution would call for the unilateral withdrawal of U.S. forces from the fight against ISIL and leave this growing evil to continue to expand, terrorizing millions.

This resolution would do more than halt all U.S. strikes against the terrorist group in Iraq and Syria, removing the approximately 3,500 U.S. trainers from Iraq; it would unwisely deny the Kurdish Peshmerga critical support to fight against the brutal and barbaric terrorist group, leaving them alone to stop this threat.

This resolution would leave ISIL unchecked by U.S. airpower and allow the vicious terrorist group to gain strength as it would further destabilize the region by threatening allies, such as Jordan, and create a largely uncontested safe haven from which ISIL could plot attacks against the United States.

It would allow the continued brutality of a group that beheads innocents, including Americans, that forces women and children into sexual slavery, that destroys religious heritage sites, and that targets Christians and others.

This resolution has nothing to do with authorizing the use of military force against ISIL; instead, this resolution simply unilaterally withdraws our U.S. forces from fighting back against this evil.

I urge opposition to this resolution.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, again, let me say that what we have here, as well-intentioned as I know it is, is a unilateral withdrawal, clean and simple. I understand the frustration, but this is like cutting off your nose to spite your face. I think we need to be very, very careful before we do these things unilaterally.

It is now my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my good friend ELIOT ENGEL from New York, the distinguished ranking member of the full committee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and I thank my friend ED ROYCE, the chairman of the full committee. They are both distinguished men, and I echo their sentiments.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in reluctant opposition to the measure offered by my friend from my home State of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, whose sincerity can never be questioned in this body.

I understand the purpose underlying this legislation, and I identify with the frustration that it expresses as, I think, do all of us.

Proponents of the measure want Congress to debate and vote on the use of military force in Iraq and Syria, and so do I. Proponents of this measure believe that Congress has failed to perform its constitutional duty by not taking up the Authorization for Use of Military Force against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, and so do I.

In fact, I believe the failure to debate an AUMF against ISIL is a continuation of a sad but 60-year pattern of Congress' abrogating one of its most fundamental constitutional roles and responsibilities. For an institution that constantly laments its subjugation at the hands of the executive branch, the retreat from its constitutional responsibility on this matter, frankly, is jaw-dropping.

It is time Congress makes crystal clear to the administration, to our allies, to our constituents, and to our military families the circumstances and parameters under which we would, once again, authorize engagement for our and by our men and women in uniform in this tumultuous region of the world or, for that matter, anywhere; but one cannot endorse the tactic of this measure.

This is constructed to be a sort of sword of Damocles that threatens us, Congress, with the automatic withdrawal of our forces in the region in order to force congressional action with an AUMF.

Congress should not heed such a message, nor should it cater to such a sword hanging over its head in order to do its job. An ill-defined mission with no clear mandate and conflicting objectives is hardly a formula for a military or a political victory.

We should welcome a robust and transparent debate on the matter of an

AUMF but not at any cost on the battlefield itself—a withdrawal, as this resolution proposes, mandated irrespective of battlefield reality, of battlefield progress lately against ISIS, a withdrawal mandated irrespective of our commitments to the Kurds or, for that matter, to the Iraqi Government itself.

□ 1400

That would be irresponsible and unworthy of a great power, however noble the underlying cause is. We have responsibilities on the ground.

This resolution was drafted, as they say in Latin, *ceteris paribus*—all other things being equal. That is to say, in a perfect world. We don't live in a perfect world. Our engagements are what they are. Our commitments are what they are.

I don't share the distinguished chairman's criticism of this administration. It is a murky region to begin with. Our leverage is limited; our choices are dark and complicated. But we are making progress in the region as we speak. To simply ignore all of that and insist we withdraw, in my view, would be irresponsible and unworthy of this great Nation.

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

Let me just say to my colleagues, while I appreciate their thoughtful statements, this resolution that we are debating here today would have no standing if there were an AUMF. We wouldn't even be allowed to bring this to the floor.

I guess my question is: What do we have to do? What do Members of this House, both Democrats and Republicans, have to do to force the leadership here to bring to the floor an AUMF so we can do our job? That is all we are asking for. And, yes, this is a blunt instrument to do it, but I don't know what else it will take to force this issue. I think we owe it to our servicemen and -women to have this debate and to have this vote.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), a co-sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. JONES. I thank Mr. MCGOVERN for the time.

Mr. Speaker, as many people have said today, even those who are for the resolution and against the resolution, we have a constitutional duty. That duty is to debate. I want to quote James Madison, to put the context on what we are trying to say today: "The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature." Not the executive branch, but the legislature.

The frustration that we have felt goes back to August of 2014, when JIM MCGOVERN and BARBARA LEE and WALTER JONES wrote asking the Speaker of the House to allow us to have a debate. That is why Mr. MCGOVERN, BARBARA LEE, and I have put this resolution in today, to force a debate. We wouldn't

be talking about the Middle East if it weren't for this resolution.

In September, I sent my own letter to Speaker BOEHNER and asked for a full debate on an Authorization for Use of Military Force in the region. None of these letters have been answered. None of them. Last September, Speaker BOEHNER told *The New York Times* that he wanted to wait until 2015 to bring an AUMF to the floor of the House for a debate and a vote to avoid bringing it up during a lame duck session. Okay, I can accept that, that makes good sense. It does.

In December, Speaker BOEHNER said the House Republicans would work with the President to get an AUMF request approved if the President sent one to Congress. As Mr. MCGOVERN just said, he did send us one in February. Most people—Democrat and Republican—didn't particularly like what was in the AUMF, but at least it was the vehicle for the debate. But then in February when the Speaker of the House received it, he didn't do anything with it. Nothing has happened.

As has been said by speakers before me, last month JIM MCGOVERN, BARBARA LEE, and I sent another letter to the Speaker of the House asking for a debate. Nothing happened. That is the reason this resolution is on the floor. It is because, as Madison said: House, do your job. He didn't say: Executive branch, do your job. He said the legislative branch. That is us. We need to do this on behalf of the Constitution and on behalf of our young men and women in uniform who will give their life for this country.

As has been said before me, it has been 314 days since President Obama started launching airstrikes and putting troops in Iraq and Syria without receiving the authorization by Congress. According to the Pentagon, we have spent over \$9 million a day fighting ISIS, for a total of \$2.7 billion. Isn't this another reason that we should be debating the Middle East and our role in the Middle East? I think so.

Let me repeat James Madison: "The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES. In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I bring these pictures to the floor of those who give their life for this country. This is a flag-draped coffin being pulled off a transport plane in Dover, Delaware, and it is time that we meet our obligation and debate this issue of war because we are not doing our job. We owe it to the American people, to the Constitution, and to those who wear the uniform.

I thank Mr. MCGOVERN for the time.

THE CONSTITUTION PROJECT,
Washington, DC, June 17, 2015.

Hon. JIM MCGOVERN,
House of Representatives,
Hon. WALTER JONES,
House of Representatives,
Hon. BARBARA LEE,
House of Representatives,

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES MCGOVERN, JONES AND LEE: We write to applaud you for your efforts to compel Congress to exercise its constitutional responsibility to decide on war. For ten months President Obama has prosecuted the war against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) under a specious legal claim that Congress authorized it fourteen years ago. Congress has done no such thing. It is high time that Members weighed in.

We take no position on grave policy choices about whether to continue to use military force against ISIL, and if so how. But Congress must. The Framers vested the war power in the legislative branch precisely because they believed that young Americans should only be put in harm's way when the people, through their representatives' collective judgment, approved it.

We know this is the most difficult issue that Members face. It is also your most important responsibility. If Congress agrees that U.S. service men and women should be engaged in battle, it is Members' constitutional duty to say so. If Congress disagrees, those men and women should come home. What Congress cannot do is continue to avoid the question. We support H. Con. Res. 55 because it would force this long-overdue debate and vote.

Please do not hesitate to contact us, via Scott Roehm at The Constitution Project, with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

MICKEY EDWARDS,
Vice President, Aspen
Institute; former
Member of Congress
(R-OK) and Chair-
man of the House
Republican Policy
Committee; co-chair
The Constitution
Project War Powers
Committee

LOUIS FISHER,
Specialist in Constitu-
tional Law, Law Li-
brary of Congress
(ret.); Scholar in
Residence, The Con-
stitution Project

VIRGINIA SLOAN,
President, The Con-
stitution Project.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and chairman of the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. I thank Chairman ROYCE for his leadership, along with Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL.

I am in opposition to H. Con. Res. 55, which would withdraw U.S. forces currently deployed to Iraq and Syria, which are providing regional stability to protect American families. Sadly, this resolution will undermine America's current campaign to fight terrorists overseas. It would end our air campaign in Iraq and Syria, stop our training and equipping of Iraqi Kurdish

Peshmerga and Sunni tribal forces, as well as moderate Syrian opposition forces, and abandon our commitment to our partners in the region.

The resolution would promote ISIS/Daesh's momentum, create safe havens for terrorists to attack American families, and increase the Tehran regime's influence of a murderous ideology that declares: Death to America, death to Israel. It would allow Daesh to become an even bigger threat to American families, as we have seen with attacks from New York to Boston. Retreating will create safe havens to enable more attacks on American families. We must remember September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. Unilateral withdrawal will not stop the war, as our enemies will continue their attacks.

The resolution does not consider the situation on the ground in Iraq or Syria or the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Indeed, this morning, Chairman Martin Dempsey said that withdrawing the troops would be a mistake and put America at greater risk.

As the grateful dad of two sons who have served in Iraq, I would prefer a clear strategy of victory for our mission in Iraq and Syria. We should not abandon the efforts of peace through strength. I want to work with Members across the aisle to develop a better approach. It is my hope we will take steps to accomplish this.

While Operation Inherent Resolve has shortcomings, it is the only course of action that takes steps toward stopping jihadist extremists overseas. I am opposed to House Concurrent Resolution 55 and urge my colleagues to vote against it as well.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE), a rising star on the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. I thank the ranking member and also the chair of our committee. I also want to thank the sponsor and author of this resolution, Mr. MCGOVERN. Thanks to him, we finally have a chance to discuss and debate this issue right here on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, before I entered this body, when I was a State legislator and a candidate, I noticed back last August-September, as the ISIS/Daesh movement was growing in Iraq and Syria and other parts of the Middle East, the British Parliament rushed back to London to debate a war resolution. I was deeply disappointed, as an American citizen, and, quite frankly, shocked that the United States Congress did not do exactly the same thing; to come here and outline and debate the parameters by which we would authorize the President to wage war against this evil and barbaric threat. Unfortunately, that did not happen.

Several months ago—I think it might have been back in January—President Obama did submit to the Committee on

Foreign Affairs, of which I am proudly a member, an Authorization for Use of Military Force. Unfortunately, that AUMF, somewhat predictably, got attacked by some on the right as insufficient in some areas; and, frankly, got attacked by some on the left as insufficient in other areas. Both sides had legitimate discussions and concerns.

What went wrong after that is that we didn't actually have that discussion or debate right here on the House floor. It was too easy for Members of this body to just say: This is too difficult; we are going to let the President handle it, and we are going to shirk our responsibility. That is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear. I do not support the resolution that is in front of us and will not be voting for it. I think an outright withdrawal of troops within the next 6 weeks would be a terrible mistake and is not the approach that we should take, but I do believe it is about time we do our duty and responsibility and have this discussion and debate. It is about time we, the Congress of the United States, on a bipartisan basis, come up with an actionable plan to fight and defeat ISIS, one that is consistent with our values and at the same time one that does not inadvertently commit us to 5 and 10 years down the road responsibilities that we do not envision today.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), who believes Congress ought to do its job and pass an AUMF.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JONES, Ms. LEE, I thought the House would be screaming at the opportunity to justify sending young men and women to a part of the world that we believe is of danger to the entire community.

I am so amazed that people are saying that this resolution calls for the immediate withdrawal of our troops. I don't read it that way because I don't know of anything that justifies them being there, and this could be screaming for a reason why the administration and Members of Congress want these troops there.

I have no clue as to why people believe that these people, who have been fighting each other for thousands of years, are a threat to my Nation's national security. I don't know of any of my constituents that go to sleep at night worried about ISIS invading their jobless community.

I do know—because I am old enough to remember—that when the Japanese struck Pearl Harbor, immediately President Roosevelt called the Congress to declare war, and America, with pride, came out to support our Nation and our President.

Now, I don't see the connection between ISIS and being struck by Japanese and Germans, but I know one thing: When an American dies, when

they lose their lives, when we send them overseas, when they come back wounded or deranged, we have an obligation in this body to justify why we have done it.

I may be wrong, but the reason I think we run away from this responsibility is because we don't really feel the pain of the people we are sending all over the world and exposing them to losing their lives. Why don't we feel it? Don't we say, "Thank you for your service"? Do we thank the people who don't come back? Do we explain and go to the funerals that I go to as to why they were there? Do we explain that the President of the United States and the Members of this House believe it is important for them to be there? All you have to do is come here, declare war, or justify why the security of the United States is being threatened, and I then will be prepared to send somebody else's kids to fight this war to protect the rest of our country. We don't have a draft. We don't pay for the war.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

□ 1415

Mr. RANGEL. I conclude by saying that, when issues are serious enough for us to draft other people's kids, when they are serious enough for us to say that we are not going to borrow money from Communist China to pay for these wars, then I can be convinced, even if I disagree, that when this Congress and this President believes my country is being threatened, you count me in.

Until such time, we are waiting to hear about the threat to our national security so that we can make up our minds.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, only in Congress do you have a resolution presented to deauthorize the use of force because you want to authorize the use of force.

It is, quite frankly, pretty insulting that you would present a proposal to this body to withdraw troops and then accuse the other side of having moral cowardice for opposing the resolution.

There needs to be more mention of the President's strategy to defeat ISIS—or lack thereof. We have a duty here in Congress to set our troops up to succeed, not to fail.

There has been a lot of debate with regard to the Authorization for Use of Military Force. I am proud to serve on the Foreign Affairs Committee. Chairman ROYCE has had multiple hearings discussing the Authorization for Use of Military Force.

Secretary Kerry was before the committee. He was asked: "Does this authorization authorize offensive action?"

He said: "No."

There was a five-paragraph letter since—with the authorization request—talking about the need to use Special Forces. We can't get a straight answer from this administration as to whether or not he is referring to ours.

Yes, we have a duty to set our troops up to succeed, and not fail. We had a Marine general in front of the Foreign Affairs Committee. When asked whether or not the general in charge of our troops overseas in Iraq has the ability to authorize the mission to take out Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi or capture actionable intelligence, he read a paragraph that simply said that that general can make a recommendation.

What is further insulting is just how many people don't even know the name of that two-star general. Not only does he not have the flexibility and resources he needs to accomplish the mission from the administration that is in charge right now, led by the Commander in Chief, my constituents—Americans—don't even know that gentleman's name.

Yes, there has been a lot of debate. We have a need to protect our troops. That is why I oppose this resolution.

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

Let me just reiterate that I agree that Congress should do its job and pass a new AUMF. The question is: Is this the best way to do it? We ought to pass the right AUMF, not just any AUMF, and we are told we should force the issue.

I had a friend who used to say: "Be careful what you wish for." If we pass this resolution, it is more than possible the Republican leadership will force through language that we on this side of the aisle cannot accept, something that does not have the limits the Democrats are seeking, or worse, just ratify the administration's argument that the 2001 AUMF applies to ISIL.

We need to pass an AUMF, I agree, but we need to pass the right AUMF, even if that means we can't do it within 6 months. I hope we can get together and do that—and we should—and that is why I think this debate is good; but I think passing any AUMF is like buying a pig in a poke, and I am not ready to go down that line.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, we should have passed an AUMF before we got into this latest war. We have been at it for 10 months. We are asking Congress to do its job in the next 6 months. How much longer do we want?

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE).

Mr. MASSIE. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

I think some words from James Madison are instructive to this debate. He said:

In no part of the Constitution is more wisdom to be found than in the clause which confides the question of war and peace to the legislature, and not to the executive department. Beside the objection to such a mixture

of heterogeneous powers, the trust and the temptation would be too great for any one man . . . War is in fact the true nurse of executive aggrandizement. In war, a physical force is to be created; and it is the executive which is to direct it. In war, the public treasures are to be unlocked; and it is the executive hand which is to dispense them.

Hence, it has grown into an axiom that the executive is the department of power most distinguished by its propensity to war; hence, it is the practice of all States, in proportion as they are free, to disarm this propensity of its influence.

That was a warning that he gave us. Unfortunately, after being in this conflict for several years without an authorization from Congress, we have devolved into the dystopian condition that he warned us about.

I don't think anybody in this body seeks to weaken our powers or give them to the President. What we are debating here is when to have the Authorization for Use of Military Force or a declaration of war. The time to have that was 2 years ago. It was years ago, before the President acted.

To the people who are against this resolution, I say you could be right. You might be right. If this resolution fails, I hope you are right, that this resolution wasn't necessary, and we do assert our constitutional prerogative, our responsibility, and have that debate and therefore instruct the President on the reasons for this engagement and what his directives are.

I just want to remind my colleagues this is a strategy, this is a parliamentary tactic that is necessary to force the debate, and let's have the debate.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Judge POE, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I, like the author of this resolution, am concerned about our troops that have been in Iraq and Afghanistan for a long time.

In my office, I have photographs of the 37 Texans with connections to my district who have been killed in Iraq or Afghanistan, of all races, both sexes, and all branches of the service. Here we are, years later, and we are still there.

I am also concerned about this group ISIS. The question is: Is ISIS a national security threat to the United States? I believe that it is. They are doing things to other people that we haven't seen in world history since the barbarians, and they are doing things much worse than even the barbarians did.

ISIS wants to establish a caliphate in the Middle East. It wants to kill us in the United States. They have made that clear.

If ISIS is a national security threat to the U.S., which I believe it is, then let's have a plan to defeat them, a plan now. Why are we waiting years to make this decision? Have the debate on the House floor: Are they a national security threat? If yes, go after them; if

not, then do something else. Meanwhile, people of all nations are dying.

I believe that ISIS will continue as long as there is not someone to stop them. It is in our national security interest to defeat them. The United States needs to have a plan. People of all nations are dying. We need to make a decision.

We need to make a decision as soon as possible, and we need to pick a horse and ride it, and we need to do it now. This bill is not the answer to doing that. Passing this legislation weakens us and weakens our national security. I oppose it.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this debate is personal to me. I watched my son Ben, then a proud United States marine, being sent off to two wars, Afghanistan and Iraq. My family was blessed; he returned safely.

Both sides of the aisle know the price of the battle: too many killed, too many deeply scarred, too many lives of loved ones disrupted, trillions of dollars spent, and the reputation of our country at stake—sometimes for good reasons and sometimes in tragic error.

I will agree with those who say that, when terror strikes in the world, it is our concern and it does require our leadership. There are times when we must risk brave lives to save many more. With that said, when I came to Washington, I vowed not to send anyone else's son or daughter in harm's way unless I understood the mission and the end game, too.

We owe this to all our children. That is why I urge my colleagues to take the time to deliberate and debate on the use of force against the terrorists who threaten the security of our country and our allies. Congress has no greater responsibility.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution is clear: Congress, and Congress alone, shall have the power to declare war.

Make no mistake, the current campaign against ISIS is a war.

Mr. Speaker, our esteemed colleague from Texas made a very cogent argument about why we need clarity. The inability to have a clear plan is based upon the fact that Congress has not yet articulated an authorization to use force that would lay out the parameters and the extent of what we would expect the President to do.

The President says he has the authorization under the 2001 and 2002 authorizations. Ambiguity, clearly, is present. I disagree with the President on those as an authorization. I have argued for more than 10 months that our military operations against ISIS need their own authorization.

The President did his part. He submitted a draft to us in February. Since

then, we have had a few committee hearings, but no real action. Leadership in both Houses has refused to schedule votes on this issue, either in committee or on the floor. That is unacceptable.

We have already run up significant costs, \$2.7 billion on operations to continue the fight against ISIS in Iraq and Syria. We have begun delivering \$1.7 billion of weapons. More importantly, we have lost 7 servicemembers already.

This has to change. This resolution is to force us, the Congress, to uphold our constitutional duty to debate and vote on the authorization for the use of force in Iraq and Syria. I have no doubt that if this resolution passes, an appropriate authorization to use force will be passed, and we will have clarity as to the scope and conduct of this war.

I thank my colleagues for introducing this legislation.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING).

Mr. HOLDING. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the resolution in front of us today.

If passed, the pressure we the United States have been able to apply against ISIS would be stopped, and our allies in the region would be left out in the cold.

There is no doubt about the true wickedness of ISIS in both Iraq and Syria. Their twisted views and thirst for blood have spread instability in the Middle East, leaving a wake of destruction.

The United States, along with our partners, has struggled to beat back ISIS' advances, and the adoption of this resolution would effectively end our operations against ISIS, thus creating a direct threat to our national security and our interests.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is misguided and unwise, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution brought to the floor by my colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN.

No one disputes the horrific nature of the activities being described today and the sickening violence in this region of the world. No one disputes they must be defeated. The question is: What is the best strategy to defeat them and what authorization is required to accomplish this objective?

This is exactly the purpose of a full, thoughtful debate on the use of military force.

□ 1430

My constituents expect Congress to do its job, and we have failed for 4 months to act on the President's draft for the Authorization for Use of Military Force.

There is no more serious duty that we have than the declaration of war,

and I thank my friend from Massachusetts for taking an action intended to force the House to perform its constitutional responsibility and debate the use of military force in Iraq and Syria. This resolution is our only vehicle to force the House to do what it has failed to do.

Over the past 14 years, the United States has lost more than 6,000 heroes who served our Nation in Iraq and Afghanistan. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the possibility that we could continue to commit more brave American men and women in uniform to a conflict without carefully considering, seriously debating, and properly authorizing that use of military force.

Allowing this military action to continue without a real public debate is failing our most solemn responsibility as Members of Congress. This is the only way that we will ultimately develop and implement a successful strategy—a rigorous debate in full public view.

We absolutely must ensure that any additional involvement in any way has clearly defined goals and objectives, is properly limited in scope, and is fully explained to and supported by the American people. That is what Mr. MCGOVERN's resolution attempts to do, to force this House over the next several months to undertake its constitutional responsibility to debate, to carefully consider, and to ultimately authorize the use of military force. We should not shirk this responsibility.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for giving us the opportunity to make our voices heard. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this hour, this minute, this second is actually a gift to the American people. I thank the proponents of this resolution because it recognizes, first and above all, that this little document, the Constitution, albeit small, creates mountains of responsibility on behalf of the American people.

This moment, this minute, this second we are giving the American people their due and their respect, and that is to acknowledge that there must be a full debate on sending our treasure continuously to Iraq and Syria. There is no divide between us on the vileness of ISIS and all of the terrorist groups and the willingness of the American people to be empathetic, sympathetic, and helping the Iraqis and Syrians and those who are suffering and those who are bleeding.

But the question has to be, after 6,000 wounded, hundreds who have been killed particularly in my State, and thousands more across the Nation, we have to find the pathway where all of us know what we are doing.

This is an important resolution. We need the debate, and we need to understand that our soldiers need to be protected and ultimately brought home.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 55, directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove United States Armed Forces deployed to Iraq or Syria on or after August 7, 2014, other than Armed Forces required to protect United States diplomatic facilities and personnel, from Iraq and Syria.

This resolution provides a procedural mechanism for Congress to do its job.

Specifically, the resolution gives the House leadership 6 months to take up an AUMF, debate it and vote up or voted down.

This time frame allows the President the opportunity to revise the AUMF to state his objectives and goals for consideration by Congress.

As a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee and the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security and Investigations, I stand in strong support of our country's armed forces' might and our valiant soldiers and armed personnel who have fought to protect our country.

I also stand with the American people and taxpayers, who have placed their trust in the President and his Administration through war and peace.

After all, not too long ago, he was one of us grappling with the war logic we were presented by the prior administration.

President Obama inherited this war, along with a problematic economy and we applaud all his good faith efforts to do "damage control" to fix a problem he did not create as it relates to ending war and facilitating a better economy for the American people.

I recognize that it is not an easy feat to fix our problematic war policies under enormous pressure from both sides of the aisle.

We recognize that the President has been thoughtful, deliberative and judicious about our presence in Iraq and Syria.

We appreciate the threat to the United States posed by the current instability in the Middle East, especially with events in the recent past: the Arab Spring, ISIS in Iraq and Syria.

We have spent nearly trillions of dollars in wars against ISIS in Iraq and Syria.

Let me be clear the threat of ISIS and terrorism is clear.

That is why we need to have a full clear and comprehensive debate on what the plan is.

We have six months to do it and thus we can be thoughtful and deliberate about it.

To keep our homeland safe, we must be able to defeat and destroy ISIS.

Over 7,000 fallen heroes have sacrificed their lives to protect our country and help facilitate democracy in Iraq and Syria.

Their devotion to our country is remarkable and inspiring.

The Islamic State, also known as ISIS is gobbling up land in Iraq and Syria.

In 2007, I introduced H.R. 930, the "Military Success in Iraq and Diplomatic Surge for Political and National Reconciliation in Iraq Act of 2007" (MSIA).

Among other things, H.R. 930, would require a diplomatic full-court press designed to engage all six of Iraq's neighbors—Iran, Turkey, Syria, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Ku-

wait—more constructively in stabilizing Iraq. These countries are already involved in a bilateral, self-interested and disorganized way.

The MSIA Act would ensure that never again will the American people or the Congress be bamboozled into rubber-stamping an ill-advised, ill-planned, preemptive war.

In the Eighteenth Congressional District of Texas alone, more than 300 Texans have made the ultimate sacrifice for their country.

Indeed, more than 3,000 Texans have been wounded.

The cost of war is brutal on our communities.

In my state, of the over 3,000 lives that have been lost, I can assure you that thousands more lives are affected.

To date, the war in Iraq alone has claimed the lives of over 4,000 brave servicemen and women. More than 30,000 Americans have been wounded, many suffering the most horrific injuries.

The mothers, fathers, wives, brothers, sisters, children, cousins, aunts, uncles and friends of those of our fallen soldiers are affected.

How do they manage?

How do they cope after losing their loved ones?

How does a mother deal with the reality of burying her son or daughter?

How does a father mourn the loss of his adult child, whose bright future carried a lot of his aspirations for a better and safer America?

That is just the human cost.

We are grateful to various U.S. agencies and non-profit organizations like the wounded warriors organizations that are helping these brave men and women attempt to put the pieces together.

We made the point that it was essential for this and prior Administrations to develop "a plan" for any war we sought to embark upon.

Yes, we understand that the Armed Forces of the United States is unparalleled on the battlefield and would decisively defeat Iraq's forces and remove Saddam Hussein, which in fact we did.

But the existential question was what do we do next?

This resolution allows time for the President to come up with a plan for Congress to look at and consider.

Just consider these facts. Since the war began in Iraq and Syria:

In addition to our American casualties, hundreds of thousands of Iraqi and Syrian civilians have been killed.

About 13.6 million people, equivalent to the population of London, have been displaced by the conflicts in Syria and Iraq, and many are without food or shelter according to the UNHCR.

More than a trillion dollars has been expended on both wars;

On the operations against ISIS, it is estimated that we are spending as much as \$22 billion a year.

Could this money be put to better use? Well, consider the following:

How about fully funding the last week's Trade Adjustment Bill we voted on to protect over 280,000 American workers displaced by U.S. involvement in global trade;

A well funded TAA is designed to help train American workers displaced into new career paths so that they are able to make a living and support their families;

Programs funded by the TAA provide a path for employment growth and opportunity through aid to U.S. workers who have lost their jobs as a result of foreign trade;

The TAA provide our trade-affected workers with opportunities to obtain the skills, resources, and support they need to become re-employed;

According to the DOL, over 5 percent of Americans are still looking for work and are unemployed or underemployed;

That means 1.5 million Americans are struggling financially;

This translates to millions of families.

Should we not be working to improve the livelihood of Americans?

Mr. Speaker, opponents of the resolution before us contend that it gives comfort to the enemy and undermines the President's strategy for success in war in Iraq and Syria.

What we need is a solid strategy that is supported by the Administration, Congress and the American people.

This starts with a plan put forth by the President and debated and approved by the Congress.

This is why we should afford the President the opportunity to come up with this plan.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before, exiles and militia leaders have found their way into Iraq and Syria in the likes of ISIS and are now a menace to peace loving people everywhere.

Peace, security, and the protection of lives is and should be our priority.

That is why I strongly and proudly support our magnificent, heroic, and selfless service men and women.

That is why I strongly support H. Con. Res. 55 which provides a procedural mechanism for Congress to do its job, by giving House leadership 6 months to take up an AUMF, debate it and vote up or voted down.

I urge all members to support the resolution before the House.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, who also served in the U.S. Air Force in Iraq and Afghanistan and was one of the earliest voices calling for airstrikes against ISIS.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this issue for, unfortunately, the long time that we have been having to deal with this.

I am surprised. We watch the news. We see what is happening overseas and from afar, and we see the human tragedy occurring; yet we are here debating an isolationism resolution to withdraw all military actions from the Middle East at a time when we see utter human tragedies. This is not the time, in fact, to halt military operations.

I would like to speak out quickly on an issue that I think underlines this whole debate. There are some that believe that if our foreign policy were simply nicer, if our foreign policy were more accommodating or less focused on military power, then the world and, more importantly, our enemies would suddenly view America in a much different light, or that the problems that we are facing today, we wouldn't be facing them at all. This is a view of pacifism or disengagement in the world,

and it represents at best a naive world view, and I think it is certainly an illusion.

Ironically, as we debate the merits of this resolution, we have a case study in the illusion of pacifism or disengagement. The President laid down a red line against Bashar al-Assad in Syria, and, in fact, the Russians supposedly gave the President an off-ramp in which he was able to exit and allow Bashar al-Assad to simply give up his chemical weapons.

When we saw that nicer new engagement by the United States, we did not see a peaceful Bashar al-Assad emerge realizing that he had simply misunderstood the United States. We saw the same brutal dictator that murdered his own people continued to be brutal and murderous.

Before we withdrew troops completely from Iraq, many implored the President to leave a residual force. We didn't do it, and we have now the next iteration of al Qaeda, named ISIS. Now, that may be a bit of an oversimplification, but it is, in essence, what we see.

I think it is fine to have a debate about AUMF in this Chamber, and we should. What the President gave us was an AUMF that not only limited his ability to fight ISIS, but limited the ability of the next President of the United States to fight and destroy ISIS. I personally won't be a party to tying the President's hands.

Mr. Speaker, I was in Iraq just a few months ago, and I saw the human tragedy that occurred. I stood in the U.N. refugee camp and had a little girl come up to me and explain through a translator how her parents were killed by ISIS and how she ran away fleeing for security, and I realized the important role that the United States of America plays, the unfortunate burden that we must bear for world security.

Mr. Speaker, we either stand up and fight ISIS now, or we sit on our knees and cower before them later.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), a senior member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is unacceptable that we have not debated in committee and on the floor of this House an AUMF and a foreign policy designed to fit current circumstances, designed to fit an Assad regime that has killed nearly 200,000 of his own people, designed to fit ISIS, which either is or isn't a part or a former part of al Qaeda. Instead, we operate under a resolution passed in the wake of the attacks in 2001.

The resolution before us I do not think is the answer to the fact that Congress has not debated a new AUMF.

The reason I rise to oppose it is because I urge Members to read it. It says that all forces must be withdrawn in 30 days unless there is some threat to their security. It says that it ends all deployment, but it is not clear how it applies to Air Force operations or

Naval air operations. Presumably, we would stop all bombing under all circumstances.

How does it apply to the rights of the President under current law to deploy our forces for 60 to 90 days if there would be some further outrage from the Assad regime?

We need a new resolution that does Congress' best job to deal with the current circumstances. What we don't need is the idea that blaming Obama for everything constitutes a foreign policy strategy.

The fact is that it was the Bush administration that installed and left al-Maliki in power. It is al-Maliki that expelled all our forces and would not allow a residual force. Would we have gone to war with the Iraqi Army under al-Maliki if he expelled our forces? I have yet to hear that suggested by the blame Obama side.

The fact is that we cannot leave our forces in a country that will not sign a status of forces agreement with us.

The great problem with Iraq today is what al-Maliki did to that country, and the person who installed al-Maliki was the former President of the United States, President George W. Bush.

So I look forward, first, to the defeat of this resolution but, second, to consideration of a new AUMF that focuses on whether we will do anything about Assad or only go after ISIS, whether we will use ground forces, which I oppose, or just use our Air Forces. That debate needs to start in our committee, but this resolution is not an answer.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I don't appreciate this resolution being mischaracterized. The troops don't have to be withdrawn for 6 months, and the point of this resolution is to force this House to do its job and pass an AUMF. If my colleagues are so upset that we haven't debated and voted on an AUMF, they ought to support this resolution because it is the only way we are going to force the leadership in this House to do its job.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. O'ROURKE).

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, this is the best way I can think of of supporting our servicemembers and their families in this time of war, because I can think of no greater way to support them, to ensure that we have a strategy with defined, achievable goals when we are going to put their lives on the line. Today, I don't know that we have that.

Do we have a partner in Iraq that has the will to fight? Do we have the resources necessary across two different battlefields in Iraq and Syria to achieve the President's goal of degrading, defeating, and destroying ISIS? Do we have a strategy that is worthy of the loss of even one American servicemember's life?

I think all of those questions are worthy of discussion and debate, a debate that would hopefully lead to an intelligent use of military force with that defined strategy.

This, Mr. Speaker, I believe, is our way of supporting soldiers and their families. It is also a way that the American people can hold us accountable by making the most important, awesome decision that a Member of Congress can, which is to put an American servicemember in harm's way.

I want to make sure that we can source the judgment and wisdom of the people that we represent. I, for one, if we have that debate and have that vote, will go back to my community. I will talk to veterans who have served in our wars. I will talk to the parents of future servicemembers whose children's lives will be put on the line, some which will be lost, some which will be changed forever. I think that is the minimum responsibility that we must meet.

I wish that an AUMF were brought to the floor in some other way, but today this is the only way to get there. For that reason, I will support this.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI), a member of the Armed Services and the Veterans' Affairs Committees.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I just came from an Armed Services Committee meeting where the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs both agreed that under no circumstances should this House consider this resolution at this time, which is conceivably an immediate withdrawal of our troops from Iraq and Syria. This causes, they discussed, an immediate risk to our homeland and our allies.

We would not be here today debating this issue if the Commander in Chief had articulated a strategy to the American people. We would not be debating this concept.

Even so, Mr. Chairman, this is dangerous for America, and this is not the way to go on a plan for an immediate withdrawal with our allies and with our homeland being at risk.

The world is watching today. The world has watched for the last several years our lack of a foreign policy plan, but today the world is watching to see if this U.S. House is going to stand together in a bipartisan manner and reject this resolution and stand together for the safety that we were sworn to stand together and uphold, which is the safety of the United States of America.

I ask my colleagues to reject this resolution.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

□ 1445

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I don't want to characterize the resolution. I want to read it.

It requires the President of the United States to remove all of our forces, except those needed to protect our diplomatic facilities—and here are the words—“by no later than the end of the period of 30 days beginning on the day on which this concurrent resolution is adopted.”

Now, that certainly applies to all our naval forces and all our air forces. But then it goes on to say, if the President determines that it is not safe to remove forces, he can have an additional period up to the end of the year. That assumes that our ground forces cannot be withdrawn within a 30-day period.

Our forces are mobile. They are capable. They are currently behind the front lines. And they can, indeed, leave within 30 days. So clause 2 is applicable only to a military that is engaged in combat or is immobile. Our military is neither.

Clause 1: "30 days beginning on the day on which this concurrent resolution is adopted."

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

I urge my colleagues to read the resolution because basically what it does, it gives the President up through the end of the year, if he so chooses. I mean, that is what the resolution says. And I would hope that in 6 months we could come together and pass an AUMF. I would hope that all my colleagues—who are complaining here that we don't have an AUMF—would actually come together in the next 6 months to do something because it hasn't happened in the first 10 months. We can point fingers all we want, but it is not getting done.

And this is a way to force this Congress to do its job. It is that simple.

This is not about walking away from the conflict in the Middle East. This is about making sure that the men and women who serve in the United States Congress live up to our constitutional responsibilities and do our job.

I am sorry that so many people think that is a radical idea, but we haven't done our job. And I think it is a disservice to the men and women who serve in our Armed Forces, and it is a disservice to our duty as Members of Congress.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, one of the great failures of this Congress in our time has been the abdication of our responsibility, which could not be more clearly defined by our Founders, for declarations of war and, subsequently, resolutions authorizing the use of force.

Clearly, the time is long overdue for this Congress to step up and assume its responsibility for these declarations, these seemingly endless wars of choice that are so costly in blood and in treasure. It is time that this Congress step up and have that debate on whether or not it is in our interest to continue our involvement in these wars. We need to be presented with a rationale. We need to be presented with a strategy. Or, in fact, it is time to put an end to them and to bring our troops home.

Mr. Speaker, my fellow colleagues, we owe it to our taxpayers, who have spent trillions of dollars in these ventures. We owe it to our Founders, who

knew and understood the importance of having the Congress make these decisions—not executives. And we owe it to our troops.

It is time to have that resolution debated and decided here, or it is time to bring the troops home, Mr. Speaker.

As Judge POE would say, "And that is just the way it is."

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), one of the co-authors of this resolution.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank Congressman MCGOVERN for yielding and for his tireless effort and leadership. Also, I am proud to join with Congressman WALTER JONES and, again, Mr. MCGOVERN on this bipartisan resolution.

This resolution calls only for the withdrawal of U.S. Armed Forces from Iraq and Syria by the end of the year absent, mind you—absent—the passage of an Authorization for Use of Military Force against ISIS.

However, this resolution is also about reclaiming a fundamental constitutional responsibility: the constitutionally protected right of Congress to debate and determine whether and when this country enters into war.

For the last 10 months, our Nation has been fighting yet another war in the Middle East, a war that Congress has yet to authorize or even to debate. We have been patient, and we have given the House leadership plenty of time to develop a strategy to bring up an authorization.

When this war began, Congressman MCGOVERN and I wrote to the Speaker, calling for an immediate debate and vote. Nothing happened. Then at the beginning of this Congress, the Speaker said that the President had to send to Congress an authorization. More than 4 months ago, the President did just that. Once again, nothing happened.

In the 10 months since the war began, we have had no real debate and certainly no vote. This is outrageous.

Now, let me be clear about what we are trying to do with this resolution. This is not about making a political point. This is about forcing Congress to take up an Authorization for Use of Military Force by the end of the year and to follow through on its constitutional responsibility. It is about making us do our job. It is unfortunate that we have to do that.

The timeline included in this bill gives the leadership of the House 6 months to bring forward an AUMF, but the clock is ticking.

Just last week, the President announced he authorized the deployment of 450 more American troops to train and assist Iraqi forces in the fight against ISIS.

Mr. Speaker, this is textbook mission creep.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to say, enough is enough. After more than a decade of wars in the Middle East, thousands of U.S. lives and billions of dollars lost, the need for Congress to reclaim its war-making powers is more critical than ever.

Members of Congress are sent to Washington, D.C., to make hard decisions, but in the case of war, Congress, instead, has chosen to duck its responsibilities.

And let me just say, the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force—which is a blank check for endless war—has been cited as the authorization for the ongoing war against ISIS. That is why, of course, I voted against it 14 years ago and have introduced legislation every Congress to repeal this blank check for endless war.

Keeping this authorization on the books indefinitely without repealing or replacing it has allowed Congress to avoid its constitutional responsibility to bring up an authorization against ISIS.

From what I remember, we only had 1 hour of debate in 2001. At least, Mr. Speaker, we have 2 hours now to debate whether or not to debate an Authorization for Use of Military Force.

Congress must have a role in how we do our work and what we are required to do, and that is exactly what this resolution is about. Many of us agree that a robust debate and a vote is necessary, long overdue, and must take place.

During the full committee markup last week of the Defense Appropriations bill, I offered a sense of Congress amendment that simply reaffirmed that Congress has a constitutional duty to debate and determine whether or not to authorize the use of military force against ISIS. This amendment was adopted with the support of six Republicans on the committee.

While we may all not agree on what an AUMF should look like, we know there is bipartisan agreement around the need for Congress to debate on a specific AUMF.

We need to do our job. We know full well there is no military solution in Iraq or Syria, for that matter, and that any lasting solution must be settled in the region among warring factions.

The American people deserve to know the costs and the consequences of this new war, and Members of Congress should represent their constituents by saying "yes" or "no."

This resolution is a procedural mechanism. It is unfortunate, again, that we have to do this to make us live up to our constitutional job and duty in the matters of war and peace.

We need to vote "yes" on this resolution. It is simple. It is bipartisan. It just requires us to do our job and to exercise our constitutional responsibilities. Enough is enough. We cannot allow the American people to have no voice in what is said and what is being done with their taxpayer dollars.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas

(Mr. MCCAUL), the chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us here today, in my judgment, is dangerous and should be defeated.

For months, Congress and the American people have demanded a strategy from this administration to defeat and destroy ISIS, a barbaric and growing terrorist empire that threatens not only the people of Iraq and Syria but also the United States.

Today the Secretary of Defense testified that “ISIS is a threat to the homeland because of its avowed intentions to strike and recruit in this country. ISIS must be and will be dealt a lasting defeat.”

But this President does not have a strategy to accomplish this. We continue to fight the terrorists with one hand tied behind our back, and the only thing worse would be to disengage completely, which is exactly what this resolution would do.

I recently led a bipartisan delegation to the Middle East, where I visited Iraq, ground zero in the fight against ISIS, a week before Ramadi was overtaken by ISIS, and I spoke with Prime Minister Abadi. Unfortunately, the current strategy, in my opinion, relies too heavily on Shia militias, a proxy of Iran, to defeat ISIS.

We now have over 3,000 American servicemembers there to advise and assist the Iraqi national military. But the President has restricted our ability to take the fight to the enemy because he is more committed to his campaign pledge to end the wars in the Middle East than he is to ending ISIS. The President has, in fact, made the situation more dangerous. His failure to negotiate a status of forces agreement and the complete failure of Prime Minister Maliki to govern effectively created a vacuum that ISIS now fills.

In Syria, a civil war continues to rage. There too ISIS has filled the void. Islamist fanatics from more than 100 countries have traveled overseas to fight with groups like ISIS and al Qaeda. Thousands of these jihadists carry Western passports and can exploit security gaps to return to the West and the homeland, where they plot attacks against the United States.

Meanwhile, Iran is actively engaged in both Iraq and Syria, embedding Shia fighters in Sunni communities in Iraq and doing Assad’s bidding in Syria.

As Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu recently told our delegation: “Iran and ISIS are competing for the crown of militant Islam.”

This resolution would ensure that Iran and ISIS will continue to dominate in the region while thousands of innocent civilians suffer and die.

Just ask the Yazidi Christians in Iraq if they support leaving security in the hands of ISIS and the Iranians. Thousands of Yazidis would have been killed last summer if it weren’t for U.S. airstrikes to repel an ISIS advancement against them. Nothing could be more

irresponsible or damaging to our interests.

But let me say this in response to those who say this is a vote to urge an AUMF vote. I personally support a strong AUMF, an authorization, but one to defeat and destroy ISIS.

We met the White House counsel. He presented a very different AUMF that would restrict further the President’s current abilities to destroy and defeat ISIS. I cannot support that.

And this resolution, with all due respect, is the wrong way to accomplish the goal of defeating ISIS through a strong Authorization for Use of Military Force.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), my friend and colleague.

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, and I commend the sponsors, Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. LEE, for introducing it. And I do so not because I necessarily think we ought to withdraw all our troops in 6 months. Maybe we should. I am not sure of that yet. But I do know that we are waging a war that is probably unconstitutional, as we did in Libya.

Since World War II, we have time after time gotten away from the constitutional command that Congress shall declare war. The Framers said war is too important to allow one person—the President—to decide on it. But we have gotten away from that. We got away from it because we didn’t have time. That was the excuse. With the missiles flying over the poles, you couldn’t call Congress into session.

But then came Iraq. We had a resolution for the use of military force. Then came Libya. No excuse. Plenty of time to consult with NATO. Plenty of time to consult with Arab countries. No time to consult with Congress. I believe that was an unconstitutional—and a foolish, as it turns out—but an unconstitutional use of force.

□ 1500

Mr. Speaker, now we have this force in the Middle East, in Iraq and in Syria. We are getting more and more into a war. I am not commenting on the intelligence of that right now. It may be that we have no choice but to fight ISIS. Maybe, as the Republicans seem to want without saying so, we should have a lot of boots on the ground, because that is what they are really saying when they say the President is doing it halfway. Or maybe the bigger threat is Iran, and we should turn our attentions to Iran instead of tacitly allying with Iran against ISIS. Or maybe we should say it is up to the Middle Eastern people—they can handle it—and pull our troops out altogether. That is the debate we ought to have. And what are the limits of our commitment, if any? That ought to be debated in Congress. Congress ought to make these decisions in the name of

the American people, not the President.

Now, because we haven’t had an AUMF on the floor, we must have this resolution.

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

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

Mr. NADLER. This resolution is not intended to force a pullout in 6 months. It is intended to force a debate in Congress in 6 months. Let us get back to our constitutional tradition. Let Congress do its job, and if the President submitted an AUMF that is too strong or too weak, let’s bring up a different one. But it is our job to make those decisions. It is our job to stand before our constituents to say we believe this is important enough to go to war with ISIS or with Iran, to send more troops there or not, and here is why and here are the limitations, we shouldn’t have boots on the ground or we should.

Mr. Speaker, these are our decisions to make, and our decisions we shouldn’t be able to avoid. That is what this is about. We have had 10 years of war, 13 years of war. The 2001 AUMF cannot possibly be relevant now. We thought we were voting for 3 weeks of strikes against bases in Afghanistan. The 2002 AUMF was to topple Saddam Hussein. He is gone. I didn’t think that was a good idea, but it is over. The consequences are not over.

We ought to debate this. We ought to debate an AUMF. We ought to pass one or not. That is our decision, but let’s pass this resolution that supports that decision on us.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

First let me thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for their tireless leadership on this issue.

Thank you, Mr. MCGOVERN.

For 14 long years, our Nation has been at war. Our people are sick and tired of war. This resolution simply opens the door to bring American soldiers home.

Let me be clear. We must maintain a strong national defense. We have a responsibility to protect our borders, our diplomats, and Americans at home and abroad. But the end to terrorism is not found through the barrel of a gun or more boots on the ground. More weapons cannot stomp out the root causes of terrorism, and more bombs cannot eradicate the seeds of hate.

Over and over again, I have stood on this very floor and reminded my colleagues that the use of force cannot—must not—be taken lightly, especially when the needs at home are so great and the sea of terrorism is so vast.

President John F. Kennedy once said, “Those who make a peaceful revolution

impossible will make violent revolution inevitable.’

Many years ago, I shared my concerns with you that young people in the Middle East would never forget the violence that they have experienced in their youth. I feared then—and I say it again—that they would grow up hating our children, our grandchildren, and generations yet unborn. I feared those young people would have very little faith in the idea of democracy, in the values of inclusion, or the hope for lasting peace.

“Hate begets hate,” as Martin Luther King, Jr., would say, “violence begets violence; toughness begets a greater toughness. We must meet the forces of hate with the power of love.”

These young people must be our focus. We must lift them up and listen to regional voices for peace. We must counter the consequences of violence by demonstrating that diplomacy and the spread of true democracy are the most effective weapons against terrorism.

Yes, I will say it again. Our people are sick and tired of war. I hope that all of my colleagues will support this resolution and vote “yes” for a method to build a peace for long a time and for years and generations to come.

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

Mr. ENGEL. It is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, Ms. ELLEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from New York for yielding to me. I have something special to say.

Mr. Speaker, as the United States has increasingly drifted into war without the usual congressional authorization, I appreciate that today’s resolution permits the House to assert its appropriate role. I only ask that the residents of the District of Columbia be permitted to be heard in the same way as other Americans. My colleagues will not only speak today, they also will vote the will of their constituents. Although District residents are already serving in Iraq, Syria, and elsewhere, I am limited to speaking without a vote.

What an outrage, especially to our veterans. That outrage is amplified, considering that District residents pay \$12,000 annually per capita in Federal taxes, more in Federal taxes than the residents of any State in the Union, to support our government in war and in peace. Regardless of what is decided on this resolution, Mr. Speaker, District residents will be there for America, as they have been for every war ever since the Nation was created. It is time that the Congress was there for District residents.

Nearly 200,000 D.C. residents have fought for America’s freedom in time of war, yet our residents, including our veterans, are still denied a vote in the national legislature that sent them to war. In fact, D.C. servicemembers fought and won the vote for citizens in

Iraq and Afghanistan, yet our veterans came home without the same voting rights for themselves. The Nation willingly accepts their sacrifices and demands their tax dollars but denies them representation in Congress.

D.C. residents have not only given their lives for this country since its creation as a nation, they have died in disproportionate numbers in all of the 21st century wars; yet these veterans, among the 650,000 Americans who live in the District of Columbia, still have no vote on national security, no vote on defense spending, no vote in the decision to send our country to war, and no vote on anything else in this House.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. NORTON. I protest, Mr. Speaker. I protest continuing to demand full citizenship costs from the residents of our Nation’s Capital while denying them the vote granted to all other Americans that come with those costs.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD.)

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for offering this important proposal that he is joined with by colleagues from California, New York, North Carolina, and other places.

I am a Republican who stands proudly with this Democrat because I think he is hitting the nail on the head. I do so because, in this instance, it has been argued against as a blunt instrument. But what the Founding Fathers were incredibly deliberate about—very blunt about, if you will—was that only Congress had the ability to declare war. And so this one blunt instrument is ultimately about backing up the bluntness of the Constitution in absolutely being declarative in suggesting that only Congress has the power to authorize war.

What the Founding Fathers knew was that, at the end of the day, body bags don’t come back to Washington, D.C., when something goes wrong in some far-off battlefield; they come back to congressional districts across this country. So they wanted a check and a balance wherein people from those local districts could report into Congress and say that this is or this isn’t working for folks back home.

Again, the Founding Fathers were so blunt. I look here at a document that is 250 days beyond the authorization of war that is even granted in the War Powers Act. I look at an administration and the Congress that is hinging, it is building and sustaining of war in the Middle East based on a 14-year-old document, in essence, a blank check, and there are no blank checks in this process.

I look at what James Madison said years ago. He said: “The Constitution supposes what the history of all gov-

ernments demonstrates, that the executive is the branch of power most interested in war, and most prone to it. It has accordingly, with studied care, vested the question of war to the legislature.”

This proposal is about cost. It is about saying we have spent \$2.5 trillion in the Middle East. The Harvard study says 6 trillion.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, for all these different reasons, we need to stop and pause, not necessarily to bring troops home, but, as has been suggested by others, to force a debate on Congress’ role. This is something Republicans and Democrats ought to equally care about: Do we or don’t we have proper lanes in the channel? Is the executive exceeding its authority or not?

This is something Republicans absolutely ought to care about. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, again, I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts for his work on this and ask for this bill which is so important for, simply, Congress’ authorization of war effort.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I first would like to insert in the RECORD a letter of support from the Constitution Project, which is signed by our former colleague, Republican Mickey Edwards of Oklahoma; a letter in support of this resolution from the Council for a Liveable War; a letter of support from Win Without War; and a letter of support from the Friends Committee on National Legislation.

THE CONSTITUTION PROJECT,
Washington, DC, June 17, 2015.

Hon. JIM MCGOVERN,
House of Representatives.
Hon. WALTER JONES,
House of Representatives.
Hon. BARBARA LEE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES MCGOVERN, JONES AND LEE: We write to applaud you for your efforts to compel Congress to exercise its constitutional responsibility to decide on war. For ten months President Obama has prosecuted the war against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) under a specious legal claim that Congress authorized it fourteen years ago. Congress has done no such thing. It is high time that Members weighed in.

We take no position on grave policy choices about whether to continue to use military force against ISIL, and if so how. But Congress must. The Framers vested the war power in the legislative branch precisely because they believed that young Americans should only be put in harm’s way when the people, through their representatives’ collective judgment, approved it.

We know this is the most difficult issue that Members face. It is also your most important responsibility. If Congress agrees that U.S. service men and woman should be engaged in battle, it is Members’ constitutional duty to say so. If Congress disagrees,

those men and women should come home. What Congress cannot do is continue to avoid the question. We support H. Con. Res. 55 because it would force this long-overdue debate and vote.

Please do not hesitate to contact us, via Scott Roehm at The Constitution Project, with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

MICKEY EDWARDS,
Vice President, Aspen Institute; former Member of Congress (R-OK) and Chairman of the House Republican Policy Committee; co-chair The Constitution Project War Powers Committee.

LOUIS FISHER,
Specialist in Constitutional Law, Law Library of Congress (ret.); Scholar in Residence, The Constitution Project.

VIRGINIA SLOAN,
President, The Constitution Project.

COUNCIL FOR A LIVABLE WORLD,
Washington, DC, June 16, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MCGOVERN, Later this week, Congress has the opportunity to take action it has conspicuously avoided: debate and vote on the war in Iraq and Syria.

While America has dropped thousands of bombs, deployed 3,500 troops—with plans to send 450 more and spent billions of dollars in our latest war, Congress has failed to perform its most basic constitutional responsibility: to debate and vote on war.

But this week, Reps. Jim McGovern (D-MA), Walter Jones (R-NC), and Barbara Lee (D-CA), are demanding that Congress do its job.

They have introduced a bipartisan resolution, H. Con. Res. 55, which could force the House of Representatives to debate and vote on the war.

If adopted, the legislation would direct the President to withdraw all American military personnel from Iraq by December 31, 2015 unless Congress votes to authorize the use of force.

The right of Congress to declare war is fundamental to our Constitution, yet Congress has avoided taking a stand on our most recent war in the Middle East. In addition, Congress holds the power of the purse, and yet the war is costing at least \$9 million per day without congressional approval. Congress owes it to the thousands of Americans we have put into harm's way to ensure it is for the right reasons.

The President should not be permitted to wage war without Congressional approval; he should not be able to claim outdated authorizations for the use of military force dating to 2001 and 2002 as his cover for war.

We urge you to support H. Con. Res. 55, the McGovern-Jones-Lee resolution. It is time for Congress to take a stand.

Sincerely,

ANGELA CANTERBURY,
Executive Director.
JOHN ISAACS,
Senior Fellow.

WIN WITHOUT WAR,
Washington, DC, June 16, 2015.

On behalf of the Win Without War coalition and our 11 million members, we urge Rep. Jim McGovern to SUPPORT H.Con.Res.55.

This bipartisan resolution, introduced by Reps. McGovern (D-MA), Jones (R-NC), and

Lee (D-CA), would force Congress to debate the use of military force in Iraq and Syria. We expect the resolution to be on the floor tomorrow, June 17.

While America has dropped thousands of bombs, deployed 3,500 troops, and spent billions of dollars in our latest war, Congress has failed to perform its most basic responsibility to debate and vote on the war in Iraq and Syria. After ten months of bombing Iraq and Syria, it is past time for Congress to do its job and debate and vote on this war. It is simply unconscionable that we are asking our men and women in uniform to risk their lives in a war that Congress has not voted on.

The McGovern-Jones-Lee Resolution would force Congress to vote on the war in Iraq and Syria, and, importantly, if Congress continues to shirk its constitutional duty, it would bring our troops home. In the words of Rep. McGovern, "if this House doesn't have the stomach to carry out its constitutional duty to debate and authorize this latest war, then we should bring our troops home. If the cowardly Congress can go home each night to their families and loved ones, then our brave troops should receive that same privilege."

However one feels about this latest war in the Middle East, we can all agree that it is long past time for Congress to do its job and finally debate and vote on the war in Iraq and Syria.

Congress needs to fulfill its constitutional duty of debating and voting on this war. We hope you will SUPPORT H.Con.Res.55.

As always, if we can be of any additional assistance as your office considers this important resolution, please let us know.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN MILES,
Advocacy Director, Win Without War.

FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON
NATIONAL LEGISLATION,
Washington, DC, June 17, 2015.

Today your boss will take an important vote on war authority. The House is expected to consider H.Con.Res.55, a privileged resolution led by Reps. Jim McGovern, Walter Jones, and Barbara Lee. By exercising Congress' ability under the War Powers Resolution to urge cessation of hostilities absent a congressional authorization of force, the resolution would serve as a forcing mechanism for Congress to finally debate the war against ISIS that has lasted more than ten months without specific congressional debate and authorization.

Nearly ten months ago, the Obama administration sidestepped its constitutional mandate to seek authority from Congress before engaging in new military hostilities. This greatly expanded the scope of the 2001 AUMF and the scope of executive war powers. Further, it deprived the American people and their elected representatives of an opportunity to express opposition, or to ask important questions about the overall strategy, and why more war will solve the region's problems, when it has failed to do so any other time.

The Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL) urges your boss to take this opportunity to debate the war, to vote for the re-establishment of congressional war power, and to vote in favor of H.Con.Res.55. It's time for Congress to weigh in on this issue.

Please do not hesitate to reach out to us at Elizabeth@fcnl.org if you have any further questions or concerns.

Thanks,

MAGGIE O'DONNELL,
*Program Assistant,
Militarism and Civil*

*Liberties, Friends
Committee on National
Legislation.*

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the gentleman from California and the gentleman from New York. I know that if it were left up to them, they could fashion an AUMF that could get 218 votes here. Quite frankly, we wouldn't be here today if we had done our job, because the only reason why you can bring up a privileged resolution under the War Powers Resolution is if our troops are in harm's way and we haven't acted. This could end right now if the Speaker of the House or the majority leader would give us a date certain by which we would debate and vote on an AUMF.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply troubled by our policy in Iraq and Syria. I do not believe it is a clearly defined mission, and I fear that it might be just more of the same.

□ 1515

I am not convinced that by enlarging our military footprint, we will end the violence in the region, defeat the Islamic State or address the underlying causes of unrest.

Regardless of whether you support the war or oppose the war, believe we should escalate our involvement or place restrictions on it, the bottom line is that Congress needs to debate an AUMF and vote on it. That is our duty. That is our job. If we don't have the guts to do so, then we should at least have the decency to bring our troops home to their families and to their loved ones.

I hope that each Member of this House, before they come down to this floor to vote on this resolution, takes a minute to look in the mirror. Ask yourself: Why do we get to go home to our families when our troops don't have that privilege?

They have been sent to Iraq and Syria to fight in our name, but we don't have the courage to stand up for them and to authorize the war, and we don't have the guts to bring them home.

Take a minute and ask: We are willing to send our troops into danger; we are willing to spend billions upon billions upon billions of borrowed money for this war, but we are not willing to carry out our constitutional duty, the same Constitution we keep asking our troops to put their lives on the line to protect? How can we keep asking them to sacrifice for us when we are not willing to put anything on the line for them?

I have had colleagues come up against this resolution and say: We share your frustration over the fact that we have not debated and voted on an AUMF.

I appreciate that, but I would ask them: What in the world can we do in a bipartisan way to force this question to come to the floor? What is it going to take to get the leadership of this House to say, I am going to schedule an AUMF, and we are going to debate it and vote on it?

We have been involved in this latest war for over 10 months. Our resolution would give them another 6 months to come up with an AUMF, and if they didn't, then we bring our troops home.

This resolution before us, I admit, is a bit of a blunt instrument; but if Congress had lived up to its responsibilities, we wouldn't need to be so blunt. Congress needs a clear deadline for a debate on an AUMF for Iraq and Syria.

That deadline is the withdrawal of our troops by the end of this year. It gives this House, it gives this Republican leadership 6 entire months to get an AUMF enacted. It gives this House and this leadership 6 more months in which to simply do their job.

A vote for this resolution is not a vote to pull out, as some have asserted; it is a vote to give House Republican leadership a deadline that they cannot ignore, to force them to do their duty as leaders of this House by finally bringing an AUMF to the floor for a vote.

I heard some of my colleagues complain that they don't like the President's policy in Iraq and Syria; yet rather than trying to bring an AUMF to the floor to define that policy better, they are simply content to sit back and criticize from the sidelines. That is not what we are here to do. That is not our job.

This is important stuff. War is a big deal. We ought to treat it like it is a big deal. War has become too easy for this Congress. I see no other way to force this issue than by supporting this resolution before us.

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of H. Con. Res. 55, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Let me, first of all, I will conclude the way I began. I want to commend my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), for raising this issue. It is an issue that has to be raised, and I am in sympathy with many of the things that he said. I don't really think we are really disagreeing here; we are just disagreeing on tactics.

As I have said, the intentions behind this resolution are commendable, but I cannot support this policy which, when you all boil everything down, would require a straight withdrawal without conditions. That is not the right policy for this country, a straight withdrawal without conditions.

I share my colleague's frustration that we haven't acted on a new AUMF. We need to pass an AUMF, but we need to pass the right AUMF.

If we pass this resolution, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle

will be pushed to pass their own language overriding this measure. What will it look like? I would wager that it won't include the limitations that many of us on this side would like to see.

Worse still, we could just rubberstamp the argument that the 2001 AUMF applies to ISIS in 2015. Again, that is why I said we have to be careful we don't cut off our nose to spite our face.

Now, the President sent us an AUMF. I thought it was a good starting point. I know it was panned on both sides—Republicans thought it was too light; Democrats thought it was too harsh—but it was a good starting point.

There are many things in an AUMF we have to consider. We need to consider time, geography; we need to consider what we do with the previous AUMFs. These are issues that should be debated, and I hope we will debate, but I think the White House put forth a good starting position.

The American people expect us to do our job and pass a new AUMF. They expect us to keep the United States out of another large-scale open-ended war and pass a responsible policy for degrading and defeating ISIS. Voting for withdrawal is not the right way forward. I believe that with all my heart.

Let's vote down this resolution and go back to the drawing board. Chairman ROYCE and I will work together in a bipartisan way, as we have so many times in the past, and let's put before this Congress the right policy to get this job done.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I very much appreciate Mr. MCGOVERN for his consistency. Even when we may disagree on substance, I have worked with him on policies with respect to human rights in Africa and, frankly, across the world on many, many issues. I agree that an AUMF would be good, but only the right AUMF.

I would make this point: the White House hasn't helped the case to move an AUMF. Indeed, as soon as the President sent up his draft AUMF text to the Congress in February, the White House said he has all the legal authority he needs to conduct these operations, regardless of what the Congress does, undercutting our effort to build a consensus, but we should not give up in terms of our effort to build this consensus.

To that end, I intend to continue to work with Mr. ENGEL and others and craft a bipartisan and successful AUMF that sends a message of unity, that sends a message of resolve.

To that end, I would point out that the committee has held seven full committee hearings and nine subcommittee oversight hearings on the ISIS threat. We have discussed the AUMF; we have discussed the U.S. and

coalition response, but given the wide range of views, including the view that we have no military business in Iraq, reaching an agreement on a bipartisan AUMF that authorizes the actions needed to defeat ISIS may not be possible, but it may be possible. For that reason, we are going to redouble our effort.

There would, though, be a price paid for failure on this floor, signaling disunity. As we work towards the effort to build a consensus, we have passed legislation to directly arm the Iraqi Kurdish Peshmerga forces who are fighting ISIS on the ground.

We have worked to strengthen U.S. defense cooperation with our regional ally Jordan, to help prevent Americans who join and fight for ISIS from returning home to the homeland—we passed that legislation—and to combat the cultural genocide being perpetrated by ISIS forces.

As I say, we will continue to work with our colleagues to try to find a way forward on a revised and updated authorization focused on the vicious and growing threat posed by ISIS, but acting without a credible way forward would be foolhardy, not brave. A divisive and unsuccessful process would be perceived by our allies, our partners, and our enemies as a no-confidence vote in the fight against ISIS, resulting in a significant blow to the national security of this country.

For that reason, I would ask Members to contemplate for a moment what the world would look like should ISIS, should our forces, our airstrikes against ISIS, be pulled out of that region because I remember what it looked like when we did not have airstrikes on ISIS before they went into Mosul, and members of our committee, in a bipartisan sense, called for airpower to be used against ISIS on that desert path as they were headed to Mosul.

Here is what we saw when they took that city: mass killings, beheadings, abductions, forced conversions, torture, rape, sexual assault, using women and children as human shields, people being burned alive and buried alive, women and girls the age of 13 being taken as captives to be sold as sex slaves and put into forced marriages with ISIS fighters. That is what we witnessed after the fall of that great city.

The question I would ask is: If we are to abandon our airstrikes in support of these Kurdish units on that 600-mile front—50,000 of those troops are women fighting against ISIS, and they no longer have U.S. air support to support them in their effort to turn back ISIS—what will become of them? What will become of others?

Because this is no longer simply a terrorist organization—it is now a full-blown army seeking to establish a self-governing state through the Tigris and Euphrates valley in what is now Syria and Iraq and Lebanon and seek to expand that further.

We know a lot now about its leader, Abu al-Baghdadi, in Syria. He is a designated global terrorist under U.S. law. His mission, he clearly states, if you want to go online and see the blueprint of ISIS.

Part of that is to gain resources and recruits and create a safe haven to attack the United States. Yes, this certainly goes to the direct security interest of the United States if we were to pull off and give a breather to Abu al-Baghdadi and to ISIS.

In Iraq, we are taking less than half measures to assist the ISF, the forces there fighting ISIS, with insufficient trainers and advisers, as I said, with no forward air controllers, with insufficient plans to train the Sunni tribes, and insufficient arms to the Kurds and Sunnis, something we are trying to do something about with our legislation. The balance of power in the Middle East is shifting against the U.S. regional interest and certainly against U.S. security.

As stated, there are no simple answers or solutions; we discussed this in this debate, but without our involvement—without our involvement—our adversaries will continue to be emboldened, and our friends out of fear are susceptible to poor decisions, while the Middle East region and the world become a more dangerous place.

This organization ISIS is simultaneously a strategic threat to the region and to the world and a genocidal terror movement. I recall us saying on the floor of this House, never again with respect to genocidal terror, and we are watching genocidal terror.

I would just close with this argument, Mr. Speaker, and that is let's work together to get an Authorization for Use of Military Force, which the President already claims he has under our prior authorization that we gave for him to attack al Qaeda and any al Qaeda affiliate, but let us not pull out our airpower that is being used right now to slow the advance of ISIS as it tries to take over that region and as it attacks civilians throughout the Middle East.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, June 16, 2015, the previous question is ordered on the concurrent resolution.

The question is on adoption of the concurrent resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the concurrent resolution will be followed by 5-minute votes on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 319, and adopting House Resolution 319, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 139, nays 288, answered “present” 1, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 370]

YEAS—139

Adams	Hahn	Nugent
Bass	Hastings	O'Rourke
Becerra	Heck (WA)	Pallone
Benishek	Higgins	Pascrell
Beyer	Himes	Payne
Blum	Hinojosa	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Honda	Pingree
Bonamici	Huffman	Pocan
Brady (PA)	Hurt (VA)	Polis
Burgess	Jackson Lee	Posey
Capps	Jeffries	Quigley
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Cárdenas	Jones	Rice (SC)
Chu, Judy	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Cicilline	Keating	Rush
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Clawson (FL)	Kildee	T.
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Sanford
Cohen	Kuster	Sarbanes
Conyers	Labrador	Schakowsky
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Davis, Danny	Larson (CT)	Schrader
DeFazio	Lawrence	Scott (VA)
DeGette	Lee	Sensenbrenner
DeLauro	Lewis	Serrano
DeBene	Lieu, Ted	Sires
DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Slaughter
Dingell	Lowenthal	Speier
Doyle, Michael	Luján, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
F.	(NM)	Takai
Duncan (TN)	Lynch	Takano
Edwards	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
Ellison	Carolyn	Thompson (MS)
Eshoo	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Esty	Massie	Marino
Farr	Matsui	McCarthy
Fattah	McCollum	McCaul
Foster	McDermott	McClintock
Frankel (FL)	McGovern	McHenry
Fudge	McNerney	McKinley
Gallego	Moore	McMorris
Garamendi	Mulvaney	Rodgers
Garrett	Murphy (FL)	McSally
Grayson	Nadler	Meadows
Griffith	Napolitano	Meehan
Grijalva	Neal	Meeks
Gutiérrez	Nolan	Yarmuth
		Yoho

NAYS—288

Abraham	Castro (TX)	Engel
Aderholt	Chabot	Farenthold
Aguilar	Chaffetz	Fincher
Allen	Clay	Fitzpatrick
Amodei	Cleaver	Fleischmann
Ashford	Coffman	Fleming
Babin	Cole	Flores
Barletta	Collins (GA)	Forbes
Barr	Collins (NY)	Fortenberry
Barton	Comstock	Fox
Beatty	Conaway	Franks (AZ)
Bera	Connolly	Frelinghuysen
Bilirakis	Cook	Gabbard
Bishop (GA)	Cooper	Gibbs
Bishop (MI)	Costa	Gibson
Bishop (UT)	Costello (PA)	Gohmert
Black	Courtney	Goodlatte
Blackburn	Cramer	Gosar
Bost	Crawford	Gowdy
Boustany	Crenshaw	Graham
Boyle, Brendan	Crowley	Granger
F.	Cuellar	Graves (GA)
Brady (TX)	Culberson	Graves (LA)
Brat	Curbelo (FL)	Graves (MO)
Bridenstine	Davis (CA)	Green, Al
Brooks (AL)	Davis, Rodney	Green, Gene
Brooks (IN)	Delaney	Grothman
Brown (FL)	Denham	Guinta
Brownley (CA)	Dent	Guthrie
Buchanan	DeSantis	Hardy
Buck	DesJarlais	Harper
Bucshon	Deutch	Harris
Bustos	Diaz-Balart	Hartzler
Butterfield	Doggett	Heck (NV)
Calvert	Dold	Hensarling
Carney	Donovan	Herrera Beutler
Carson (IN)	Duckworth	Hice, Jody B.
Carter (GA)	Duffy	Hill
Carter (TX)	Duncan (SC)	Holding
Cartwright	Ellmers (NC)	Hoyer
Castor (FL)	Emmer (MN)	Hudson

Huelskamp	Mica	Scott, Austin
Huizenga (MI)	Miller (FL)	Scott, David
Hultgren	Miller (MI)	Sessions
Hunter	Moolenaar	Sewell (AL)
Hurd (TX)	Mooney (WV)	Sherman
Israel	Moulton	Shimkus
Issa	Mullin	Shuster
Jenkins (KS)	Murphy (PA)	Simpson
Jenkins (WV)	Neugebauer	Sinema
Johnson (OH)	Newhouse	Smith (MO)
Johnson, Sam	Noem	Smith (NE)
Jolly	Norcross	Smith (NJ)
Jordan	Nunes	Smith (TX)
Joyce	Olson	Smith (WA)
Katko	Palazzo	Stefanik
Kelly (PA)	Palmer	Stewart
Kilmer	Paulsen	Stivers
Kind	Pearce	Stutzman
King (IA)	Perlmutter	Thompson (PA)
King (NY)	Perry	Thornberry
Kinzinger (IL)	Peters	Tiberi
Kline	Peterson	Tipton
Knight	Pittenger	Trott
LaMalfa	Pitts	Turner
Lamborn	Poe (TX)	Upton
Lance	Poliquin	Valadao
Langevin	Pompeo	Vargas
Latta	Price (NC)	Veasey
Levin	Price, Tom	Vela
Lipinski	Ratcliffe	Wagner
LoBiondo	Reed	Walberg
Loebsack	Reichert	Walden
Long	Renacci	Walker
Loudermilk	Ribble	Walorski
Love	Rice (NY)	Walters, Mimi
Lowey	Richmond	Walz
Lucas	Rigell	Wasserman
Luettkemeyer	Roby	Schultz
Lujan Grisham	Roe (TN)	Weber (TX)
(NM)	Rogers (AL)	Webster (FL)
Lummis	Rogers (KY)	Welch
MacArthur	Rohrabacher	Wenstrup
Marchant	Rokita	Westerman
Marino	Rooney (FL)	Whitfield
McCarthy	Ros-Lehtinen	Williams
McCaul	Roskam	Wilson (SC)
McClintock	Ross	Wittman
McHenry	Rothfus	Womack
McKinley	Rouzer	Yoder
McMorris	Royce	Russell
Rodgers	Ruiz	Young (AK)
McSally	Ruppersberger	Young (IA)
Meadows	Russell	Young (IN)
Meehan	Ryan (WI)	Zeldin
Meeks	Salmon	Zinke
Meng	Scalise	
Messer	Schweikert	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Amash

NOT VOTING—5

Byrne	Johnson (GA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Hanna	Kelly (MS)	

□ 1606

Messrs. ABRAHAM, MEADOWS, CRENSHAW, GRAVES of Louisiana, DUFFY, MCCAUL, COFFMAN, RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, HARDY, CROWLEY, AL GREEN of Texas, RYAN of Wisconsin, and KLINE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. FARR, COHEN, Mses. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, ADAMS, Messrs. NEAL, RICE of South Carolina, Mses. KAPTUR, KELLY of Illinois, Messrs. THOMPSON of California, MURPHY of Florida, and LABRADOR changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the concurrent resolution was not agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 370 on H. Con. Res. 55, I am not recorded

because I was absent for personal reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 160, PROTECT MEDICAL INNOVATION ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1190, PROTECTING SENIORS' ACCESS TO MEDICARE ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 319) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 160) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1190) to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 186, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 371]
YEAS—241

Abraham Donovan Johnson (OH)
Aderholt Duffy Johnson, Sam
Allen Duncan (SC) Jolly
Amash Duncan (TN) Jones
Amodei Ellmers (NC) Jordan
Babin Emmer (MN) Joyce
Barletta Farenthold Katko
Barr Fincher Kelly (PA)
Barton Fitzpatrick King (IA)
Benishek Fleischmann King (NY)
Bilirakis Fleming Kinzinger (IL)
Bishop (MI) Flores Kline
Bishop (UT) Forbes Knight
Black Fortenberry Labrador
Blackburn Foxx LaMalfa
Blum Franks (AZ) Lamborn
Bost Frelinghuysen Lance
Boustany Garrett Latta
Brady (TX) Gibbs LoBiondo
Brat Gibson Long
Bridenstine Gohmert Loudermilk
Brooks (AL) Goodlatte Love
Brooks (IN) Gosar Lucas
Buchanan Gowdy Luetkemeyer
Buck Granger Lummis
Bucshon Graves (GA) MacArthur
Burgess Graves (LA) Marchant
Calvert Graves (MO) Marino
Carter (GA) Griffith Massie
Carter (TX) Grothman McCarthy
Chabot Guinta McCaul
Chaffetz Guthrie McClintock
Clawson (FL) Hardy McHenry
Coffman Harper McKinley
Cole Harris McMorris
Collins (GA) Hartzler Rodgers
Collins (NY) Heck (NV) McSally
Comstock Hensarling Meadows
Conaway Herrera Beutler Meehan
Cook Hice, Jody B. Messer
Costello (PA) Hill Mica
Cramer Holding Miller (FL)
Crawford Hudson Miller (MI)
Crenshaw Huelskamp Moolenaar
Culberson HuiZENGA (MI) Mooney (WV)
Davis, Rodney Hultgren Mullin
Denham Hunter Mulvaney
Dent Hurd (TX) Murphy (PA)
DeSantis Hurd (VA) Neugebauer
DesJarlais Issa Newhouse
Diaz-Balart Jenkins (KS) Noem
Dold Jenkins (WV) Nugent

Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen

Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton

NAYS—186

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuan
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)

Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano

Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—6

Byrne Hanna Kelly (MS)
Curbelo (FL) Johnson (GA) Sanchez, Loretta

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1614

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

Stated for:
Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 371, I was in a meeting. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 186, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 372]
AYES—241

Abraham Emmer (MN) Kinzinger (IL)
Aderholt Farenthold Kline
Allen Fincher Knight
Amash Fitzpatrick Labrador
Amodei Fleischmann LaMalfa
Babin Fleming Lamborn
Barletta Flores Lance
Barr Forbes Latta
Barton Fortenberry LoBiondo
Benishek Foxx Long
Bilirakis Franks (AZ) Loudermilk
Bishop (MI) Frelinghuysen Love
Bishop (UT) Garrett Lucas
Black Gibbs Luetkemeyer
Blackburn Gibson Lummis
Blum Gohmert MacArthur
Bost Goodlatte Marchant
Boustany Gosar Marino
Brady (TX) Gowdy Massie
Brat Granger McCarthy
Bridenstine Graves (GA) McCaul
Brooks (AL) Graves (LA) McClintock
Brooks (IN) Graves (MO) McHenry
Buchanan Griffith McKinley
Buck Grothman McMorris
Bucshon Guinta Rodgers
Calvert Guthrie McSally
Carter (GA) Hardy Meadows
Carter (TX) Harper Meehan
Chabot Harris Messer
Chaffetz Hartzler Mica
Clawson (FL) Heck (NV) Miller (FL)
Coffman Hensarling Miller (MI)
Cole Herrera Beutler Moolenaar
Collins (GA) Hice, Jody B. Mooney (WV)
Collins (NY) Hill Mullin
Comstock Holding Mulvaney
Conaway Hudson Murphy (PA)
Cook Huelskamp Neugebauer
Costello (PA) HuiZENGA (MI) Newhouse
Cramer Hultgren Noem
Crawford Hunter Nugent
Crenshaw Hurd (TX) Nunes
Culberson Hurd (VA) Olson
Curbelo (FL) Issa Palazzo
Davis, Rodney Jenkins (KS) Palmer
Denham Jenkins (WV) Paulsen
Dent Johnson (OH) Pearce
DeSantis Johnson, Sam Perry
DesJarlais Jolly Pittenger
Diaz-Balart Jones Pitts
Dold Jordan Poe (TX)
Donovan Joyce Poliquin
Duffy Katko Pompeo
Duncan (SC) Kelly (PA) Posey
Duncan (TN) King (IA) Price, Tom
Ellmers (NC) King (NY) Ratcliffe

Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise

Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner

Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—186

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)

Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano

Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradler
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Burgess
Byrne
Hanna
Johnson (GA)
Kelly (MS)
Sanchez, Loretta

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1620

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2588

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2588.

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

There was no objection.

PROTECT MEDICAL INNOVATION
ACT OF 2015

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 319, I call up the bill (H.R. 160) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 114-157, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 160

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 "Protect Medical Innovation Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF MEDICAL DEVICE EXCISE TAX.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subchapter E.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subsection (a) of section 4221 of such Code is amended by striking the last sentence.

(2) Paragraph (2) of section 6416(b) of such Code is amended by striking the last sentence.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of subchapters for chapter 32 of such Code is amended by striking the item relating to subchapter E.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to sales in calendar quarters beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), the author of this legislation, be permitted to control the time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker and Members, defibrillators, operating room monitors, insulin pumps, pacemakers, heart valves, artificial hips, x ray machines, ventilators, and ultrasound machines, these are life-improving and lifesaving technologies that have reduced costs for the improved health of millions of Americans.

Unfortunately, the President's healthcare law implemented a new tax on all of these innovative devices, a tax on medical devices. Only in Washington, Mr. Speaker, would you impose a tax on lifesaving medical technology and think you will actually reduce healthcare costs. This is bad tax policy, and it needs to be repealed.

The medical device industry is truly an American success story, employing more than 400,000 people. In my State of Minnesota, 35,000 people are employed in this industry, 400 companies alone in the State of Minnesota; 80 percent of device manufacturers are small businesses with less than 50 employees; 98 percent of all these companies have less than 500 employees.

It can take these small startups 10 to 15 years to even achieve profitability or earn one penny of profit because they rely on investment and the promise of a future of earnings to survive.

The device industry is a net exporter. We have a trade surplus with our exports. Most importantly, these companies are producing lifesaving and life-improving devices for millions of our patients across the world.

Medical advancements have helped add 5 years to U.S. life expectancy in the last two decades. It has helped slash the death rate from heart disease by a stunning 50 percent and cut the death rate from stroke by 30 percent.

Devices have contributed to a 16 percent decrease in mortality rates and an astounding 25 percent decline in elderly disability rates in just the last 20 years of innovation. Medical innovation is leading and will continue to lead the way we improve lives for our seniors who have chronic disease.

Despite all the benefits that this industry provides, a 2014 Harvard Business Review article recently found that the device industry now faces one of the most uncertain competitive environments in the entire country. Instead of hurting this industry, we should be empowering this industry, creating more jobs, producing more innovation, and helping more patients.

We often hear that America needs to start making things again to help

jump-start the economy, and one of the best ways to protect American manufacturing and spur innovation is to repeal this harmful medical device tax because here is what the tax is doing: it is costing us jobs.

One company that I spoke with said they have never laid off any employees in the last 22 years of their history of business, but they laid off 25 employees, and they refrained from hiring another 15 employees because of the tax.

If you take it to a bigger, larger picture, up to 39,000 jobs have been lost because of the tax since it has been imposed. These are high-paying jobs, Mr. Speaker, that pay nearly \$20,000 more than the national average.

□ 1630

And the 2.3 percent excise tax, it may not sound like much, but here's the problem: it is taxing revenue; it is not taxing profit.

A small device manufacturer, they may not be making any money, but they still have to pay that tax. One company I spoke to, they have 20 employees. They recently said they are borrowing \$100,000 a month from the bank just to pay the tax. That doesn't make any sense.

Mr. Speaker, it is also raising tax rates. Medical device companies now have to pay one of the highest effective tax rates of any industry in the world. Recent testimony in the Joint Economic Committee, there was a small company from Minnesota that now says because of the tax, they have a 79 percent effective tax rate. Who here can justify that?

It is also harming innovation because instead of investing in the next generation of innovative devices that can literally save people's lives, companies are spending money on compliance and accountants instead of on research and development, which is the lifeblood of this industry.

Members should know that this is separate from the debate about how we reform health care. This is about a bipartisan effort today on the floor to promote American innovation to protect and promote American manufacturing and research and development jobs because Democrats and Republicans, conservatives and liberals in both parties, in the House and the Senate, favor repealing this tax. It is a bad tax policy that is killing jobs. It is hurting our seniors, and it is harming innovation.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to protect our American seniors, American patients, and American innovation and repeal this destructive tax.

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

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

There are certain basic facts here. One is this industry participated in the creation of healthcare reform. They, like other providers, were involved; and like other providers, they said that they would participate in helping to

pay for it. That is a fact. Now they want out.

Another fact is that they have benefited from it. According to a recent analysis by Ernst & Young, the industry's revenue increased by \$8 billion in the year the tax took effect.

Also, there has been a reference to R&D. R&D, according to that report, spending by the industry, also increased by 6 percent in the same year.

There has also been reference to employment. The analysis of Ernst & Young also says that, in that year, employment increased, and the overall employment has increased by 23,500. There has been a 23,500 increase in employment.

So those are the facts.

There is another aspect. If people vote for this industry to essentially go back on its commitment to participate, other providers are going to ask for the same treatment. So in that respect, what the Republicans are aiming to do is to unravel ACA.

Another fact is this is unpaid for. So when you add this unpaid-for provision, you get, all together, well over \$610 billion that the Republicans have passed in permanent tax cuts without paying for one dime.

Another factor is that this applies to imports as well as to those that are produced in this country and not at all to exports. So look at the equities. Look at how this industry has benefited. Look at the irrationality and irresponsibility and coming forth to this body and saying let's repeal and not pay for at all from a party that talks about fiscal responsibility.

So let me just read from the Statement of Administration Policy. That is another fact. If this were ever to pass the House and the Senate, it would be vetoed. So here is the Statement of Administration Policy:

"The Affordable Care Act has improved the American health care system, on which Americans can rely throughout life. After more than five years under this law, 16.4 million Americans have gained health coverage. Up to 129 million people who could have otherwise been denied or faced discrimination now have access to coverage. And health care prices have risen at the slowest rate in nearly 50 years. As we work to make the system even better, we are open to ideas that improve the accessibility, affordability, and quality of health care, and help middle-class Americans."

And it concludes:

"In sum, H.R. 160 would increase the deficit to finance a permanent and costly tax break for industry without improving the health system or helping middle-class Americans. If the President were presented with H.R. 160, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill."

So I close with this. You know, people can be provincial in the sense that they respond to one pressure point or another, and I understand that. What you have to do is to look at an entire

system, an entire structure, and what it means for Americans throughout this country.

This industry, as I said, participated in helping to pay for healthcare reform. They have benefited from it, and now, essentially, they are coming forth and saying: Just take us out of it; separate us out.

That is unfair, unwise, irresponsible, and sets a pattern that will do what Republicans really want to do, and that is to pick apart and tear apart this reform that has been 75 years in coming. So I urge everybody to look at the broader interests of the people of this country and to vote "no."

I reserve the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 160, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, just in response to the report that was just mentioned, the Ernst & Young report, it is true that companies have been hiring and growing in certain cases, but all of that growth from the report is outside of the United States. So if you want to continue to promote more jobs outside of the United States, don't vote for the repeal, and we will continue to see jobs move overseas.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by dispelling the premise that somehow this whole thing was devised so that we can allow the medical device companies to flourish. The thing we want to flourish is research and development that is producing the kinds of things that are helping the American people, and that is the essence of what the medical device R&D innovation is doing, and this is stifling.

At the precise moment where breakthrough opportunities, oftentimes, in small businesses—I see them, Mr. Speaker; I visit them in my district—and at the time that it is the most fragile for them, they are being hit with this 2.4 percent tax which touches them at the time when it is not on profits. These are the very dollars that are being used to be invested into R&D, whether they sell that product or not. We are killing our innovation right in the cradle.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to support the repeal of the medical device tax.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), the ranking member on the Health Subcommittee.

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. LEVIN was correct. When we were designing the Affordable Care Act, everyone was expected to share in the cost as we work for the American people.

The medical device industry initially opposed 5 percent. They said: How about 2.3 percent? We will go for that.

They agreed to it. Here they are today asking for us to give them nothing, no taxes; they don't have to pay anything no matter how they benefit from it.

Now, repealing this tax, which the nonpartisan analysts have shown has no negative effect on jobs, will add \$24.4 billion to the deficit. It would eliminate an important source of revenue simply to appease an industry that has benefited directly and greatly from the expansion of the coverage of ACA.

On top of that, the bill is a distraction from a more important issue that the Congress needs to address in the context of medical devices. They would not let us vote on an amendment in the committee to bring up the institution of unique device identifiers.

An essential tool of improving patient safety is the UDI. A UDI is a number associated with a medical device right on the device. They contain important information about where, when, and by whom the device was made. They provide for post-market surveillance to identify problems and notify patients when objects that they put in their bodies are faulty or dangerous. This has dramatic impacts for safety.

In 2010, a massive recall of breast implants in France impacted tens of thousands of women. Many cancer patients undergo reconstructive surgery following mastectomy, and their lives are threatened when faulty implants leak dangerous contaminants into their bodies. In situations like this, it is essential that we know who has given the faulty device so that recall efforts can save as many lives as possible.

Unfortunately, even when the FDA finishes its new UDI regulations in the coming years, we will lack important tools, including devices, in the agency's postmarket safety checking system, the Sentinel Initiative. The primary source of information for the Sentinel is insurance claims forms, yet, unlike pharmaceuticals, CMS does not currently require UDIs to be listed on Medicare claims. That makes it all but impossible to apply the Sentinel Initiative to the device context.

Furthermore, additional gaps exist in the FDA's rulemaking on UDIs. For example, there is no requirement that UDIs be affixed directly to the implantable devices.

As we look forward, I encourage my colleagues to look beyond efforts to undermine the ACA and to look for opportunities to enhance safety and improve the system for patients, not just the device industry.

I urge Members to vote "no" on this and come back with a bill—if you want

to take the tax off, that is one thing, but at least make them identify the name and the place and the number of where it came from so, if somebody you know gets impacted by one of these devices going bad, we will have a way to trace it.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), a leader on the Ways and Means Committee, who is also concerned about the impact of this tax on his home State of Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, ObamaCare's medical device tax has already been devastating to innovation, patient care, and job creation, especially in my home State of Indiana.

Up north, we have Warsaw, which is known around the world as the orthopedics capital of the world. In central Indiana, we have a burgeoning life sciences industry centered around the Indianapolis area. Further south, we have Bloomington, which is home to Cook Medical, the largest privately held medical device manufacturer in the world.

Medical device startups dot Indiana's landscape from Lake Michigan down to the Ohio River. Indiana's world-class medical device companies like Biomet, Boston Scientific, Hill-Rom, Zimmer, and dozens more don't just create and produce lifesaving technology. They also employ tens of thousands of Hoosiers, and these jobs pay well.

At a time when factories have closed and jobs in rust belt States have been sent overseas, medical device manufacturing jobs have been a lifeline for hard-working Hoosiers and their families.

□ 1645

Every day this tax remains in effect, we continue to slow advancements in lifesaving and life-improving technologies, and we hinder patient care. This day is long overdue. It is time to support H.R. 160 and finally repeal this harmful, ill-advised tax.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a member of our committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the gentleman from Indiana is leaving the floor right now because one of the companies he mentioned—one of the companies, there are others—was brought before the Justice Department because of their behavior not long ago. So my friend from Indiana talks about Zimmer Holdings. That is one of the reasons why I am asking you to review your support of this legislation. Because let me tell you what happened to Zimmer and Stryker in the State of New Jersey not that many years ago when the U.S. Attorney looked at these two companies and many others.

Here is what they were brought to heel about: bribing doctors to recommend their prosthetic to senior citizens under Medicare. Dante said, what place in hell will they be? These guys should be in the deepest place in hell—

the deepest. You check the record. You can't make this stuff up.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this legislation. When the Affordable Care Act was being negotiated, these companies were at the table. They agreed to this. You can't deny that. Because of the ACA, the health care market includes millions of newly insured Americans, more business for these companies, by the way, driving up the demand for medical devices and other health care services—increased demand, capitalism, you know about that.

However, the device industry wants it both ways. They want new businesses, and they want new business under the ACA, that the ACA has created, and since the law was passed, they have been lobbying for repeal of what they agreed to. I swear you can't make it up.

Mr. Speaker, I support the ACA and its goals. You don't. And it needs to be funded. It is the law of the land, as the Speaker once said. You can't support the goals of the ACA and then start stripping out the pieces of the law that fund the realization of the goals.

Oh, but you can. And you have tried 56 different times to repeal this legislation, and you failed every time, even though you are in the majority.

This legislation would add \$24.4 billion to the deficit—through the Speaker to my good friend from Pennsylvania—and it is not paid for. Despite industry claims of job loss and economic hardship, medical device companies have seen a 7 percent growth in employment since the ACA. Furthermore, I remain concerned about some of the behavior we have seen in this industry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to remind the gentleman to address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. PASCRELL. Sure, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I became highly involved in the medical device issues since 2007 when a number of device manufacturers entered into controversial deferred prosecution agreements for providing doctors with kickbacks for using their knee and hip replacement devices. A number of these products ended up being recalled. That is the record.

As a result, on the justice side, I have worked to put an end to deferred prosecution agreements that don't hold the bad actors accountable. There are many good companies providing medical devices, but the facts are the facts, and the history is the history, and the culture of this industry needs to be known. I have also worked to improve the safety of medical devices for patients by encouraging the use of clinical data registries.

Repealing the device tax is not good policy, Mr. Speaker, and it is not good for our budget—another \$24.5 billion added to the deficit. I think if you would ask our ranking member, Mr. LEVIN, he would give you a precise

number as to how much you have increased the deficit in legislation you have provided over the last 6 months.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I just want to address something that was stated by one of the previous speakers from Washington State who made a comment to the effect that the medical device industry supported that tax. Well, that is a statement that is simply not based in fact. In fact, what happened, as I recall, Senator Baucus helped impose the tax on the industry because he felt that they were not providing enough at the table in terms of concessions for the ACA. In fact, since they weren't doing enough at the table, the medical device industry was placed on the menu. They fought this tax vigorously. There is no letter to indicate they had any support for this tax.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation to repeal the medical device tax. However you feel about the 2010 health care law on the whole, we can all agree that the legislation has its flaws. Again, one of the most glaring deficiencies in the law is the medical device tax, designed to extract \$26 billion from the industry over 10 years. This new law is already stifling critical innovation and threatening high quality jobs in my district.

More importantly, it is increasing costs for consumers on products which are an absolute necessity of life for those who rely on them, such as prosthetics, pacemakers, and artificial hearts. Costs are also being passed on to consumers at all levels through increased insurance premiums and bills from medical providers.

The medical device industry currently supports over 75,000 jobs in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Several of the companies affected by the new tax are located in my district, including OraSure Technologies, Olympus, Boas Surgical, and B. Braun. In fact, B. Braun CFO Bruce Heugel recently testified before the Senate Finance Subcommittee on Health Care that his company has been forced to drastically reduce investments in research and development and also has had job losses as a result of the medical device tax. In fact, they are not building a new headquarters because of this tax. These are good paying, 21st century jobs, and this Congress should not support policies that will kill them or send them overseas.

Mr. Speaker, the medical device tax is a punitive tax, and it is creating disincentives for companies looking to stay competitive, hire domestically, and create lifesaving new technologies. It is past time that Congress repeal this onerous new tax, and I urge my colleagues to support the Protect Medical Innovation Act. Let's get rid of this thing once and for all. Let's excise the excise tax.

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA). Since he was first elected in 2010, he has been a leader on this, organizing freshman Members, recognizing the importance of repealing this disastrous tax.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding the time. He has been the leader on this from day one, and I am happy to join him. I also thank Chairman RYAN of the Ways and Means Committee for allowing this to come to the floor the way it has. I think it is very important. Most of America thinks this is very important, and to have it stand alone here where it can be debated, hopefully honestly, I think speaks well to the process, I think it speaks well to the leadership of Chairman RYAN and Member PAULSEN and others who are behind this.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to be back on the floor to support this. It is long overdue. It needs to happen. There is an old adage, Mr. Speaker, and that is, if you want less of something, tax it. The same is true here. If you want less jobs in this area, like the 56,000 jobs in Indiana alone, tax the devices that those jobs produce. If you want less innovation, tax these medical devices. If you want America to be less of a leader in the world when it comes to this industry, tax it. That is all their argument, Mr. Speaker, is saying, and our bill corrects that. Let the free market work, and let innovation work. Let's keep us a leader in the world in this area.

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS) who has also been a leader as part of the Indiana delegation on the issue.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague from Minnesota for leading this effort since I came to Congress in 2013.

I rise today joining my fellow Hoosiers seeking greater opportunity for all Americans, and I rise today to call for a swift end to a tax that is standing in the way of that opportunity.

Back home, I hear from countless Hoosiers about the restrictions the medical device tax is placing on our life sciences industry, not only in Indiana but across the country. This tax takes away the opportunities to innovate, to hire more people, and most importantly to improve the patient access to critical technology.

In Indiana the life sciences industry is vitally important. It has a \$59 billion impact on our economy and employs more than 56,000 people. In fact, we are second—Indiana is second only to California in exports of life sciences products.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle know that the unfair medical device tax jeopardizes our

competitive edge, it stunts our workforce opportunities, but most importantly, it is decreasing access to life-saving technology for people.

Mr. Speaker, I want to stand for jobs, stand for improving people's health, and stand for more opportunity. I urge my colleagues to repeal the medical device tax.

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK) who has also been doing an awesome job of organizing a lot of the freshman Members and recognizing the importance of this issue to the State of New York.

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 160, the Protect Medical Innovation Act introduced by Mr. PAULSEN, and in March I was proud to lead a bipartisan letter by 43 freshman lawmakers to Speaker BOEHNER calling for a vote to repeal the medical device tax.

According to a 2014 industry survey, the tax resulted in employment reductions of 14,000 industry workers in 2013 and years prior to implementation of this tax, with approximately an additional 4,500 jobs lost in 2014. Furthermore, if we don't repeal this tax, the industry will forgo hiring of nearly 20,500 employees over the next 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, this important bipartisan legislation will repeal the Affordable Care Act's medical device tax that is limiting access to health care devices that North Country families need and undermining the medical device industry that is so important to our local economy.

Repealing the medical device tax will help our small businesses create jobs for North Country families and protect employees who are currently at risk from this job-killing tax. This an extremely important issue for my district, especially in Warren County, home of what is called "catheter valley" because of the numerous catheter manufacturers.

I commend the House for bringing this important legislation to the floor, and I urge all Members to support this measure.

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN), someone I traveled with in the State of Indiana who showed me firsthand the impact this device tax had in Indiana.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 160, the Protect Medical Innovation Act, and I appreciate the work that Congressman PAULSEN has done on this very important issue that has affected my district dramatically.

As a sitting U.S. Congressman of Warsaw, Indiana, known as the Orthopedic Capital of the World, the burdensome medical device tax hits very close to home for my constituents. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Hoosier State as a

whole is second in the Nation in exports of life science products, and across the State over 20,000 Hoosiers are directly employed by this industry. The impact on our communities and our neighbors is one of the reasons I have fought so long and hard alongside Mr. PAULSEN and my colleagues to repeal this very destructive tax.

Mr. Speaker, back home in Indiana, Hoosiers know that taxation does not create jobs; it kills them. In fact, a recent study has shown that the medical device tax, implemented to fund ObamaCare, has cost more than 33,000 jobs nationally so far. Mr. Speaker, repealing this medical device tax is a simple, commonsense reform, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

□ 1700

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO), who knows the importance of this issue.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the cost of health care continues to increase in this country.

As a philosophical matter, I do not believe inserting more government between a patient and their doctor will reduce costs. In fact, to the contrary. But there are things government can do.

That is why we in the House of Representatives are putting more money into NIH funding. It is why 21st Century Cures has been introduced—to streamline approval processes at the FDA and make sure that various stakeholders involved in finding cures are all working together.

Yet what remains as a contradiction at the heart of ObamaCare is the policy that taxes those who seek to innovate and improve public health outcomes through pioneering medical device equipment. We are taxing those who are trying to help improve, and who have improved, public health outcomes. It just doesn't make sense.

Simply put, it is a disincentive to invest capital in precisely the industry that has proven itself to be the single most important in the history of civilization to improve public health—our life sciences industry here in this country.

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) to speak on this issue.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 160, the Protect Medical Innovation Act of 2015, also known as the medical device tax repeal.

This bill would repeal the tax on medical device manufacturers that was put into place under ObamaCare. The medical device tax rate is 2.3 percent, and this is in addition to the State sales tax on common medical devices

such as pacemakers, hearing aids, and insulin pumps.

This tax hurts the very same Americans we should be helping. For example, 13 percent of West Virginians—the State I am blessed to represent—have diabetes. This 2.3 percent tax makes it more difficult for struggling taxpayers in West Virginia and around the country to access critical healthcare devices like insulin pumps.

If gone unchecked, this tax will continue to weaken the industry's ability to grow and help people in need. It will also continue to hinder the development of lifesaving treatments and devices.

I hope my colleagues will join me tomorrow in voting for the repeal of the ill-advised medical device tax.

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK), a physician who works with patients each and every day and understands the importance of repealing this tax.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 160, the Protect Medical Innovation Act.

H.R. 160 will permanently repeal the misguided excise tax on medical devices that was imposed by the President's healthcare law.

I am a cosponsor of this important legislation, along with over 280 Members of this House of Representatives. In the 113th Congress, the Senate endorsed getting rid of this burdensome tax by an overwhelming margin. It is clearly time for this tax to go.

The medical device tax discourages innovation, lowers the quality of medical care available to the American people, and cuts jobs while driving production overseas.

Companies like RTI Surgical, based in my district, are being harmed by this burdensome tax. Instead of hamstringing these manufacturers, we should be allowing them to produce new medical devices and create jobs.

I am a doctor who treated patients in northern Michigan for 30 years. I know how important medical devices are for providing quality health care, and I believe that getting rid of this tax will improve our Nation's healthcare system.

I hope all my colleagues will join me in supporting this commonsense and long overdue fix for the train wreck that is the President's healthcare law.

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), a State that has been a leader in developing new medical technologies.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this effort to prevent this very destructive tax from having the harmful impact that we know it will have. This medical device tax is perhaps the most odious of any tax

that has ever been loaded upon the shoulders of the American people in the history of our Republic.

Our first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, John Marshall, once pointed out: "The power to tax is the power to destroy." Well, who is being destroyed and who is being hurt by this medical device tax? It is the American people who are suffering maladies and health challenges, and we are putting them as the people who are going to be basically paying the bill or doing without their medical devices.

I would like to give a personal example of this. I know it is very painful for me to do so, but I think I need to share this with my colleagues.

Two and a half years ago, I was notified that my daughter, who was at that time 9 years old, had leukemia. It was a horror story for my family, a horror story, just like it is for families across America. We came out of that. We went through it. It was a tough, tough road for a year. Last week, she had her last cancer treatment and, last week, she was declared cancer free.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAULSEN. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Ninety percent of the kids who get leukemia today are cured from leukemia after a period of time. They actually will live through this. Only 40 years ago, 90 percent of the kids who got leukemia died.

We have had different advances in medicine that have actually achieved this goal. But in my daughter's case, I could see very easily a medical device was put under her skin, a portal, so that she did not have to take the chemotherapy into her arms, which resulted in younger kids decades ago with their veins collapsing because of the chemotherapy being shot into their arm.

The people who devised that medical device saved my daughter's life, and now we want to make them the most heavily taxed people in our country. That is ridiculous. We want to encourage people to build these types of devices that will save our children and help those people who are suffering.

This medical device tax is odious, it is wrong, and it was wrongheaded from the very beginning. In the name of saving future children from things that we might be able to cure with a proper medical device, we need to make sure we eliminate this tax and keep faith with future generations, as well as those people who are suffering today.

I ask my colleagues to join me in getting rid of this tax on medical devices.

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire the amount of time remaining? The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota has 11 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Minnesota.

I rise today as a 30-year health care professional and a proud cosponsor of H.R. 160, the Protect Medical Innovation Act of 2015.

This bill would repeal the Affordable Care Act's 2.3 percent tax on medical devices. These are medical devices that save and improve lives for millions of Americans. These devices include pacemakers, artificial joints, CAT scan machines, and many, many more.

Mr. Speaker, the medical device tax is a terrible policy that is stifling innovation and United States competitiveness and is hurting small businesses all across the Nation, and certainly in the Pennsylvania Fifth Congressional District.

This legislation, which has strong bipartisan support, will help to protect American jobs, keep America at the cutting edge of technological medical advances, and preserve a patient's access to affordable, lifesaving devices.

Having served in a nonprofit healthcare setting for three decades, I rise today and ask my colleagues to join me in voting to repeal this unnecessary and very harmful tax.

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

There is no one that questions the importance of this industry—no one. This country has been in the forefront in terms of creating medical devices. There has been innovation and there has been enterprise, and it has impacted the lives of millions of people. That is not the issue here.

The issue is this. A number of industries and a number of providers participated in creating the Health Care Reform Act. Essentially, I am not sure it is the industry as much as some Members are essentially coming here and saying: Give this industry a free ride in terms of their participation, while others are doing their part.

That isn't fair; it isn't workable; and it is also fiscally irresponsible. I would like to talk to the CEOs of any of these companies and ask them if they think it is fiscally responsible to repeal this provision costing well over \$20 billion, unpaid for, made permanent.

Indeed, this is industry joined with others in the healthcare world in this country in a letter of May 11, 2009, to the President:

Dear Mr. President,

We believe that all Americans should have access to affordable, high-quality healthcare services. Thus, we applaud your strong commitment to reforming our Nation's healthcare system. The times demand and the Nation expects that we, as healthcare leaders, work with you to reform the healthcare system.

And it concludes with this paragraph:

We, as stakeholder representatives, are committed to doing our part to make reform a reality in order to make the system more affordable and effective for patients and purchasers. We stand ready to work with you to accomplish this goal.

And it was signed by a number of representatives—the AMA; America's

Health Insurance Plans, their leadership; the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers; et cetera, and also signed by the president and CEO of the Advanced Medical Technology Association.

So now people are coming here and saying what was essentially committed to in 2009 should essentially be ripped out of ACA in 2015.

I just want to read from a report by the National Center for Health Research. And I refer, for example, to the chart on the number of employees at the 12 largest U.S.-based device companies. All of them show an increase in employment of the 12 largest, except two, and in one case, the reduction was from 10,800 to 10,500. One company did have a larger loss, but it wasn't anything close to catastrophic.

Then the number of employees at the small, publicly traded device companies—one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine—of those, only seven show a reduction in the number of employees from 2012 to 2014. In one of them, there was a reduction of one, and the other, a reduction of four employees. And then there is another with a reduction of four, and another, a reduction of six. The others had increases in their employment, and two of them, one went from 230 to 320, and another from 244 to 303. These are the smallest.

□ 1715

Let me also refer in this document to stock prices for the 12 largest U.S.-based device companies.

When you look down at the profit margin, all of their profits went up except one, which had a reduction of 1.6 percent from the close of January 2, 2013, to the close of January 2, 2015. That reduction was tiny. The others had a very substantial reduction, some in the twenties, one in the thirties, and the average was a 13.8 percent increase in the profit margin.

Also, this report reads:

Similarly, the report on 2013 employment, released by a financial analysis news service, EP Vantage, showed that 11 of the top 15 device makers expanded their workforce after the device tax went into effect.

I think what is happening here is that a few of my colleagues are coming here and are using a few examples—and I don't deny, in a capitalist system, there are some losers as well as winners.

Everybody isn't necessarily a winner, and there was a recession in this country during some of these years, but to come here and to use those examples that really are refuted by the overall data, I think, is essentially saying that we ought to begin, on this point, to rip apart the ACA because, in every case, there hasn't been an improvement for every company. In terms of research and development, the Ernst & Young report makes it very clear that spending by the industry increased by 6 percent in the same year.

I am just asking everybody who cares about healthcare reform and who cares

about the overall picture here in the United States to resist the temptation to take several examples, perhaps, from their own districts, to draw conclusions about what really has happened in the medical device industry and to, essentially, come forth because of those relatively few examples and say that we should now, essentially, repeal this provision, costing well over \$20 billion—unpaid for—permanently.

That is not only contrary to the letter I read, but it is contrary to fairness within the healthcare industry, and it is really unfair to the millions of people who have benefited from the ACA when the motive, really, of so many of the Republicans who come here is not to simply repeal this tax, but it is part of an effort to, essentially, repeal the ACA altogether. We should resist that.

The people of this country do not want that repeal, so let's vote "no"—and a resounding "no"—on this proposal.

MAY 11, 2009.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We believe that all Americans should have access to affordable, high quality health care services. Thus, we applaud your strong commitment to reforming our nation's health care system. The times demand and the nation expects that we, as health care leaders, work with you to reform the health care system.

The annual growth in national health expenditures—including public and private spending—is projected by government actuaries to average 6.2% through the next decade. At that rate, the percent of gross domestic product spent on health care would increase from 17.6% this year to 20.3% in 2018—higher than any other country in the world.

We are determined to work together to provide quality, affordable coverage and access for every American. It is critical, however, that health reform also enhance quality, improve the overall health of the population, and reduce cost growth. We believe that the proper approach to achieve and sustain reduced cost growth is one that will: improve the population's health; continuously improve quality; encourage the advancement of medical treatments, approaches, and science; streamline administration; and encourage efficient care delivery based on evidence and best practice.

To achieve all of these goals, we have joined together in an unprecedented effort, as private sector stakeholders—physicians, hospitals, other health care workers, payors, suppliers, manufacturers, and organized labor—to offer concrete initiatives that will transform the health care system. As restructuring takes hold and the population's health improves over the coming decade, we will do our part to achieve your Administration's goal of decreasing by 1.5 percentage points the annual health care spending growth rate—saving \$2 trillion or more. This represents more than a 20% reduction in the projected rate of growth. We believe this approach can be highly successful and can help the nation to achieve the reform goals we all share.

To respond to this challenge, we are developing consensus proposals to reduce the rate of increase in future health and insurance costs through changes made in all sectors of the health care system. We are committed to taking action in public-private partnership

to create a more stable and sustainable health care system that will achieve billions in savings through:

Implementing proposals in all sectors of the health care system, focusing on administrative simplification, standardization, and transparency that supports effective markets;

Reducing over-use and under-use of health care by aligning quality and efficiency incentives among providers across the continuum of care so that physicians, hospitals, and other health care providers are encouraged and enabled to work together towards the highest standards of quality and efficiency;

Encouraging coordinated care, both in the public and private sectors, and adherence to evidence-based best practices and therapies that reduce hospitalization, manage chronic disease more efficiently and effectively, and implement proven clinical prevention strategies; and,

Reducing the cost of doing business by addressing cost drivers in each sector and through common sense improvements in care delivery models, health information technology, workforce deployment and development, and regulatory reforms.

These and other reforms will make our health care system stronger and more sustainable. However, there are many important factors driving health care costs that are beyond the control of the delivery system alone. Billions in savings can be achieved through a large-scale national effort of health promotion and disease prevention to reduce the prevalence of chronic disease and poor health status, which leads to unnecessary sickness and higher health costs. Reform should include a specific focus on obesity prevention commensurate with the scale of the problem. These initiatives are crucial to transform health care in America and to achieve our goal of reducing the rate of growth in health costs.

We, as stakeholder representatives, are committed to doing our part to make reform a reality in order to make the system more affordable and effective for patients and purchasers. We stand ready to work with you to accomplish this goal.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN J. UBL,
President and CEO,
Advanced Medical
Technology Association.

KAREN IGNAGNI,
President and CEO,
America's Health Insurance
Plans.

RICH UMBDENSTOCK,
President and CEO,
American Hospital
Association.

J. JAMES ROHACK, MD,
President-elect American
Medical Association.

BILLY TAUZIN,
President and CEO,
Pharmaceutical Research
and Manufacturers of America.

DENNIS RIVERA,
Chair, *SEIU*
Healthcare, Service
Employees International
Union.

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

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

I have a couple of points right off the bat. My friend from Michigan claims that the tax hasn't necessarily impacted jobs, that there are only certain stories. I would just point out that, in

his home State, there is a company named Stryker—now, it is a larger company—that laid off 1,000 employees back in November of 2011 to provide efficiencies and realign resources in advance of the new medical device excise tax.

As to a lot of data that was mentioned earlier, those figures that are talking about how well the industry is doing and as to the growth and the sales numbers are global data. These are companies that have global awareness and a global presence. Those are not U.S. jobs. We want those jobs in the United States. If we can repeal this tax, we can make sure that job growth is here in the U.S. instead of outside of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this is not smart tax policy. It is hurting our innovators, and it is costing us jobs. This industry is an American success story. We all know the names of the larger companies because some of those were mentioned here in debate on the floor today, but there are thousands of these companies—the vast majority—because, again, 98 percent have fewer than 500 employees, and over 80 percent have fewer than 50 employees.

These are companies you have never heard of, but there is a doctor or an engineer or an entrepreneur who has started or who has come up with an idea to create a company in the backyard or in the garage to help improve lives or to save lives. That is what we are trying to protect here, Mr. Speaker.

These are not technicians in some white lab coats who are trying to improve widgets or to build a widget faster. These are, literally, small businesses that are on missions to save lives. If you think about it, what could be more entrepreneurially worthwhile than that?

We in Congress have a responsibility to give America's innovators the best shot, the best opportunity possible, by removing any obstructions to those inventions that are going to bring us all a better quality of life. We have the ability to help create a new age of American innovation, and we can help kick-start that process this week—today, tomorrow, with a vote—by repealing the destructive medical device tax.

It was mentioned as a part of the debate also that the industry came forward and that there was vast support for the Affordable Care Act, and they agreed to the tax. Mr. Speaker, there are no letters from the industry whatsoever that support their buy-in for a 2.3 percent excise tax—a tax on revenue, not on profit.

It is true that there were letters that were put out that said they were committed to healthcare reform and that they wanted to see that process move forward, but then they were very vocal when this excise tax idea was floated as a part of the new healthcare law and even after the law passed. It has been continuous, this awareness about their opposition in their knowing of the detrimental effects that it would have.

Mr. Speaker, this is also not about the Affordable Care Act because we have had many votes on that—to repeal it, to change it, to move in a different direction. This is about a tax that is going into the general fund, that is not going into some special account to fund ObamaCare. That is not what this tax is doing. This is going into the general fund.

That Affordable Care Act discussion will come up at another time with the Court case coming up in the near future. This is more of an opportunity to stand up with a bipartisan voice to declare our support for American manufacturing, for American jobs, and for protecting our patients, including our seniors.

I just want to remind my friends that the President has said that he has been open to any ideas that will improve accessibility, that will improve affordability, and the quality of health care. That is exactly what this bill does. It is about protecting access to those devices.

It is also important to point out the 281 cosponsors. The bipartisan support is deep, and it is broad. If you think back to the sustainable growth rate debate we had just a little over a month ago, that is important to bring up. Why? It is because there was broad, bipartisan support and a belief that the policy was harming patient care and innovation.

This is good policy now if we can repeal this tax. It is about doing the right thing for our constituents, which outweighs the concerns of the offsets.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 319, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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.

STRENGTHENING MEDICARE ADVANTAGE THROUGH INNOVATION AND TRANSPARENCY FOR SENIORS ACT OF 2015

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2570) to establish a demonstration program requiring the utilization of Value-Based Insurance Design to demonstrate that reducing the copayments or coinsurance charged to Medicare beneficiaries for selected high-value prescription medications and clinical services can increase their utilization and ultimately improve clinical outcomes and lower health care expenditures, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2570

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 “Strengthening Medicare Advantage through Innovation and Transparency for Seniors Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. TREATMENT OF PATIENT ENCOUNTERS IN AMBULATORY SURGICAL CENTERS IN DETERMINING MEANINGFUL EHR USE.

Section 1848(o)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4(o)(2)) is amended by adding at the end of the following new subparagraph:

“(D) TREATMENT OF PATIENT ENCOUNTERS AT AMBULATORY SURGICAL CENTERS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), for a payment year after 2015 any patient encounter of an eligible professional occurring at an ambulatory surgical center (described in section 1833(i)(1)(A)) shall not be treated as a patient encounter in determining whether an eligible professional qualifies as a meaningful EHR user. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may implement this clause by program instruction or otherwise.

“(ii) SUNSET.—Clause (i) shall no longer apply as of the first payment year that begins more than 3 years after the date the Secretary determines, through notice and comment rulemaking, that certified EHR technology is applicable to the ambulatory surgical center setting.”.

SEC. 3. VALUE-BASED INSURANCE DESIGN DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (in this section referred to as the “Secretary”) shall establish a 3-year demonstration program to test the use of value-based insurance design methodologies (as defined in subsection (c)(1)) under eligible Medicare Advantage plans offered by Medicare Advantage organizations under part C of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-21 et seq.). The Secretary may extend the program to a duration of 4 or 5 years, as determined necessary by the Secretary in coordination with the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation.

(b) DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM DESIGN.—

(1) SELECTION OF MEDICARE ADVANTAGE SITES AND ELIGIBLE MEDICARE ADVANTAGE PLANS.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(A) select at least two Medicare Advantage sites with respect to which to conduct the demonstration program under this section; and

(B) approve eligible Medicare Advantage plans to participate in such demonstration program.

In selecting Medicare Advantage sites under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall take into account area differences as well as the availability of health maintenance organization plans and preferred provider organization plans offered in such sites.

(2) START OF DEMONSTRATION.—The demonstration program shall begin not later than the third plan year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) ELIGIBLE MEDICARE ADVANTAGE PLANS.—For purposes of this section, the term “eligible Medicare Advantage plan” means a Medicare Advantage plan under part C of title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-21 et seq.) that meets the following requirements:

(A) The plan is an Medicare Advantage regional plan (as defined in paragraph (4) of section 1859(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-28(b))) or Medicare Advantage local plan (as defined in paragraph (5) of such section) offered in the Medicare Advantage region selected under paragraph (1)(A).

(B) The plan has—

(i) a quality rating under section 1853(o) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-23(o)) of 4 stars or higher based on the most recent data available for such year, or (ii) in the case of a specialized Medicare Advantage plan for special needs individuals, as defined in section 1859(b)(6)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-28(b)(6)(A)), a quality rating under section 1853(o) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-23(o)) equal to or higher than the national average for special needs plans (excluding Institutional-Special needs plans) based on the most recent data available for such year; and

(ii) at least 20 percent of the population to whom the plan is offered in a service area consists of subsidy eligible individuals (as defined in section 1860D-14(a)(3)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-114(a)(3)(A))).

(4) DISCLOSURE TO BENEFICIARIES.—The Secretary shall provide to each individual eligible to enroll under a Medicare Advantage plan approved to participate under the demonstration program during a plan year for which the plan is so selected—

(A) notification that the plan is participating in such demonstration program;

(B) background information on the demonstration program;

(C) clinical data derived from the studies resulting from the demonstration program; and

(D) notification of the potential benefits that the individual will receive, and of the other potential impacts that the individual will experience, on account of the participation of the plan in the demonstration program.

(c) VALUE-BASED INSURANCE DESIGN METHODOLOGIES.—

(1) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term “value-based insurance design methodology” means a methodology for identifying specific prescription medications, and clinical services that are payable under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, for which the reduction of copayments, coinsurance, or both, would improve the management of specific chronic clinical conditions because of the high value and effectiveness of such medications and services for such specific chronic clinical conditions, as approved by the Secretary.

(2) USE OF METHODOLOGIES TO REDUCE COPAYMENTS AND COINSURANCE.—A Medicare Advantage organization offering an eligible Medicare Advantage plan approved to participate under the demonstration program, for each plan year for which the plan is so selected and using value-based insurance design methodologies—

(A) shall identify each prescription medication and clinical service covered under

such plan for which the plan proposes to reduce or eliminate the copayment or coinsurance, with respect to the management of specific chronic clinical conditions (as specified by the Secretary) of Medicare Advantage eligible individuals (as defined in section 1851(a)(3) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-21(a)(3))) enrolled under such plans, for such plan year;

(B) may, for such plan year, reduce or eliminate copayments, coinsurance, or both for such prescription medication and clinical services so identified with respect to the management of such conditions of such individuals—

(i) if such reduction or elimination is evidence-based and for the purpose of encouraging such individuals in such plan to use such prescription medications and clinical services (such as preventive care, primary care, specialty visits, diagnostic tests, procedures, and durable medical equipment) with respect to such conditions; and

(ii) for the purpose of encouraging such individuals in such plan to use health care providers that such organization has identified with respect to such plan year as being high value providers; and

(C) if a reduction or elimination is applied pursuant to subparagraph (B), with respect to such medication and clinical services, shall, for such plan year, count toward the deductible applicable to such individual under such plan amounts that would have been payable by the individual as copayment or coinsurance for such medication and services if the reduction or elimination had not been applied.

(3) PROHIBITION OF INCREASES OF COPAYMENTS AND COINSURANCE.—In no case may any Medicare Advantage plan participating in the demonstration program increase, for any plan year for which the plan is so participating, the amount of copayments or coinsurance for any item or service covered under such plan for purposes of discouraging the use of such item or service.

(d) REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the demonstration program under this section begins under subsection (b)(2), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the status of the implementation of the demonstration program.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall, with respect to eligible Medicare Advantage plans participating in the demonstration program for the first plan year of such program, include the following:

(A) A list of each medication and service identified pursuant to subsection (c)(2)(A) for such plan with respect to such plan year.

(B) For each such medication or service so identified, the amount of the copayment or coinsurance required under such plan with respect to such plan year for such medication or service and the amount of the reduction of such copayment or coinsurance from a previous plan year.

(C) For each provider identified pursuant to subsection (c)(2)(B)(ii) for such plan with respect to such plan year, a statement of the amount of the copayment or coinsurance required under such plan with respect to such plan year and the amount of the reduction of such copayment or coinsurance from the previous plan year.

(e) REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT OF UTILIZATION OF VALUE-BASED INSURANCE DESIGN METHODOLOGIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall enter into a contract or agreement with an independent entity to review and assess the implementation of the demonstration program under this section. The review and assessment shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the utilization of value-based insurance design methodologies

by Medicare Advantage plans participating under such program.

(B) An analysis of whether reducing or eliminating the copayment or coinsurance for each medication and clinical service identified pursuant to subsection (c)(2)(A) resulted in increased adherence to medication regimens, increased service utilization, improvement in quality metrics, better health outcomes, and enhanced beneficiary experience.

(C) An analysis of the extent to which costs to Medicare Advantage plans under part C of title XVIII of the Social Security Act participating in the demonstration program is less than costs to Medicare Advantage plans under such part that are not participating in the demonstration program.

(D) An analysis of whether reducing or eliminating the copayment or coinsurance for providers identified pursuant to subsection (c)(2)(B)(ii) resulted in improvement in quality metrics, better health outcomes, and enhanced beneficiary experience.

(E) An analysis, for each provider so identified, the extent to which costs to Medicare Advantage plans under part C of title XVIII of the Social Security Act participating in the demonstration program is less than costs to Medicare Advantage plans under such part that are not participating in the demonstration program.

(F) Such other matters as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(2) **REPORT.**—The contract or agreement entered into under paragraph (1) shall require such entity to submit to the Secretary a report on the review and assessment conducted by the entity under such paragraph in time for the inclusion of the results of such report in the report required by paragraph (3). Such report shall include a description, in clear language, of the manner in which the entity conducted the review and assessment.

(3) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 4 years after the date on which the demonstration program begins under subsection (b)(2), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the review and assessment of the demonstration program conducted under this subsection. The report shall include the following:

(A) A description of the results of the review and assessment included in the report submitted pursuant to paragraph (2).

(B) Such recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate for enhancing the utilization of the methodologies applied under the demonstration program to all Medicare Advantage plans under part C of title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to reduce copayments and coinsurance under such plans paid by Medicare beneficiaries for high-value prescription medications and clinical services for which coverage is provided under such plans and to otherwise improve the quality of health care provided under such plans.

(4) **OVERSIGHT REPORT.**—Not later than three years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on the demonstration program that includes an assessment, with respect to individuals enrolled under Medicare Advantage plans approved to participate under the demonstration program, of the impact that the age, co-morbidities, and geographic regions of such individuals had upon the implementation of the demonstration program by the plans with respect to such individuals.

(f) **SAVINGS.**—In no case may any reduction in beneficiary copayments or coinsurance resulting from the implementation of the demonstration program under this section result in expenditures under parts A, B, and D of the title XVIII of the Social Security Act

that are greater than such expenditures without application of this section.

(g) **EXPANSION OF DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.**—Taking into account the review and assessment conducted under subsection (e), the Secretary may, through notice and comment rulemaking, expand (including implementation on a nationwide basis) the duration and scope of the demonstration program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, other than under the original Medicare fee-for-service program under parts A and B of such title, to the extent determined appropriate by the Secretary, if the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2) and (3) of subsection (c) of section 1115A of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1315a), as applied to the testing of a model under subsection (b) of such section, applied to the demonstration under this section.

(h) **WAIVER AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary may waive such provisions of titles XI and XVIII of the Social Security Act as may be necessary to carry out the demonstration program under this section.

(i) **IMPLEMENTATION FUNDING.**—For purposes of carrying out the demonstration program under this section, the Secretary shall provide for the transfer from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund under section 1817 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395i) and the Federal Supplementary Insurance Trust Fund under section 1841 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395t), including the Medicare Prescription Drug Account in such Trust Fund, in such proportion as determined appropriate by the Secretary, of such sums as may be necessary.

SEC. 4. TREATMENT OF INFUSION DRUGS FURNISHED THROUGH DURABLE MEDICAL EQUIPMENT.

Section 1842(o)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395u(o)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “(and including a drug or biological described in subparagraph (D)(i) furnished on or after January 1, 2017)” after “2005”; and

(2) in subparagraph (D)—
(A) by striking “infusion drugs” and inserting “infusion drugs or biologicals” each place it appears; and

(B) in clause (i)—
(i) by striking “2004” and inserting “2004, and before January 1, 2017”; and
(ii) by striking “for such drug”.

SEC. 5. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE IMPLEMENTATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF QUALITY INCENTIVE PAYMENTS TO MEDICARE ADVANTAGE PLANS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Secretary of Health and Human Services has incorrectly interpreted subsection (n) of section 1853 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-23) as prohibiting the provision of any Medicare quality incentive payments under subsection (o) of such section with respect to Medicare Advantage plans that exceed the payment benchmark cap under such subsection (n) for the area served by such plans; and

(2) the Secretary should immediately apply quality incentive payments under such subsection (o) with respect to such Medicare Advantage plans without regard to the limits set forth in such subsection (n).

SEC. 6. MEDICARE IMPROVEMENT FUND.

Section 1898(b)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395iii(b)(1)) is amended by striking “during and after fiscal year 2020, \$0” and inserting “after fiscal year 2020, \$220,000,000”.

SEC. 7. NON-INCLUSION OF DME INFUSION DRUGS UNDER DME COMPETITIVE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1847(a)(2)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-3(a)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and excluding” and inserting “, excluding”; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and excluding drugs and biologicals described in section 1842(o)(1)(D)”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 1842(o)(1)(D)(ii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395u(o)(1)(D)(ii)) is amended by striking “2007” and inserting “2007, and before the date of the enactment of the Strengthening Medicare Advantage through Innovation and Transparency for Seniors Act of 2015”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARDY). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2570, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I stand in strong support of H.R. 2570, the Strengthening Medicare Advantage through Innovation and Transparency for Seniors Act.

This package is comprised of two policies, and I will let the sponsors, who have worked so hard, speak to them in more depth.

The Electronic Health Fairness Act of 2015, as marked up by the committee back in February, brings fairness to physicians who are practicing in the ASC setting by reducing meaningful use burdens for sites of service that were left out of the EHR technology requirements. This exemption only lasts until the ASCs are able to catch up, and then everybody will be on an equal footing regarding meaningful use requirements.

The bill then establishes a new demonstration program based on value-based insurance design. This proposal would give plans the ability to adjust benefits based on their enrollees' needs. The one-size-fits-all policies in Medicare Advantage create the need for different types of plans that wouldn't be necessary if regular Medicare Advantage plans could adjust their benefit structures to better serve our seniors.

Reducing copays or cost sharing for beneficiaries for the sake of better healthcare outcomes is right in line with the principles that I support as all seniors are different and should be served as such, so that all have an opportunity for positive health outcomes.

The bill also includes a policy that changes the way Medicare pays for drugs that doctors prescribe that are infused through durable medical equipment items. This change means that Medicare payments will be more market based.

The policy does take away the potential that these rates could change significantly in the future by exempting the drugs from DME competitive bidding. I am committed to ensuring that beneficiaries who need these drugs are able to continue to get them in their homes, and I will certainly monitor the impact.

I want to thank Ways and Means members Mrs. BLACK of Tennessee and Mr. BLUMENAUER of Oregon for their continued leadership in improving Medicare Advantage. Their very hard work will ensure that seniors, for years to come, will enjoy better healthcare choices and more options at that.

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

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

I join with the gentleman from Texas in supporting H.R. 2570. Representative DIANE BLACK and Representative EARL BLUMENAUER have worked hard on this issue.

This legislation will allow the Secretary of HHS to conduct a demonstration, giving managed care organizations the ability to offer plans with a variety of benefit structures that would lower the cost sharing for high-value service. We think it makes a lot of sense, and I concur.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1730

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), a key member of the Committee on Ways and Means and a healthcare professional herself.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, as a nurse for over 40 years, I understand the challenge of helping Americans find affordable healthcare coverage, but the sad truth is, even for those who do have health coverage, high deductibles and out-of-pocket costs can leave too many Americans functionally uninsured.

When families are forced to choose between buying groceries and filling a prescription, their health is sidelined, and they risk facing even higher medical costs down the road. That is why I authored H.R. 2570, the Strengthening Medicare Advantage Through Innovation and Transparency for Seniors Act. Our bill directs CMS to set up a pilot project for what is known as Value-Based Insurance Design, or otherwise known as VBID.

Instead of the current one-size-fits-all approach to cost sharing, VBID embraces the idea that by lowering a patient's out-of-pocket costs for essential prescription drugs and services, customers will then be motivated to stick with their regimen and stay healthier. This will, in turn, decrease the overall long-term costs to our healthcare system and provide a higher quality of care for our patients.

My bill also helps our providers by offering ambulatory surgical centers relief from the electronic health records' meaningful use mandate.

While this recordkeeping system may make sense in a hospital setting, it doesn't always work for a small, outpatient surgical facility. Providers who practice medicine in these settings should not be penalized as a result.

I thank Congressman BLUMENAUER and Congresswoman CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS for their strong commitment to VBID policy.

I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 2570.

Mr. RANGEL. I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I concur with the gentleman from Texas. Members have worked hard in perfecting these bills, and I support H.R. 2570.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a very good bill. It is a good improvement to Medicare Advantage, and it is really a case of Republicans and Democrats finding common ground and doing it in a way that helps seniors with their choices and really tailoring health care to them.

I strongly urge support for this bill.

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 Texas (Mr. BRADY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2570, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to the treatment of patient encounters in ambulatory surgical centers in determining meaningful EHR use, establish a demonstration program requiring the utilization of Value-Based Insurance Design to demonstrate that reducing the copayments or coinsurance charged to Medicare beneficiaries for selected high-value prescription medications and clinical services can increase their utilization and ultimately improve clinical outcomes and lower health care expenditures, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASING REGULATORY FAIRNESS ACT OF 2015

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2507) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish an annual rulemaking schedule for payment rates under Medicare Advantage, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2507

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 "Increasing Regulatory Fairness Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHING AN ANNUAL RULEMAKING SCHEDULE FOR PAYMENT RATES UNDER MEDICARE ADVANTAGE.

Section 1853(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-23(b)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by inserting "ANNUAL RULEMAKING SCHEDULE FOR PAYMENT RATES FOR 2017 AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS" after "RATES";

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the subparagraph heading, by inserting "BEFORE 2017" after "YEARS"; and

(ii) in the matter preceding clause (i), by inserting "and before 2017" after "2005"; and

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

"(C) ANNUAL RULEMAKING SCHEDULE FOR PAYMENT RATES FOR 2017 AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—For 2017 and each subsequent year, before April 1 of the preceding year, the Secretary shall, by regulation and in accordance with the notice and public comment periods required under paragraph (2) for such a year, annually determine and announce the following:

"(i) The annual MA capitation rate for each MA payment area for such year.

"(ii) The risk and other factors to be used in adjusting such rates under subsection (a)(1)(A) for payments for months in such year.

"(iii) With respect to each MA region and each MA regional plan for which a bid was submitted under section 1854, the MA region-specific non-drug monthly benchmark amount for that region for the year involved.

"(iv) The major policy changes to the risk adjustment model, and the 5-star rating system established under subsection (o), that are determined to have an economic impact.";

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting "(or, for 2017 and each subsequent year, at least 60 days)" after "45 days"; and

(B) by inserting "(for 2017 and each subsequent year, of no less than 30 days)" after "opportunity".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2507 currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of H.R. 2507, the Increasing Regulatory Fairness Act. This is an important piece of legislation. Today, the Medicare Advantage program serves more than 16 million seniors throughout the country. Enrollment has increased more than threefold over the past decade, and it is expected to nearly double in the next.

To ensure that seniors are able to continue receiving the kind of high-

quality care they receive under the program, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, known as CMS, is expected to pay about \$156 billion to more than 3,600 Medicare Advantage plans just this year. That is nearly 30 percent of all Medicare spending, by the way.

Typically, every year CMS sends out what is called the rate notice to plans and Medicare Advantage companies that details the various payment rates and benefit changes the agency plans to make for the following year. This notice follows the standard rulemaking process of other payment systems. That is, a draft notice is published, the public has a certain amount of time to submit comments and questions, and then the agency publishes a final notice based on that feedback.

Right now, this current process takes about 45 days. Do you know how many days are currently allotted for public comment? The answer: A mere 15 days—15 days for thousands of plans and millions of stakeholders to submit comments on proposed changes to a program that amounts to one-third of all Medicare spending.

I could almost understand this if the rate notice were a short and concise document, easy to understand, and simple to implement, but of course it is not. The rate notice has grown from around 16 pages in 2006 to nearly 150 pages this year. That is over a ninefold increase. All the while, the time for the public comment period has remained the same. This means less and less time for plans and Congress to conduct the necessary review so we can provide CMS with the kind of feedback that would better help the agency assess the impact of their proposed changes. This is important because without accurate feedback, CMS could inadvertently move forward with a proposed change to the Medicare Advantage program that might negatively impact these seniors who depend on these plans for access to essential medical care.

The legislation before us is simple and straightforward. All it proposes to do is extend the public notice period from 45 days to 60 days, which would mean an extension of the comment period from 15 to 30 days. This is a commonsense, good government fix we can make that will give plans more time to understand the changes that Medicare proposes, offer constructive feedback, and make the Medicare Advantage program overall more responsive to senior needs.

I want to thank Mr. THOMPSON of California, who is a key member of our Committee on Ways and Means, and Mr. PITTS, the chairman of the Health Subcommittee on Energy and Commerce, for their thoughtful and very helpful work on this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. BRADY. It was a pleasure working with him on this piece of legislation.

I rise in support of H.R. 2507. Every year, as was pointed out, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services publishes its Medicare Advantage call letter and rate notice that outlines all the payment rates and the changes for nearly 2,000 plans that serve our most vulnerable population.

About 10 years ago the call letter and rate notice were less than 20 pages long. Since then, enrollment in Medicare Advantage has nearly tripled. Medicare Advantage policies have become more complex, and the call letter and the rate notice has grown nearly tenfold. They run about 150 to 200 pages.

The same time, the time between the publishing of the draft notice and the final notice, which is currently 45 days, has remained unchanged. During this 45-day period, in which there are only 15 days to comment on the proposed changes in the program, the plans, Members of this body and our staff are expected to review 150 pages of regulatory changes and understand the impacts of the proposed policy changes on those programs that provide essential medical care to over one-third of Medicare beneficiaries.

As we all know, and as we have all experienced every February and March, this does not lend itself to an efficient, effective, nor transparent process. Moreover, it deprives CMS of thoughtful, constructive feedback that is necessary to improve a program that our seniors love and rely on. This bill is a simple, straightforward measure that will improve the current process by expanding the current cycle from 45 to 60 days, which will give plans, stakeholders, Members, and our staff 30 full days—double the current time allowed—to analyze and provide feedback on the draft call letter and rate notices.

This is a no-cost, good government, bipartisan bill that will make the process more transparent, more fair, and more advantageous for the beneficiaries whom we serve. Therefore, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER), a key new member of the House of Representatives who understands the importance of Medicare Advantage.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, one of the things I always strive for in my personal and professional life is always trying to do things better. As I tell my staff, there is no such thing as standing still. If you are not moving forward, then you are moving backward. We can all continue to get better at what we do.

That is the goal of H.R. 2507, the Increasing Regulatory Fairness Act of 2015. As part of an annual rulemaking

process, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services update payments to the Medicare Advantage program. With the current structure of this annual process, health insurers are given little time to submit comments to the new payment rates or even determine whether the payment adjustment is beneficial to Medicare Advantage enrollees.

With H.R. 2507, health insurers will have additional time to analyze whether the payment adjustments for Medicare Advantage plans are justified and overall beneficial. I believe we must always try to get better every day. This includes our work as civil servants. H.R. 2507 will provide a better environment for CMS and health insurers to create the best payment rate agreement regarding Medicare Advantage plans. By providing more time for comments and the finalizing of rates, Medicare Advantage enrollees will receive a better calculated benefit for their plans.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I concur with the statements previously made by my colleagues and thank both Mr. BRADY and Mr. PITTS for working with me on this legislation. As I have stated before, this is a simple, no-cost bill that will improve the current process and the Medicare Advantage program for our seniors. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2507.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I join with Congressman THOMPSON. I appreciate so much his work in this area in a bipartisan way on a bill that not only bridges both parties but a number of committees in this Congress and really just provides a commonsense way to make sure the public, Congress, and others can comment, and to make sure these rules really benefit the seniors who are receiving Medicare Advantage. I urge strong support for this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today expands an annual regulatory schedule for Medicare Advantage (MA) payment rates so that stakeholders have the necessary time to review and provide feedback to ensure seniors continue to have access to quality, low-cost plans of their choosing.

H.R. 2507, the Increasing Regulatory Fairness Act of 2015, was introduced by my colleague, Representative KEVIN BRADY (TX), Chairman of the Health Subcommittee of Ways and Means, and I cosponsored along with MIKE THOMPSON (CA), PETE SESSIONS (TX), and KYRSTEN SINEMA (AZ). This bipartisan, commonsense legislation will facilitate greater understanding and collaboration between industry stakeholders and regulators, and will offer a greater opportunity for public input in the establishment of policies affecting the MA and Part D plans.

Since 2006, when the Medicare Modernization Act's official implementation, and the Medicare Advantage/Part D call letter and rate

notice were around 16 pages long, a two-week comment period may have been adequate. Today, however, that document has grown to nearly 150 pages—and the comment period—still just 15 days—is simply not enough time for plans that now serve one-third of the Medicare population to analyze and gather substantive comments on increasingly complex policy changes. This bill would increase that comment period to 30 days, a strong step towards regulatory fairness for the successful Medicare Advantage/Part D programs.

Expanding this comment period allows for a fair amount of time in which both stakeholders, as well as Members of Congress and Committees, have sufficient time to understand the policy implications and formulate comments, if they so choose. More time equals better, more thoughtful policies.

Mr. Speaker, by approving this legislation, we will be giving seniors, insurance plan providers and other interested stakeholders adequate time to comprehend and provide comments on proposed changes to Medicare Advantage plans.

This is an important and necessary legislative change and I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 2507.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to, specifically, the provision of H.R. 2570 that pays for the Value Based Insurance Design for Better Care Act. If this bill passes with its current pay-for in place, it will do so at the detriment of Americans who rely on home infusion therapies.

“Infusion therapy” refers to the administration of medication directly into the bloodstream through a needle or catheter. A patient will undergo infusion therapy when his or her disease or infection cannot be adequately treated by oral medications. Infusion therapy is used to treat cancers, congestive heart failure, immune deficiencies, multiple sclerosis, rheumatoid arthritis, gastrointestinal diseases, and other conditions.

The administration of infusion therapies is significantly more involved than that of oral medications. Infusion therapy entails specialized equipment, supplies, and professional services, including sterile drug compounding, care coordination, and patient education and monitoring.

Currently, Medicare fully covers infusion therapy when it is administered in a hospital, doctor’s office or nursing home. However, Medicare’s coverage of infusion therapy in the home is fractured and does not adequately cover the services needed to provide infusions in the home.

Not only does this coverage gap force patients into expensive institutional settings, but it also puts patients at risk of developing additional infections in these environments. What’s more, this coverage gap prevents patients from receiving the treatment they need in the most comfortable setting possible: their homes.

Although Medicare does not presently pay for the services that are essential for a patient to receive infusion therapies at home, providers have been able to offer a limited set of home infusion drugs to Medicare beneficiaries via Medicare Part B DME coverage, as the reimbursement they receive for home infusion drugs is substantial enough to cover the services necessary to administer those drugs.

If H.R. 2570 passes in its current form, this will no longer be the case.

The demonstration program that this legislation creates is financed by modifying the reimbursement structure for infusion drugs under the Medicare Part B durable medical equipment benefit. This change will perpetuate the coverage gap that prevents Medicare from covering the indispensable service component of home infusion therapy.

In addition, the drug reimbursement that providers receive will no longer be significant enough to capture home infusion services as it does currently. As a result, it will become exceedingly difficult for providers to offer Medicare beneficiaries infusion therapy in their homes.

I want to emphasize that I do not oppose changing the manner in which home infusion drugs are paid for. On the contrary, I have introduced H.R. 605, the Medicare Home Infusion Site of Care Act, with Congressman PAT TIBERI. Our bill, which has garnered cosponsors from both sides of the aisle, would explicitly cover the services that must be provided to administer infusion drugs at home.

I ask that my colleagues think about the patients who depend on home infusion therapies. If we allow H.R. 2570 to pass in its current form, we simultaneously deny patients the ability to receive life-saving therapies in their homes, forcing them into institutional settings that will come at a cost to the Medicare program and, most importantly, to patients’ quality of life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2507, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1745

MEDICARE ADVANTAGE COVERAGE TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2015

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2505) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the annual reporting of data on enrollment in Medicare Advantage plans, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2505

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 “Medicare Advantage Coverage Transparency Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENT FOR ENROLLMENT DATA REPORTING FOR MEDICARE.

Section 1874 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395kk) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) REQUIREMENT FOR ENROLLMENT DATA REPORTING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than May 1 of each year (beginning with 2016), the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the

Committee on Finance of the Senate a report on enrollment data (and, in the case of part A, on data on individuals receiving benefits under such part) for the plan year or, in the case of part A and part B, for the fiscal year or year (as applicable) ending before January 1 of such plan year, fiscal year, or year. Such enrollment data shall be presented—

“(A) by zip code, congressional district, and State;

“(B) in a manner that provides for such data based on enrollment (including receipt of benefits other than through enrollment) under part A, enrollment under part B, enrollment under an MA plan under part C, and enrollment under part D; and

“(C) in the case of enrollment data described in subparagraph (B) relating to MA plans, presented in a manner that provides for such data for each MA–PD plan and for each MA plan that is not an MA–PD plan.

“(2) DELAY OF DEADLINE.—If the Secretary is unable to submit a report under paragraph (1) by May 1 of a year for data of the plan year, fiscal year, or year (as applicable) ending before January 1 of such year, the Secretary shall, not later than April 30 of such year, notify the committees described in such paragraph of—

“(A) such inability, including an explanation for such inability; and

“(B) the date by which the Secretary will provide such report, which shall be not later than June 1 of such year.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2505 currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, after my remarks, I will include in the RECORD an exchange of letters between the committees of jurisdiction.

I stand in strong support of H.R. 2505, the Medicare Advantage Coverage Transparency Act of 2015. This is commonsense legislation. It is truly about transparency in healthcare data.

Medicare Advantage currently makes up close to one-third of the Medicare program’s enrollees. The Congressional Budget Office projects that Medicare enrollment numbers will swell over the next decade and that Medicare Advantage will grow to over 40 percent of Medicare.

It will be beneficial for Members of Congress to fully understand what the makeup of health enrollment is in their district, whether it is Medicare Advantage; part D, the prescription drug plan; or fee-for-service. Members and their staff will be able to serve their constituents better and more

fully with access to this data. As we continue to work on, process, and pass legislation to improve the Medicare program, getting this enrollment snapshot will provide very necessary transparency and openness.

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), Mr. KIND, and Mr. BILIRAKIS for their hard work in getting this legislation through the committee and to the House floor.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, June 12, 2015.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RYAN: I write in regard to H.R. 2505, Medicare Advantage Coverage Transparency Act of 2015, which was ordered reported by the Committee on Ways and Means on June 2, 2015. As you are aware, the bill also was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce. I wanted to notify you that the Committee on Energy and Commerce will forgo action on H.R. 2505 so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

This is done with the understanding that the Committee on Energy and Commerce's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered. In addition, the Committee reserves the right to seek conferees on H.R. 2505 and requests your support when such a request is made.

I would appreciate your response confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 2505 and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during consideration of the bill on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, June 9, 2015.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding the Committee's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 2505, the Medicare Advantage Coverage Transparency Act of 2015, and your willingness to forego consideration by your committee.

I agree that the Committee on Energy and Commerce has a valid jurisdictional interest in certain provisions of the bill and that the Committee's jurisdiction will not be adversely affected by your decision to forego consideration. As you have requested, I will support your request for an appropriate appointment of outside conferees from your committee in the event of a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation should such a conference be convened.

Finally, I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of H.R. 2505. Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

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

I concur with the gentleman from Texas. My dear friend MIKE KELLY and Congressman RON KIND have worked together in trying to get more information for the Congress from our congress-

sional districts to see exactly what the enrollments are in Medicare. It makes us better legislators so we can improve the bill.

I think these bills are worthy of the support of the House of Representatives, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), a new member of the Ways and Means Committee and a businessperson who understands the openness and transparency required to improve Medicare.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson once opined:

The cornerstone of democracy rests on the foundation of an educated electorate. Whenever the people are well-informed, they can be trusted with their own government.

Jefferson's vision for our democracy was premised on the notion that individuals are intelligent enough to determine the best choices for their lives, their families, and their communities, and not some monolithic, paternalistic government.

A prerequisite to being well-informed, however, is to ensure that the American people have adequate information about how Federal policies and decisions made in Washington will or are impacting their lives. That is why transparency is so vital to our system of government: it provides the necessary information to educate or our on which our democracy depends.

Laws and their impacts should not be shrouded in secrecy. Congress and the administration need to be fostering a culture of openness and transparency when legislating and making decisions here in Washington. That is what this legislation is all about: providing more transparency to the American people about their health care, specifically Medicare Advantage coverage.

H.R. 2505, the Medicare Advantage Coverage Transparency Act, is a bill to do just that. With passage of H.R. 2505, CMS will be required to provide additional information on Medicare Advantage enrollment based on ZIP Code, congressional district, and State.

This data will be available for both Medicare Advantage Prescription Drug Plans as well as regular Medicare Advantage. Enrollment data under part A, part B, enrollment under an MA plan under part C, and enrollment under part D would also be covered.

The purpose of this additional data is to provide greater information to the public, policymakers, and the healthcare community so that they have the benefit of more and better information when making decisions.

CMS should provide a more transparent accounting of Medicare enrollment data to Congress, other government offices, and the American people so committees of jurisdiction can better understand how Medicare is serving the healthcare needs of the Nation as

well as individual congressional districts.

H.R. 2505 would require an annual report on Medicare enrollment data so that Members of Congress have more accurate information regarding the constituents' use of Medicare programs. Such transparency will allow Americans and Members of Congress to better know and understand the scope of Medicare enrollment on a local level as well as the specific population affected.

In 2014, the majority of the 54 million people on Medicare are in the traditional Medicare program, with 30 percent enrolled in a Medicare Advantage plan. Since 2004, the number of beneficiaries enrolled in private plans has almost tripled—from 5.3 million to 15.7 million in 2014.

In Pennsylvania, 18 percent of the total population in the Commonwealth is enrolled in some form of Medicare. Of the 18 percent, 39 percent of those Medicare beneficiaries are enrolled in Medicare Advantage plans. That means that 7 percent of Pennsylvanians are enrolled in the Medicare Advantage plan.

This legislation will give me and my constituents more information about how changes to Medicare Advantage plans in Washington will impact my constituents at home in the Third Congressional District of Pennsylvania and every Member and their constituents around this great country.

I want to thank Chairman RYAN for bringing up this bill. I also want to thank Leader MCCARTHY for bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), one of the key authors of the legislation and one of the leaders of health care on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a bill I am proud to sponsor with my friends—Representative KELLY, who is the lead sponsor, and Representative KIND—H.R. 2505, the Medicare Advantage Coverage Transparency Act.

Fifteen million Americans choose Medicare Advantage. By all accounts, Medicare Advantage has been successful for its enrollees, including those I represent. Similarly, approximately 37 million seniors chose part D as of 2014. Over 1,000 Medicare part D plans are offered nationwide, and the program has continued to grow in popularity and be well under its initial budget projections. I think Medicare part D is one of the greatest programs in the history of the Congress.

The Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services' Office of Legislation used to issue reports on the Medicare Advantage and part D enrollment data for each congressional district; however, in 2012, they stopped issuing these

reports. Why? It is now 2015, and they have still not provided this data.

Information is valuable to legislators and health researchers. The more information we have about how a program is working, the better decisions we can make. Currently, enrollment data for Medicare Advantage and part D come from third-party sources; however, it is time for CMS to continue to do its job and provide this information.

As I said earlier, by all accounts from third parties, both Medicare Advantage and part D are successful programs and, of course, as is traditional Medicare. These programs are used by so many seniors, Mr. Speaker. They are keeping our seniors healthier and saving them money.

This is a good government bill, and I am hopeful for a strong, bipartisan vote.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I concur with the objectives of this bill. I advocate a “yes” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate the leadership of Mr. KELLY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. KIND from Wisconsin, who together, Republicans and Democrats, crossed committees and recognized the need for openness.

Knowledge is power. Knowledge of Medicare Advantage and who is receiving it in whose district we think is very important to strengthening Medicare as an entire program going forward.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2505, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2146, DEFENDING PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. SESSIONS (during consideration of H.R. 2505) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-167) on the resolution (H. Res. 321) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2146) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SENIORS' HEALTH CARE PLAN PROTECTION ACT OF 2015

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2582) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the risk adjustment under the Medicare Advantage program, to delay the authority to terminate Medicare Advantage contracts for MA plans failing to achieve minimum quality ratings, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2582

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 “Seniors’ Health Care Plan Protection Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. DELAY IN AUTHORITY TO TERMINATE CONTRACTS FOR MEDICARE ADVANTAGE PLANS FAILING TO ACHIEVE MINIMUM QUALITY RATINGS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Consistent with the studies provided under the IMPACT Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-185), it is the intent of Congress—

(1) to continue to study and request input on the effects of socioeconomic status and dual-eligible populations on the Medicare Advantage STARS rating system before reforming such system with the input of stakeholders; and

(2) pending the results of such studies and input, to provide for a temporary delay in authority of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) to terminate Medicare Advantage plan contracts solely on the basis of performance of plans under the STARS rating system.

(b) DELAY IN MA CONTRACT TERMINATION AUTHORITY FOR PLANS FAILING TO ACHIEVE MINIMUM QUALITY RATINGS.—Section 1857(h) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-27(h)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) DELAY IN CONTRACT TERMINATION AUTHORITY FOR PLANS FAILING TO ACHIEVE MINIMUM QUALITY RATING.—The Secretary may not terminate a contract under this section with respect to the offering of an MA plan by a Medicare Advantage organization solely because the MA plan has failed to achieve a minimum quality rating under the 5-star rating system established under section 1853(o) during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this paragraph and through the end of plan year 2018.”.

SEC. 3. IMPROVEMENTS TO MA RISK ADJUSTMENT SYSTEM.

Section 1853(a)(1)(C) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-23(a)(1)(C)) is amended by adding at the end the following new clauses:

“(iv) EVALUATION AND SUBSEQUENT REVISION OF THE RISK ADJUSTMENT SYSTEM TO ACCOUNT FOR CHRONIC CONDITIONS AND OTHER FACTORS FOR THE PURPOSE OF MAKING THE RISK ADJUSTMENT SYSTEM MORE ACCURATE, TRANSPARENT, AND REGULARLY UPDATED.—

“(i) REVISION BASED ON NUMBER OF CHRONIC CONDITIONS.—The Secretary shall revise for 2017 and periodically thereafter, the risk adjustment system under this subparagraph so that a risk score under such system, with respect to an individual, takes into account the number of chronic conditions with which the individual has been diagnosed.

“(ii) EVALUATION OF DIFFERENT RISK ADJUSTMENT MODELS.—The Secretary shall evaluate the impact of including two years of data to compare the models used to determine risk scores for 2013 and 2014 under such system.

“(iii) EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS ON CHRONIC KIDNEY DISEASE (CKD) CODES.—The Secretary shall evaluate the impact of removing the diagnosis codes related to chronic kidney disease in the 2014 risk adjustment model and conduct an analysis of best practices of MA plans to slow disease progression related to chronic kidney disease.

“(iv) EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON USE OF ENCOUNTER DATA.—The Secretary shall evaluate the impact of including 10 percent of encounter data in computing payment for 2016 and the readiness of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services to incorporate encounter data in risk scores. In conducting such evaluation, the Secretary shall use data collected as encounter data on or after January 1, 2012, shall analyze such data for accuracy and completeness and issue recommendations for improving such accuracy and completeness, and shall not increase the percentage of such encounter data used unless the Secretary releases the data publicly, indicates how such data will be weighted in computing the risk scores, and ensures that the data reflects the degree and cost of care coordination under MA plans.

“(v) CONDUCT OF EVALUATIONS.—Evaluations and analyses under subclause (ii) through (iv) shall include an actuarial opinion from the Chief Actuary of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services about the reasonableness of the methods, assumptions, and conclusions of such evaluations and analyses. The Secretary shall consult with the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission and accept and consider comments of stakeholders, such as managed care organizations and beneficiary groups, on such evaluation and analyses. The Secretary shall complete such evaluations and analyses in a manner that permits the results to be applied for plan years beginning with the second plan year that begins after the date of the enactment of this clause.

“(vi) IMPLEMENTATION OF REVISIONS BASED ON EVALUATIONS.—If the Secretary determines, based on such an evaluation or analysis, that revisions to the risk adjustment system to address the matters described in any of subclauses (ii) through (iv) would make the risk adjustment system under this subparagraph better reflect and appropriately weight for the population that is served by the plan, the Secretary shall, beginning with 2017, and periodically thereafter, make such revisions.

“(vii) PERIODIC REPORTING TO CONGRESS.—With respect to plan years beginning with 2017 and every third year thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the most recent revisions (if any) made under this clause, including the evaluations conducted under subclauses (ii) through (iv).

“(v) NO CHANGES TO ADJUSTMENT FACTORS THAT PREVENT ACTIVITIES CONSISTENT WITH NATIONAL HEALTH POLICY GOALS.—In making any changes to the adjustment factors, including adjustment for health status under paragraph (3), the Secretary shall ensure that the changes do not prevent Medicare Advantage organizations from performing or undertaking activities that are consistent with national health policy goals, including activities to promote early detection and better care coordination, the use of health risk assessments, care plans, and programs to slow the progression of chronic diseases.

“(vi) OPPORTUNITY FOR REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENT REGARDING CHANGES TO ADJUSTMENT FACTORS.—For changes to adjustment factors effective for 2017 and subsequent years, in addition to providing notice of such changes in the announcement under subsection (b)(2), the Secretary shall provide an opportunity for review of proposed changes of not less than 60 days and a public comment period of

not less than 30 days before implementing such changes.”.

SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO MEDICARE ADVANTAGE STAR RATING SYSTEM.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services has inadvertently created a star rating system under section 1853(o)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w–23(o)(4)) for Medicare Advantage plans that lacks proper accounting for the socioeconomic status of enrollees in such plans and the extent to which such plans serve individuals who are also eligible for medical assistance under title XIX of such Act; and

(2) Congress will work with the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services and stakeholders, including beneficiary groups and managed care organizations, to ensure that such rating system properly accounts for the socioeconomic status of enrollees in such plans and the extent to which such plans serve such individuals described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 5. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO MEDICARE ADVANTAGE RISK ADJUSTMENT.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Secretary of Health and Human Services should periodically monitor and improve the Medicare Advantage risk adjustment model to ensure that it accurately accounts for beneficiary risk, including for those individuals with complex chronic comorbid conditions;

(2) the Secretary should closely examine the current Medicare Advantage risk adjustment methodology to ensure that plans enrolling beneficiaries with the greatest health care needs receive adequate reimbursement to deliver high-quality care and other services to help beneficiaries avoid costly complications and further progression of chronic conditions and to the extent data indicate this to be the case, the Secretary should make necessary adjustment to the risk adjustment methodology; and

(3) the Secretary should reconsider the implementation of changes in the Medicare Advantage risk adjustment methodology finalized for 2016 and to use to the extent appropriate the methodology finalized in 2015 for one additional year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2582, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of H.R. 2582, the Securing Seniors' Health Care Act of 2015.

When Medicare began implementing the STARS ratings measurement system, they did so using the typical Washington approach of one size fits all. The STARS program uses the same

measures to evaluate plans with different benefit designs and different coverage mixes. Congress needs to work with stakeholders and Medicare to reform this system to make it work for all.

CMS should continue to study issues like the effect that socioeconomic conditions have on health care and the effect that coverage of duals has on various rating systems and thus properly serve their populations.

This legislation is common sense. Let's not restrict seniors from plans they have chosen and like just because they aren't performing well under CMS's poorly managed STARS standards.

Until we truly understand the effects of duals and low-income beneficiaries on the plan's STARS ratings, we shouldn't be terminating them. A 3-year delay will do just that: give CMS and Congress the time to address the STARS rating system and allow all seniors access to the plans they choose and that they like.

CMS has made some poor policy decisions in recent years through the regulatory process in Medicare Advantage and part D of the prescription drug plan, and this year's call letter and rate notice is no exception.

The changes to the risk adjustment system include masking coding intensity adjustments, while in press releases CMS touts not exceeding statutory levels of coding intensity adjustments.

In plain English, Medicare Advantage plans are managed care plans, and the changes in the recent regulations handcuff plans from properly managing some of our frailest seniors suffering from, for example, blood and kidney diseases.

This bill requires that CMS review the changes made in their most recent regulatory cycle and reverse those that negatively affect risk adjustments.

□ 1800

This bill has CMS reviewing the use of encounter data as well. CMS has told Congress, the Government Accountability Office, and MedPAC that the data is not ready yet to show us; yet it is being used for risk adjustment in Medicare Advantage? That doesn't make sense. We need to see a stronger commitment by CMS to be transparent about their policies and their data in Medicare Advantage.

The changes made this year to MA just don't make sense, and I look forward to working with all my colleagues to reverse some of these changes and make continued improvements to the system as a whole.

I want to thank Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. LOESACK for their hard work in getting this policy moving forward.

I want to, again, reiterate my thanks to Mrs. BLACK and Mr. BLUMENAUER on our committee for their leadership regarding these issues.

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

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

I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for bringing up this bill and also my colleague, Mr. BUCHANAN of Florida.

There was some comment that CMS was making some mistakes that have not been transparent. It has been my understanding that they have had problems wrestling with this so-called star system themselves and have not enforced the law, that we are now saying that they will not enforce the law until after they study the complexities and report back to the Congress in an additional 3 years.

In short, they have this star system and, as most people should recognize, that when you are dealing with old, fragile, sick, poor people, there are more complexities to performance than in ordinary programs that compete with Medicare Advantage.

We have this population, and they have penalized some of the providers because they have had just more problems to deal with than just medical problems, and they haven't been able to resolve them. They haven't enforced this provision.

Under this bill, which Mr. BUCHANAN and the other sponsors have agreed, it tells the CMS to go back and to find out a way that you can treat these recipients of health care in a fairer way. It also tells CMS to take into consideration that the problems that Medicare Advantage has still to come are far more severe and far more complex than in other areas.

This is particularly true with our citizens in Puerto Rico that don't really have an option to anything except Medicare Advantage. Of course, as we all know, the economic conditions and the poverty that prevails there is extreme.

I don't have any other requests for time, but I do want to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for assisting to make certain that the Affordable Care program and other programs like it become more effective.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), one of the thought leaders on health care on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I do thank the gentleman from Texas for his leadership and for, really, his commitment to working these issues through. As you have heard him say, dealing with Medicare Advantage issues are important, and it is important that we get them right.

That is why I appreciate the fact that we come to the floor with these suspension bills to revisit these issues and say: Look, there are some things that just are not working as they were intended.

As you have heard, there has been bipartisan agreement, that the stars rating program needs a revisit, and CMS even agrees that the rules are not working.

As the gentleman from New York said, this has a specific effect on the frail, the low-income, those beneficiaries that are the most frail. It also affects the dual eligibles, those that are both Medicare and Medicaid eligible.

It is appropriate that we look at this rating program, that we back up and pause and consider the negative impact that some of these arbitrary ratings have on these programs when it may be the only program that is available that will meet these needs.

This is common sense. It is the right thing to do. I thank my colleagues that they are willing to say: CMS, it is not working; you have to come to the table with us.

This delay, this pause, and a review of the system is appropriate.

I thank everyone involved for their leadership, and I do express thanks to Mr. BUCHANAN and his team for the way they have worked with us and the Energy and Commerce Committee on the issue.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), again, one of our key healthcare leaders on the Ways and Means Committee who is critical in the advancement of this legislation.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2582, the Seniors' Health Care Plan Protection Act.

I am pleased that this legislation includes the language of my bill, the Securing Care for Seniors Act; and I thank Congressman BUCHANAN for his efforts to bring this important policy solution to the floor of the House today.

Across the country, 16 million seniors enjoy the flexibility of the Medicare Advantage plan. When we make changes to this program, seniors are the ones impacted. It just makes sense that they would have a place at the table when these changes are discussed.

Recently, CMS revised the Medicare Advantage risk adjustment model under the shroud of secrecy with little input from Congress and, most importantly, from Medicare beneficiaries.

Members of both parties have concerns that these modifications could discourage plans to detect and care for the chronic conditions in their early stages. That is why, today, we are calling for a timeout on CMS' changes.

We are instructing the agency to re-evaluate their risk adjustment model and to move forward with metrics that are accurate, evidence-based, and are transparent. This will ensure that seniors pay a fair cost for their healthcare plans, and that the MA program remains sustainable in the long term.

I urge a "yes" vote on H.R. 2582.

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

I would just like to say that this has been one of the most exciting recent legislative experiences I have had, where we are dealing with Americans who are not Republican and Democrat, but they are sick people; and, in this particular case, they are sick, and they are old, and they are fragile, and the government is not serving them.

Both sides of the aisle have agreed that the administration has to do something to make certain that they study how we can be fair to the providers and, at the same time, provide the service to those people that need it. They, themselves, agree that, for 3 years, they have not been able to find an answer.

What we have said jointly is you find that answer in 3 years. Until such time, don't you think about terminating these programs. It is with this cooperation that we both have a common sense of our obligation as legislators, and it has been really a legislative pleasure working with my colleagues on these suspensions this evening.

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

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

I agree with the gentleman from New York that this is a bill that brings, really, a team of Republicans and Democrats together with their best ideas on how we can help improve Medicare for our seniors.

This bill is titled "Securing Seniors' Health Care Act." It is aptly titled.

I am hopeful that today is just one example of more common ground between Republicans and Democrats, not just on the Ways and Means Committee, but through the House as well. I urge strong support for passage of this bill.

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 Texas (Mr. BRADY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2582, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill To amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to delay the authority to terminate Medicare Advantage contracts for MA plans failing to achieve minimum quality ratings, to make improvements to the Medicare Adjustment risk adjustment system, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOURLY OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

PASS THE PROTECT MEDICAL INNOVATION ACT

(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 to urge this body to pass the Protect Medical Innovation Act, which will repeal the 2.3 percent medical device excise tax.

This harmful tax, mandated by ObamaCare, stifles innovation, sends jobs abroad, hurts consumers, and places a heavy burden on small businesses in my State and across the country.

More than 35,000 Minnesotans are employed in the medical device industry, and thousands of Minnesotans depend on these state-of-the-art devices to enhance or even save their lives.

This bill has been stalled for long enough. It is imperative that Congress pass this legislation now to encourage the development of these innovative technologies, rather than enact laws that discourage their creation and accessibility.

I am grateful for the tremendous work by my Minnesota colleague, ERIK PAULSEN. Representative PAULSEN has done much to ensure the medical device industry in Minnesota continues to thrive for many years to come with this legislation.

Again, I ask my colleagues to support the Protect Medical Innovation Act and pass it immediately.

REPEAL THE MEDICAL DEVICE TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the medical device tax that is found within the President's Affordable Care Act sends American jobs overseas, hurts American jobs here in the United States, raises healthcare costs for all Americans, and stifles innovation.

While I have supported the House's action to repeal this onerous tax and support innovation, it is important that I highlight an important issue to my constituents back home in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, because it is tied into this whole debate. That issue is medical device safety, and it is patient safety.

Many who serve in this Chamber may have seen the headlines over the past several months regarding a medical device known as a power morcellator and, specifically, the devastating damage it has caused to women's health by spreading unsuspected cancer throughout their body.

These devices are gynecological tools used to remove uterine fibroids and have been on the market for over two decades, but only recently, we have learned that the use of these devices increases the risk of spreading unsuspected cancers in women to as high as 1 in 350 cases.

That finding prompted the FDA to issue a black box warning on the devices last fall. Several major insurance companies have stopped covering the procedure, and some medical device manufacturers have pulled them from the shelves—all appropriate steps to be taken when it becomes clear that a previously approved device has potential to harm instead of help.

As a lawmaker, I must ask: How is it that we have gotten to this point? What are the FDA and the medical device industry's protocols?

That is why, on February 19 of this year, I sent a letter to the FDA asking pointed questions about the current streamlined regulatory process that the power morcellator went through, known as 510(k).

I asked about FDA's reporting process for dangerous devices and their postmarket surveillance techniques. I asked for detailed explanations on why the power morcellator remains on the market, despite the high risks that have now been revealed.

To date, nearly 4 months from the date that this letter was hand-delivered to the FDA, I have not received a written reply. I will insert my letter to the FDA into the RECORD.

These are important questions, the answers to which will inform any next steps that we need to take.

□ 1815

My constituents want answers. I want answers. And I think this Chamber needs answers so that we can properly begin to address these gaps in our device safety regulations that allowed the morcellator to slip through the cracks for so long.

Ensuring the safety of our constituents is paramount to each Member of this body, and that is what I seek when it comes to this issue. I am hoping the FDA will partner with me. I am hoping that every Member of this body will partner with me.

Industry and government need to work together to develop a robust, modernized postmarket device surveillance program that allows us to catch issues like the power morcellator faster and encourages responsive reporting protocols so if a doctor finds an issue with a device, the manufacturer and the FDA are promptly notified and provided accurate data to take the next appropriate steps.

But, unfortunately, it is becoming clear that the reporting system for faulty and deadly devices is broken. A recent Wall Street Journal story highlighted how, in 2006, a doctor from central Pennsylvania started to raise the alarm and asked questions about power morcellators. He was seeing an alarm-

ing number of cancerous tissues arriving at his lab that were coming in from morcellation surgeries. He estimated the occurrence at somewhere in the range of 1 in 300.

It took the FDA and industry nearly a decade to come to that same conclusion. Within that decade, an unknown number of women were harmed and deceased because their cancers went from localized and treatable to stage four and metastasized within days of being spread by the blades of this device.

What happened with the power morcellator should never be allowed to happen again. We need to ensure that risks are adequately assessed before devices hit the market. We need to monitor the devices once they are on the market. And we need to have efficient and effective reporting procedures in place. And those within industry and the FDA need to be held accountable if it is found that they are turning a blind eye to these issues.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in ensuring that patients and safety always come first.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 19, 2015.
Commissioner MARGARET A. HAMBURG,
U.S. Food and Drug Administration,
Silver Spring, MD.

DEAR COMMISSIONER HAMBURG, I write to seek clarification of your agency's regulation of medical devices. I am specifically looking to obtain answers about the 510(k) process, and hoping to gather information about whether the FDA has plans to alter this process in light of recommendations from the Institute of Medicine (IOM)

It is my understanding that the 510(k) clearance process for medical devices was established through the Medical Devices Amendments (MDA) passed by Congress in 1976. The process was created as a by-product of the three-tiered medical device regulatory framework created by the MDA to balance competing considerations of ensuring product safety and fostering further innovation.

After 1976, medical devices were organized into three classes.

Class I—devices for which general controls such as misbranding and adulteration prohibitions and Good Manufacturing Practices (GMP) suffice to reasonably assure safety and effectiveness.

Class II—devices that require both general controls and product performance to reasonably assure the same.

Class III—devices for which only a pre-market approval (PMA) process similar to new drug approval can ensure safety and effectiveness.

Section 510(k) was created as part of the MDA's attempt to address medical devices that were on the market prior to its enactment and new medical devices introduced later consistently within this framework. Since its creation, the 510(k) process has come to dominate the path to market for virtually all Class I, Class II, and some Class III medical devices despite the fact that consumer protection is severely lacking. To reinforce this statement, it has been reported that between 1976 and 1990, more than 98 percent of FDA-regulated medical devices were cleared through the 510(k) premarket notification, and in the year 2005, almost 99 percent of devices were cleared through the 510(k) process.

In 2011, the FDA sought to address this process, and turned to the Institute of Medi-

cine (IOM) to review the 510(k) process and answer two questions:

1. Does the current 510(k) process protect patients optimally and promote innovation in support of public health?

2. If not, what legislative, regulatory, or administrative changes are recommended to achieve the goals of the 510(k) process optimally?

IOM found that the current 510(k) process is flawed based on its legislative foundation. Rather than continuing to modify the thirty-five year old 510(k) process, the IOM concluded that the FDA's finite resources would be better invested in developing an integrated pre-market and post-market regulatory framework that provides a reasonable assurance of safety and effectiveness throughout the device life cycle. The IOM outlined its criteria for the framework in a comprehensive report they provided to your agency that same year.

Following the release of IOM's recommendation, the US Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor & Pensions (HELP) held a full committee hearing entitled "Medical Devices: Protecting Patients and Promoting Innovation" on November 15, 2011. During this hearing, Jeffrey Shuren, the Director of the Center for Device and Radiological Health (CDRH) within the FDA, provided testimony to Committee Members about CDRH's premarket review process and the center's plan to improve the predictability, consistency, and transparency of their regulatory processes. When asked about 510(k) Mr. Shuren stated that getting rid of this clearance process as IOM suggested would be highly disruptive to both the FDA and medical device manufacturers, but assured the Committee that the FDA would focus on trying to improve the process along with the safety of medical devices.

Nearly four years has passed since this hearing and to my knowledge, the 510(k) process remains the same. I respectfully request that you answer the following questions regarding this process:

1. Does the 510(k) mechanism ensure patient safety in the medical device arena by requiring premarket safety testing?

2. Does the 510(k) mechanism have a specific mechanism for surveillance of adverse outcomes? What are the legislative barriers to FDA surveillance of adverse outcomes in the medical device space?

3. The majority of medical devices in the United States are cleared via the 510(k) process. This process operates based on a "predicate" system. What is the process through which FDA makes the determination that a device is an appropriate predicate?

4. Type 2 devices are reviewed via the 510(k) mechanism. Who assigns a device as being a type 2 device? Is this determination reviewed by any expert committees, and how? If not, why not? Are there specific examples where the Type 2 status was assigned, but was then later changed or should have been changed?

5. As previously mentioned, A committee of The Institute of Medicine concluded and subsequently testified to the senate HELP committee, in 2011, that the 510(k) legislation cannot ensure patient safety and must be overhauled. What specific steps did the FDA take to mitigate the patient safety deficit in response to this analysis?

6. The Institute of Medicine report of 2011 also expressed significant concern to FDA and congress regarding the lack of pre-market safety testing requirements and absence of any post-market adverse outcomes surveillance mechanisms in 510(k). What are the barriers at FDA for implementation of such safety standards in the medical device space?

7. What specific guidelines does the FDA currently use to determine if a device is eligible for a 510(k) application?

8. Does the FDA currently permit persistence of devices approved via 510(k), whose predicate device has been found to be faulty?

The FDA's primary focus should be to ensure patient safety. Please consider the following questions regarding the reporting process and post-market surveillance techniques for harmful medical devices:

9. Does FDA have a legal and prosecutable "positive mandate to self-report adverse outcomes in the medical device space" for individual practitioners? If so have there been any prosecutions for failure to report?

10. Does FDA have a legal and prosecutable "positive mandate to self-report adverse outcomes in the medical device space" for hospitals? If so have there been any prosecutions for failure to report?

11. Does FDA have a legal and prosecutable "positive mandate to self-report adverse outcomes in the medical device space" for device manufacturers? If so have there been any prosecutions for failure to report?

12. The FDA has a database that could be used to report adverse outcomes in the medical device space, known as MAUDE. Public concerns have been raised that this database is a "dead mail-box" with inefficient to ineffective monitoring. How is the MAUDE database monitored? And how are safety concerns registered in MAUDE addressed by FDA?

13. Is there a role for implementation of new legislation to require a window of post-market surveillance of adverse outcomes related to the use of new devices? And can the FDA under its current authority mandate post-market surveillance of adverse outcomes related to the use of new devices?

14. Can the FDA, under its current legal authority, mandate a positive duty for practitioners, organizations that provide health care services, and manufacturers to report adverse outcomes to the FDA? And is there a role for new legislation focused on more strongly and clearly mandating a "positive requirement to self-report adverse outcomes" to FDA by practitioners, hospitals and manufacturers?

15. Please explain the asymmetry between the safety and reporting requirements imposed on the medical device, versus drug industries, by FDA?

The Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH) is the branch of the FDA responsible for the premarket approval of all medical devices, as well as overseeing the manufacturing, performance and safety of these devices. Please respond to the following questions regarding the CDRH:

16. How many people are employed at the CDRH and in what capacities? How effective

is this staff at protecting patient safety and is the first and foremost priority of this group's agenda to protect and promote patient safety? What consumer/patient protection mechanisms have been established by the CDRH to promote patient safety and how is the efficacy of these mechanisms evaluated?

17. Does the CDRH consider the medical device industry as equal stakeholder to patients and consumers in the United States?

Lastly, as you are likely aware, many safety concerns have been raised in conjunction with the use of power morcellators in routine surgeries. Please consider the following questions regarding that specific device.

18. Recently, FDA placed a black box warning on a device known as a power morcellator. FDA recognized and reported to the public that as many as one in 350 unsuspecting American women undergoing morcellation will be at risk of having their occult uterine cancers upstaged with devastating consequences. Johnson & Johnson, the largest manufacturer of the power morcellator subsequently voluntarily recalled its product from the worldwide market. Other manufacturers, such as the german company KARL STORZ, have elected not to recall the product and many gynecologists continue to believe the risk to be minimal.

a. Given the avoidable nature of this potentially deadly hazard and unwillingness of industry advocates and many gynecologists to abandon this practice, why did FDA elect not to ban this device from market?

b. Was there any role for the FDA commissioner's office to exercise its authority under Title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulation, Section 895? And why was this option not exercised?

19. The FDA's analysis demonstrated that up to one in 350 unsuspecting American women undergoing morcellation were put in deadly harm's way using FDA authorized power morcellators. The American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology subsequently demonstrated that the incidence may be as high as one in 156. It, therefore, appears that morcellation and Power morcellators may have caused the unnecessary or premature deaths of many hundreds (if not thousands) of American women for over 2 decades. It now appears that the manufacturers of power morcellators and many gynecological specialty organizations had full knowledge of this hazard. However, no one appears to have reported this potentially deadly hazard back to FDA, a complication associated with the use of this device until December 2013-20 years after the device was introduced to market using 510(k) clearance.

a. Can you confirm that this is, in fact, the case? The reporting of adverse outcomes associated with the use of medical devices is a requirement set forth in the Code of Federal Regulation, Title 21, Section 803. This requirement was not followed by the manufacturers, practitioners, hospitals, or specialty organizations.

b. Is there any role for the FDA, the HHS Office of Inspector General or the United States Congress to inquire and hold FDA, the device manufacturers or the gynecological specialty organizations accountable for the loss of life in the United States?

Thank you in advance for your diligent and timely reply.

Sincerely,

MIKE FITZPATRICK,
Member of Congress.

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

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISIONS TO THE ALLOCATIONS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2016 BUDGET RESOLUTION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, June 17, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, Office of the Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record revisions to the budget allocations of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016, S. Con. Res. 11, pursuant to section 4503 of such concurrent resolution—a Deficit Neutral Reserve Fund Related to the Medicare Provisions of the President's Health Care Law. These revisions are designated for H.R. 1190, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015, as amended pursuant to H. Res. 319. A corresponding table is attached.

This revision represents an adjustment for purposes of budgetary enforcement. These revised allocations are to be considered as the allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to S. Con. Res. 11, as adjusted. Pursuant to section 3403 of such resolution, the revision to the allocations shall apply only while H.R. 1190, as amended pursuant to H. Res. 319, is under consideration or upon its enactment.

Sincerely,

TOM PRICE, M.D.,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget.

TABLE 1—REVISION TO COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS—AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

House Committee	2016		2016–2025 Total	
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Budget Authority	Outlays
Ways and Means				
Current Allocation	962,805	962,080	13,224,077	13,222,960
Adjustment for H.R. 1190, Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015	0	0	7,100	7,100
Revised Allocation	962,805	962,080	13,231,177	13,230,060
Energy & Commerce				
Current Allocation	389,635	392,001	4,341,991	4,346,043
Adjustment for H.R. 1190, Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015	0	0	-8,845	-7,145
Revised Allocation	389,635	392,001	4,333,146	4,338,898

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 18, 2015, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1852. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Depart-

ment's affirmation of interim rule as final rule — Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of the Salable Quantity and Allotment Percentage for Class 3 (Native) Spearmint Oil for the 2014-2015 Marketing Year [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0087; FV14-985-1B FIR] received June 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1853. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tart Cherries Grown in the States of Michigan, et al.; Free and Restricted Percentages for the 2014-15 Crop Year for Tart Cherries [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0077; FV14-930-2 FR] received June 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1854. A letter from the Finance and Loan Analyst, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Reserve Account (RIN: 0575-AC99) received June 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1855. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's affirmation of interim rule as final rule — Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Relaxation of the Handling Regulation for Area No. 3 [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0092; FV15-948-1 FIR] received June 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1856. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2013 Annual Progress Report to Congress on the C.W. Bill Young Cell Transplantation Program and the National Cord Blood Inventory Program, pursuant to the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act of 2005 (Pub. L. 109-129), as amended; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1857. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2012 Annual Progress Report on the C.W. Bill Young Cell Transplantation Program and National Cord Blood Inventory Program, pursuant to the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act of 2005 (Pub. L. 109-129), as amended; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1858. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition of Certain Person to the Entity List [Docket No.: 150304211-5211-01] (RIN: 0694-AG55) received June 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1859. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification of proposed issuance of an export license, pursuant to Secs. 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTT 15-047; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1860. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's FY 2014 annual report, pursuant to 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.

1861. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Federal Employees Health Benefits Program; Rate Setting for Community-Rated Plans (RIN: 3206-AN00) received June 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1862. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, and Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense Joint Executive Committee FY 2014 Annual

Report, pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 8111; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1626. A bill to reduce duplication of information technology at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-162). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1633. A bill to provide for certain improvements relating to the tracking and reporting of employees of the Department of Homeland Security placed on administrative leave, or any other type of paid non-duty status without charge to leave, for personnel matters, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 2200. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear intelligence and information sharing functions of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security and to require dissemination of information analyzed by the Department to entities with responsibilities relating to homeland security, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 2206. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require recipients of State Homeland Security Grant Program funding to preserve and strengthen interoperable emergency communications capabilities, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1640. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit to Congress a report on the Department of Homeland Security headquarters consolidation project in the National Capital Region, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 321. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2146) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-167). 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. ELLISON (for himself, Ms. MOORE, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WELCH, Ms. LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. AL GREEN

of Texas, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California):

H.R. 2798. A bill to modify provisions of law relating to refugee resettlement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, 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. GRIFFITH (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HARPER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 2799. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to stroke telehealth services under the Medicare program; 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. WALBERG (for himself, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas):

H.R. 2800. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to provide protections against pregnancy discrimination in the workplace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BABIN (for himself, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. RATCLIFFE):

H.R. 2801. A bill to prohibit the Administrator of General Services from leasing space for certain purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LABRADOR (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SANFORD, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. PALMER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. SALMON, Mr. WEST-MORELAND, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BABIN, Mr. YOHO, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. ROUZER, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BRAT, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. STEWART):

H.R. 2802. A bill to prevent discriminatory treatment of any person on the basis of views held with respect to marriage; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. ZELDIN:

H.R. 2803. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure State control over academic standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS,

Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 2804. A bill to establish an integrated national approach to respond to ongoing and expected effects of extreme weather and climate change by protecting, managing, and conserving the fish, wildlife, and plants of the United States, and to maximize Government efficiency and reduce costs, in cooperation with State, local, and tribal governments and other entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana (for herself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. MESSER):

H.R. 2805. A bill to address prescription opioid abuse and heroin use; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California):

H.R. 2806. A bill to ensure prompt access to Supplemental Security Income, Social Security disability, and Medicaid benefits for persons released from certain public institutions; 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. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 2807. A bill to create a centralized website on reports issued by the Inspectors General, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mr. FOSTER, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 2808. A bill to prohibit U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement from negotiating contracts with private detention companies that require a minimum number of immigration detention beds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLD (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 2809. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to prohibit sewage dumping into the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. COOPER, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. SCHRADER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BERA, and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 2810. A bill to provide for a review of efforts to reduce Federal agency travel expenses through the use of video conferencing and a plan to achieve additional reductions in such expenses through the use of video conferencing, to implement such plan through rescissions of appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for con-

sideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. JONES, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. GALLEG0, and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 2811. A bill to repeal section 3003 of the the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. YOHO, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. ISSA, Mr. COLE, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ROUZER, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 2812. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for premiums for insurance which constitutes medical care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 2813. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish a grant pilot program to provide housing to elderly homeless veterans; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 2814. A bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Sevierville, Tennessee, the Dannie A. Carr Veterans Outpatient Clinic; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROKITA, and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 2815. A bill to require the Secretary of Education to complete a data analysis study on the impacts of all income- or employment-based outcome measures of quality in higher education before issuing or implementing regulations utilizing such metrics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 2816. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land in Blaine County, Idaho, to the city of Ketchum, Idaho to be used to support recreation, educational, and public purposes, including river restoration, floodplain management, and municipal water storage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TURNER (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. KATKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. CLYBURN):

H.R. 2817. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to extend the authorization of appropriations for the Historic Preservation Fund; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CON-

YERS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H. Res. 322. A resolution recognizing the importance of providing services to children of incarcerated parents; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DESJARLAIS:

H. Res. 323. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Government of Mexico should forthwith repatriate the remains of those American Soldiers who fought in the battle of Monterrey in 1846; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CLAY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. BASS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. PLASKETT, and Mr. RUSH):

H. Res. 324. A resolution recognizing the commencement of Ramadan, the Muslim holy month of fasting and spiritual renewal, and commending Muslims in the United States and throughout the world for their faith; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. HANNA, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VALADAO, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. HAHN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H. Res. 325. A resolution recognizing the month of June as "Immigrant Heritage Month," a celebration of the accomplishments and contributions immigrants and their children have made in shaping the history, strengthening the economy, and enriching the culture of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY
STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 2798.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statement is submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States, which states:

"The Congress shall have 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. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 2799.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 2800.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States; the power to regulate commerce among the several states.

The purpose of the bill is to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to provide protections against pregnancy discrimination in the workplace, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BABIN:

H.R. 2801.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 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. LABRADOR:

H.R. 2802.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation has been written pursuant to protections guaranteed by the First Amendment, which states, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech."

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress "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" as outlined in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution. Additionally, Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution states, Congress shall have power "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof".

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 2803.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 2804.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; and

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 Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana:

H.R. 2805.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 2806.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Clause 1 of section 8 of , Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 2807.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 and 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 2808.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution and Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. DOLD:

H.R. 2809.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 2810.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 2811.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 2812.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 2813.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 2814.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The United States Constitution Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 2815.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States of America

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 2816.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the

general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and 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 Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 2817.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8; and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States of America

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. KATKO, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. ASHFORD.

H.R. 167: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. COHEN, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 169: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 170: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 213: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. ZINKE, and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 333: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 358: Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. PLASKETT, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 540: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 546: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 600: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 605: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 624: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 662: Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 663: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LONG, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 680: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 684: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 692: Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GOWDY, and Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 699: Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 707: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 712: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 746: Mr. POLIS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 766: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 767: Mr. HANNA, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. SIREs.

H.R. 774: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 828: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 829: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 920: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 963: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 970: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 985: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 986: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 999: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 1002: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1087: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 1094: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1151: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 1211: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1247: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 1299: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 1321: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. DOLD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1356: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 1369: Mr. LOEBSACK.

- H.R. 1375: Mr. LOEBACK.
H.R. 1388: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. PITTINGER.
H.R. 1401: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 1427: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 1457: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 1462: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 1464: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1475: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MARINO, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 1479: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 1516: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 1531: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 1533: Mr. COHEN and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 1559: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 1599: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DENT, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, and Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 1608: Ms. MOORE, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 1610: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 1624: Mr. POLIS, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HUDSON, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 1655: Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. TAKAI.
H.R. 1684: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 1728: Mr. TAKAI.
H.R. 1742: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 1752: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota and Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 1769: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 1781: Mrs. TORRES and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 1814: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. CARNEY, and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 1834: Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 1848: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 1854: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 1900: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 1901: Mr. JORDAN.
H.R. 1910: Ms. MOORE and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 1920: Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 1953: Mr. WESTERMAN and Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 1964: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 1977: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 1982: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 1994: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mr. ZINKE.
H.R. 2017: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 2019: Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 2043: Mr. TONKO and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 2072: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2083: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2096: Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 2102: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 2123: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 2124: Mr. POCAN, Ms. ESTY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2128: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 2141: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 2147: Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLEAVER, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 2148: Mr. RICE of South Carolina and Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 2156: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2216: Mr. TAKAI.
H.R. 2217: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2230: Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 2259: Mr. ISSA.
H.R. 2260: Mr. GALLEGO.
H.R. 2280: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 2303: Mrs. DINGELL and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 2309: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2358: Mr. WESTERMAN.
H.R. 2362: Mr. PITTINGER and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2404: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2407: Mr. VALADAO and Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 2410: Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 2429: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2431: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2450: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2457: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2477: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 2500: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 2516: Mr. COHEN and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2523: Mr. LOEBACK.
H.R. 2560: Mr. PALMER.
H.R. 2567: Mr. KLINE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 2576: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 2582: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 2609: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 2616: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2646: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 2652: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 2653: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 2654: Mr. KILMER, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 2658: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 2660: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 2662: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2669: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 2675: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 2689: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2692: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2694: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2697: Mr. COHEN, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 2698: Mr. GUINTA.
H.R. 2710: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 2716: Mr. LABRADOR.
H.R. 2726: Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 2739: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 2742: Ms. GRAHAM.
H.R. 2747: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 2750: Ms. MCSALLY.
H.R. 2770: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 2775: Mr. ROSS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mrs. LOVE.
H.R. 2788: Mr. MARCHANT.
H. J. Res. 22: Mr. TAKAI.
H. J. Res. 32: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. PASCRELL.
H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. PETERS.
H. Con. Res. 53: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Con. Res. 55: Mr. SERRANO and Ms. HAHN.
H. Res. 34: Mr. COSTA, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H. Res. 139: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. SHERMAN.
H. Res. 207: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. NORCROSS.
H. Res. 220: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KLINE, Mr. HENSARLING, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. STIVERS.
H. Res. 291: Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. Radewagen, Mr. CLAY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. RUSH.
H. Res. 310: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. SIREN.

DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

- H.R. 2588: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.