



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2015

No. 158

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 27, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID G. VALADAO 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.

THE SPEAKER'S RACE

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, between 2000 and 2014, in the 16 to 65 age bracket, although the American economy created 5.6 million net new jobs, American-born citizens lost 127,000 jobs. All job gains in America—and more—went to people born in foreign countries.

In 2012, 51 percent of households headed by immigrants relied on welfare compared to 30 percent of households headed by someone born in America,

thus driving up America's deficits and driving down America's ability to pay for safety nets for Americans.

This week I vote on PAUL RYAN's bid for House Speaker. While PAUL RYAN has excellent communication skills, is charismatic, understands the economic risk of out-of-control deficits, and the like, PAUL RYAN and I have a major disagreement on border security.

Last week, on October 22, PAUL RYAN, I, and others met about his candidacy. Border security was discussed. Thereafter, I hand-delivered to PAUL RYAN, on the House floor, at, roughly, 4 p.m., a letter that states:

"Paul: Struggling American families have lost more than 8 million job opportunities to illegal aliens. All lower and middle income American workers have suffered from suppressed wages caused by the surge in both illegal alien and lawful immigrant labor supply.

"Your past record and current stance on immigration conflicts with the values of the Americans I represent and causes great concern to me and the Americans I represent.

"Yesterday during discussions about the Speaker race, you made two representations about immigration that stood out. They are:

"1. It is unwise or unproductive to bring up any immigration legislation so long as Barack Obama is President.

"2. As Speaker, you will not allow any immigration bill to reach the House Floor for a vote unless the immigration bill is 'supported by a majority of the majority' of Republican House Members.

"Although you talk faster than I can write your words down, I believe the above statements properly reflect what you said. I send this letter to confirm that I accurately portray your remarks and that I may rely on them when the House Floor Vote for Speaker occurs next week.

"If my portrayal of your words errs in any respect, please deliver to me

(before the GOP Conference meeting next week in which we are to conduct Speaker elections) a written communication correcting my errors.

"If I do not receive such a communication from you, then I will infer that you concur that my portrayal of your remarks is accurate and that I, and the rest of the GOP Conference, and the American people, may rely on your words as I have written them.

"I need your assurance that you will not use the Speaker's position to advance your immigration policies, except when in accord with the two above statements, because there is a huge gap between your immigration position and the wishes of the American citizens I represent. Your words yesterday constitute the needed assurance.

"If your assurances as I have portrayed them are accurate, then I am much more comfortable voting for you for Speaker on the House Floor (and will do so, absent something startling coming to my attention between now and the election, which I don't anticipate).

"If, however, you would use the Speaker's chair to advance an immigration belief system that is unacceptable to the Americans I represent, it will be very difficult for me to vote for you for Speaker on the House Floor.

"To be clear, I intend to publicly share this letter and your responding letter, if any, to help explain to my constituents why I voted as I did on the House Floor in the Speaker's election.

"Thank you for considering the contents of this letter."

At roughly 5:20 p.m., PAUL RYAN called me and stated that my letter accurately portrayed his immigration representations. PAUL RYAN confirmed that he meant what he said and would keep his word.

Based on PAUL RYAN's representations and my trust that PAUL RYAN is a man of his word, I will vote for PAUL RYAN for House Speaker on the House floor if he is the Republican nominee.

□ 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.

H7191

Mr. Speaker, I submit this letter for the RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 22, 2015.

Hand-delivered on House Floor to Paul Ryan at approx. 4 p.m., 10/22/15

Paul Ryan called Mo and confirmed accuracy of letter via phone at 5:20 p.m. (during staff meeting)

Re: Immigration Positions & Speaker Race.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,

Chairman, Ways and Means Committee.

PAUL: Struggling American families have lost more than 8 million job opportunities to illegal aliens. All lower and middle income American workers have suffered from suppressed wages caused by the surge in both illegal alien and lawful immigrant labor supply.

Your past record and current stance on immigration conflicts with the values of the Americans I represent and causes great concern to me and the Americans I represent.

Yesterday during discussions about the Speaker race, you made two representations about immigration that stood out. They are:

1. It is unwise or unproductive to bring up any immigration legislation so long as Barack Obama is President.

2. As Speaker, you will not allow any immigration bill to reach the House Floor for a vote unless the immigration bill is "supported by a majority of the majority" of Republican House Members.

Although you talk faster than I can write your words down, I believe the above statements properly reflect what you said. I send this letter to confirm that I accurately portray your remarks and that I may rely on them when the House Floor Vote for Speaker occurs next week.

If my portrayal of your words errs in any respect, please deliver to me (before the GOP Conference meeting next week in which we are to conduct Speaker elections) a written communication correcting my errors.

If I do not receive such a communication from you, then I will infer that you concur that my portrayal of your remarks is accurate and that I, and the rest of the GOP Conference, and the American people, may rely on your words as I have written them.

I need your assurance that you will not use the Speaker's position to advance your immigration policies, except when in accord with the two above statements, because there is a huge gap between your immigration position and the wishes of the American citizens I represent. Your words yesterday constitute the needed assurance.

If your assurances as I have portrayed them are accurate, then I am much more comfortable voting for you for Speaker on the House Floor (and will do so, absence something startling coming to my attention between now and the election, which I don't anticipate).

If, however, you would use the Speaker's chair to advance an immigration belief system that is unacceptable to the Americans I represent, it will be very difficult for me to vote for you for Speaker on the House Floor.

To be clear, I intend to publicly share this letter and your responding letter, if any, to help explain to my constituents why I voted as I did on the House Floor in the Speaker's election.

Thank you for considering the contents of this letter.

Sincerely,

MORRIS J. "MO" BROOKS, JR.,
M.C., AL-5.

A BIPARTISAN MAJORITY—A NEW PRECEDENT FOR SOLVING PROBLEMS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in over a dozen years, an unusual legislative procedure—a discharge petition—has been successfully mounted in the House. This is an extraordinary effort to allow the House to work its will—a mechanism that was part of a package of reform, dating back over a century, to deal with the iron rule of Speaker Joe Cannon. The subject of the petition, the Ex-Im Bank, was almost as obscure as the procedure that brought it to the House.

This is an agency that for over 70 years has provided financing for transactions similar to which all of our competitor nations provide their exporting companies. In this case, American companies will have the credit tools that will enable them to cost-effectively engage in international transactions that other private institutions won't finance because of political or commercial risks.

Even if providing this service meant a modest exposure to the taxpayer, which might occasionally cost money, it was probably worth it to have the businesses support good-paying American jobs and to be able to compete with foreign companies.

Yes, it would be worth it. It is not just a low-risk proposition. The Ex-Im Bank is a service that has made billions of dollars for the United States Treasury. It turns a profit—about \$2 million in the last 2 fiscal years.

This is interesting—a service that all of our competitor nations provide their companies. It hasn't cost the taxpayers any money. In fact, it makes money for the Treasury. Why was it allowed to expire?

This is another example of where a minority of the House, for ideological reasons, decided they were going to take over the process. In this case, they were going to kill the Ex-Im Bank. They did so over the objections of the administration, of the business community, of many Members of Congress, of people in organized labor.

It was hard to maintain decorum during last night's debate when the chair of the committee complained that, somehow, by approving the discharge petition and the procedural motions that followed, we were stifling the will of the House. I smiled as people lamented that they would not be able to offer amendments. Members came to the floor, saying they had amendments they wished they could offer and now they were being shut out.

How ironic.

His committee had no intention of allowing the House to participate in the give-and-take of legislation he was lamenting was slipping away. His committee didn't allow this proposal to come to the floor. The committee did

not amend and refine the Ex-Im Bank. The committee killed it by having the authorization expire without giving the whole House a chance to be part of that decision.

Now the people who were caught on the wrong side of the majority of the House, with a losing argument and a minority position, were suddenly concerned that the House was being shut out. They had been shutting out the House for the last 2 years. They had denied efforts at reform. Only when their hand was forced did they somehow resort to the most specious of arguments. This is like, as they say, the person who kills his parents and then pleads for mercy from the court because he is an orphan.

There is no reform because they didn't want reform. They were the ones who shut the House out. Now, because of the courageous action by a bipartisan group, led by our Republican colleagues—eloquently and bravely—the House will no longer be shut out. American business will be stronger; and the House has demonstrated that there sometimes will be opportunities for a bipartisan majority to have its interests represented.

We can only hope that this sets a precedent for how we solve other problems, from raising the debt ceiling, to dealing with budgets, to rebuilding and renewing America. Involve the entire House—solutions are possible—and America will be better served.

THE TRIUMPH OF EVIL

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

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, President Obama used his veto power for the fifth time since taking office. This time, it was to reject the \$612 billion defense authorization bill: H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act.

President Obama vetoed the defense bill on the same day that an American was killed in Iraq. With so much uncertainty and conflict around the world, I would have expected our President to have understood the importance of supporting this bipartisan defense bill. This veto is inexcusable. Not only is this a blatant show of disrespect for our troops, but it is disrespect for our Nation.

The National Defense Authorization Act also contains key provisions that will greatly benefit my State of West Virginia. The provisions include the drug interdiction and counterdrug program, the National Guard State Partnership Program, and \$3.9 million in funding for the Charleston, West Virginia, Air National Guard Base.

It is shortsighted and wrong that the President refused to sign this critical defense bill. The bill gives our troops essential resources, but President Obama vetoed it because he wants concessions in other areas of government spending.

It is time to stop playing politics with our military. I urge my colleagues in the House and Senate to join together to override this veto.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I stood on the floor of this Chamber and shared the stories of my constituents who have family members in Syria who are experiencing the political turmoil that is seen on the news daily. These stories paint a disturbing picture of what life is like in Syria right now.

Syrian dictator Bashar al-Assad is inflicting a reign of terror on his own people that include the worst kinds of torture, the repeated uses of chemical weapons bombardments, and the siege and starvation of innocent people. Assad has killed more than 130,000 of his own people and has forced an additional 3 to 4 million to flee the country.

These problems have been exacerbated by the failure of leadership from the United States of America. It is not just that Obama has a bad plan for how to handle the crisis in Syria. It is that he has no plan at all.

Edmund Burke once said: "All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing."

That is exactly what the Obama administration has done: nothing. Evil is triumphing because of it. Innocent people will continue to die if we do not act now. We must take the first step and establish a no-fly zone so that Assad cannot continue to bomb his own people from the sky. It is so photos like these won't be commonplace in our news.

This critical action will help, but we have to do more. I call upon this administration to wake up to that fact.

□ 1015

A POWERFUL COALITION

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, over the last several weeks, I visited six high schools in my district to meet with juniors and seniors, about 2,000 students in total.

Almost all of the students I meet are U.S. citizens. The majority are Latinos. Some have immigrant parents, and most will soon be eligible to vote.

All of them have one question for me. It starts every Q and A at every high school I visit. The questions are about Donald Trump. Is he going to be our next President? Is it true that he wants to revoke our citizenship and deport us to the countries our parents came from? Is it true he wants to round us up, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and deport us all?

It is very sad when the questions a Congressman gets from American high school students are about how much they should fear their own government, whether their own government is going to break up their families, whether their own government is going to treat

them not as citizens and as equal partners, but as outsiders and pariahs in their own country.

When they hear that Trump is "leading in the polls," they think that means there is a pretty good chance that he will be the next President. When they see him on TV shows like Jimmy Fallon, not to mention CNN and Fox News, they get the feeling that he is a celebrity that all of us in America admire.

When they hear that Trump is hosting "Saturday Night Live"—not just being a guest but actually hosting, even after saying Mexican are mostly rapists, criminals, and drug dealers—they get the impression that calling whole groups of people rapists, criminals, and drug dealers based on their ethnicity or national origin is basically okay with us in America.

The real question these Chicago-area high school students have is: Hey, GUTIÉRREZ, what are you going to do to defend us from Donald Trump? What are you going to do to stand up for us?

This leads to an intense discussion about American politics. And I ask the students right back: What are you going to do to stand up for yourselves, for your community?

Look, motivating 17- and 18-year-olds to do something is not always easy, including motivating them to register to vote when they are old enough and to actually go out and vote. But when I ask these young Americans whether they plan to get registered and vote, every hand goes up in the classroom.

Donald Trump is spurring youth voter mobilization like I have never seen before. Nationally, we know that 93 percent of Latinos under the age of 18 are citizens of the United States and that every 30 seconds a Latino citizen turns 18. That is about a million a year for the next decade or so. If they are half as motivated as the young people I am talking to in Chicago, Donald Trump could have a tremendous impact on the youth vote in the coming election.

But let's be honest, do we really want to motivate civic participation through fear of deportation, racial profiling, and families being broken up? These are American teenagers growing up to distrust their government.

Trump wants to take us back to the good old days of race relations, which apparently means the 1950s, when President Eisenhower evicted millions of immigrants and U.S. citizens from the United States. Dr. Carson, who believes that human history is only about 5,000 years old—that is what he says, we have only been around 5,000 years—says of mass deportation schemes: "I think it's worth discussing."

Here in the House, we have considered measures to deport children more quickly, to make groups more distrustful of the police, and to delay Homeland Security funding.

Testifying on one of these bills before the Rules Committee last year, I made

the unfortunate but real suggestion that Republicans were gravitating toward mass deportation policies, which provoked a response from the chairman, Mr. SESSIONS. He said: GUTIÉRREZ, "there is no one in responsible Republican leadership that has said we should deport 13 or 11 million people. And I find it extremely distasteful that people would come here and suggest things that we have not suggested."

Well, now that people are suggesting mass deportation openly and are gaining in the public opinion polls in the Republican Party, I wonder why there is so much silence from the Republican Members of this body.

But it is not just young Latino voters in Chicago that are being motivated by Republican attacks. When Republicans attack Planned Parenthood and block laws to guarantee equal pay for women, that motivates women to register and vote. When Republicans celebrate people who will not issue marriage licenses to two men or two women, a lot of people in the LGBT community get motivated to register and vote.

When Republicans rail against unions and block increases in the minimum wage, while, of course, they earn \$174,000 a year, and block environmental standards and block sensible gun laws, a lot of working class and middle class Americans get motivated to register and vote.

Together with those young people I talked about at those high schools, we are forming a very, very powerful coalition, a coalition so powerful that some day, even Republicans themselves will want to be part of it.

HOLDING THE EPA ACCOUNTABLE

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring awareness to the reckless acts of the Environmental Protection Agency.

On August 5, 2015, the EPA triggered the release of millions of gallons of toxic waste into the Animas River near Durango, Colorado, containing lead, arsenic, and other pollutants.

Originally, contaminated water was seeping into the Gold King Mine from another nearby mine. When the Gold King Mine owner refused to allow the EPA on his property, the EPA threatened to fine him up to \$35,000 a day—let me repeat—\$35,000 a day for a leak that wasn't coming from the owner's mine. It was only after these thuggish threats that he was forced to let the EPA on his property.

In fact, as recently as last week, investigators from the Interior Department concluded their independent investigation into the August spill and determined that the spill was preventable and occurred due to the actions of the EPA. The best that EPA administrator Gina McCarthy could do is say

that she was “deeply sorry” and that the spill was a “tragic and unfortunate accident.” That is not all; there was no accountability, no reparation, nothing.

How can the American people trust a government agency charged with protecting our environment when the same Agency is responsible for causing even more damage? Actions speak louder than words. This is more of the same from the EPA. They are another arm of the Federal Government looking to bully private citizens, but this is nothing new from the EPA.

Almost a decade ago, a gentleman from my district faced a costly, almost devastating battle with the EPA. Mr. Paul McKnight owned an old cotton warehouse in Senoia, Georgia. After a former deadbeat tenant of Mr. McKnight, who had already been responsible for the EPA spending \$1.6 million in a brownfield cleanup, could not afford to remove 2,000 barrels of toxic waste from this warehouse that Mr. McKnight knew did not exist, the EPA was called in to inspect the building by some anonymous caller who said that they could smell a leak. Once the EPA got there, their inspector said they couldn't smell a leak. There was no leak, but they did find 2,000 barrels containing toxic material.

Without Mr. McKnight's knowledge, the EPA declared this warehouse an “imminent fire hazard” and cleaned up the chemicals at a cost of \$800,000, even though the previous tenant had a bid of 170. Later, at a public forum, an EPA representative stated that the EPA had the funds to clean up the warehouse, only to bill Mr. McKnight later for that overpriced cleanup. Not only did they bill him for the overpriced cleanup, but they sought over \$1 million in cleanup fees and placed a lien on his real estate holdings, including his farm and his home.

I helped Mr. McKnight to get the case reconsidered. After 8 years in court, he was able to get it reduced down to \$600,000.

The EPA shouldn't use legal loopholes and cover behind exemptions at the cost of taxpayers and, not only that, to charge somebody that had no knowledge of the barrels even being there, rather than the man who put the barrels there. This gentleman served 1 year and 4 months in Federal prison for this. It was his second offense, and yet Mr. McKnight was fined over \$1 million.

That is why I have introduced three bills over the last 2 months targeting the EPA. My bills: H.R. 3531, No Exemptions for EPA Act; H.R. 3655, EPA Pays Act; and H.R. 3699, Judgment Fund Taxpayer Accountability Act are all aimed at holding the EPA to the same standards and requirements as private citizens.

My bills remove these legal loopholes from the EPA and force them to repay the Federal Government for any damages the EPA causes. If I were to accidentally cause the same disaster, do you think that I would get off by just

saying “I'm sorry and I promise not to do it again”? That is why we have introduced these three bills.

So I ask my colleagues to, please, join me in holding the EPA accountable in any future accidents by supporting H.R. 3531, 3655, and 3699.

DEBT CEILING

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, in 1983, President Ronald Reagan wrote to then-Senate Majority Leader Howard Baker, urging him to raise the debt ceiling. In his letter, he said: “The risks, the costs, the disruptions, and the incalculable damage lead me to but one conclusion: The Senate must pass this legislation before the Congress adjourns.”

Twenty-three years later, we now find ourselves 1 week away from defaulting on our debt for the first time in our Nation's history. Instead of making sure we preserve the full faith and credit of the United States, as President Reagan had done 18 times during his tenure, some want to hold our economy hostage to extract ideological wins.

This is not the time for partisan bickering and political gamesmanship, not when it means delaying Social Security benefits for seniors and those with disabilities, withholding paychecks from our brave Active Duty servicemembers, and postponing interest payments on government-issued bonds.

We have a responsibility to live up to our obligations no matter what. That is not politics; it is basic governing.

The longer we wait to meet our obligations and raise the debt ceiling, the closer we get to another credit rating downgrade, a spike in interest rates, and a severe slowdown in economic growth. This is not an overstatement.

Let's look back at what happened in 2013 during the last debt ceiling standoff. Just the possibility of default caused rates on Treasuries to rise by almost half a percentage point. That cost taxpayers as much as \$70 million.

This time around, if we actually default, market forecasters estimate that interest payments on Treasuries would increase Federal deficits by \$10 billion over the short term and by \$70 billion a year after that. That is money that wouldn't be going to critical investments in research and development, education, and infrastructure.

On top of that, higher interest rates on Treasuries could lead to a 1 percent reduction in GDP. That would mean the loss of almost 700,000 jobs, and that is just a conservative estimate.

Make no mistake, every American would be impacted. Middle class families looking to buy a home would face higher mortgage rates. A half a percentage point increase in mortgage rates would increase the lifetime cost of an average home loan by almost

\$19,000. Small-business owners would face difficulties trying to secure new loans as lending tightens up. And students will have an even harder time trying to pay for college as student loan rates skyrocket.

We owe it to our constituents to move toward responsible governing and away from governing by crisis, which has become all too common around here.

The bipartisan budget package unveiled last night affirms the full faith and credit of the United States and represents real progress for hard-working American families who are tired of threats of default and partisan gridlock.

Now is not the time for politics. Now is the time for thoughtful consideration, bipartisan compromise, and, most importantly, finding a path forward for the American people.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, this is the last week of National Breast Cancer Awareness Month. Before it ends, I would tell the American people about two amazing women from Sugar Land, Texas, two good friends of my family, two women who are here for a reason, two people who are touching others in need, two people who are making a difference.

□ 1030

Meet Irma and Sasha. Stunning, aren't they? They are related. They look like sisters, but they are not. They are mother and daughter. The mom, Irma, is on the left. Her baby girl, Sasha, is on the right. Irma and Sasha are sisters in a cause. Both have fought breast cancer, and both have won.

Each year over 200,000 American women hear four crushing words: You have breast cancer. Irma feared those words because she knew they may be coming. Both of her sisters heard those four words. One died.

Irma beat her cancer, but lived in fear. With her family's history of breast cancer, her daughter had a good chance of hearing those four terrible words. Five years after Irma beat breast cancer, Sasha banged on her door, crying without end. She was 31, and she had aggressive breast cancer.

Irma was by Sasha's side every second of her fight against cancer. Mom watched her daughter lose each breast. Mom watched her daughter go through 16 rounds of harsh chemotherapy. Mom watched her daughter lose all of her hair, her eyebrows, her eyelashes. Mom watched her daughter lose that smile. Sasha thought that she was no longer beautiful. Her will to fight was decreasing.

Irma took charge. She told Sasha that “no matter how sick you feel, get

up, shower, and put some lipstick on. You are beautiful.”

Then it hit both of them. They were women of style and grace. Cancer took that away. The only wigs they could find looked good on circus clowns. There was not a beauty shop for women with breast cancer, a place where they are pampered, a place where they are beautiful. They were going to end that.

Dad had no choice. He gave Sasha his life savings, and in 2013 my wife and I walked into our friends' dream store, Cure & Co., on its opening day. Cure & Co. gives women with cancer real wigs, real facials, and real beauty products. Sasha and Irma give their clients hope and love in the worst of times, the greatest gifts of all.

Look one last time at Irma and Sasha. They are gorgeous, stunning, and beautiful. They have had breast cancer. Both of them have beaten breast cancer, and both of them will never leave the fight until breast cancer is cured forever.

REFUGEE CRISIS IN EUROPE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last week I came to the floor and recommended that the Obama administration appoint a special envoy with a very broad portfolio: dispatched to work on a diplomatic solution to the tragedy that is destroying Syria and unfolding in the Middle East, now having broad impact in greater Europe.

I want to point out to those who are listening that the displacement crisis in the Middle East, centered in Syria, has consumed seven nations and propelled the largest refugee crisis Europe has faced since World War II. Already in Syria, over a quarter of a million people have been killed—civilians—and that is probably a low number.

With over 12 million people displaced, Europe is being besieged by hundreds of thousands, legions, of the dispossessed. Meanwhile, it almost seems surreal that no effective diplomatic negotiation is underway that holds the prospect of leading to peace.

I again ask the Obama administration to dispatch a special envoy with a broad portfolio to work full time on a diplomatic solution to the tragedy that is destroying Syria.

Then yesterday in The New York Times appeared an editorial by the legendary 39th President of the United States, Jimmy Carter, entitled “A Plan to End the Syrian Crisis.” I served President Carter during his years in the Presidency.

I well remember the incredible moment in 1979 when President Carter stood with Anwar Sadat, the President of Egypt, and the Prime Minister of Israel, Menachem Begin, and they signed that treaty in March of 1979. Who would have ever thought that that moment in history would have been possible? Yet, until today, that treaty

holds between Egypt and Israel, and it has made a gigantic difference in the saving of lives in that extremely troubled region.

In his editorial to The New York Times, President Carter references that the Carter Center—which he founded and to which he has dedicated his life with his wife Rosalyn ever since his service as President—has been deeply involved in Syria since the early 1980s. Who would know more than he?

He recommends the only real chance of ending the conflict is to engage the United States, Russia, Iran, Turkey, and Saudi Arabia in preparing a comprehensive peace protocol with Syria. He knows what that requires. He recommends a cease-fire, formation of a unity government, constitutional reforms, and elections.

Mr. Speaker, I include for today's RECORD the editorial entitled “A Plan to End the Syrian Crisis.”

I say to my colleagues and to those who are listening: As we watch this tragedy unfold, our Nation is the most powerful nation in the world. Surely, we should have the wisdom and the will to take this latest tragedy, which we had no small part in precipitating, and find a way to bring the parties to the table.

What is happening in Syria due to the lack of a diplomatic solution is now impacting Europe in ways that we have not seen since World War II. It is very destabilizing.

With what is happening inside Ukraine today due to Russia's invasion, with over 1.7 million displaced persons internally, if Russia would happen to turn the tourniquet tighter in eastern Ukraine and cause additional displacement across Europe, imagine what the winter months would bring.

I can't urge in strong enough terms that the Obama administration pay heed to President Carter's very lucid editorial in yesterday's New York Times. I commend all Members and citizens to read it.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 26, 2015]

A PLAN TO END THE SYRIAN CRISIS

(By Jimmy Carter)

I have known Bashar al-Assad, the president of Syria, since he was a college student in London, and have spent many hours negotiating with him since he has been in office. This has often been at the request of the United States government during those many times when our ambassadors have been withdrawn from Damascus because of diplomatic disputes.

Bashar and his father, Hafez, had a policy of not speaking to anyone at the American Embassy during those periods of estrangement, but they would talk to me. I noticed that Bashar never referred to a subordinate for advice or information. His most persistent characteristic was stubbornness; it was almost psychologically impossible for him to change his mind—and certainly not when under pressure.

Before the revolution began in March 2011, Syria set a good example of harmonious relations among its many different ethnic and religious groups, including Arabs, Kurds,

Greeks, Armenians and Assyrians who were Christians, Jews, Sunnis, Alawites and Shiites. The Assad family had ruled the country since 1970, and was very proud of this relative harmony among these diverse groups.

When protesters in Syria demanded long overdue reforms in the political system, President Assad saw this as an illegal revolutionary effort to overthrow his “legitimate” regime and erroneously decided to stamp it out by using unnecessary force. Because of many complex reasons, he was supported by his military forces, most Christians, Jews, Shiite Muslims, Alawites and others who feared a takeover by radical Sunni Muslims. The prospect for his overthrow was remote.

The Carter Center had been deeply involved in Syria since the early 1980s, and we shared our insights with top officials in Washington, seeking to preserve an opportunity for a political solution to the rapidly growing conflict. Despite our persistent but confidential protests, the early American position was that the first step in resolving the dispute had to be the removal of Mr. Assad from office. Those who knew him saw this as a fruitless demand, but it has been maintained for more than four years. In effect, our prerequisite for peace efforts has been an impossibility.

Kofi Annan, the former United Nations secretary general, and Lakhdar Brahimi, a former Algerian foreign minister, tried to end the conflict as special representatives of the United Nations, but abandoned the effort as fruitless because of incompatibilities among America, Russia and other nations regarding the status of Mr. Assad during a peace process.

In May 2015, a group of global leaders known as the Elders visited Moscow, where we had detailed discussions with the American ambassador, former President Mikhail S. Gorbachev, former Prime Minister Yevgeny M. Primakov, Foreign Minister Sergey V. Lavrov and representatives of international think tanks, including the Moscow branch of the Carnegie Center.

They pointed out the longstanding partnership between Russia and the Assad regime and the great threat of the Islamic State to Russia, where an estimated 14 percent of its population are Sunni Muslims. Later, I questioned President Putin about his support for Mr. Assad, and about his two sessions that year with representatives of factions from Syria. He replied that little progress had been made, and he thought that the only real chance of ending the conflict was for the United States and Russia to be joined by Iran, Turkey and Saudi Arabia in preparing a comprehensive peace proposal. He believed that all factions in Syria, except the Islamic State, would accept almost any plan endorsed strongly by these five, with Iran and Russia supporting Mr. Assad and the other three backing the opposition. With his approval, I relayed this suggestion to Washington.

For the past three years, the Carter Center has been working with Syrians across political divides, armed opposition group leaders and diplomats from the United Nations and Europe to find a political path for ending the conflict. This effort has been based on data-driven research about the Syrian catastrophe that the center has conducted, which reveals the location of different factions and clearly shows that neither side in Syria can prevail militarily.

The recent decision by Russia to support the Assad regime with airstrikes and other military forces has intensified the fighting, raised the level of armaments and may increase the flow of refugees to neighboring countries and Europe. At the same time, it has helped to clarify the choice between a political process in which the Assad regime

assumes a role and more war in which the Islamic State becomes an even greater threat to world peace. With these clear alternatives, the five nations mentioned above could formulate a unanimous proposal. Unfortunately, differences among them persist.

Iran outlined a general four-point sequence several months ago, consisting of a ceasefire, formation of a unity government, constitutional reforms and elections. Working through the United Nations Security Council and utilizing a five-nation proposal, some mechanism could be found to implement these goals.

The involvement of Russia and Iran is essential. Mr. Assad's only concession in four years of war was giving up chemical weapons, and he did so only under pressure from Russia and Iran. Similarly, he will not end the war by accepting concessions imposed by the West, but is likely to do so if urged by his allies.

Mr. Assad's governing authority could then be ended in an orderly process, an acceptable government established in Syria, and a concerted effort could then be made to stamp out the threat of the Islamic State.

The needed concessions are not from the combatants in Syria, but from the proud nations that claim to want peace but refuse to cooperate with one another.

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 39 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Prior to the Great Compromise, Benjamin Franklin addressed the Constitutional Convention: "We indeed seem to feel our own want of political wisdom, since we have been running about in search of it. In this situation of this assembly, groping as it were in the dark to find political truth and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, have we now forgotten (our) powerful friend?"

Lord, You are the powerful friend referred to by Franklin, and we turn again to You to ask that Your wisdom might break through the political discussions of these days.

Bless the Members of the people's House and all of Congress with the insight and foresight to construct a future of security in our Nation's politics, economy, and society. May they, as You, be especially mindful of those who are poor and without power.

May all that is done today 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 gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DOLD 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.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, October marks Breast Cancer Awareness Month, a month to especially recognize and celebrate breast cancer patients, survivors, and advocates. While breast cancer affects individuals and families throughout the year, I especially appreciate the awareness and advocacy efforts that occur this week, especially the Walk for Life and Women's Night Out.

The Walk for Life/Race for Life at Palmetto Health, though rescheduled due to tragic flooding, is celebrating 25 years of raising funds and awareness for survivors and treatment in the Midlands. In the past 25 years, the Walk for Life, led by Chair Janet Snider, has gone from 200 participants in the first year to over 11,000 participants last year, raising over \$800,000.

Women's Night Out at Lexington Medical Center, led by President Mike Biediger, is an inspiring evening at Burkett, Burkett & Burkett CPAs where the hospital honors breast cancer patients, survivors, and their families.

I know firsthand of the success at Lexington Medical Center where my son, Addison, in high school, was successfully treated for thyroid cancer and now himself is an orthopedic surgeon.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President by his actions never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this summer, when a small group of Republicans successfully blocked the renewal of the Export-Import Bank, they were very dismissive of the negative effects their efforts would have on job creation here in our country. Now it is autumn, and without the Ex-Im Bank, we are losing American jobs.

Last month, General Electric announced it will move production of large, gas-powered engines to Canada, along with 350 jobs, because the company cannot access financing from the Export-Import Bank.

Boeing was recently told by a Singapore-based satellite company not even to bother bidding on a satellite contract because they lacked the financing from Ex-Im.

These are just a few real-life examples of the real-world consequences of letting Ex-Im expire. There is never a good time to commit economic suicide.

I urge my colleagues to join together in renewing the Export-Import Bank and saving and growing American jobs.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS 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 October as Breast Cancer Awareness Month. This disease has touched everyone in some way, and we must do all we can to fight it.

An astonishing one in eight women will be diagnosed with breast cancer over the course of her lifetime. This is one of the many reasons that I supported increased funding for the National Institutes of Health. American scientists and researchers are the best in the world, but they do need our support to put an end to this disease once and for all.

I am also proud to be the lead Republican sponsor of H.R. 1925, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Dr. Ernie Bodai, the creator of the breast cancer research stamp. Since its introduction in 1998, the stamp has been an effective tool for increasing awareness and has raised over \$80 million to support the cause.

This month, please take a moment to join me in remembering those who lost the battle to breast cancer, while celebrating survivors, those currently fighting the disease, and all of those helping women live longer, healthier lives.

SOLAR ENERGY

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, solar energy serves the national interest in a number of ways. It is reducing our reliance on fossil fuels that are causing climate change. It is helping America

to become energy independent. It is creating jobs, 3,000 of them, at or near the solar plant under construction in Buffalo, New York.

Solar panels empower consumers to generate clean and affordable energy at home and to sell the extra energy that they do not use to the grid. A policy called "net metering," which requires utilities to pay a fair price for this energy to the consumer, is currently in place in all but six States. It has been vital to the growth of the solar industry by providing consumers with certainty on the savings that solar will produce in their energy bill.

That is why I have introduced legislation to direct the Department of Energy to conduct a study on all of the impacts of net metering. Through a comprehensive analysis, we can ensure that regulators and policymakers have the accurate information they need to make a sound decision on whether to support consumer-generated solar energy.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT VETOED

(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, my heart breaks for our military men and women who last week watched their Commander in Chief as he vetoed the NDAA, the National Defense Authorization Act. This was a bill that would give them more pay and better benefits for the job that they are doing. He vetoed it, great flourish, called a ceremony.

He vetoed the bill because he wanted more money for his domestic agenda that includes more money for broken agencies like the EPA and the IRS. Imagine that.

In Congress, our first responsibility is to provide for the common defense, and the NDAA just does that.

This year's defense bill passed both the House and the Senate with an overwhelming bipartisan majority. It is the most reform-centered defense bill in decades.

It includes pay and benefits for our troops. Did you know 83 percent of our military personnel have retired with no retirement benefits? It changes that.

The President vetoed it. It would have given them 401(k)-style benefits. The President vetoed it. He should be ashamed of those actions. The men and women in uniform deserve better.

NATION'S CRUMBLING INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, well, it is long past time for Congress to do its job and get serious about funding a long-term solution to fix our crumbling roads and bridges, all of our infrastructure in this country.

In Michigan, of all States, we know that we need to invest in order to grow our economy. To build a 21st century economy, we need state-of-the-art infrastructure.

No more short-term fixes, no more month-to-month funding. I have voted against these short-term bills in the past, and I am going to continue to do so.

We are in urgent need of dramatic investment in infrastructure. Nearly a third of our roads are in poor or mediocre condition. One out of four of our bridges require significant repair. In my own hometown, our water infrastructure is wholly inadequate to provide even clean water to our residents.

We just cannot continue to threaten our economy by failing to do our job. Congress needs to do its job. The American people go to work every single day, and the least that they can expect is that we do the same thing and do our job.

If we really believe in our future in this Congress, we ought to be willing to invest in it.

FAIRNESS AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR MARRIED HOUSEHOLDS WITH STUDENT LOANS ACT

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, student loan debt is now the fastest growing and second-largest type of household debt in America. It is no surprise that many Americans are putting off marriage and family life for financial reasons.

The decline in marriage is a problem that could impact our economy and society for decades to come. Yet, our Tax Code punishes married households who have student debt. That is why I have introduced the Fairness and Opportunities for Married Households With Student Loans Act.

Currently, an individual with student loans can deduct up to \$2,500 in interest paid on their loans, but that amount does not increase for married couples filing jointly. So spouses who both have student loan debt are limited to just one \$2,500 deduction. This is not fair.

My bill increases the deduction to \$5,000 for married couples. It only makes sense. It also strengthens incentives toward marriage and financial independence.

With student debt putting pressure on our economy, let's stop penalizing marriage and start helping families build a stronger future.

2015 JOBS FAIR AND ECONOMY

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I recently hosted my third annual hiring event where 500 applicants connected with more than 70 employers looking to fill positions.

I was delighted to see Ramona Young and Sommatra Jackson at the event, two women hired at my first event in 2013. They were back this year representing the company that hired them.

Their success continues to motivate me. For every Ramona and Sommatra, there are hundreds of Americans looking for good-paying jobs that allow them to build toward a future.

So today I rise on behalf of those American workers still looking for good-paying jobs.

We all know the statistics. Our economy is growing. After 67 months of consecutive job growth, our unemployment rate stands at 5.1 percent for the first time since 2008, but the fact is there are nearly 8 million Americans still searching.

The people I met at my hiring event were talented, skilled, and driven. They are hungry for an opportunity to work, to put their skills to good use, and to provide for their families.

I urge my colleagues to join me in creating an economy that works for everyone.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS

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

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize October as Domestic Violence Awareness Month. Far too many families fall victim to domestic violence. In fact, one in four women will experience domestic violence at some point in their lives.

I want to recognize and thank the organizations, their staff, and their volunteers across my district for what they do to help victims of domestic violence.

To cite just one example, Mr. Speaker, last week the Berks Women in Crisis held their annual Silent Witness Project march and ceremony to honor and remember victims lost. A group of about 75 people marched from the Berks Women in Crisis center to the Reading Area Community College, carrying 25 red silhouettes of women, men, and children killed due to domestic violence. Each cutout held a brass shield with the summary of that victim's story.

By spreading awareness of these horrors of domestic violence and encouraging victims to speak up, we can and must help reduce the number of women victimized.

I applaud the efforts of this annual ceremony and march and want to let them know that their work is recognized by the community. Indeed, the work of all the organizations, their staff, and volunteers is critical.

□ 1215

STAND WITH SHERIFF LUPE
VALDEZ

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stand with Lupe. That is Dallas County Sheriff Lupe Valdez. Sheriff Lupe Valdez has a great history in Dallas County, but recently she has come under attack from our Governor for trying to build relationships between the law enforcement community and the immigrant community.

Governor Abbott sent a threatening letter to Sheriff Valdez, questioning her decision to decline certain Federal ICE detainers when the immigrant in question is not a public safety risk—not a public safety risk.

Sheriff Valdez understands that, in order to serve and protect the immigrant community, she must have the trust of that community.

I call on Governor Abbott, instead of trying to erode that trust between law enforcement and the immigrant community, to work with the Republican Texas delegation to push for comprehensive immigration reform, to push for the things that the business community wants, that the church community wants, in order to do something about our broken immigration system instead of trying to push for things like sanctuary city bills.

If we work together with the immigrant community and do the right thing, together we can work on solving a lot of these issues.

I ask my colleagues and the Governor to stand with Lupe and to do the right thing when it comes to Texas immigrants.

HONORING VESTA MANGUN

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

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a faithful and God-fearing woman, Ms. Vesta Mangun of Alexandria, Louisiana, who will soon be celebrating her 90th birthday.

Ms. Mangun is a dedicated member of The Pentecostals of Alexandria Church. She has been instrumental in the life and spirit of the Pentecostal community for a long, long time.

Ms. Mangun and her husband, G.A. Mangun, started The Pentecostals of Alexandria when it was known as the First United Pentecostal Church with just 38 members. Today The Pentecostals of Alexandria is made up of thousands of members, largely thanks to the dedication of the Mangun family.

The work of Ms. Mangun extends far beyond community. A daughter of an east Texas pioneer, Vesta Mangun has dedicated her life to sharing the Lord's word as a speaker at camp meetings across the country and across the world.

I commend the Mangun family for their tireless dedication to Louisiana, and I congratulate The Pentecostals of Alexandria in their celebration this week commemorating 65 years of ministry.

GOOD THINGS AND BAD THINGS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, today we will have an opportunity to support the Export-Import Bank opening so that constituents across America, including Houston, Texas, will have the opportunity to grow jobs and to compete internationally. That is a good thing, Mr. Speaker.

Soon I hope we will be able to reopen Riverside Hospital in my congressional district with the collaboration and work with Health and Human Services and State authorities to open the doors for those who need health care. That is a good thing.

Mr. Speaker, the showing of a video of a student being dragged out of a classroom violently while educators stand by and watch is a bad thing. It calls upon the Justice Department of that State, the Attorney General, and the local district attorney to stand up and be counted. It also calls upon the U.S. Department of Justice to determine whether the civil rights of that student were violated.

Not one American should be able to tolerate the heinous, horrific, violent actions of throwing a young girl student on the floor, up against the door, dragged as if she were a bag of potatoes. No one should tolerate that.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon everyone to address the conditions in schools and violence along with those who are perpetrating these acts against students.

NDAA VETO

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

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, last week the President once again disappointed the American people while only seeking to advance his own political agenda. Despite only vetoing four bills in 7 years, the President took the extraordinary measure of vetoing a bill vital to keeping Americans safe.

The annual National Defense Authorization ensures our troops have the tools and training they need to destroy our enemies and to return to their loved ones back at home. This bill has been passed for 53 consecutive years, yet this President saw fit to veto it, putting campaign promises above our military and the American people.

Mr. Speaker, the world is not becoming a safer place. In fact, it is becoming much more dangerous. China is building military islands in the South China Sea. The Russians are destabilizing Europe. Foreign fighters are flooding to

ISIS by the thousands. Iran is on the path to having a nuclear weapon. Yet this President is more concerned about liberal politics than he is about the safety of our Nation. As a veteran, I find it disgraceful.

WEAR RED WEDNESDAY

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is Wear Red Wednesday to Bring Back Our Girls.

This month President Obama announced he will deploy 300 troops to Cameroon to help with the fight against the ISIS-linked terrorist organization, Boko Haram. These American troops will provide vital intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance support to the multinational regional coalition fighting Boko Haram.

I applaud the President's commitment to rooting out and destroying radical terrorism in the region. This newly announced aid could be a turning point in the fight against Boko Haram.

Mr. Speaker, until the precious Chibok girls are returned, we will continue to wear red and continue to tweet, tweet, tweet. Continue to tweet, tweet, tweet #bringbackourgirls. Tweet, tweet, tweet #joinrepwilson.

OCTOBER IS NATIONAL FARM TO
SCHOOL MONTH

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a very innovative program in my home State of Arkansas. Governor Asa Hutchinson proclaimed October to be Farm to School Month. The Farm to School program provides healthy, locally grown food to our State's schools while creating new revenue streams for our Arkansas farmers.

According to the USDA, 169 schools, serving over 86,000 young Arkansans, participate in the program. This directed over \$600,000 into local economies by purchasing products from local farmers.

The Farm to School program helps to combat childhood obesity by encouraging healthy eating habits among our youngest, most impressionable citizens. Also, at a time when families are moving away from the rural, agricultural parts of our Nation, I believe it is vital that our children know how and where their food is produced. The Farm to School program helps to educate them.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Farm to School program is important to the economy, health, and education of Arkansas' Fourth District. I look forward to working with the many stakeholders in Arkansas to see the continued success of the Farm to School program.

CLEAN THE BARN

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, Speaker BOEHNER has pledged to clean the barn before handing the Speakership over later this week.

So far, we are off to a good start. First, a bipartisan majority is finally able to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. Ex-Im supports countless American jobs and historically has enjoyed broad bipartisan support.

Today we learned of a bipartisan deal. I am still reviewing the details of this compromise, but I am encouraged that the leaders of both parties came together to protect the full faith and credit of the United States and to reduce the burden of sequestration.

Now, I represent the heart of San Diego. We don't have many farms in my district, but even I know that, when you put off cleaning the barn, the you-know-what tends to pile up.

There is so much more that Congress should be doing that we are not doing this week. We still need a highway bill that will improve our Nation's infrastructure and create jobs. We need meaningful immigration reform and a deal to get rid of sequestration once and for all.

Let's hope this week marks the beginning of an effort to not just clean the barn, but to keep the barn clean.

FIRST ANNUAL CRISTINA GOMEZ
5K RUN/WALK

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge south Floridians to run or walk this Sunday, November 1, to support the Cristina M. Gomez Traumatic Brain Injury Foundation—TBI Foundation—at its first annual Cristina Gomez 5K Run/Walk at Miami Executive Airport.

Cristina was a senior majoring in education at my alma mater, Florida International University, when she suffered a traumatic brain injury after falling while out on a run.

While her family is encouraged by Cristina's slow, but steady, recovery, she still requires 24/7 care, and her continuing treatment is not fully covered by insurance, concerns that they share with many other families.

As a result, proceeds from Sunday's event will help ensure that other traumatic brain injury victims and their families in our community receive the emotional and the financial support they need to keep hope alive.

Registration is online now at cristinagomezfoundation.org.

WHITE HOUSE INITIATIVE FOR
EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE FOR
HISPANICS

(Mr. CASTRO of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 25th anniversary of the White House Initiative on Educational Excellence for Hispanics, a bipartisan effort to increase educational opportunities and improve educational outcomes for Latinos in America.

Over the past 2½ decades, the initiative has made great progress. The percentage of Hispanics with a high school degree has jumped by nearly 20 percent. The percentage of Hispanics dropping out of high school is nearly 20 percent lower. The percentage of Hispanics with a bachelor's degree or higher has nearly doubled.

Progress like this is possible because of so many committed organizations across our Nation. The initiative has identified certain "Bright Spots" in this effort, and I would like to recognize those programs that received the "Bright Spot" designation in my own congressional district.

They are: The Academy for Teacher Excellence, the Graduate Support Center at UIW, IDRA's Coca-Cola Valued Youth Program, Northwest Vista College's College Connection Program, and San Antonio College's College and Grants Development Department.

Congratulations to these "Bright Spots," and thank you to all the organizations out there helping to make this program a success.

HOME HEALTH CARE PLANNING
IMPROVEMENT ACT

(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 to bring attention to the dire need for nurses in the Granite State. The New Hampshire Union Leader—my newspaper of Manchester, New Hampshire—reports the need will only increase as our population ages and more nurses reach retirement.

Also, healthcare facilities are concentrated outside the State, increasing the need for healthcare practitioners in New Hampshire. I recently hosted a Manchester Job Fair to help meet the need, and I am a proud cosponsor of the Home Health Care Planning Improvement Act of 2015.

Right now, according to Medicare rules, a nurse practitioner may not prescribe home healthcare services for beneficiaries. They must seek a doctor's permission, a process that would take weeks in rural areas like northern New Hampshire.

The New Hampshire Nurse Practitioner Association visited me in Washington last month to tell me about this critical problem. Current rules add extra time and cost to home health care. Qualified nurses should be able to make the best decisions for their patients, especially in the isolated or homebound arena.

The Home Health Care Planning Improvement Act would allow nurses to

do their jobs and help patients recover. It is time to remove a needless layer of bureaucracy and give them the tools they need to succeed.

□ 1230

FARM TO SCHOOL ACT OF 2015

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to pay attention to the Farm to School Act of 2015. Like my colleague from Arkansas, California is a big agricultural State, and we know that kids go hungry.

We have the 2010 Healthy, Hunger-Free Children Act, providing some \$5 million annually in competitive programs for schools to establish the Farm to School Act programs. These programs are vitally important to farmers, increasing their income, but even more important to kids who can get good, healthy food, locally grown and available in their schools.

So let's pay attention here. Let's get this new bill underway. Let's move this program forward. Let's put some money so our kids can have good food and our local farmers can have a good market.

FREE AND FAIR ELECTIONS IN
TURKEY

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

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the upcoming Parliamentary elections being held in Turkey. With so much on the line for Turkey, both domestically and internationally, it is my sincere hope that the elections are held in an environment that is consistent with international standards on November 1.

Free and fair elections are a fundamental part of any democratic society, and Turkish citizens of all backgrounds deserve to know that not only does their vote count, but it will be cast in a welcoming, safe and open atmosphere.

Freedom of the press is also a crucial part of democracy and, with the future of Turkey at the forefront of the November elections, Turkish citizens deserve to hear every narrative, and journalists and reporters should not have to worry about intimidation or legal action, simply for doing their jobs.

As Turkey enters a pivotal moment in its history, I wish them a safe and successful election day. And just like any democratic society, the real winners at the end of the day will be the citizens of Turkey.

CONGRESS' LAST SHORT-TERM
EXTENSION OF THE HIGHWAY BILL

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, today we will vote on what, hopefully, will be this Congress' last short-term extension of the highway bill. We have made progress on a long-term bill, and the House should consider that legislation next week. This is good news.

But the short-term bill also includes an inevitable but disappointing extension of the deadline for railroads to install positive train control technology. This technology can prevent train accidents and is designed to save lives.

Originally, Congress gave railroads 7 years to install positive train control, but as that deadline approaches, the railroads are woefully behind schedule. With the railroad industry's threat to shut down over our heads, we have no choice but to go through with this extension.

I worry what the consequences will be for this. This has to be the last delay that we give to the railroads.

Congress did not mandate positive train control to be a thorn in the railroads' side. It was done to save lives.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT ON MEAT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to set the record straight regarding a claim this week by the International Agency for Research on Cancer classifying processed meats as carcinogenic and red meat as a probable carcinogen.

According to the American Cancer Society, there is a lifetime risk of developing colorectal cancer of 5 percent. By this organization's own findings, eating a cold-cut sandwich or a hot dog every day would only raise that risk to around 6 percent.

Doctors with the International Agency for the Research on Cancer admit that the risk for someone to develop cancer due to red meat consumption is dwarfed by the risk caused by cigarette and alcohol consumption.

With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, this study should not be used for scare-mongering in causing people across the Nation to believe that red meats or processed foods are dangerous.

The fact remains that variety is the key to a healthy, well-balanced diet, and that cancer is not caused by a single food.

FIX OUR BROKEN IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

(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, today I call upon the House of Representatives to finally fix our broken immigration system.

The American people have had enough. They have had enough of the

lack of security around our borders. They have had enough of the economic damage of not being able to hire and retain the people we need to grow our economy and make us strong.

We have had enough of the chaos within our borders, of the difficult decisions that police and law enforcement officials have had to make with regard to enforcing a set of unenforceable laws, under which more than 10 million people here don't have documentation.

This needs to end. We should not have 12 million illegal immigrants. We should not have 8 million illegal immigrants. We shouldn't even have 1 million illegal immigrants.

If we simply acted upon the bipartisan proposal that passed the Senate with more than two-thirds support last session and, I believe, would pass the House today if we brought it to the floor, we would finally unite families, secure our borders, boost our economy, and end the enormous number of people who are here without their papers.

I call upon this body to act.

CONGRATULATING PAUL MODRICH AND AZIZ SANCAR

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate scientists Paul Modrich of Duke University and Aziz Sancar of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill on winning the 2015 Nobel Prize in Chemistry. They share this prestigious award with Swedish scientist Tomas Lindahl for their work in understanding how cells repair damaged DNA.

Dr. Modrich is the James B. Duke Professor of Biochemistry at Duke's medical school and a member of the Duke Cancer Institute. He is also an investigator with the Howard Hughes Medical Institute. Dr. Modrich's research has demonstrated how the cell corrects errors that occur when DNA is replicated during cell division.

Dr. Sancar is the Sarah Graham Kenan Professor of Biochemistry at UNC's medical School. Only the second Turk to win a Nobel Prize, he is the co-founder of the Aziz and Gwen Sancar Foundation, a nonprofit organization that promotes Turkish culture and supports Turkish students in the United States. Dr. Sancar has mapped the mechanism that cells use to repair UV damage to DNA.

Congratulations to Dr. Modrich and Dr. Sancar on their extraordinary achievements. We are fortunate they call North Carolina home.

EX-IM BANK DISCHARGE REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank.

In the First District of Georgia, the Ex-Im Bank facilitates exports for over 17 companies, more than half of which are small businesses, over \$500 million in exports, and supports over 3,200 jobs.

Around Georgia, those numbers jump to more than \$4 billion in exports from 205 companies supporting almost 30,000 jobs.

With the recent expiration of the Ex-Im Bank, many of these companies have suffered the loss of millions of dollars in new business growth, market access, and risked thousands of jobs.

While we stand here debating the future of the Ex-Im Bank, our competitors are leveraging their own versions of their export-import agencies to increase their market shares abroad.

While I advocated for reforms that go further than this legislation, it does provide critical reforms necessary to ensure taxpayers are protected while allowing the bank to do its important work.

Passing this legislation is essential to protecting thousands of jobs, and I urge my colleagues to join us in reauthorizing the Ex-Im Bank and to let the world know America is open for business.

CONGENITAL HEART FUTURES ACT

(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 on behalf of the nearly 1 in 100 newborns born with congenital heart disease. Congenital heart disease is the most common birth defect and is the number one cause of birth defect related deaths.

This disease demands our attention. That is why I founded the Congenital Heart Caucus, and that is why, this week, I am introducing legislation to reauthorize the Congenital Heart Futures Act.

This legislation focuses on studying, educating, and raising awareness of the continuing impact congenital heart disease has throughout the life span. It promotes more research at NIH and encourages the need to seek and maintain lifelong, specialized care.

This bill helps give hope to the 40,000 babies born with congenital heart disease each year and their families across the U.S. I urge my colleagues to support this very important bill. We must continue our efforts to help our future generations live longer, healthier lives.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 27, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 27, 2015 at 9:39 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 313.

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 639.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE PROCEEDINGS ON MOTION TO RECOMMIT ON H.R. 597, REFORM EXPORTS AND EXPAND THE AMERICAN ECONOMY ACT

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the question of adopting a motion to recommit on H.R. 597 may be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1090, RETAIL INVESTOR PROTECTION ACT

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 491 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 491

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1090) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide protections for retail customers, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-31 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 Financial Services; (2) the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Lynch of Massachusetts or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. 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. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on House Resolution 491 currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to bring forward this rule on behalf of the Rules Committee and the hundreds of thousands of young men and women who one day hope to retire.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 1090, the Retail Investor Protection Act. The Rules Committee met on this measure yesterday evening and heard testimony from both the chairman and ranking member of the Financial Services Committee.

The rule brought forward by the committee is a structured rule. There was only one amendment submitted to the Rules Committee on this bill, and the House will have the opportunity to debate and vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) later today.

□ 1245

This legislation went through regular order in the Financial Services Committee and was also passed by the House in the 113th Congress by a vote of 254-166 with a number of my friends from the other side of the aisle voting for the legislation. I hope we can put aside our political differences and vote in a similar bipartisan fashion here today.

This rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to hearing the stories that Members will share highlighting the desperate need for H.R. 1090 to become law.

I also have heard firsthand from men and women in my district who are scared about their financial future. Navigating retirement planning can be a difficult task, especially for young men and women just entering the workforce. They often rely on financial planners to offer advice on the steps they need to take today so one day they can retire.

I had the opportunity to meet with one of those financial planners in my office just a few months ago. Beth Baldwin is a financial planner who works for Edward Jones in my hometown of Gainesville, Georgia. She took

the time to come to Washington to meet with me and other elected officials because she was scared about the impact that the fiduciary rule would have on her ability to do her job. She told me that the administration's fiduciary rule prevents her from helping people.

Beth told me that financial advisers should always provide advice that is in their client's best interest, but the rule places unnecessary and burdensome requirements on both advisers and clients.

That is not what we are about as a country, Mr. Speaker. We are the world's greatest economic engine, the land of hope and opportunity, because we believe in the ingenuity and hard work of people. Our founders believed in people. They were on their team, and they created a governmental structure that is for the people and by the people. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, that is what this Republican majority stands for: the people who get up every day looking to how they can make it better.

The Republican majority is for people. We believe in their hopes, we believe in their dreams, and we want them to succeed. When my son gets a little older and starts thinking about retirement, I want him to be able to go to a professional and get some advice and seek good information.

If H.R. 1090 isn't signed into law, then financial advisers like Beth Baldwin won't be able to help him. In fact, they won't be able to help others who have helped my family, like Wayne Parrish, who is a dear friend of our family, but is also someone who advises us in our financial decisions. This is something that is threatening not only his livelihood, but many teachers that work with my wife. This is about people, Mr. Speaker.

Across the Nation today, there are 9 million households that rely on small business retirement plans. And there are 3 million small-saver households. These are the people who need Congress now, more than ever, to be on their team.

To them, this debate isn't over definitions and enhanced coordination and studies. It is over their future. It is over their ability to make informed decisions, to find somebody like Beth or Wayne or a number of others all across this country who can help them plan for the future.

Financial advisers should be free to offer advice to their clients based on what is best for them as individuals and small businesses, not based on what advice most limits their liability.

Saving for retirement is already difficult. It requires tough decisions. But the one thing that can keep a devastating financial decision from being made is advice from a qualified professional.

I in no way believe we should model our policies after other countries. We have talked about that before here. However, when we can learn from their mistakes, we should.

The United Kingdom implemented a similar rule in 2013. Two years later we can see the negative effects. The rule has created an advice gap in which 60,000 investors are unable to receive financial advice because their accounts are too small.

Mr. Speaker, I know some stories that have been told on the floor and from many Members here. I remember when I and my wife were just starting out. To tell me what little bit that I had saved was too small is an affront to the very free enterprise system that helps people climb to where they want to go and fulfill their dreams. We should never be satisfied with when we tell people they can't get advice because their pot, so to speak, is too small.

Several of my constituents from northeast Georgia recently wrote to me about the administration's fiduciary rule. Here is what they said: "The rule as proposed is not workable and would have numerous unintended consequences for American workers and retirement savers, particularly those who are middle class. The requirements in the rule would drive the market to fee-based arrangements that are used only for wealthier clients and are not the best fit for many investors. As a result, middle-class savers would be forced into low-service, do-it-yourself accounts, depriving them of meaningful, personalized planning advice."

Let me repeat that: "depriving them of meaningful, personalized planning advice."

We are here today as the Republican majority, advancing H.R. 1090, because we are for the middle class. Because we refuse to accept any rule from this administration that would deprive the middle class of the tools they need to make good financial decisions.

One of my constituents also wrote: "The time to act is now before Americans are deprived of consumer choice on how to plan for retirement and invest their savings."

Another said: "Recently, I became aware of a proposed rule that would undermine my ability to plan for my retirement in ways I believe best for me."

It is the very heart of why we are here, Mr. Speaker. It is taking up for those who need someone to say: Government, it is time to let the free enterprise, time to let the middle class, the hardworking folks of our country, have advice and be able to access that.

I cannot understand why some of my friends on the other side of the aisle support a rule that would undermine anyone's ability to plan for their retirement in ways that are best for them. This isn't a political issue. It is about people and their future. It is as simple as that.

Financial planning isn't one size fits all. It is customized, individualized, based on the need of a particular family or small business. ObamaCare is a perfect example of what happens when the administration takes over an in-

dustry without regard to the needs of the middle and lower class.

Another constituent wrote to me and said: "With this rule, it seems the government has determined that I am not smart enough to make my own informed investment decisions. I do not agree. Saving for retirement is difficult enough. Why add more obstacles and complexity? I urge you to please preserve the freedoms investors currently enjoy to choose how we invest in our retirement accounts and plan for a better financial tomorrow."

This administration, Mr. Speaker, is already costing families jobs, constitutional liberties, affordable quality health care, and a strong national defense. Let's not also take away from them the ability to plan for retirement.

I remember when, just a little over 27 years ago, my wife and I walked down the aisle and we said, "I do," for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer. And, Mr. Speaker, we have been through all of that.

But, at times, we had people who came into our lives, investment advice that would help us with her teacher retirement, help us with advice that I didn't have the time or really the understanding to work on.

If we take that away from folks like myself and families in my district and families in your district and families all over the country, then what are we saying to the American people? We are saying: the government knows better than you.

I am a firm believer that this government was started and will stand both for the people and of the people, and that is what this Republican majority is doing today. That is why this rule is important, and that is why this bill is important.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker. Rather than having a mere Speaker pro tempore, as I had the opportunity to do as a freshman in the majority, it is always exciting to be presided over by the actual Speaker of the body, the second in line to be President of the United States, and particularly somebody who has dedicated so much of his life to public service, Mr. Speaker, as you have, and left his mark on this institution.

I am sure that there will be additional opportunities for showing our great regard and esteem with which this body holds you, Mr. Speaker. But I think it is somewhat apt that perhaps, if not the final time you act as presiding officer of this body, at least the final rule is related to retirement, which you, Mr. Speaker, will presumably soon be experiencing, and is an important topic of discussion for this body.

Now, we may have our disagreements about whether curtailing this rule is in

the interest of the American people or not, but I know that we both have a deep and abiding interest in making sure that Americans are safe in their retirement. I think it is wonderful that you are highlighting the importance of retirement security by presiding over this particular debate yourself, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to the rule, which is a structured rule for H.R. 1090. Frankly, it is premature to be considering this bill when we don't know what the final rules will look like out of the Department of Labor, rather than allow the Department of Labor to continue doing its job, which has included many stakeholders.

I know firsthand the Secretary of Labor has not only reached out to me and met with me on numerous occasions as well as my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and has appeared before one of the committees of jurisdiction that I serve on, the Committee on Education and the Workforce, of which you, Mr. Speaker, are a prior chair as well, and engaged with the financial services community, consumer protection organizations, and many others in his very earnest and serious attempt at making sure that the many shortcomings of the initial draft rule, which you and I might agree on, Mr. Speaker, are addressed in the final rulemaking. I think the Secretary deserves that opportunity. The hardworking men and women of the Department of Labor deserve that opportunity.

And then, if, in fact, the mark is missed, it might be appropriate for this body to consider amending or changing any rule to address the fears that both of us share on both sides of the aisle with regard to ensuring that people of low and moderate income do have access to high-quality advice and that the legitimate educational activities of financial services organizations are allowed to continue to provide that type of advice.

Now, this legislation is somewhat wrapped in a seemingly arcane matter. It has to do with whether it is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor or the Securities and Exchange Commission regarding new fiduciary standards of care.

We had the chair of the Financial Services Committee, Mr. HENSARLING, before us in the Rules Committee yesterday. He simply said that, under Dodd-Frank, the SEC has the ability to pass rules regarding fiduciary standards of care. I don't think anybody disputes that the SEC has the legal authority to do so.

I question here—and I think this was well established—that they are unlikely, because of their ongoing implementation work in many other areas, to get to this any time soon, whereas the Department of Labor is nearing the end of a 2-year-long-plus process around trying to make sensible rules to ensure that conflicts of interest within retirement advice are offered, consumer protections are provided, and

the market is allowed to operate in a more efficient way with regard to offering quality retirement products and appropriate retirement products to consumers.

After the Department of Labor retracted the flawed first version of this rule several years ago, they released a new version of the rule in 2015. They have been getting input from a broad spectrum of stakeholders through a long and extended comment period.

I have provided feedback. Stakeholders in the retirement community have. Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle have. We all know what some of the fundamental issues that we are trying to address are, Mr. Speaker.

Today most Americans are not saving enough for retirement and are not securing their retirement. The retirement savings gap is estimated at \$14 trillion, and one in five Americans who are approaching retirement have zero private retirement savings.

As the ranking member on the Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions Subcommittee of the Education and the Workforce Committee, I am very interested in working in a bipartisan fashion to address this savings gap. Helping to make sure that Americans save for retirement is not a partisan issue. Whether one is a Democrat or a Republican, eventually, you are going to need to retire, some of us, Mr. Speaker, before others.

This bill did not have to be partisan either. I think, if we had waited and targeted any particular flaws in the final rule, there might have been an ability to build a bipartisan consensus. I am optimistic that the Secretary of Labor and the Department of Labor will get their rules right.

Investors need to be able to trust the person advising them about the money they need to live after retirement. On the other hand, we need to protect individuals' and small businesses' access to advice.

Mistakes in investments cost billions of dollars to individuals and the economy. Of course, a mistake can occur with wrongful advice from somebody who has a conflict of interest, but mistakes can also occur if there is a lack of access to quality advice. We need to be cognizant of both of those potentials as we look at improving the ability of the American people to save for their retirement.

I know that everybody involved with this rule and many of the stakeholders who will be impacted actually agree on a lot of the big concepts. They agree generally that financial advisers should use the best interest or fiduciary standard because the client's best interest should be paramount.

The main disagreement is about how to make this happen and how to implement the rule in a way that makes sense. Most advisers today do what is in the best interest of their client. They are good actors, and they help their clients save for retirement.

It is critical that our final rule, as the Secretary himself has said, does not upend an entire business model that works for good actors and works for many American families. However, making sure that we have a standard in place that the few bad actors need to abide by and are not able to wreak havoc in allowing American families to plan for their retirement is also essential.

□ 1300

Now, just because there is disagreement on some of the specifics of the rule doesn't mean that we should use a bill that wholesale removes this authority and transfers it entirely to an SEC entity, which is unlikely to proceed with rulemaking and can't even proceed with rulemaking while this President is in office under a timeline even if they were to begin expeditiously. So, effectively, this underlying legislation is an effort to thwart the ability of this President, this Secretary of Labor, and even the SEC under this President, from acting in a way to protect the American people from conflicts of interest in retirement products that are not suitable for their needs.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1090 would actually prevent the Department of Labor from issuing any sort of fiduciary rule until after the Securities and Exchange Commission issued a rule. Now, the Department of Labor clearly has the authority to write and implement this rule. That is not even being called into question; it is simply the timeline of which agency goes first. But due to the realities of the SEC, the Commission is not moving forward a rule any time in the near future, and that is simple reality.

So what this bill actually does is it effectively kills the Department of Labor's ability under President Obama to update the fiduciary standard under ERISA. Would it make sense for Congress to mandate that the IRS couldn't take action to collect taxes until the Treasury acted first? This is a similar situation.

I believe the Department of Labor must take into account the high number of outstanding questions and requests for comments that they proposed in the rule, the incredible volume of feedback the rule has received, including from myself and Members on both sides of the aisle and outside stakeholders. To date, there has been a number of letters from both parties requesting changes to the proposed rule. I signed onto a letter with 96 Democrats, and there are over 3,500 public comments, hundreds of thousands of people signing their names to petitions. The Department of Labor hopefully will listen to this feedback as they issue their final draft rule to make the effort streamlined while protecting investors and workers.

My staff and I have had dozens of meetings and phone calls to the Department of Labor with Secretary Perez. I have submitted over two dozen

questions for the record to the Department of Labor on the subject, and I am satisfied and optimistic that these concerns will be addressed in the final rule.

I am just now leading a letter with several of my colleagues requesting an additional comment period to look at the changes the Department of Labor is planning to make to the rule. So the answer, I think, Mr. Speaker, is to take the time to get these rules right, make sure they don't have unintended consequences, and not prejudge them by invalidating them before they are out of the gate. That is what I consider a constructive way forward.

Mr. Speaker, I have learned from these conversations that we need to move forward with a productive process, and I believe the Labor Secretary is committed to doing that. We may have disagreements about the final outcome, but we should see what that final outcome is before we pass legislation that requires us to pretend that the problem doesn't exist.

While the specifics of the fiduciary rule are important, and DOL needs to make changes and communicate them to stakeholders, this legislation is very counterproductive to those ongoing discussions that have occurred over the last several years. This bill would effectively prevent protections from being implemented after years of work, meetings, and due diligence involving financial services companies and involving retirement advocacy organizations, not to mention the fact that this bill will not become law. The President has already put out a promise to veto the legislation should it reach his desk. So, instead, we should be spending our time on more important work for the American people. With just over a month to take action until a government shutdown and with the transportation bill expiring, we have six congressional working days to raise a clean debt ceiling. I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that you will be able to bear witness to that as a Member and leader of this body in the short future, in the next couple of days. Just as astonishing, we have the highway funding shutdown.

So here we are again. I think that we need to work on bills that have a chance of becoming law. We shouldn't prejudge rules that I think the Secretary has really worked hard to ensure involve multiple stakeholders, and hopefully, we will be satisfied with the final rules that address many of the potential unintended consequences and concerns that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have raised, including myself.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the comments just made, but I think there is a general disagreement, and we will have a disagreement in just a few moments about article I and what we are supposed to be doing here and taking care of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Georgia for yielding. In the spirit of bipartisanship, let me associate myself with the opening remarks and kind words of Mr. POLIS about the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if adopted, the proposed fiduciary rule would reduce access to reasonably priced investment options for lower and middle class families and small-business owners across the country. It will also increase costs for Americans trying their best to save for retirement.

Our country faces difficult retirement challenges, and the last thing the Federal Government should do is create new barriers blocking the retirement security the American people deserve. The fact is we have seen this scheme before. This proposal contains many of the same flaws as the administration's failed 2010 proposal, which was ultimately withdrawn because of harsh bipartisan opposition.

The Department of Labor's rushed and uncoordinated process has again resulted in an unworkable proposal, and I urge the administration to use the same logic that it did the first time and withdraw its damaged proposal.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, many American workers don't have access to paid sick days, which means they can't miss work without losing a day's pay or risking their job security. If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation that would allow workers to earn paid sick leave.

Mr. Speaker, everyone should be able to take care of themselves or their loved ones when they are sick and not have to worry about losing their jobs or falling behind on their bills because of illness.

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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. To discuss our proposal, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question. Defeating the previous question will allow us to amend the rule to provide for consideration of the Healthy Families Act. What is the Healthy Families Act? It is an act that would allow workers to earn up to 7 days of job-protected sick leave each year.

Mr. Speaker, being a working parent should not mean choosing between your job and taking care of yourself and your family. But at least 43 million private sector workers—39 percent of our workforce—must make this decision every time illness strikes. Mil-

lions more cannot earn paid sick time to care for a sick child or for a family member.

Employers ultimately suffer when workers have to make this choice. Increased turnover rates amount to greater costs, and employers can jeopardize the health of other employees when their policies force employees to come to work sick.

With regard to families, I listen to people—as we all do in our communities—all of the time. I can talk to you about Eva, the bus driver who picks up kids in the morning on their way to school. They are there with their parents, and she says that I see parents with tears in their eyes as they are putting their child on the bus, knowing that their child is sick, but they can't afford to stay home with that child because they could lose their job. They could get pay docked. They are making a choice, and that is not how they view themselves as a parent.

Paid sick day policies have been enacted successfully at the State and at the local levels. Nearly 20 jurisdictions across the country have adopted paid sick days, and there is strong public support for universal access to paid sick days. Eighty-eight percent of Americans support paid sick day legislation.

The Healthy Families Act allows working families to meet their health and their financial needs while boosting businesses' productivity and retention rates—strengthening our Nation's economy. It is common sense. It is business savvy. This is the right thing to do.

Today there isn't a parent staying home with their children. Mothers, fathers, grandmothers, aunts, and uncles, everyone is in the workplace. Let our public policy reflect the way that families are trying to make it today. We need to work to protect public health, to boost the economy, and to help hardworking families have access to paid sick days.

Let's pass the Healthy Families Act, and I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and the underlying legislation. I am the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government. My subcommittee is charged with overseeing the budget of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

That is the agency of the Federal Government that is charged with protecting investors and making sure that the capital markets are fair and orderly, and that is what they do every day. In fact, Dodd-Frank gives them more authority in this area than any other agency in the Federal Government, so I find it a little bit surprising

that the Department of Labor, whose day-to-day job is not to oversee investment advisers, whose day-to-day job is not to oversee broker-dealers, and yet they will decide that they are going to write a rule dealing with fiduciary standards for those that are involved in retirement accounts. Well, it just seems to me that is backwards. That is upside down.

The SEC ought to be acting in this area. That is their primary role. If we are going to let other agencies write rules that might be in conflict, might create confusion, and might be duplicative, then it seems to me we are going to give those individuals who are struggling to make a living and to make ends meet, we are going to have a difficult time understanding what their retirement accounts are all about and who is in charge and what are the rules and the standards.

So the SEC should act first, and that is all this bill does. It says the SEC should act first in dealing with investor security to make sure that capital markets are fair and orderly and that the Department of Labor is prohibited from finalizing any rule in this regard.

So I think it is a commonsense piece of legislation. I thank the sponsors for bringing it, and the committee for bringing it up, and so I urge adoption of this rule and adoption of the underlying legislation as well.

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

Mr. Speaker, even if my friends on the other side of the aisle think they might not like this final rule, let's at least give the Department of Labor, after several years of hard work, the chance to produce it. If at that point the majority feels that there are parts of the rule that they don't want or don't like or want to invalidate or are counterproductive, that would be the appropriate time for this kind of bill to intervene in those efforts before those rules are finalized.

Mr. Speaker, I have been very satisfied with the work of the Department of Labor and the Secretary of Labor to engage Members of this body on both sides of the aisle and the financial services community to ensure that many of the acknowledged flaws that are in the draft bill are addressed in any final rule that is brought forward.

This bill is effectively an effort to thwart the entire process around addressing a real problem, and that real problem is the conflict of interest and poor quality retirement advice that is being given to too many American families.

The Secretary is not seeking to upend a business structure that allows access to quality financial advice for millions of middle class American families, and I believe that any concerns with regard to that will be addressed in the final rulemaking.

With little time left before so many deadlines and cliffs that this body has—transportation funding expiring, the Federal budget expiring without a

potential government shutdown, the debt ceiling, and so many others—why are we discussing a bill that is not going to become law? Again, you are seeking to overturn a ruling before it is made. The President himself would veto this bill. There will not be two-thirds of this body to overturn this veto.

When we are discussing taking actions that affect actions that the President is taking, keep in mind that under our constitutional republic, if we were to override the President, it would take both Democrats and Republicans, and Democrats in large numbers. Now, I understand there may be a few handful of my Democratic colleagues supporting this final bill, not very many, certainly not enough to bring it close to the two-thirds threshold. So, again, that would qualify as a waste of time for this body, and a premature waste of time at that.

Let's give the Department of Labor the ability and the benefit of the doubt to bring forward these rules, and then perhaps if they overstep and have a lot of flaws, then, Mr. Speaker, the Republicans might have more Democrats willing to join them in counteracting these rules. But at this point, it is entirely premature to interdict the entire rulemaking process to protect American retirement without even knowing what those rules are that we are seeking to circumvent.

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

□ 1315

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

I think it is a fundamental difference, again, in the way we choose to look at how we do our business up here. There is a constitutional flow to this. It is called Article I. It is our responsibility as elected Representatives, both from Georgia, from Colorado, from all over this country, it is our responsibility to look at this.

I think one of the things that frustrates me, and I know it frustrates many of my constituents back home, is that it seems like every time—as my friend has said—that we are pre-empting or putting down all this hard work done by the agencies, well, everything that is pointed to so far, it is not our job as Congress to worry about the work product of an agency. Our job is to take care of the American people and make sure that their interests are best concerned. My first interest is the folks of the Ninth District of Georgia. My first interest is not, did the office or agency of an administration of any, Republican or Democrat, did they work real hard on it? I appreciate their work.

But the problem we are coming back to here is we are facing a real issue. We are simply saying the SEC needs to go first. We are simply saying let's put these priorities in line, and let's simply say that we look at this. It is not the

executive body's determination to make the law, so to speak. It is our body. So if we choose to intervene here, then it is our prerogative to do so, taking care of what we are doing.

I think also to simply say—and I love this argument—that if the President is not going to sign and we don't have enough to override, then fine, let's make that argument to the American people. And if the administration chooses to do this and chooses not to, then let them tell the American people and the teachers in my district and the law enforcement officers in my district and people who need this advice and looking at the history and say: We don't care about you, let our bureaucracy work, let bureaucracy ring instead of freedom ring.

If that is what the President and the administration wants to do, then so be it. I will stand on the side of the American people. I will stand on the side of the middle class. I will stand on them being able to take what they have and get advice so they can make it better. If that is the argument they want to be had, let's have it.

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

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

I think that the remarks by my colleague on the Rules Committee are part of the problem here. The way that laws are passed require the House and the Senate to pass a bill in the same form and the President to sign that bill, or if the President vetoes that bill, two-thirds of the body to overrule it.

And, of course, no one doubts that if this body of the House wants, they can continue to pass bills that the Senate won't bring up, as they have dozens, I would have to get a count, perhaps, hundreds of times, or bills that the Senate will pass but the President will veto, and the President vetoed, I believe, his fifth bill with the defense reauthorization last week.

Certainly, if the majority chooses, if the Republicans choose, this body can continue to do that, or this body can work together with the Senate and the President to pass laws that address issues that the American people have brought to us to solve, and that takes compromise. That doesn't mean this body should say, "It is our way or the highway," and the Senate says, "Sorry, it is the highway," and the President says, "Sorry, it is the highway." It means, roll up your sleeves and work together.

If we are going to solve a problem like immigration in this country, our broken immigration system, and replace our broken immigration system with one that works, that restores border security, the rule of law, benefits our economy, and unites families, it will take all sides working together. Guess what? Last session, the Senate passed a bill. It was this House that didn't spend even a minute of time on the floor debating that bill or bringing forward something that the American

people demand to replace our broken immigration system with one that works and protects our country.

So, again, I don't doubt the ability of this body to keep passing bills that don't go anywhere. Perhaps, it makes some of my Republican colleagues feel good. They go home, and they say: Gee, we passed this out of the House. We passed that out of the House. The problem is the Senate. The problem is the President.

But that is just an excuse for blame and more and more problems. I think what the American people want is not this finger pointing. They don't want the Senate to say: We solved immigration; it was the House's fault. They don't want the House to say: We defunded ObamaCare; it is the Senate and President's fault they didn't do it.

They want us to work together, work together to implement the Affordable Care Act and address some of the problems in it, work together to replace our broken immigration system with one that works, one to work together to cut our budget deficit, one to work together to fund an infrastructure and transportation bill, and—this is an example—if there are deficiencies in the final rule, work together to make sure that those deficiencies are addressed so that our common goal the Democrats and Republicans share of making sure that Americans have quality, nonconflicted advice in their retirement savings is able to occur across the country.

I call on Speaker BOEHNER and, of course, whoever succeeds him as Speaker, as well as the rest of the House leadership, to present truly bipartisan efforts to move forward on the various issues that we face and not yield to the easy temptation to pass single-Chamber bills in the House that aren't even brought up by the Senate and, if they were, it would be vetoed by the President. That is not how laws are made. That is how rhetoric is made. The American people want their problems addressed by this body, not just more hot wind and rhetoric that this bill is an example of.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I appreciate that because there are many people in America right now who remember just a few years ago when there was plenty of hot rhetoric coming from this Chamber, and it is really punishing the American people now. It is called ObamaCare. It is called Dodd-Frank. I guess the warm winds are still blowing.

It is amazing to me that when you look at this—and I can go back in history—and I think the one thing that we maybe can come to an agreement on is when you govern and when you are in the majority, you pass bills that reflect your majority values. You do not reflect, in this case, an administration that happens to have different values. We are continuing to work for the

American people, just as my friend when he was in the majority—as he said, he sat in the chair as a freshman—they would have passed bills that, oh, by the way, probably wouldn't have made it through that Republican administration. Some got vetoed. And if it did get vetoed, you would come back and work the process of an override, and that can happen.

The problem here is I believe—and this is just fundamental—I believe that we can work on different ideas. There are things that the gentleman from Colorado and I can agree on or disagree on. I think it goes back just basically to the problem that many of us are frustrated with, is that there are three branches of government that the Congress, the House and the Senate, whether we agree on everything or not, is not the point. The point is, are we making the voices heard from our districts and doing so in a meaningful way?

If that means that Republicans feel one way and Democrats feel another way, that so be it. But I, as long as I am part of the majority, we are going to put our values forward, and we are going to say: This is what we believe in. We would like for you to come on. And we will find areas where we can agree.

But I will never stand by just because the administration, as they did just this past week with the NDAA, put politics over our troops. As someone who served in Iraq, it is time to quit playing politics with our troops.

If we want to get specific about what we are playing politics with here, then we can understand that. That is a disgrace. And what we have got to understand is—we are going to put stuff here—we are simply saying: Here is a fix that we believe; let the SEC work first.

That is our policy statement. If they don't agree, fine. But when it is fighting for the people of the Ninth District of Georgia and also people for America and middle class and lower income folks who are just trying to make their retirement and get good advice, I will never back up or apologize for taking the time to fight for the American people. If that is a waste of time, I will be up here every day taking that time for the American people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

This is a very interesting discussion with my colleague from Georgia. When you look at the work product of this body in the House of Representatives, this body has voted to repeal ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act, over 54 times. So it is clear to the American people—my colleague from Georgia can tell his constituents—we voted to repeal ObamaCare. We did. I didn't vote for that, but the majority of this body did that—not once, not twice, not three times, not four times, not five times. I can count all the way up to over 54 times. In fact, many of us

are losing track about how many times this body is on the RECORD opposing ObamaCare, but that is not how laws are made. That is part of the process. One would say once should suffice for it to pass this body.

The bill also would need to pass the Senate. And as the President has indicated, it is unlikely that something called by many people ObamaCare would be repealed by a President named Barack Obama. He, of course, would veto any legislation that ended the Affordable Care Act, his signature health care policy that he passed in his first term in office.

So, again, it looks at what we do with this body. When one wonders why the approval ratings of the House of Representatives are as low and continuing to plummet as they are, I think it is because rather than address the concerns of the American people around making health care work and more affordable and passing constructive laws through the system that address some of the shortcomings in ObamaCare, whether it is addressing some of the shortcomings in Dodd-Frank, rather than taking that path, this body instead is passing single-Chamber bills, like we are here today, with regard to undermining a rule that we haven't even seen yet because some people think it might be counter-productive or bad. If it is, let's have that discussion.

But, again, as a Member of this body, I have been happy so far with the efforts of the Secretary of Labor to engage with the stakeholder groups and Members of this body to get this rule right. I honestly believe that the only reason this legislation was brought to the floor is it is hard for the Republican caucus to agree on much else. It is hard for them to agree on something that might be a governing effort to pass. So, instead, we are dealing with single-Chamber bills. On weeks that we could be dealing with funding transportation or infrastructure or cutting our deficit or going after government waste and fraud, we are instead repealing ObamaCare again and again and again or repealing a rule that we haven't even seen because people think they might not like it if they do.

Look, we have a choice in this body. The Republicans in the majority can either sit back and bring partisan legislation to the floor each week and watch costs of the American people go up and watch problems go unsolved, or we can come to the table and start a serious discussion with the House and the Senate, with the President, with Members of this body on both sides of the aisle, about important things that actually move our country forward, grow our economy, promote our national security, reduce our deficit, including the basics of keeping our government open and paying our bills on time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. I urge a "no" vote on the rule,

and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I want to just finalize some time here and just really look at this because what is really interesting in the last few minutes is many times in this—and I appreciate my colleague from Colorado—this is, frankly, why I believe most of us came into public service, is to have honest debate, go back and forth. But I will have to say as I close here, I do want to make it back to what this bill does and what this rule is that you are going to be voting on. It just says: Let the SEC go first.

Now, I know that is hard to understand. And if you are watching this, you might have a hard time understanding because my friend just said that we won't wait on a rule and then that we are repealing a rule. So I am not sure how you can repeal a rule that you have not waited on, and if the rule is not there, you are repealing. No, we are simply saying: Let the SEC go first. So you can't repeal something that your own statement said you are waiting on.

And, also, by the way, a Dear Colleague letter that says that we know from many, many of my Democrat friends across the aisle are sending around saying: DOL, we have got a lot of concerns about this; we want to make sure you do it right. I think this is a good way to do it, and it is called being part of a bipartisan solution here on the floor, and let's put it back right and let it go that way instead of sending a letter to DOL and letting them make sure they get it right because they acknowledge that there are real concerns about the workability of this rule in progress, and this is right now being circulated.

I think I just want to say I support this bill, H.R. 1090, because I believe that men and women should have the ability to choose their type of financial professional who best meets their investment needs. This isn't about protecting investors. It is about the administration once again telling families that they know what is best for them. They have told families that they know better when it comes to health care. They have told families they know better when it comes to education. They have told families they know better when it comes to how and where to spend their money, and the results have been devastating.

H.R. 1090 isn't going to undo all the devastating impacts of this one-size-fits-all regulatory approach, but it will prevent from taking away the ability of families to plan their financial future. This bill passed with bipartisan support last Congress, and on behalf of my constituents, I deeply hope it does so again.

Again, it is about who you fight for. It is a consistency. I will consistently stand here and say what is best for those hard-working, middle class,

lower income class, and anybody else who earns as much as they want to to have the access to get the financial planning they need in the way that is best for them without the interference of a bureaucratic organization that has taken so long and already shows results from other places that are devastating. We are not going to do that. We are going to put this forward and let's see who we are really standing with and who we are really standing for.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 491 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 932) to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration, and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 932.

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

□ 1330

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair

will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

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

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2015

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3819) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3819

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; RECONCILIATION OF FUNDS; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2015".

(b) RECONCILIATION OF FUNDS.—The Secretary of Transportation shall reduce the amount apportioned or allocated for a program, project, or activity under this Act in fiscal year 2016 by amounts apportioned or allocated pursuant to the Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015, including the amendments made by that Act, for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015.

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:
Sec. 1. Short title; reconciliation of funds; table of contents.

TITLE I—SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM EXTENSION

Subtitle A—Federal-Aid Highways

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

Sec. 1002. Administrative expenses.

Subtitle B—Extension of Highway Safety Programs

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

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

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

Subtitle C—Public Transportation Programs

Sec. 1201. Formula grants for rural areas.

Sec. 1202. Apportionment of appropriations for formula grants.

Sec. 1203. Authorizations for public transportation.

Sec. 1204. Bus and bus facilities formula grants.

Subtitle D—Hazardous Materials

Sec. 1301. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 1302. Ensuring safe implementation of positive train control systems.

TITLE II—REVENUE PROVISIONS

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

TITLE I—SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM EXTENSION

Subtitle A—Federal-Aid Highways

SEC. 1001. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1001(a) of the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of

2014 (128 Stat. 1840) is amended by striking “October 29, 2015” and inserting “November 20, 2015”.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—Section 1001(b)(1)(B) of the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1840) is amended by striking “for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015, ^{29/366} of the total amount” and inserting “for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015, ^{51/366} of the total amount”.

(2) GENERAL FUND.—Section 1123(h)(1) of MAP-21 (23 U.S.C. 202 note) is amended by striking “and \$2,377,049 out of the general fund of the Treasury to carry out the program for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015” and inserting “and \$4,180,328 out of the general fund of the Treasury to carry out the program for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015”.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1001(c)(1)(B) of the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1840) is amended—

(A) by striking “October 29, 2015,” and inserting “November 20, 2015.”; and

(B) by striking “^{29/366}” and inserting “^{51/366}”.

(2) OBLIGATION CEILING.—Section 1102 of MAP-21 (23 U.S.C. 104 note) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (a)(4) and inserting the following:

“(4) \$5,595,839,851 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”;

(B) in subsection (b)(12) by striking “, and for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015, only in an amount equal to \$639,000,000, less any reductions that would have otherwise been required for that year by section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a), then multiplied by ^{29/366} for that period” and inserting “, and for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015, only in an amount equal to \$639,000,000, less any reductions that would have otherwise been required for that year by section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a), then multiplied by ^{51/366} for that period”;

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “October 29, 2015” and inserting “November 20, 2015.”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking “for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015, that is equal to ^{29/366} of such unobligated balance” and inserting “for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015, that is equal to ^{51/366} of such unobligated balance.”; and

(D) in subsection (f)(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking “October 29, 2015” and inserting “November 20, 2015”.

SEC. 1002. ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

Section 1002 of the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 (128 Stat. 1842) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a)(2) and inserting the following:

“(2) \$61,311,475 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(2) by striking “and for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015, subject to the limitations on administrative expenses under the heading ‘Federal Highway Administration’” and inserting “and for the period

beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015, subject to the limitations on administrative expenses for the Federal Highway Administration and Appalachian Regional Commission”.

Subtitle B—Extension of Highway Safety Programs

SEC. 1101. EXTENSION OF NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.

(a) EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS.—

(1) HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.—Section 31101(a)(1)(D) of MAP-21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended to read as follows:

“(D) \$32,745,902 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”.

(2) HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—Section 31101(a)(2)(D) of MAP-21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended to read as follows:

“(D) \$15,815,574 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”.

(3) NATIONAL PRIORITY SAFETY PROGRAMS.—Section 31101(a)(3)(D) of MAP-21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended to read as follows:

“(D) \$37,901,639 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”.

(4) NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER.—Section 31101(a)(4)(D) of MAP-21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended to read as follows:

“(D) \$696,721 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”.

(5) HIGH VISIBILITY ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM.—

(A) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 31101(a)(5)(D) of MAP-21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended to read as follows:

“(D) \$4,040,984 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”.

(B) LAW ENFORCEMENT CAMPAIGNS.—Section 2009(a) of SAFETEA-LU (23 U.S.C. 402 note) is amended—

(i) in the first sentence by striking “October 29, 2015” and inserting “November 20, 2015.”; and

(ii) in the second sentence by striking “October 29, 2015,” and inserting “November 20, 2015.”.

(6) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 31101(a)(6)(D) of MAP-21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended to read as follows:

“(D) \$3,553,279 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”.

(b) COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.—Section 403(f)(1) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$198,087 of the total amount available for apportionment to the States for highway safety programs under section 402(c) in the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015,” and inserting “and \$348,361 of the total amount available for apportionment to the States for highway safety programs under section 402(c) in the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”.

(c) APPLICABILITY OF TITLE 23.—Section 31101(c) of MAP-21 (126 Stat. 733) is amended by striking “October 29, 2015,” and inserting “November 20, 2015.”.

SEC. 1102. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS.

(a) MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY GRANTS.—Section 31104(a)(11) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(11) \$30,377,049 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 31104(i)(1)(K) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(K) \$36,090,164 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”.

(c) GRANT PROGRAMS.—

(1) COMMERCIAL DRIVER'S LICENSE PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT GRANTS.—Section 4101(c)(1) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by striking “and \$2,377,049 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015” and inserting “and \$4,180,328 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015”.

(2) BORDER ENFORCEMENT GRANTS.—Section 4101(c)(2) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by striking “and \$2,535,519 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015” and inserting “and \$4,459,016 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015”.

(3) PERFORMANCE AND REGISTRATION INFORMATION SYSTEM MANAGEMENT GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 4101(c)(3) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by striking “and \$396,175 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015” and inserting “and \$696,721 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015”.

(4) COMMERCIAL VEHICLE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND NETWORKS DEPLOYMENT PROGRAM.—Section 4101(c)(4) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by striking “and \$1,980,874 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015” and inserting “and \$3,483,607 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015”.

(5) SAFETY DATA IMPROVEMENT GRANTS.—Section 4101(c)(5) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1715) is amended by striking “and \$237,705 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015” and inserting “and \$418,033 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015”.

(d) HIGH-PRIORITY ACTIVITIES.—Section 31104(k)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and up to \$1,188,525 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015,” and inserting “and up to \$2,090,164 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”.

(e) NEW ENTRANT AUDITS.—Section 31144(g)(5)(B) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and up to \$2,535,519 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015,” and inserting “and up to \$4,459,016 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”.

(f) OUTREACH AND EDUCATION.—Section 4127(e) of SAFETEA-LU (119 Stat. 1741) is amended by striking “and \$316,940 to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015,” and inserting “and \$557,377 to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”.

(g) GRANT PROGRAM FOR COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATORS.—Section 4134(c) of SAFETEA-LU (49 U.S.C. 31301 note) is amended by striking “and \$79,235 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”.

SEC. 1103. DINGELL-JOHNSON SPORT FISH RESTORATION ACT.

Section 4 of the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “October 29, 2015” and inserting “November 20, 2015.”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1)(A) by striking “October 29, 2015,” and inserting “November 20, 2015.”

Subtitle C—Public Transportation Programs
SEC. 1201. FORMULA GRANTS FOR RURAL AREAS.

Section 5311(c)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) by striking “and \$396,175 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015,” and inserting “and \$696,721 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B) by striking “and \$1,980,874 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015,” and inserting “and \$3,483,607 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”

SEC. 1202. APPORTIONMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FORMULA GRANTS.

Section 5336(h)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$2,377,049 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015,” and inserting “and \$4,180,328 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”

SEC. 1203. AUTHORIZATIONS FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION.

(a) **FORMULA GRANTS.**—Section 5338(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking “and \$681,024,590 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015” and inserting “and \$1,197,663,934 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by striking “and \$10,205,464 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015,” and inserting “and \$17,947,541 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”;

(B) in subparagraph (B) by striking “and \$792,350 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015,” and inserting “and \$1,393,443 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”;

(C) in subparagraph (C) by striking “and \$353,281,011 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015,” and inserting “and \$621,287,295 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”;

(D) in subparagraph (D) by striking “and \$20,466,393 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015,” and inserting “and \$35,992,623 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”;

(E) in subparagraph (E)—

(i) by striking “and \$48,159,016 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015,” and inserting “and \$84,693,443 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”;

(ii) by striking “and \$2,377,049 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015,” and inserting “and \$4,180,328 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”; and

(iii) by striking “and \$1,584,699 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015,” and inserting “and \$2,786,885 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”;

(F) in subparagraph (F) by striking “and \$237,705 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015,” and inserting “and \$418,033 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”;

(G) in subparagraph (G) by striking “and \$396,175 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015,” and inserting “and \$696,721 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”;

(H) in subparagraph (H) by striking “and \$305,055 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015,” and inserting “and \$536,475 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”;

(I) in subparagraph (I) by striking “and \$171,615,027 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015,” and inserting “and \$301,805,738 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”;

(J) in subparagraph (J) by striking “and \$33,896,721 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015,” and inserting “and \$59,611,475 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”; and

(K) in subparagraph (K) by striking “and \$41,669,672 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015,” and inserting “and \$73,281,148 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”

(b) **RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT DEMONSTRATION AND DEPLOYMENT PROJECTS.**—Section 5338(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$5,546,448 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015” and inserting “and \$9,754,098 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”

(c) **TRANSIT COOPERATIVE RESEARCH PROGRAM.**—Section 5338(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$554,645 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015” and inserting “and \$975,410 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”

(d) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT.**—Section 5338(d) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$554,645 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015” and inserting “and \$975,410 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”

(e) **HUMAN RESOURCES AND TRAINING.**—Section 5338(e) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$396,175 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015” and inserting “and \$696,721 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”

(f) **CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS.**—Section 5338(g) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$151,101,093 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015” and inserting “and \$265,729,508 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”

(g) **ADMINISTRATION.**—Section 5338(h) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking “and \$8,240,437 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015” and inserting “and \$14,491,803 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”;

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking “and not less than \$396,175 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015,” and inserting “and not less than \$696,721 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”; and

(3) in paragraph (3) by striking “and not less than \$79,235 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015,” and inserting “and not less than \$139,344 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”

SEC. 1204. BUS AND BUS FACILITIES FORMULA GRANTS.

Section 5339(d)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “and \$5,189,891 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015,” and inserting “and \$9,127,049 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”;

(2) by striking “\$99,044 for such period” and inserting “\$174,180 for such period.”; and

(3) by striking “\$39,617 for such period” and inserting “\$69,672 for such period.”

Subtitle D—Hazardous Materials

SEC. 1301. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 5128(a)(4) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(4) \$5,958,639 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”

(b) **HAZARDOUS MATERIALS EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND.**—Section 5128(b)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(2) **FISCAL YEAR 2016.**—From the Hazardous Materials Emergency Preparedness Fund established under section 5116(i), the Secretary may expend for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015—

“(A) \$26,197 to carry out section 5115;

“(B) \$3,037,705 to carry out subsections (a) and (b) of section 5116, of which not less than \$1,902,049 shall be available to carry out section 5116(b);

“(C) \$20,902 to carry out section 5116(f);

“(D) \$87,090 to publish and distribute the Emergency Response Guidebook under section 5116(i)(3); and

“(E) \$139,344 to carry out section 5116(j).”

(c) **HAZARDOUS MATERIALS TRAINING GRANTS.**—Section 5128(c) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking “and \$316,940 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on October 29, 2015,” and inserting “and \$557,377 for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on November 20, 2015.”

SEC. 1302. ENSURING SAFE IMPLEMENTATION OF POSITIVE TRAIN CONTROL SYSTEMS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Positive Train Control Enforcement and Implementation Act of 2015.”

(b) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 20157 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) by striking “18 months after the date of enactment of the Rail Safety Improvement Act of 2008” and inserting “90 days after the date of enactment of the Positive Train Control Enforcement and Implementation Act of 2015.”;

(B) by striking “develop and”;

(C) by striking “a plan for implementing” and inserting “a revised plan for implementing”;

(D) by striking “December 31, 2015” and inserting “December 31, 2018”; and

(E) in subparagraph (B) by striking “parts” and inserting “sections”;

(2) by striking subsection (a)(2) and inserting the following:

“(2) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—

“(A) **CONTENTS OF REVISED PLAN.**—A revised plan required under paragraph (1) shall—

“(i) describe—

“(I) how the positive train control system will provide for interoperability of the system with the movements of trains of other railroad carriers over its lines; and

“(II) how, to the extent practical, the positive train control system will be implemented in a manner that addresses areas of greater risk before areas of lesser risk;

“(ii) comply with the positive train control system implementation plan content requirements under section 236.1011 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations; and

“(iii) provide—

“(I) the calendar year or years in which spectrum will be acquired and will be available for use in each area as needed for positive train control system implementation, if such spectrum is not already acquired and available for use;

“(II) the total amount of positive train control system hardware that will be installed for implementation, with totals separated by each major hardware category;

“(III) the total amount of positive train control system hardware that will be installed by the end of each calendar year until the positive train control system is implemented, with totals separated by each hardware category;

“(IV) the total number of employees required to receive training under the applicable positive train control system regulations;

“(V) the total number of employees that will receive the training, as required under the applicable positive train control system regulations, by the end of each calendar year until the positive train control system is implemented;

“(VI) a summary of any remaining technical, programmatic, operational, or other challenges to the implementation of a positive train control system, including challenges with—

“(aa) availability of public funding;

“(bb) interoperability;

“(cc) spectrum;

“(dd) software;

“(ee) permitting; and

“(ff) testing, demonstration, and certification; and

“(VII) a schedule and sequence for implementing a positive train control system by the deadline established under paragraph (1).

“(B) ALTERNATIVE SCHEDULE AND SEQUENCE.—Notwithstanding the implementation deadline under paragraph (1) and in lieu of a schedule and sequence under paragraph (2)(A)(iii)(VII), a railroad carrier or other entity subject to paragraph (1) may include in its revised plan an alternative schedule and sequence for implementing a positive train control system, subject to review under paragraph (3). Such schedule and sequence shall provide for implementation of a positive train control system as soon as practicable, but not later than the date that is 24 months after the implementation deadline under paragraph (1).

“(C) AMENDMENTS.—A railroad carrier or other entity subject to paragraph (1) may file a request to amend a revised plan, including any alternative schedule and sequence, as applicable, in accordance with section 236.1021 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(D) COMPLIANCE.—A railroad carrier or other entity subject to paragraph (1) shall implement a positive train control system in accordance with its revised plan, including any amendments or any alternative schedule and sequence approved by the Secretary under paragraph (3).

“(3) SECRETARIAL REVIEW.—

“(A) NOTIFICATION.—A railroad carrier or other entity that submits a revised plan under paragraph (1) and proposes an alternative schedule and sequence under paragraph (2)(B) shall submit to the Secretary a written notification when such railroad carrier or other entity is prepared for review under subparagraph (B).

“(B) CRITERIA.—Not later than 90 days after a railroad carrier or other entity submits a notification under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall review the alternative

schedule and sequence submitted pursuant to paragraph (2)(B) and determine whether the railroad carrier or other entity has demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, that such carrier or entity has—

“(i) installed all positive train control system hardware consistent with the plan contents provided pursuant to paragraph (2)(A)(iii)(II) on or before the implementation deadline under paragraph (1);

“(ii) acquired all spectrum necessary for implementation of a positive train control system, consistent with the plan contents provided pursuant to paragraph (2)(A)(iii)(I) on or before the implementation deadline under paragraph (1);

“(iii) completed employee training required under the applicable positive train control system regulations;

“(iv) included in its revised plan an alternative schedule and sequence for implementing a positive train control system as soon as practicable, pursuant to paragraph (2)(B);

“(v) certified to the Secretary in writing that it will be in full compliance with the requirements of this section on or before the date provided in an alternative schedule and sequence, subject to approval by the Secretary;

“(vi) in the case of a Class I railroad carrier and Amtrak, implemented a positive train control system or initiated revenue service demonstration on the majority of territories, such as subdivisions or districts, or route miles that are owned or controlled by such carrier and required to have operations governed by a positive train control system; and

“(vii) in the case of any other railroad carrier or other entity not subject to clause (vi)—

“(I) initiated revenue service demonstration on at least 1 territory that is required to have operations governed by a positive train control system; or

“(II) met any other criteria established by the Secretary.

“(C) DECISION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the receipt of the notification from a railroad carrier or other entity under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall—

“(I) approve an alternative schedule and sequence submitted pursuant to paragraph (2)(B) if the railroad carrier or other entity meets the criteria in subparagraph (B); and

“(II) notify in writing the railroad carrier or other entity of the decision.

“(ii) DEFICIENCIES.—Not later than 45 days after the receipt of the notification under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall provide to the railroad carrier or other entity a written notification of any deficiencies that would prevent approval under clause (i) and provide the railroad carrier or other entity an opportunity to correct deficiencies before the date specified in such clause.

“(D) REVISED DEADLINES.—

“(i) PENDING REVIEWS.—For a railroad carrier or other entity that submits a notification under subparagraph (A), the deadline for implementation of a positive train control system required under paragraph (1) shall be extended until the date on which the Secretary approves or disapproves the alternative schedule and sequence, if such date is later than the implementation date under paragraph (1).

“(ii) ALTERNATIVE SCHEDULE AND SEQUENCE DEADLINE.—If the Secretary approves a railroad carrier or other entity's alternative schedule and sequence under subparagraph (C)(i), the railroad carrier or other entity's deadline for implementation of a positive train control system required under paragraph (1) shall be the date specified in that railroad carrier or other entity's alternative

schedule and sequence. The Secretary may not approve a date for implementation that is later than 24 months from the deadline in paragraph (1).”;

(3) by striking subsections (c), (d), and (e) and inserting the following:

“(C) PROGRESS REPORTS AND REVIEW.—

“(1) PROGRESS REPORTS.—Each railroad carrier or other entity subject to subsection (a) shall, not later than March 31, 2016, and annually thereafter until such carrier or entity has completed implementation of a positive train control system, submit to the Secretary a report on the progress toward implementing such systems, including—

“(A) the information on spectrum acquisition provided pursuant to subsection (a)(2)(A)(iii)(I);

“(B) the totals provided pursuant to subclauses (III) and (V) of subsection (a)(2)(A)(iii), by territory, if applicable;

“(C) the extent to which the railroad carrier or other entity is complying with the implementation schedule under subsection (a)(2)(A)(iii)(VII) or subsection (a)(2)(B);

“(D) any update to the information provided under subsection (a)(2)(A)(iii)(VI);

“(E) for each entity providing regularly scheduled intercity or commuter rail passenger transportation, a description of the resources identified and allocated to implement a positive train control system;

“(F) for each railroad carrier or other entity subject to subsection (a), the total number of route miles on which a positive train control system has been initiated for revenue service demonstration or implemented, as compared to the total number of route miles required to have a positive train control system under subsection (a); and

“(G) any other information requested by the Secretary.

“(2) PLAN REVIEW.—The Secretary shall at least annually conduct reviews to ensure that railroad carriers or other entities are complying with the revised plan submitted under subsection (a), including any amendments or any alternative schedule and sequence approved by the Secretary. Such railroad carriers or other entities shall provide such information as the Secretary determines necessary to adequately conduct such reviews.

“(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Not later than 60 days after receipt, the Secretary shall make available to the public on the Internet Web site of the Department of Transportation any report submitted pursuant to paragraph (1) or subsection (d), but may exclude, as the Secretary determines appropriate—

“(A) proprietary information; and

“(B) security-sensitive information, including information described in section 1520.5(a) of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

“(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than July 1, 2018, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the progress of each railroad carrier or other entity subject to subsection (a) in implementing a positive train control system.

“(e) ENFORCEMENT.—The Secretary is authorized to assess civil penalties pursuant to chapter 213 for—

“(1) a violation of this section;

“(2) the failure to submit or comply with the revised plan required under subsection (a), including the failure to comply with the totals provided pursuant to subclauses (III) and (V) of subsection (a)(2)(A)(iii) and the spectrum acquisition dates provided pursuant to subsection (a)(2)(A)(iii)(I);

“(3) failure to comply with any amendments to such revised plan pursuant to subsection (a)(2)(C); and

“(4) the failure to comply with an alternative schedule and sequence submitted under subsection (a)(2)(B) and approved by the Secretary under subsection (a)(3)(C).”;

(4) in subsection (h)—

(A) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) PROVISIONAL OPERATION.—Notwithstanding the requirements of paragraph (1), the Secretary may authorize a railroad carrier or other entity to commence operation in revenue service of a positive train control system or component to the extent necessary to enable the safe implementation and operation of a positive train control system in phases.”;

(5) in subsection (i)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (3) as paragraphs (3) through (5), respectively; and

(B) by inserting before paragraph (3) (as so redesignated) the following:

“(1) EQUIVALENT OR GREATER LEVEL OF SAFETY.—The term ‘equivalent or greater level of safety’ means the compliance of a railroad carrier with—

“(A) appropriate operating rules in place immediately prior to the use or implementation of such carrier’s positive train control system, except that such rules may be changed by such carrier to improve safe operations; and

“(B) all applicable safety regulations, except as specified in subsection (j).

“(2) HARDWARE.—The term ‘hardware’ means a locomotive apparatus, a wayside interface unit (including any associated legacy signal system replacements), switch position monitors needed for a positive train control system, physical back office system equipment, a base station radio, a wayside radio, a locomotive radio, or a communication tower or pole.”; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

“(j) EARLY ADOPTION.—

“(1) OPERATIONS.—From the date of enactment of the Positive Train Control Enforcement and Implementation Act of 2015 through the 1-year period beginning on the date on which the last Class I railroad carrier’s positive train control system subject to subsection (a) is certified by the Secretary under subsection (h)(1) of this section and is implemented on all of that railroad carrier’s lines required to have operations governed by a positive train control system, any railroad carrier, including any railroad carrier that has its positive train control system certified by the Secretary, shall not be subject to the operational restrictions set forth in sections 236.567 and 236.1029 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, that would apply where a controlling locomotive that is operating in, or is to be operated in, a positive train control-equipped track segment experiences a positive train control system failure, a positive train control operated consist is not provided by another railroad carrier when provided in interchange, or a positive train control system otherwise fails to initialize, cuts out, or malfunctions, provided that such carrier operates at an equivalent or greater level of safety than the level achieved immediately prior to the use or implementation of its positive train control system.

“(2) SAFETY ASSURANCE.—During the period described in paragraph (1), if a positive train control system that has been certified and implemented fails to initialize, cuts out, or malfunctions, the affected railroad carrier or other entity shall make reasonable efforts to determine the cause of the failure and ad-

just, repair, or replace any faulty component causing the system failure in a timely manner.

“(3) PLANS.—The positive train control safety plan for each railroad carrier or other entity shall describe the safety measures, such as operating rules and actions to comply with applicable safety regulations, that will be put in place during any system failure.

“(4) NOTIFICATION.—During the period described in paragraph (1), if a positive train control system that has been certified and implemented fails to initialize, cuts out, or malfunctions, the affected railroad carrier or other entity shall submit a notification to the appropriate regional office of the Federal Railroad Administration within 7 days of the system failure, or under alternative location and deadline requirements set by the Secretary, and include in the notification a description of the safety measures the affected railroad carrier or other entity has in place.

“(k) SMALL RAILROADS.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall amend section 236.1006(b)(4)(iii)(B) of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to equipping locomotives for applicable Class II and Class III railroads operating in positive train control territory) to extend each deadline under such section by 3 years.

“(1) REVENUE SERVICE DEMONSTRATION.—When a railroad carrier or other entity subject to (a)(1) notifies the Secretary it is prepared to initiate revenue service demonstration, it shall also notify any applicable tenant railroad carrier or other entity subject to subsection (a)(1).”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 20157(g), is amended—

(1) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) CONFORMING REGULATORY AMENDMENTS.—Immediately after the date of the enactment of the Positive Train Control Enforcement and Implementation Act of 2015, the Secretary—

“(A) shall remove or revise the date-specific deadlines in the regulations or orders implementing this section to the extent necessary to conform with the amendments made by such Act; and

“(B) may not enforce any such date-specific deadlines or requirements that are inconsistent with the amendments made by such Act.

“(3) REVIEW.—Nothing in the Positive Train Control Enforcement and Implementation Act of 2015, or the amendments made by such Act, shall be construed to require the Secretary to issue regulations to implement such Act or amendments other than the regulatory amendments required by paragraph (2) and subsection (k).”.

TITLE II—REVENUE PROVISIONS

SEC. 2001. EXTENSION OF HIGHWAY TRUST FUND EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY.

(a) HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—Section 9503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “October 30, 2015” in subsections (b)(6)(B), (c)(1), and (e)(3) and inserting “November 21, 2015”, and

(2) by striking “Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015” in subsections (c)(1) and (e)(3) and inserting “Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2015”.

(b) SPORT FISH RESTORATION AND BOATING TRUST FUND.—Section 9504 of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking “Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015” each place it appears in

subsection (b)(2) and inserting “Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2015”, and

(2) by striking “October 30, 2015” in subsection (d)(2) and inserting “November 21, 2015”.

(c) LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND.—Section 9508(e)(2) of such Code is amended by striking “October 30, 2015” and inserting “November 21, 2015”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 3819.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in support of H.R. 3819, which extends Federal surface transportation programs through November 20, 2015.

This bill allows States to continue to fund transportation projects, and it prevents 4,100 U.S. Department of Transportation employees from being furloughed. H.R. 3819 funds these programs at the authorized levels for fiscal year 2014. No offsets or transfers of funding to the highway trust fund are necessary for this extension since the trust fund will remain solvent during this period.

Last week, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure unanimously approved a bipartisan, multiyear surface transportation reauthorization bill. This extension will enable the House to continue its work on this important legislation. H.R. 3819 also includes critical language extending the deadline for railroads to implement positive train control technology to 2018.

We have known for some time that railroads simply cannot meet the congressionally mandated positive train control, or PTC, deadline of December 31, 2015. What has become more apparent is how catastrophic it would be for the Nation’s economy if we don’t extend the deadline now.

Without an extension, railroads will stop shipping important chemicals critical to manufacturing, agriculture, clean drinking water, and other industrial activities. In fact, some railroads are already notifying shippers they will stop accepting chemical shipments by December 1. This is creating extreme uncertainty across a variety of groups that rely on rail shipments, from farmers who need ammonia for fertilizer, to water utilities that need chlorine to purify drinking water.

Some industrial companies have already begun the planning process for shutting down plants because they cannot operate without chemicals delivered by rail. We have heard from one

chemical company in New Hampshire that said its railroad will stop picking up chlorine on November 13.

This company is the only supplier of chlorine to the entire six-State New England region for drinking water and wastewater treatment. Therefore, after November 13, New England could very well be without chlorine to clean its water.

On a broader scale, a PTC-related rail shutdown would pull \$30 billion out of the economy in one quarter alone and lead to 700,000 jobs lost in just one month. It is our responsibility to extend this deadline now and avoid such harm to the Nation's economy.

This language is based on bipartisan, bicameral work over the last several weeks, and it would ensure that railroads implement positive train control as quickly as possible.

I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 3819.

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

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

On July 1, when we last visited the issue of a short-term extension for surface transportation, I bemoaned the fact that little progress had been made on a long-term, 6-year bill. I am pleased today that I don't have to use the same talking points.

We did, through the actual legislative process—with lengthy negotiations leading up to it—pass out of committee a 6-year bill, which relates to policies that would underlie a 6-year investment in our crumbling infrastructure. That is the good news.

It was ultimately a bipartisan effort in the tradition of the committee. There is not too much to make partisan about moving goods and people from here to there efficiently except for those who are opposed to the Federal Government being involved and, who, luckily, don't represent a majority on our committee. So that is the good news.

The bad news is we still do not have the funding mechanism before us, so we have to do another short-term extension. Also, the currently stated objective for funding is totally inadequate. I mean, America is falling apart. It is embarrassing, actually.

These States, including many all-red Republican States—14 States—have voted to raise gas taxes since 2013 to invest in maintaining or in rebuilding their infrastructure or in building out new transportation options to get their citizens and goods out of congestion—14 States. Since 2008, nearly half of the States have taken action to raise more funds.

The Federal Government last raised the gas tax in 1993, and we are told any increase in user fees—gas tax, barrel tax, indexation of the gas tax, vehicle miles traveled—is all off the table. We cannot ask those who use the system to pay user fees to improve the system that they use on a daily basis. I think the American people are more realistic than that.

Luckily, this bill contains a provision that, should this Congress or a future, more enlightened Congress decide to allocate additional funds, those funds will flow through under the policies set out in this bill and the formulas set out in this bill without any further action by Congress, as it is really a good idea to avoid coming to Congress for anything whenever you can. So that is, I think, a very important provision of the bill.

There is an AP story today that kind of goes to the heart of this, and it talks about the fact that, in many States, they are abandoning roads and bridges. We are not just talking about the rural heartland anymore. This has been somewhat commonplace in the rural heartland, where they have been saying, "We can't afford to pave these roads anymore. We are going back to gravel." We are talking about King County in Washington State. We are talking about the counties and State areas surrounding Des Moines, Iowa.

We are talking about major urban areas and the fact that, since the Federal Government has failed to invest and to live up to its partnership for major, critical urban area projects or major projects for our ports or other choke points on the system, States have had to concentrate resources there.

They have tried to raise more money, again, with no help from the Federal Government. Now they are having to abandon the 20th-century transportation system. I mean, that is pretty darned pathetic, that we are not holding up our end of that bargain and making any effort to do that. So that is the bad news part.

As the chairman mentioned, this bill also includes critical provisions to extend positive train control deadlines. With the exception of some portion of Amtrak, nobody will be able to meet the deadline of January 1, which does mean an extraordinary disruption of the movement of freight and commuter and passenger rail across the United States.

We have worked very hard with the Senate in negotiations, and we have a bicameral agreement on the extension. It is tough. It says we are not going to get to this point again. It is not going to be kick the can, kick the can, kick the can.

It says that all of the entities that are required to put in place positive train control will put forward a plan for approval with measurable benchmarks over this 3-year period, and they will be tracked as to meeting those benchmarks during that 3-year period.

So it won't be that, suddenly, we get to the end of 3 years and we hear from a majority of freight and/or passenger-commuter railroads, saying, "Gee, we just can't make it."

We will know where we are headed and will be able to target our efforts on those who are lagging behind. At the end of that, yes, it will be possible to get another extension, but they all will

have had to have installed the equipment.

The reality is that this is an expensive and complicated process, and putting in the equipment is, obviously, the first critical part and turning it on, but then it can take up to 2 years to get it certified as operational. So we are acceding to that reality in this legislation by saying: 3 years and measurable goals to get to the 3 years. Everybody is up with installation, and, hopefully, most will be operational at that point.

Some may not be due to circumstances beyond their control, even though they have made the necessary investments, and under negotiations with the Secretary of Transportation, they could get further extensions. So that is a very time-sensitive portion of this bill.

I have had many colleagues on my side saying, "I am really tired of these short-term extensions. I really don't want to vote for another one."

I have said that this is different. We have the policy in place—we don't have the funding yet—and we have got this very critical element of positive train control.

I am urging Members on my side of the aisle to support this proposal.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM), the subcommittee chairman on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials.

Mr. DENHAM. I thank Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, and Ranking Member CAPUANO for working with us to develop this important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation would ensure that railroads actually implement positive train control. We need to do it as quickly as possible and as safely as possible for the safety of our country.

As chairman of the Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials Subcommittee, we have been monitoring the railroads' progress in implementing PTC, positive train control, including holding a hearing in June that brought stakeholders in from across the country so as to understand exactly what the impacts are.

We have known for some time that most railroads simply won't be done with positive train control implementation by the end of this year. Now, several different things went into the delays of this, one of which is the FCC, where you have two government agencies not working together to get the tens of thousands of poles permitted so that they could actually have the communication interface.

PTC is a huge undertaking, requiring 38,000 wayside interfaces be installed along 60,000 miles of track. In addition, 18,000 locomotives need to be upgraded and 12,000 signals need to be replaced. All of these elements need to be seamlessly communicated across different railroads.

But what is important here is that we actually have benchmarks in place on implementation, that we have reporting on the progress and enforcement of the metrics throughout the entire extension. We need to make sure that this gets done right and that it gets done quickly.

Given this obvious need for an extension, a few weeks ago, Chairman SHUSTER and I, with Ranking Members DEFAZIO and CAPUANO, introduced a 3-year PTC extension. This bipartisan piece of legislation has garnered over 130 coauthors. Additionally, more than 200 stakeholders have signed letters to the Transportation Committee who support a PTC extension.

Just to give you a few examples from California:

If we don't extend the PTC deadline, the Altamont Corridor Express commuter rail service will shut down, putting more commuters on California's congested highways.

In the Central Valley, farmers will be negatively impacted, as farmers rely on rail for their fertilizers and our dairies and our cattle yards depend on feed that only comes in on rail. That is why the California Farm Bureau Federation and the California League of Wheat Growers are supporting a PTC extension deadline.

Those are just a few examples of broad and wide agreement among railroads, shippers, and consumers that Congress should pass this legislation.

In conclusion, we have worked in a bipartisan manner with our Senate counterparts to develop this legislation, and I believe this bill will ensure that PTC gets done as soon as possible and as safely as possible.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), the ranking Democrat.

□ 1345

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SHUSTER and Chairman GRAVES as well as Ranking Member DEFAZIO for working with me and for all of us being able to work together on what will be, when it gets to the floor in November, I believe, the first 6-year or long-term transportation bill in 10 years. That is why it is possible not to fret that we are now going through another extension.

As a matter of fact, the States have the funds until January. These short-term extensions have compelled the States to stash their money without spending all of it because what they need to get to are long-term projects or at least projects that take more than a few months or a year or two, so we are making progress. When we authorize a 6-year bill, there will be a real burden on us to make sure that, in fact, it is 6 years.

I would advise my colleagues to support this last short-term extension. It is bipartisan. It is both Chambers. It avoids furloughs.

There is a bill waiting off stage. However, there is a funding mystery. I

don't like mysteries, particularly with long-term bills. But I have to believe that the appropriate committee is meeting every day—it must be in secret—in order to fund this bill.

At least we have done our work, and we have done it in a bipartisan way. I won't trouble with the entire bill. There will be time to get to that.

I will say, on positive train control, that I regret there had to be a 3-year extension. I do think that puts at jeopardy those that have to be in these trains—employees and passengers. As I looked at what it took to do positive train control, I don't think we had any alternative. So that gives people 3 years.

With the benchmarks, I hope that we will get most of this done way before 2018. I don't like permitting individual waivers because, after all, there have been at least 2 years spent trying to do something about positive train control, and the jeopardy is clear when we see what has happened already with respect to terrible crashes that have taken human life.

Finally, I just want to say that perhaps the greatest challenge we have is a challenge that we must meet.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, and that is a new way to fund the highway trust fund. There is in the final bill some experimentation that I regard as urgent.

I thank my good friends on both sides of the aisle for this short-term extension, which I hope will be the last in a very long time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this legislation.

I first want to thank Chairman SHUSTER as well as Ranking Member DEFAZIO for their hard work in marking up a meaningful, long-term transportation bill. It truly is something our country has eagerly anticipated, and we appreciate both you and your staff's hard work for giving our country the certainty that is needed on road and rail projects.

I also want to say I appreciate you including a deadline extension for the full implementation of positive train control safety technology. While this technology is vitally important for safety and many reasons, it has become increasingly clear that our Nation's passenger and freight railroads are unable to meet the current deadline.

As a farmer, I can tell you the resulting shutdown our country's freight network could experience if this deadline is not extended would have devastating consequences for both our farms and our entire Nation's economy. I appreciate your swift attention to this issue.

I urge all of my colleagues' support.

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

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

I just want to say my heartfelt thanks to the leaders of the Democrats on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Mr. DEFAZIO and Ms. NORTON, for getting this extension until November 20. It doesn't give us much time, but we need to get down to work, get this passed next week, get it into conference, and work to get this on the floor as soon as possible.

I also thank them for a sound extension to PTC, which is absolutely vital to the Nation's economy to get this thing extended so we continue rail shipments and to make sure that we have got something in place that gets this important technology deployed in a reasonable way, a responsible way to make sure that our rail system continues to be even safer than it is today. It is a very, very safe system today.

So I urge all my colleagues to support this.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for this extension and I truly hope this is the last one we need to pass for a very long time. This extension also addresses an emergency involving Positive Train Control (PTC).

Positive Train Control (PTC) is a critical system and it's very important that we address this issue in a rational manner. We need to implement positive train control as soon as humanly possible, but we need to get it done right. I don't want to see a situation where the federal government is fining railroads on a daily basis or picking winners and losers, because I don't think that is good for anyone. Our railroads are a critical part of our nation's economy and I'd much rather have them spending their money on implementing PTC and improving and expanding their infrastructure.

I believe wholeheartedly that reauthorizing a surface transportation bill will give the economy just the type of boost it needs. A long term transportation bill will strengthen our infrastructure, provides quality jobs, and serves as a tool to put America back on a path toward long-term economic growth.

Last week the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee passed a fair bill that moves us closer to sending a long term bill for President Obama to sign in to law.

This important legislation included a critical freight grant program, additional programs and funding for transit systems and their operators, continues the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) and creates a new non-motorized safety grant program, includes a much needed extension of Positive Train Control (PTC) implementation, increased funding for Grade Crossings, Requires more information on Hazardous Trains to State Emergency Response Commissions, incentivizes states to combat racial profiling, and extends the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Program.

Unfortunately, without critically needed additional funds, we're robbing Peter to pay Paul and forcing our states and local transportation agencies to pay more for New Starts and other programs while limiting their flexibility to use these funds. And we're missing out on an opportunity to ensure our infrastructure is meeting the needs of the disadvantaged and

working class to ensure they have fair access to employment and economic centers.

We absolutely need to do more to protect pedestrians and bike riders from harm. According to the May 2014 Pedestrian Danger Index (PDI), Orlando is ranked as the most dangerous place for pedestrians, with Jacksonville and Tampa also included in the top five most dangerous cities. This bill spends more time protecting corporations from liability than it does protecting the traveling public. Moreover, we need to ensure that all sizes and modes of transportation are treated equally in the freight grant program and should remove any caps on funding for these entities.

Again, I encourage my colleagues to support this extension and support bringing a long term transportation bill to the House floor as soon as possible.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I rise to speak on H.R. 3819, "Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2015," which reauthorizes federal-aid highway and transit programs for three weeks through November 20, 2015.

The bill also extends by three years the December 31, 2015 deadline for railroads to install positive train control systems but, within 90 days of enactment, all affected railroads must submit to the U.S. Department of Transportation a revised PTC compliance plan.

Mr. Speaker, instead of this 22-day temporary extension, I would have strongly preferred that we were debating a comprehensive, fair, equitable, and long-term transportation reauthorization bill the nation desperately needs.

We have had two years to do so.

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

But I reluctantly support this emergency but temporary measure because as the Department of Transportation has reported, if we do not act now highway trust fund balances will reach dangerously low levels by November 20 and result in a reduction of payments to states by an average of 28 percent.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Highway Trust Fund was created in 1956 during the Eisenhower Administration to help finance construction of the Interstate Highway System, which modernized the nation's transportation infrastructure and was instrumental in making the United States the world's dominant economic power for two generations.

Our national leaders then understood that investing in our roads and bridges strengthened our economy, created millions of good-paying jobs, and improved the quality of life for all Americans.

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

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

However, those tax rates—18.4 cents/gallon federal tax on gasoline and a 24.4 cents/gallon tax on diesel fuel—have remained unchanged since 1993 and were not indexed to inflation so the value of those revenues has eroded over the years, and, combined with the fact that vehicles have been getting increasingly better mileage, the revenues deposited into the Highway Trust Fund beginning last decade have not kept pace with highway and transit spending from the trust fund.

Consequently, since 2008, Congress has periodically had to transfer at the 11th hour general Treasury revenues into the trust fund to pay for authorized highway and transit spending levels and avoid a funding shortfall.

The total amount to date is more than \$62 billion.

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

Mr. Speaker, the last transportation authorized by Congress for 4 years or more, SAFETEA-LU, expired on September 30, 2009, at the end of FY 2009.

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

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

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

Instead, House Republicans have wasted the nation's time voting to repeal the Affordable Care Act more than 60 times, waging a War on Women, pursuing partisan investigations into the Benghazi tragedy, the IRS, defunding Planned Parenthood, and trying to overturn President Obama's executive actions that make our immigration enforcement laws less inhumane.

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

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

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

To do that we have to extend the reauthorization of current transportation programs and to authorize the transfer of the funds to the Highway Trust Fund needed to fund author-

ized construction projects and keep 700,000 workers, including 106,100 in Texas on the job.

But that is only a start and just a part of our job.

The real work that needs to be done in the remaining days of this Congress is to reach an agreement on a long-term highway and transportation bill that is fair, equitable, fiscally responsible, creates jobs and leads to sustained economic growth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3819.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 491;

Adopting House Resolution 491, if ordered;

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 450; and

Adopting House Resolution 450, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1090, RETAIL INVESTOR PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 491) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1090) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide protections for retail customers, and for other purposes, 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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 185, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 570]

YEAS—242

Abraham	Bishop (UT)	Buck
Aderholt	Black	Bucshon
Allen	Blackburn	Burgess
Amash	Blum	Byrne
Amodei	Bost	Calvert
Babin	Boustany	Carter (GA)
Barletta	Brady (TX)	Carter (TX)
Barr	Brat	Chabot
Barton	Bridenstine	Chaffetz
Benishek	Brooks (AL)	Clawson (FL)
Bilirakis	Brooks (IN)	Coffman
Bishop (MI)	Buchanan	Cole

Collins (GA) Johnson (OH)
 Collins (NY) Johnson, Sam
 Comstock Jolly
 Conaway Jones
 Cook Jordan
 Costello (PA) Joyce
 Cramer Katko
 Crawford Kelly (MS)
 Crenshaw Kelly (PA)
 Culberson King (IA)
 Curbelo (FL) King (NY)
 Davis, Rodney Kingzinger (IL)
 Denham Kline
 Dent Knight
 DeSantis Labrador
 DesJarlais LaHood
 Diaz-Balart LaMalfa
 Dold Lamborn
 Donovan Lance
 Duffy Latta
 Duncan (SC) LoBiondo
 Duncan (TN) Long
 Ellmers (NC) Loudermilk
 Emmer (MN) Love
 Farenthold Lucas
 Fincher Luetkemeyer
 Fitzpatrick Lummis
 Fleischmann MacArthur
 Fleming Marchant
 Flores Marino
 Forbes Massie
 Fortenberry McCarthy
 Foxx McCaul
 Frelinghuysen McClintock
 Garrett McHenry
 Gibbs McKinley
 Gibson McMorris
 Gohmert Rodgers
 Goodlatte McCaul
 Gosar Meadows
 Gowdy Meehan
 Granter Messer
 Graves (GA) Mica
 Graves (LA) Miller (FL)
 Graves (MO) Miller (MI)
 Griffith Moolenaar
 Grothman Mooney (WV)
 Guinta Mullin
 Guthrie Mulvaney
 Hanna Murphy (PA)
 Hardy Neugebauer
 Harper Newhouse
 Harris Noem
 Hartzler Nugent
 Heck (NV) Nunes
 Hensarling Olson
 Herrera Beutler Palazzo
 Hice, Jody B. Palmer
 Hill Paulsen
 Holding Perry
 Hudson Pittenger
 Huelskamp Pitts
 Huizenga (MI) Poe (TX)
 Hultgren Poliquin
 Hunter Pompeo
 Hurd (TX) Posey
 Issa Price, Tom
 Jenkins (KS) Ratcliffe
 Jenkins (WV) Reed

NAYS—185

Adams Clark (MA)
 Aguilar Clarke (NY)
 Ashford Clay
 Bass Cleaver
 Beatty Clyburn
 Becerra Cohen
 Bera Connolly
 Beyer Conyers
 Bishop (GA) Cooper
 Blumenauer Courtney
 Bonamici Crowley
 Boyle, Brendan Cuellar
 F. Cummings
 Brady (PA) Davis (CA)
 Brown (FL) Davis, Danny
 Brownley (CA) DeFazio
 Bustos DeGette
 Butterfield Delaney
 Capps DeLauro
 Capuano DeBene
 Cárdenas DeSaulnier
 Carney Deutch
 Carson (IN) Dingell
 Cartwright Doggett
 Castor (FL) Doyle, Michael
 Castro (TX) F.
 Chu, Judy Duckworth
 Cicilline Edwards

Jackson Lee McDermott
 Jeffries McGovern
 Johnson (GA) McNeerney
 Johnson, E. B. Meng
 Kaptur Moore
 Keating Moulton
 Kelly (IL) Murphy (FL)
 Kennedy Nadler
 Kildee Napolitano
 Kilmer Neal
 Kind Nolan
 Kirkpatrick Norcross
 Kuster O'Rourke
 Langevin Pallone
 Larsen (WA) Pascrell
 Larson (CT) Payne
 Lawrence Pelosi
 Lee Perlmutter
 Levin Peters
 Lewis Peterson
 Lieu, Ted Pingree
 Lipinski Pocan
 Loeb sack Polis
 Lofgren Price (NC)
 Lowenthal Quigley
 Lowey Rangel
 Lujan Grisham Rice (NY)
 (NM) Richmond
 Luján, Ben Ray Roybal-Allard
 (NM) Ruiz
 Lynch Ruppertsberger
 Maloney, Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean Ryan (OH)
 Matsui T.
 McCollum Sanchez, Loretta

NOT VOTING—7
 Costa Meeks Takai
 Franks (AZ) Pearce
 Hurt (VA) Roskam

□ 1417

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

Messrs. SALMON and GOODLATTE changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

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

Stated for:

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 570, a recorded vote on the previous question on H. Res. 491. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

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 244, noes 186, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 571]

AYES—244

Abraham Bost
 Aderholt Boustany
 Allen Brady (TX)
 Amash Brat
 Amodei Bridenstine
 Babin Brooks (AL)
 Barletta Brooks (IN)
 Barr Buchanan
 Barton Buck
 Benishek Bucshon
 Bilirakis Burgess
 Bishop (MI) Byrne
 Bishop (UT) Calvert
 Black Carter (GA)
 Blackburn Carter (TX)
 Blum Chabot

Denham Kelly (MS)
 Dent Kelly (PA)
 DeSantis King (IA)
 DesJarlais King (NY)
 Diaz-Balart Kinzinger (IL)
 Dold Kline
 Donovan Knight
 Duffy Labrador
 Duncan (SC) LaHood
 Duncan (TN) LaMalfa
 Ellmers (NC) Lamborn
 Emmer (MN) Lance
 Farenthold Latta
 Fincher LoBiondo
 Fitzpatrick Long
 Fleischmann Loudermilk
 Fleming Love
 Flores Lucas
 Forbes Luetkemeyer
 Fortenberry Lummis
 Foxx MacArthur
 Franks (AZ) Marchant
 Frelinghuysen Marino
 Garrett Massie
 Gibbs McCarthy
 Gibson McCaul
 Gohmert McClintock
 Goodlatte McHenry
 Gosar McKinley
 Gowdy McMorris
 Granter Rodgers
 Graves (GA) McCaul
 Graves (LA) Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO) Meehan
 Griffith Messer
 Grothman Mica
 Guinta Miller (FL)
 Guthrie Miller (MI)
 Hanna Moolenaar
 Hardy Mooney (WV)
 Harper Mullin
 Harris Mulvaney
 Hartzler Murphy (PA)
 Heck (NV) Neugebauer
 Hensarling Newhouse
 Herrera Beutler Noem
 Hice, Jody B. Nugent
 Hill Nunes
 Holding Olson
 Hudson Palazzo
 Huelskamp Palmer
 Huizenga (MI) Paulsen
 Hultgren Perry
 Hunter Pittenger
 Hurd (TX) Hurd (TX)
 Hurd (VA) Hurd (VA)
 Issa Issa
 Jenkins (KS) Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (WV) Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (OH) Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam Johnson, Sam
 Jolly Jolly
 Jones Jones
 Jordan Jordan
 Joyce Joyce
 Katko Katko

NOES—186

Adams Cleaver
 Aguilar Clyburn
 Ashford Cohen
 Bass Connolly
 Beatty Conyers
 Becerra Cooper
 Bera Costa
 Beyer Courtney
 Bishop (GA) Crowley
 Blumenauer Cuellar
 Bonamici Cummings
 Boyle, Brendan Davis (CA)
 F. Davis, Danny
 Brady (PA) DeFazio
 Brown (FL) DeGette
 Brownley (CA) Delaney
 Bustos DeLauro
 Butterfield DeBene
 Capps DeSaulnier
 Capuano Deutch
 Cárdenas Dingell
 Carney Doggett
 Cartwright Doyle, Michael
 Castor (FL) F.
 Castro (TX) Duckworth
 Chu, Judy Edwards
 Cicilline Ellison
 Clark (MA) Engel
 Clarke (NY) Eshoo
 Clay Farr

Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney (FL)
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Royce
 Russell
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Love
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 MacArthur
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McCaul
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Messer
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Neugebauer
 Newhouse
 Noem
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Palmer
 Paulsen
 Perry
 Pittenger
 Hurd (TX)
 Hurd (VA)
 Issa
 Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jolly
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce
 Katko

Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moore
Moulton

Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Tonko
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader

Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
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

Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Elmiers (NC)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce

Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—4

Meeks
Pearce

Roskam
Takai

□ 1425

So the resolution was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 597, REFORM EXPORTS AND EXPAND THE AMERICAN ECONOMY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 450) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 597) to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes, 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 271, nays 158, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 572]

YEAS—271

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Amodi
Ashford
Barletta
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany

Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Conolly
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Cartwright

Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa

NAYS—158

Abraham
Allen
Amash
Babin
Barr
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (TX)
Chabot

Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Culberson
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)

NOT VOTING—5

Meeks
Pearce

Rice (SC)
Roskam

□ 1432

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 275, nays 154, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 573]

YEAS—275

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Ashford
Barletta
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Cartwright

Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
DelBene
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch

Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Elmiers (NC)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler

Hastings
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Knight
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeback
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur

Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meehan
Meng
Mica
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Newhouse
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush

Russell
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Welch
Whitfield
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NAYS—154

Allen
Amash
Babin
Barr
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Burgess
Byrne
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Crawford
Culberson
Denham
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox

Franks (AZ)
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Grayson
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Harris
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
King (IA)
Kline
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance

Rouzer
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (MO)

Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup

Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—5

Amodei
Meeks

Pearce
Roskam

Takai

□ 1440

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.

Stated for:
Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 573, I would like to be recorded as voting "yea."

Stated against:
Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I hurriedly returned to the House chamber from a meeting. I voted "yes" on rollcall 573. I intended to vote "no."

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REFORM AND REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 450, the House will proceed to the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 597) to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 450, the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 3611 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 597

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015".

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

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- TITLE I—TAXPAYER PROTECTION PROVISIONS AND INCREASED ACCOUNTABILITY
- Sec. 101. Reduction in authorized amount of outstanding loans, guarantees, and insurance.
- Sec. 102. Increase in loss reserves.
- Sec. 103. Review of fraud controls.
- Sec. 104. Office of Ethics.
- Sec. 105. Chief Risk Officer.
- Sec. 106. Risk Management Committee.
- Sec. 107. Independent audit of bank portfolio.
- Sec. 108. Pilot program for reinsurance.

TITLE II—PROMOTION OF SMALL BUSINESS EXPORTS

Sec. 201. Increase in small business lending requirements.

Sec. 202. Report on programs for small and medium-sized businesses.

TITLE III—MODERNIZATION OF OPERATIONS

Sec. 301. Electronic payments and documents.
Sec. 302. Reauthorization of information technology updating.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. Extension of authority.
Sec. 402. Certain updated loan terms and amounts.

TITLE V—OTHER MATTERS

Sec. 501. Prohibition on discrimination based on industry.
Sec. 502. Negotiations to end export credit financing.
Sec. 503. Study of financing for information and communications technology systems.

TITLE I—TAXPAYER PROTECTION PROVISIONS AND INCREASED ACCOUNTABILITY

SEC. 101. REDUCTION IN AUTHORIZED AMOUNT OF OUTSTANDING LOANS, GUARANTEES, AND INSURANCE.

Section 6(a) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635e(a)) is amended—

- (1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and
- (2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

"(2) APPLICABLE AMOUNT DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term 'applicable amount', for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019, means \$135,000,000.

"(3) FREEZING OF LENDING CAP IF DEFAULT RATE IS 2 PERCENT OR MORE.—If the rate calculated under section 8(g)(1) is 2 percent or more for a quarter, the Bank may not exceed the amount of loans, guarantees, and insurance outstanding on the last day of that quarter until the rate calculated under section 8(g)(1) is less than 2 percent."

SEC. 102. INCREASE IN LOSS RESERVES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635e) is amended—

- (1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and
- (2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

"(b) RESERVE REQUIREMENT.—The Bank shall build to and hold in reserve, to protect against future losses, an amount that is not less than 5 percent of the aggregate amount of disbursed and outstanding loans, guarantees, and insurance of the Bank."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 103. REVIEW OF FRAUD CONTROLS.

Section 17(b) of the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012 (12 U.S.C. 635a-6(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) REVIEW OF FRAUD CONTROLS.—Not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, and every 4 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

- (1) review the adequacy of the design and effectiveness of the controls used by the Export-Import Bank of the United States to prevent, detect, and investigate fraudulent applications for loans and guarantees and the compliance by the Bank with the controls, including by auditing a sample of Bank transactions; and
- (2) submit a written report regarding the findings of the review and providing such recommendations with respect to the controls described in paragraph (1) as the Comptroller General deems appropriate to—

“(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

“(B) the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.”.

SEC. 104. OFFICE OF ETHICS.

Section 3 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) OFFICE OF ETHICS.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an Office of Ethics within the Bank, which shall oversee all ethics issues within the Bank.

“(2) HEAD OF OFFICE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of the Office of Ethics shall be the Chief Ethics Officer, who shall report to the Board of Directors.

“(B) APPOINTMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Chief Ethics Officer shall be—

“(i) appointed by the President of the Bank from among persons—

“(I) with a background in law who have experience in the fields of law and ethics; and

“(II) who are not serving in a position requiring appointment by the President of the United States before being appointed to be Chief Ethics Officer; and

“(ii) approved by the Board.

“(C) DESIGNATED AGENCY ETHICS OFFICIAL.—The Chief Ethics Officer shall serve as the designated agency ethics official for the Bank pursuant to the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 101 et seq.).

“(3) DUTIES.—The Office of Ethics has jurisdiction over all employees of, and ethics matters relating to, the Bank. With respect to employees of the Bank, the Office of Ethics shall—

“(A) recommend administrative actions to establish or enforce standards of official conduct;

“(B) refer to the Office of the Inspector General of the Bank alleged violations of—

“(i) the standards of ethical conduct applicable to employees of the Bank under parts 2635 and 6201 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations;

“(ii) the standards of ethical conduct established by the Chief Ethics Officer; and

“(iii) any other laws, rules, or regulations governing the performance of official duties or the discharge of official responsibilities that are applicable to employees of the Bank;

“(C) report to appropriate Federal or State authorities substantial evidence of a violation of any law applicable to the performance of official duties that may have been disclosed to the Office of Ethics; and

“(D) render advisory opinions regarding the propriety of any current or proposed conduct of an employee or contractor of the Bank, and issue general guidance on such matters as necessary.”.

SEC. 105. CHIEF RISK OFFICER.

Section 3 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a), as amended by section 104, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1) CHIEF RISK OFFICER.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—There shall be a Chief Risk Officer of the Bank, who shall—

“(A) oversee all issues relating to risk within the Bank; and

“(B) report to the President of the Bank.

“(2) APPOINTMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Chief Risk Officer shall be—

“(A) appointed by the President of the Bank from among persons—

“(i) with a demonstrated ability in the general management of, and knowledge of and extensive practical experience in, financial risk evaluation practices in large governmental or business entities; and

“(ii) who are not serving in a position requiring appointment by the President of the United States before being appointed to be Chief Risk Officer; and

“(B) approved by the Board.

“(3) DUTIES.—The duties of the Chief Risk Officer are—

“(A) to be responsible for all matters related to managing and mitigating all risk to which the Bank is exposed, including the programs and operations of the Bank;

“(B) to establish policies and processes for risk oversight, the monitoring of management compliance with risk limits, and the management of risk exposures and risk controls across the Bank;

“(C) to be responsible for the planning and execution of all Bank risk management activities, including policies, reporting, and systems to achieve strategic risk objectives;

“(D) to develop an integrated risk management program that includes identifying, prioritizing, measuring, monitoring, and managing internal control and operating risks and other identified risks;

“(E) to ensure that the process for risk assessment and underwriting for individual transactions considers how each such transaction considers the effect of the transaction on the concentration of exposure in the overall portfolio of the Bank, taking into account fees, collateralization, and historic default rates; and

“(F) to review the adequacy of the use by the Bank of qualitative metrics to assess the risk of default under various scenarios.”.

SEC. 106. RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a), as amended by sections 104 and 105, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(m) RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a management committee to be known as the ‘Risk Management Committee’.

“(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The membership of the Risk Management Committee shall be the members of the Board of Directors, with the President and First Vice President of the Bank serving as ex officio members.

“(3) DUTIES.—The duties of the Risk Management Committee shall be—

“(A) to oversee, in conjunction with the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the Bank—

“(i) periodic stress testing on the entire Bank portfolio, reflecting different market, industry, and macroeconomic scenarios, and consistent with common practices of commercial and multilateral development banks; and

“(ii) the monitoring of industry, geographic, and obligor exposure levels; and

“(B) to review all required reports on the default rate of the Bank before submission to Congress under section 8(g).”.

(b) TERMINATION OF AUDIT COMMITTEE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States shall revise the bylaws of the Bank to terminate the Audit Committee established by section 7 of the bylaws.

SEC. 107. INDEPENDENT AUDIT OF BANK PORTFOLIO.

(a) AUDIT.—The Inspector General of the Export-Import Bank of the United States shall conduct an audit or evaluation of the portfolio risk management procedures of the Bank, including a review of the implementation by the Bank of the duties assigned to the Chief Risk Officer under section 3(1) of

the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended by section 105.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than every 3 years thereafter, the Inspector General shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a written report containing all findings and determinations made in carrying out subsection (a).

SEC. 108. PILOT PROGRAM FOR REINSURANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635 et seq.), the Export-Import Bank of the United States (in this section referred to as the “Bank”) may establish a pilot program under which the Bank may enter into contracts and other arrangements to share risks associated with the provision of guarantees, insurance, or credit, or the participation in the extension of credit, by the Bank under that Act.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON AMOUNT OF RISK-SHARING.—

(1) PER CONTRACT OR OTHER ARRANGEMENT.—The aggregate amount of liability the Bank may transfer through risk-sharing pursuant to a contract or other arrangement entered into under subsection (a) may not exceed \$1,000,000,000.

(2) PER YEAR.—The aggregate amount of liability the Bank may transfer through risk-sharing during a fiscal year pursuant to contracts or other arrangements entered into under subsection (a) during that fiscal year may not exceed \$10,000,000,000.

(c) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter through 2019, the Bank shall submit to Congress a written report that contains a detailed analysis of the use of the pilot program carried out under subsection (a) during the year preceding the submission of the report.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect, impede, or revoke any authority of the Bank.

(e) TERMINATION.—The pilot program carried out under subsection (a) shall terminate on September 30, 2019.

TITLE II—PROMOTION OF SMALL BUSINESS EXPORTS

SEC. 201. INCREASE IN SMALL BUSINESS LENDING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2(b)(1)(E)(v) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(1)(E)(v)) is amended by striking “20 percent” and inserting “25 percent”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter.

SEC. 202. REPORT ON PROGRAMS FOR SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED BUSINESSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635g) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) REPORT ON PROGRAMS FOR SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED BUSINESSES.—The Bank shall include in its annual report to Congress under subsection (a) a report on the programs of the Bank for United States businesses with less than \$250,000,000 in annual sales.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to the report of the Export-Import Bank of the United States submitted to Congress under section 8 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635g) for the first year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE III—MODERNIZATION OF OPERATIONS

SEC. 301. ELECTRONIC PAYMENTS AND DOCUMENTS.

Section 2(b)(1) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(M) Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Bank shall implement policies—

“(i) to accept electronic documents with respect to transactions whenever possible, including copies of bills of lading, certifications, and compliance documents, in such manner so as not to undermine any potential civil or criminal enforcement related to the transactions; and

“(ii) to accept electronic payments in all of its programs.”.

SEC. 302. REAUTHORIZATION OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY UPDATING.

Section 3(j) of the Export-Import Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a(j)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “2012, 2013, and 2014” and inserting “2015 through 2019”;

(2) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “(I) the funds” and inserting “(i) the funds”; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking “2012, 2013, and 2014” and inserting “2015 through 2019”.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635f) is amended by striking “2014” and inserting “2019”.

(b) DUAL-USE EXPORTS.—Section 1(c) of Public Law 103-428 (12 U.S.C. 635 note) is amended by striking “September 30, 2014” and inserting “the date on which the authority of the Export-Import Bank of the United States expires under section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635f)”.

(c) SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Section 2(b)(9)(B)(iii) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(9)(B)(iii)) is amended by striking “September 30, 2014” and inserting “the date on which the authority of the Bank expires under section 7”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the earlier of the date of the enactment of this Act or June 30, 2015.

SEC. 402. CERTAIN UPDATED LOAN TERMS AND AMOUNTS.

(a) LOAN TERMS FOR MEDIUM-TERM FINANCING.—Section 2(a)(2)(A) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(a)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) with principal amounts of not more than \$25,000,000; and”.

(b) COMPETITIVE OPPORTUNITIES RELATING TO INSURANCE.—Section 2(d)(2) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(d)(2)) is amended by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$25,000,000”.

(c) EXPORT AMOUNTS FOR SMALL BUSINESS LOANS.—Section 3(g)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a(g)(3)) is amended by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$25,000,000”.

(d) CONSIDERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS.—Section 11(a)(1)(A) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635i-5(a)(1)(A)) is amended by striking “\$10,000,000 or more” and inserting the following: “\$25,000,000 (or, if less than \$25,000,000, the threshold established pursuant to international agreements, including the Common Approaches for Officially Supported Export Credits and Environmental and Social Due

Diligence, as adopted by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Council on June 28, 2012, and the risk-management framework adopted by financial institutions for determining, assessing, and managing environmental and social risk in projects (commonly referred to as the ‘Equator Principles’)) or more”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter.

TITLE V—OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 501. PROHIBITION ON DISCRIMINATION BASED ON INDUSTRY.

Section 2 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (6 U.S.C. 635 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) PROHIBITION ON DISCRIMINATION BASED ON INDUSTRY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this Act, the Bank may not—

“(A) deny an application for financing based solely on the industry, sector, or business that the application concerns; or

“(B) promulgate or implement policies that discriminate against an application based solely on the industry, sector, or business that the application concerns.

“(2) APPLICABILITY.—The prohibitions under paragraph (1) apply only to applications for financing by the Bank for projects concerning the exploration, development, production, or export of energy sources and the generation or transmission of electrical power, or combined heat and power, regardless of the energy source involved.”.

SEC. 502. NEGOTIATIONS TO END EXPORT CREDIT FINANCING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 11 of the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012 (12 U.S.C. 635a-5) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “Secretary of the Treasury (in this section referred to as the ‘Secretary’)” and inserting “President”; and

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “(OECD)” and inserting “(in this section referred to as the ‘OECD’)”; and

(ii) by striking “ultimate goal of eliminating” and inserting “possible goal of eliminating, before the date that is 10 years after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015;”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “Secretary” each place it appears and inserting “President”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) REPORT ON STRATEGY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, the President shall submit to Congress a proposal, and a strategy for achieving the proposal, that the United States Government will pursue with other major exporting countries, including OECD members and non-OECD members, to eliminate over a period of not more than 10 years subsidized export-financing programs, tied aid, export credits, and all other forms of government-supported export subsidies.

“(d) NEGOTIATIONS WITH NON-OECD MEMBERS.—The President shall initiate and pursue negotiations with countries that are not OECD members to bring those countries into a multilateral agreement establishing rules and limitations on officially supported export credits.

“(e) ANNUAL REPORTS ON PROGRESS OF NEGOTIATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, and annually thereafter through calendar year 2019, the President shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and

Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on the progress of any negotiations described in subsection (d).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) shall apply with respect to reports required to be submitted under section 11(b) of the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012 (12 U.S.C. 635a-5(b)) after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 503. STUDY OF FINANCING FOR INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS.

(a) ANALYSIS OF INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY INDUSTRY USE OF BANK PRODUCTS.—The Export-Import Bank of the United States (in this section referred to as the ‘Bank’) shall conduct a study of the extent to which the products offered by the Bank are available and used by companies that export information and communications technology services and related goods.

(b) ELEMENTS.—In conducting the study required by subsection (a), the Bank shall examine the following:

(1) The number of jobs in the United States that are supported by the export of information and communications technology services and related goods, and the degree to which access to financing will increase exports of such services and related goods.

(2) The reduction in the financing by the Bank of exports of information and communications technology services from 2003 through 2014.

(3) The activities of foreign export credit agencies to facilitate the export of information and communications technology services and related goods.

(4) Specific proposals for how the Bank could provide additional financing for the exportation of information and communications technology services and related goods through risk-sharing with other export credit agencies and other third parties.

(5) Proposals for new products the Bank could offer to provide financing for exports of information and communications technology services and related goods, including—

(A) the extent to which the Bank is authorized to offer new products;

(B) the extent to which the Bank would need additional authority to offer new products to meet the needs of the information and communications technology industry;

(C) specific proposals for changes in law that would enable the Bank to provide increased financing for exports of information and communications technology services and related goods in compliance with the credit and risk standards of the Bank;

(D) specific proposals that would enable the Bank to provide increased outreach to the information and communications technology industry about the products the Bank offers; and

(E) specific proposals for changes in law that would enable the Bank to provide the financing to build information and communications technology infrastructure, in compliance with the credit and risk standards of the Bank, to allow for market access opportunities for United States information and communications technology companies to provide services on the infrastructure being financed by the Bank.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Bank shall submit to Congress a report that contains the results of the study required by subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and

ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their designees.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is going to be an important debate that we have today because it is a debate about what type of economy we are going to have: an economy based upon fairness, where your prosperity is dependent upon how hard you work on Main Street; or is it dependent upon who you know in Washington?

□ 1445

I respect the views of all Members, but if we are ever—ever—to deal with the threat of a social welfare state, we must first take care of the corporate welfare state, and the face of the corporate welfare state is the Export-Import Bank.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), the chairman of the Monetary Policy and Trade Subcommittee of the Financial Services Committee

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the work that my chairman has done. I chair the Monetary Policy and Trade Subcommittee, the subcommittee that has jurisdiction directly over this.

In the last conference when I was vice chair of that committee, we started a work group looking at various reforms that could happen, and that continued on into this term. We had a number of us on all sides of the issue that were working together.

The real problem arose, though, when those of us who felt that we needed to move in a direction where we were transferring that liability from the taxpayer back to businesses—when we felt that we were proposing some of those reforms, those who were most benefiting from the program said: Absolutely not. Not a direction we can go. Cannot be a phaseout. Cannot be a sunset. Cannot be a change to make these recourse loans. Cannot make them only loans as opposed to grants. In other words, it was business as usual.

It might be a good business decision to transfer business liability and risk to somebody else, but it is a bad idea to transfer that additional liability to the U.S. taxpayer.

I think that we have a couple of issues in front of us, Mr. Speaker, as was talked about yesterday. First is the issue of the Ex-Im Bank and the entitlement mentality that has grown up, and that is just a symptom of it.

As the chairman has said, if we cannot take care of and tackle this entitlement mentality within the business community, how in the world are we going to have the moral standing to tackle that same entitlement men-

tality on the social side of our spending?

So it is sad to believe, in my mind, that some people think that this is the only or the best program that we can put forward for the U.S. to remain competitive on the world stage.

We know that we have put ourselves at a disadvantage through the regulatory environment that has been created not only under this administration, but under previous administrations as well. We know that the tax regime that we have is also a huge problem.

I just ask that my colleagues oppose this effort to make sure that it is status quo in Washington, D.C.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday this House took a historic and bipartisan vote in support of reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank. We showed that Democrats and Republicans can work together to overcome the obstruction caused by an ideologically driven minority that put its own uncompromising principles over the needs of the American people.

The 4-month shutdown of the Export-Import Bank engineered by the chairman of the Financial Services Committee has led to hopelessness, uncertainty, and fear for the many workers across this country whose livelihoods rely on the support of the Ex-Im Bank.

As reports continued to pile in on the loss of jobs caused by the Bank's shutdown, the chairman has remained deliberately indifferent to the harm inflicted on the lives of these Americans. The cost of this indifference is more than 100 transactions worth more than \$9 billion that have been indefinitely put on hold pending the Bank's reauthorization. Unfortunately, many of these contracts have now been lost for good.

Today we are showing the small-business owners and their employees that this indifference does not extend to the whole House of Representatives. Supporters of the Bank care about them, about their jobs and their communities.

It is high time we reopened the Ex-Im Bank for business. Instead of shipping jobs abroad, let's start shipping American exports again. Let's put America back to work and pass this bill.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my strong disapproval for this bill for the Export-Import Bank. This is a profound debate we are having. It is about what kind of economy we are going to have. Are we going to reward good work or good connections? I think

there are plenty of other ways to expand opportunity in this country, and corporate welfare is not one of them.

The biggest beneficiaries of this bank, two-thirds of their money goes to ten companies and 40 percent goes to one company. And this bank does cost money. Just ask the Congressional Budget Office when they use real scorekeeping.

Do you remember Fannie Mae? Do you remember their accounting? Do you remember when they told us they weren't going to cost any money? Until they did. And it cost us billions.

The other excuse, Mr. Speaker, that I just don't buy is that other countries do this and so should we. We shouldn't acquire other countries' bad habits. We should be leading by example. We should be exporting democratic capitalism, not crony capitalism.

There is this criticism of those of the free enterprise system who compare it to competition like a sport where the critics of free enterprise say there is a winner and there is a loser, just like a boxing match or a football game.

Well, that is true when it comes to crony capitalism. That is the case when it comes to corporate welfare because, in that case, the winner is the person with the connections, it is the company with power, and it is the company with clout.

The loser is the person who is out there working hard, playing by the rules, not knowing anybody, not going to Washington, and hoping and thinking that the merit of their idea and the quality of their work is what will win the day. That is what is rewarded under a free enterprise system.

Free enterprise is more about collaboration. It is more about transactions of mutual benefit where everybody benefits, the rising tide lifts all boats, equality for all, and equal opportunity. That is free enterprise. That is small d, democratic capitalism. This thing is crony capitalism. I urge it be rejected.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), a member of the Financial Services Committee and the ranking member of the Monetary Policy and Trade Subcommittee, which has jurisdiction over the reauthorization of the Ex-Im Bank. I just want to take a moment to recognize her tireless work on behalf of the reauthorization of the Ex-Im Bank.

Ms. MOORE. I thank you so much, Madam Ranking Member.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to support this bipartisan initiative to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. The Export-Import Bank is about three things in this country that we need to be debating here more often, and that is jobs, jobs, and jobs. Getting the bill to the floor for this historic vote is about something the country also needs more of, and that is bipartisanship.

I am very distressed, Mr. Speaker, to continue to hear the debate that somehow the financing of the Export-Import Bank is contributing to the welfare state and that, if we are to tackle the social welfare programs under Social Security, we have got to get rid of this corporate welfare.

I am distressed to continue to hear that defeating the Export-Import Bank is a backdoor approach to ending Social Security. If you listen very carefully, colleagues, you are going to hear this over and over again.

I do want to thank Representatives HOYER, LUCAS, WATERS, HECK, FINCHER, and the House Members on both sides so that we can now go back to our districts, look U.S. workers in the eyes and say that we are not giving them welfare, that we are giving the thousands upon thousands upon thousands of people in the chain an opportunity to work for a living. This is not a Democrat or a Republican victory, but a victory for all our workers.

I would ask that the body vote for the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. I hope the Senate takes our example and we send this to the President for his signature. Our work and our businesses should not have to wait one more day to reignite this powerful engine of job creation.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE), the distinguished chairman of the House Budget Committee.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, this is a difficult and an important issue. With all due respect, I urge my colleagues to proceed with caution regarding a reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank, particularly under the procedural motion that has been used to get this bill to the floor today.

Many Members, including myself, have real concerns that we are sidestepping the important work of our committees, in this case, both the Financial Services Committee and the Rules Committee.

This leaves no room for amending or altering the legislation to better reflect the overall will of the House. This bill is, in fact, not even a product of the House. It is the exact same text that was taken from the Senate, and, just like this one, it bypassed the committee procedure over there as well.

By shortchanging the process, this effort is shortchanging the debate that we should be having about legitimate disagreements over the Export-Import Bank, and, thereby, we are shortchanging the American people.

For example, we know that, by statute, 20 percent of the Export-Import Bank's authorizations are supposed to go to small businesses. Yet, today only 1 percent of 1 percent of small businesses are actually aided by the Bank.

We also know that, when the Ex-Im subsidizes foreign corporations, it runs the risk of undermining American busi-

ness. It is estimated that the Export-Import Bank has led to the loss of 7,500 jobs in the American airline industry alone and a loss of over \$684 million in revenue.

These are serious concerns at a time when we should be fostering a climate of healthy economic opportunity and growth right here at home rather than a system that effectively chooses winners and losers.

It may not necessarily be the intention of my colleagues who supported this discharge petition effort to undermine the legislative process or to diminish the importance of our committees or, above all, to limit what we can and should be having here, a healthy debate over legitimate policy disagreements.

But, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what is occurring. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this process and to stop this dangerous precedent from taking root.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), a tireless advocate for our exporters who has never missed an opportunity to fight for the Export-Import Bank and the American workers it supports.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, watching the nonstop ideological warfare waged on the Export-Import Bank over the last nearly 3 years reminds me of my very favorite Will Rogers adage: People feel about Congress the same way they do when baby gets hold of the hammer. And that is, in fact, what we have been treated to.

But the fact of the matter is today we have an opportunity to turn that adage on its ear and do something that the American public will feel good about Congress for, for today we have an opportunity to vote for jobs, 164,000 in just last calendar year supported by the Ex-Im, good-paying jobs, send-your-kid-to-college jobs, buy-a-home jobs, take-a-vacation jobs, and have-a-secure-retirement jobs.

Mr. Speaker, tonight we have an opportunity to strengthen and protect the manufacturing base of America, because the truth of the matter is it is not unrelated to our national defense infrastructure. The same entities that make up our manufacturing base keep us safe, and we should not forget that.

Tonight we have an opportunity, indeed, to vote for reform of the Export-Import Bank despite the fact that it has a default rate that is the envy of commercial banks and a collection rate as well.

Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is we can vote to increase loss reserves, improve risk management, modernize and update their IT, and notwithstanding what was said by the gentleman from Michigan, it also has a pilot recourse program in it on the re-insurance for payment side.

Tonight we have an opportunity to vote for a reduction of the deficit. Yes.

The Ex-Im for a generation has transferred cash—the heck with your theoretical accounting model—transferred cash into the U.S. Treasury, \$675 million just last fall.

Let me say it again. Tonight we have an opportunity to vote for jobs. No more Waukesha, Wisconsin, Ms. MOORE, no more Waukesha, Wisconsin, where an entire factory is being shuttered because we have failed to do our job in reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member, the leader, the whip, and especially I want to thank my friends, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma and Mr. FINCHER of Tennessee, for their profile in courage. It was, indeed, a profile in courage to do the right thing. Tonight we have an opportunity to put American jobs first. Tonight we have an opportunity to put America first.

I don't know about you, but I came here from the private sector. I don't reside in some kind of fantasy plot within an Ayn Rand novel. I live in the real world, and in the real world we solve problems. This will solve problems. Vote "yes".

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ), chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee that held a number of key hearings on the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I stand to express opposition to the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

As we look at these weighty issues, I think it is important that we look at both the liability and the accountability in this factor.

When you look at the reliability, whenever we make decisions about spending money, we are talking about pulling money out of somebody's wallet and giving it to somebody else.

□ 1500

And, in this case, as we look at liability, we are taking every American's wallet and putting it on the line and saying: Should we or should we not create liability for more individuals across the heartland? And for mom and dad, I just don't think that is the right equation. I fundamentally disagree with it.

If these are such good loans and they are so profitable, then do them in the private sector. You don't need the Federal Government to do them.

And when it comes to accountability. Let's remember, this is a bank that just this year had a bank employee who plead guilty to bribery—bribery of all things. The inspector general of the bank testified before our committee that they expect even more actions. And the inspector general on one project could not even validate more than \$500 million in spending. And I can tell you, as the chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, they have not been transparent in giving us the information.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her leadership.

I rise in strong support of reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank.

There is never really a good time to commit economic suicide, and now would be especially a bad time. The Export-Import Bank creates jobs by supporting exports, and it costs taxpayers nothing—zero. In fact, since 1992, the Ex-Im has returned nearly \$7 billion to the U.S. Treasury.

Killing the Ex-Im Bank would be especially bad right now. Export demand is falling because of our strong dollar and economic headwinds in China and Greece and Europe. We have to remember that there are 85 different export-import banks around the world from China to Canada, all of which are supporting exports more than we are. We are in a competitive world. They say when you lose a job, it goes somewhere else. But what the opposition isn't saying is that it is going overseas.

I support the Export-Import Bank, and we should vote for reauthorization.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), chairman of the Capital Markets Subcommittee of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

In June of this year, after 81 years of doling out taxpayer-funded welfare for megacorporations, the American people said enough, and Congress let the Export-Import Bank expire.

Yet, today, through a little known and little used legislative maneuver being used to circumvent the will of the American people, they are resurrecting this fund for corporate welfare.

The Export-Import Bank transformed the role of government from a disinterested referee in the economy into a biased actor that uses your taxpayer dollars to tilt the scales in favor of its friends, and it mocks the American Dream by making victims of the startups that dare to compete.

If we promoted responsible government policies, responsible budget policies, expanded free markets, lowered and simplified the income taxes, and repealed onerous regulations, American businesses would thrive in the global markets. But none of that is on the table today on what we are about to consider.

Instead, the proposal before us is the resurrection of a bank that embodies the corruption of the free enterprise system. Yes, we have the opportunity today to save capitalism from cynicism. Yes, we have the opportunity to protect the American taxpayer and the American Dream and to preserve free enterprise. We have the opportunity

today to keep the Export-Import Bank out of business. We should take each of those opportunities.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the ideologically perfect world of Ayn Rand novels, there is no Ex-Im Bank for the United States or any other country. In the real world, Germany has an export credit agency. China has one. Canada has one. They are all much bigger than ours.

When I gave 100 speeches for George McGovern, they accused us of favoring unilateral military disarmament. Now, we see some who are in favor of unilateral economic disarmament. Our products face tough competition, and sometimes the order goes to whomever has the best financing. Ninety percent of Ex-Im Bank's loans go to small business and the other 10 percent help Big Business buy from American suppliers. Two hundred and fifty Members of this Congress support Ex-Im Bank, with particular courage among the 40-something Republicans who signed the discharge petition.

As co-chair of the CPA Caucus, let me tell you, the Ex-Im Bank makes a substantial profit under generally accepted accounting principles. That is why they have been able to transfer \$7 billion to the Treasury.

Ronald Reagan said: The Export-Import Bank contributes in a significant way to our Nation's export sales.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND), a valuable Member of the House Financial Services Committee.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 597, to the Export-Import Bank, and to the process Members have used to circumvent regular order and the amendment process of the House.

I have more Delta employees in my district than any other district in the United States. Their jobs are at risk because the Export-Import Bank picks winners and losers in the American economy.

When the Ex-Im Bank finances a Boeing airplane for Emirates Airlines—as if Emirates Airlines would need any financing—the Bank is telling pilots and flight attendants and mechanics and others in my district that their jobs don't matter to the government. That is wrong.

My colleagues from Washington State and other areas want you to believe that they are fighting for the jobs in their district, and I am sure they are. I am here fighting for the jobs of my constituents. My colleagues want their constituents to have jobs, but not my constituents.

Well, I have news for my colleagues. I care about everyone's job. I care about Boeing jobs, I care about Caterpillar jobs, and, yes, I care about Delta jobs. I want the free market and the quality of U.S. products to dictate who gets contracts. This is how America was built—quality products made by quality employees stamped “Made in America.”

Three years ago, Congress directed the Export-Import Bank to focus on an economic impact analysis to ensure the Bank knew the consequences of their lending decisions. Unfortunately, the Export-Import Bank acts as if they are above the requirements of Congress. Instead of following the law, the leadership at the Export-Import Bank colluded with Boeing to design an economic impact analysis to keep the status quo in place.

Mr. Speaker, if you don't believe me, the House Financial Services Committee has the emails to prove it. These are the bureaucrats that my colleagues are up here protecting. It is shameful, truly shameful.

To add insult to injury, my colleagues refuse to allow to offer amendments to defend my constituents. These are the very same people who cry “regular order” yet won't deny the Members to have an ability to fight for their constituents.

I ask everybody for a “no” vote.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), also a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of allowing the majority of the Congress to work its will and reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

The Bank has supported more than 1.3 million private sector American jobs since 2009, with nearly 90 percent of its transactions directly supporting small businesses. The Bank is an unbridled, market-driven success story that I am proud to support.

Three months have passed since a small group of Tea Party Caucus members threw common sense out the window and surrendered to an ideological drive to shut down the Bank despite warnings from across the private sector of the devastating consequences for our economy, American small-business exporters, and their employees.

Today, I stand side by side with my colleagues from across the aisle to fight for them, including Ventech Engineers International, based in my area of south Texas. Ventech manufactures small, pre-built oil refineries for export supplying fuel to remote and impoverished areas. Ventech cannot create more jobs or assist in our national security objectives without financing provided by the Bank.

We cannot allow a small minority of the minority Chamber to block job creation and weaken our international priorities.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from

California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished Republican majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for yielding.

We are having a debate, a healthy debate, but I don't think this is the structure or the forum in which we should have a debate about this because we don't have the option for amendments. I think there is a better way to do this.

People have two views about the argument today. But the real question of the debate we are having comes down to this: Do we let government pick and choose who it gives special taxpayer loans to or not? I believe our constituents know very well what the right choice is. They don't want their tax dollars backing up loans for any businesses. That is not the government's job. The private sector can and should do that. Our economy does best when the government is left out.

When government gets involved trying to centralize power and money in itself, corruption is inevitable. The Ex-Im Bank is a perfect example of this, and this is my concern. An inspector general is investigating at least 31 cases of fraud of the Ex-Im Bank, and this fraud has wasted millions of taxpayer dollars.

But it doesn't stop there. A former Ex-Im Bank employee, Johnny Gutierrez, pleaded guilty this year to taking bribes on 19 different occasions to help applicants get loans from the Ex-Im.

Another Ex-Im Bank employee was indicted for taking \$100,000 in bribes to help a Nigerian businessman get loans from the Ex-Im.

And we all remember a Congressman, William Jefferson, who was sentenced to 13 years in prison for taking bribes to help a company get loans from the Ex-Im.

You see, there is a pattern, a pattern that won't be solved today, regardless of what side you are on.

Since 2009, in fewer than 6 years, there have been 49 criminal judgments against Ex-Im Bank employees or people who benefited from the Ex-Im. Many of these people have gone to prison for it. In fact, if you add them all up, that is 75 years they are serving.

Now, I wish I could tell you that was my only complaint and problem and it ended there, but it does get worse. A large number of loans of Ex-Im guarantees aren't even for American companies. The Bank actually uses taxpayer money to back up loans for companies owned by governments of China, Russia, Saudi Arabia, and others.

These loans to corporations outside of America don't always go well. Do you remember NewSat? That is an Australia company that lost \$139 million in taxpayer-backed loans. NewSat's CEO allegedly diverted company funds to his yacht company.

So the question, Mr. Speaker, is when does the corruption become too bad? When is it that too many people take bribes? How many taxpayer loans must be issued by fraud?

So the question I have before this House is, if we are serious, if we want

to really make a difference, let's have a process that can change things, let's have a process that can offer amendments, let's have a process that offers an honest debate, and let's not be shy about what the problems are because I think the American people expect more.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

There is a better way to do this. It is called regular order through the committee process, bring it to the floor, and make amendments. However, when that doesn't prevail, the rules allow for what we are doing today, which is exceedingly important.

I would say this: the Ex-Im Bank does not take deposits; it makes deposits, and it makes deposits that help us with our deficit. The numbers have been called to our attention: in 2013, about \$1 billion; in 2014, \$675 million. But the Ex-Im Bank has done something more important than all of these things that have been called to our attention for the most part.

I think one of the most significant things that it has done is it has caused us to do something that we couldn't do for ourselves, and that is create the bipartisanship necessary to span the chasm of partisanship that has manifested itself in this House for too long.

□ 1515

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), another valuable member of the committee.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that someone has been missing from this debate. It is the forgotten man or woman—the everyday taxpayer—who is being asked to carry a risk that those in the private sector will not.

In 2008, we learned a tough lesson about privatizing profits and socializing losses. During the good times, many in Congress cheered on Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and their shareholders prospered while executives made millions; but when the good times ended, the taxpayers were forced to bail out Fannie and Freddie to the tune of \$187 billion.

The Federal Government is today the guarantor of more than \$3 trillion in loans backed by numerous agencies. This level of taxpayer leverage is not sustainable, and we must begin to identify parts of the portfolio that can be transitioned away from taxpayers.

Given that 98 percent of our exports are made without the Export-Import Bank, the Bank is one agency that is suitable for transition over time to the private sector.

However, in the immediate future, Congress must act to protect tax-

payers. For example, in this reauthorization, Congress could insist that these loans be fully collateralized, just as is the practice in the private sector.

Congress could also require exporters, which profit from the Bank's lending to foreign purchasers of their products, to guarantee the repayment of all or of even a fraction of these loans.

If phased in smartly, reforms like these would mitigate the potential for the type of \$3 billion bailout that the Ex-Im Bank sought in 1987, and they would also incentivize our trade representatives to actually initiate negotiations with our trading partners to eliminate all government-supported export subsidies and protect the taxpayer from potential losses, which is just as they were supposed to do in the last reauthorization.

Without these commonsense reforms, it is the taxpayer—the forgotten man or woman—and not the entity that made the profit who is on the hook for the loss. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” so that real reform proposals for this institution may be pursued.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank the ranking member for allowing me to speak.

Mr. Speaker, in my district, which are the suburbs of Denver, 18 small companies benefit from the Export-Import Bank and the guarantees and the support that it provides—hundreds and hundreds of jobs. These are jobs in plastics, scientific equipment, food manufacturing, wood products, and electrical equipment. Those are the forgotten people in this argument. Those are real jobs, real people.

Mr. MCCARTHY said there were two questions. I think the two questions are:

“Should the United States unilaterally disarm at the expense of American businesses and U.S. jobs? I think the answer is a resounding “no.”

The second question is: Should ideology trump reality? The reality is that we are just going to give these jobs to countries all across the globe instead of having them here in America. That is wrong.

I urge the passage of H.R. 597.

I thank Mr. HECK; I thank Mr. FINCHER; and I thank Mr. LUCAS for bringing this forward. Let's pass this bill today.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), another valuable member of the committee.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, have you ever had one of those instances in which you are listening and you are trying to find a way to say, “I believe much of the argument we are hearing here is intellectually disingenuous”?

The fact of the matter is every year there are trillions and trillions of dollars of surety and import-export credit

that moves through the markets, and it doesn't have a government guarantee. It does not have a guarantee from our taxpayers.

Look, this institution still has a \$32 million loan from pre-Castro Cuba on their books. When they tell you "Oh, we have this tiny number of charge-offs," what they are telling you is a lie.

Do you remember the hearings we had when we had the discussions as to what their impairments were? They just stared back at you because they didn't want to have that discussion, because every other financial institution has to honestly say, "Here are our impairments. On this one, it was oil. We only had this level of charge-off." What they are not telling you is that they are still carrying loans that have sat on their books, without a payment, for 50 years.

To every citizen of this country, understand that, when this piece of legislation passes, you have just been put on the hook. Your credit has just been put on the hook for these types of loans.

That is what you intend to do to your taxpayers? That is what you are going to do to your constituencies?

This piece of legislation also purports to have reforms in it. As for the reforms, if they are not already doing these things, they should be locked up already because much of this is the most basic level that you would expect from any financial institution.

Then I come to another tab from the GAO and see repeat, after repeat, after repeat where it has already been the law and they have been ignoring it. Yet we are going to re-charter them again—an organization to which we are going to claim we are providing reforms when they are the very reforms from the last time we did this that they did not follow.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the ranking member for yielding and for her leadership on this issue, along with thanking Mr. HECK, Ms. MOORE, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. LUCAS.

Mr. Speaker, the Ex-Im Bank used to be bipartisan legislation. It is so interesting to hear the outrage expressed by Members on the other side for a program that was supported repeatedly by President Ronald Reagan. Where was your outrage then? I don't recall the outrage back then because then it was fine.

I also have heard that this is not the appropriate venue for this debate. This is the Congress of the United States of America, and I suspect that the American people think this is a perfectly appropriate venue.

The rule that we have utilized to bring this issue to the floor of the House is a rule that you wrote that allows Members of this body, by discharge petition, to bring legislation to

the floor, supported by Republicans and Democrats.

We are using the rules of the House that you wrote. This is not an inappropriate venue. This is an argument about jobs for the American people, and I will use every venue available to me to fight for jobs for the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 13½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 18½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), the chairman of the Monetary Policy and Trade Subcommittee.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. I thank the chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to come back up here to talk again a little bit about this process.

We were starting to talk about what had happened through the committee. There is a work group that was put together both in the last Congress and in this Congress that came up with some, I think, very interesting things: reforms. Included in the reforms was: How do we extract ourselves out of this?

You see, here is what happened the last time.

The last time the Bank was reauthorized, it was through a short-circuited system much like we are experiencing today. It did not go through regular order. It did not have all of the backing that it needed. It was kind of jammed down on everybody on the House floor.

To let that smooth over a little bit, there was a requirement that the U.S. Treasury start a negotiation with the Europeans about one specific product: the wide-body aircraft. That is what maintains a vast majority of the business of the Export-Import Bank.

But here is the thing: The U.S. Treasury ignored that directive. They ignored the law as they were compelled to go in and start talking about: How do we unwind ourselves internationally from this mess that has been created?

Then, I think, there is a logical question to ask, Mr. Speaker: If they are willing to ignore that part of the law, what part of the law that we are trying to reform now are they willing to ignore?

My guess is all of it because, as I was talking about and as we were floating these ideas of various reforms of making these recourse loans, of making sure that—oh, I don't know—a bank examiner could come in and actually allow this "Bank" to pass any banking standards as their portfolio weighting is way off, they could never pass any kind of exam that any traditional bank would have to go through.

Every time any of those kinds of commonsense reforms were proposed,

the word came back from down on high—from those big companies that utilize this bank—and they said, "No way. No way are we going to allow this to happen." So, truly, the characterization of this being regular order is way out of line, in my opinion.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY), who is also a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mrs. BEATTY. I thank Ranking Member WATERS.

Mr. Speaker, here is what I know.

The American people are clamoring for us to do our job and work together to help hard-working American families get ahead. We can do that today by reviving the Export-Import Bank, a job-creating organization that reduces the Federal debt—with no subsidies, with no taxpayers' money.

Last night my caucus and some Republicans joined together to force today's vote on reviving the Export-Import Bank. Why? Because it creates jobs. It helps small businesses, female-owned businesses.

It is so important today for us to do this. I know it firsthand, Mr. Speaker, because, in my district alone, there are 14 businesses, including eight small businesses, one minority owned and one female owned. The Export-Import Bank supports some \$71 million in exports—and here is the key—at no cost to American taxpayers.

We have heard a lot today, some misinformed, some misleading. So here is what I think, as the evidence is clear, Mr. Speaker: Let us renew the Bank's charter without delay.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, in order to help equalize the time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I have to speak fast.

The Export-Import Bank is good for America, and the arguments against it, in my opinion, are un-American.

This is the perfect Republican dream. It reduces the deficit. It adds to the Treasury. It creates jobs. It costs taxpayers nothing. It is unilateral disarmament to not recharge and reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. I support the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

In the darkest corner of the anti-empiricist wing of this Congress lies the plan to kill the Export-Import Bank.

Opponents of the Bank do not care that it supports small businesses and creates jobs.

Last year, nearly 90% of the Bank's loans benefited small businesses, and those loans supported more than 164,000 jobs.

Opponents are loath to admit that it reduces the federal budget deficit.

Ex-Im returned \$675 million to the Treasury last year and more than \$1 billion in each of the previous two years.

Opponents disregard the Bank's support for American exports.

Every other industrialized nation has an export-import bank, and this unilateral disarmament would cede American competitiveness.

I ask that my colleagues reject this blind pursuit of ideological purity, and reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of the Ex-Im Bank.

Hundreds of families in New York's Capital Region face uncertainty after one of the largest employers had to move jobs to France because its contracts needed a government-backed loan guarantee that the Ex-Im Bank would have provided.

I thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for their leadership. It is too bad that it took procedural gymnastics to finally receive a vote on a bill with such broad, bipartisan support. Look what we can accomplish when we work together to do what is best for the thousands of people we each represent in this body.

The Export-Import Bank equals jobs. Let's get it done. Let's put people before politics.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of reauthorizing the Ex-Im Bank.

You have two types of people. You have practical people who care about real solutions for American workers and American businesses, and you have slaves to ideology. Practical people want the Ex-Im Bank reauthorized.

This is supporting good-paying, family-sustaining manufacturing export jobs, and the people in opposition are slavishly adhering to this ideology that hurts America. In this case, the Ex-Im Bank returns a profit to the American people and it reduces the deficit and the debt. We ought to reauthorize it.

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

□ 1530

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bipartisan Export-Import Bank reauthorization.

The Ex-Im Bank was founded by FDR to increase the competitiveness of American exports. It provides significant capital for U.S. companies and provides opportunities for U.S. jobs, al-

lowing our companies to be competitive with companies overseas.

It provides confidence to businesses and investors, allowing them to compete in the global marketplace. In Rhode Island alone, The Bank has helped 26 businesses with a combined export value of \$134 million.

The Ex-Im Bank is a vital part of our Nation's economic infrastructure, and I urge my colleagues to support its reauthorization.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 597, the renewal of the United States Export-Import, or Ex-Im, Bank.

In Pennsylvania, the Ex-Im Bank is essential to the economic health throughout Pennsylvania's Fifth District, supporting 11,000 jobs. The Bank supports 40,000 jobs across the commonwealth in nearly 300 companies, adding \$7 billion to Pennsylvania's economy since 2007.

Exporters in my district range from powdered metal companies to technology firms and to those involved in the manufacture of rubber and plastic products. All of these businesses provide jobs which sustain our local communities. Since 2007, exports from the Fifth Congressional District in Pennsylvania have amounted to more than \$1.3 billion, supporting thousands of jobs in rural Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, the Ex-Im Bank is not a burden on the taxpayers. In fact, in 2013, The Bank covered its own expenses before directing more than a billion dollars into the U.S. Treasury.

Now, I was proud to join a bipartisan group of my colleagues to bring renewal of The Bank to the floor today and to cast a vote in favor of the bill's passage.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS).

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan once said the closest thing to eternal life on Earth is a government bureau.

How rare is it that we actually reduce government around here? Yet here we are debating resurrecting a defunct agency that has already gone out to pasture.

Now, my friends on the other side of the aisle are central planners. They believe in the type of politicized economy for which the Ex-Im Bank has become a poster child. So they are actually being consistent in their position.

What I can't understand is how Members who preach limited government are willing to turn over the floor of the House to the minority party for the purpose of rechartering a bank whose authority has lapsed.

If we simply did nothing, we would have less government. Taxpayers would face less exposure. There would be less corruption. And the economy would be less politicized.

So, by all means, vote how you want. Please, if you support resurrecting this agency, just spare us all the notion that you are actually here to reduce the size and scope of government.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, with all the gridlock and all the partisanship and inability of this Congress to fix things and get things done, we are looking at a great opportunity here where Democrats and Republicans have come together to fix things.

The simple truth is that this Ex-Im Bank doesn't cost the taxpayers a penny. It creates tens of thousands of jobs all across the country, and it yields a \$7 billion profit for deficit reduction in this country. Life should be so good if we had a few more agencies like that. We are doing such great work for the American people.

Let's reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), the chairman of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I want to quickly address my good friend from Minnesota's comments that this Ex-Im Bank doesn't cost any money. The truth is it does. We bailed it out to the tune of \$3 billion in the 1980s.

That same argument was made that Fannie and Freddie don't cost the taxpayers any money. Well, it doesn't cost taxpayers money until it does. It is a government backstop. It is a government guarantee.

You see how hard it is: when you are going to take away a government subsidy, man, do businesses fight like you know what to make sure you can't take it away. They love their subsidies, and they will lobby and they will work to make sure to get what they think is theirs.

I tell you, I am tired when I hear some of those Presidential candidates talk about cronyism and those who look out for corporate welfare and they try to point their finger to this side of the aisle.

If you open your ears and listen to this debate, ask yourself: Who is fighting for corporate welfare? Who is fighting to make sure that you have a guarantee in the Ex-Im Bank that supports 80 percent of the dollars to big, massive American businesses? It is Democrats. Democrats partner Big Government with Big Business, and that is what is happening right here.

Picking winners and losers, the story of Delta: Delta has to compete with airplanes that are subsidized in foreign markets by the American taxpayer. They can't compete. So we picked Boeing jobs over Delta jobs? Who are we in this institution to say what job is better?

Let's let the market work. Let's not be the ones that come in and dictate what works and what doesn't.

To think that we are going to set up a system that the Democrats—my friends will say this is about all American jobs. But it is only about American jobs if it meets our political criteria in that if you are dealing with carbon and I don't like carbon and if you are a carbon job, the Bank won't support those who are involved in a carbon export. That is wrong.

Let's stand together. Let's work together. Let's fight for the American taxpayer and take away this government subsidy.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished leader who has been a steadfast advocate on behalf of the interests of American workers and who has made reauthorization of the Ex-Im Bank a top priority.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the reauthorization of the Ex-Im Bank.

As a former ranking member on the State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, I saw on a regular basis how important this was to our economy and to small businesses in America.

So here today we are coming to the floor in a bipartisan way to create good-paying jobs. How many good-paying jobs? 1.5 million since the year 2007.

We are here to reduce the deficit. How much are we reducing the deficit? In the past two decades, \$7 billion in money has come in to reduce the deficit.

So we are creating good-paying jobs, reducing the deficit, fueling our economy, and we are respecting the entrepreneurship and the optimism of small- and moderate-sized businesses across the country.

Yes, there are some big businesses that benefit, but most of them have subcontractors that need the work of the Ex-Im Bank.

So when we talk about making it in America, I want to recognize the great leadership of our whip, Mr. HOYER. Make it in America, this is what this is about. Make it in America so that people can make it in America but that, also, we can find markets abroad for our products made in America.

Thank you, Mr. HOYER, for your leadership on that and on the reauthorization of the Ex-Im Bank. Because of all of that work, the term "Made in America," that label continues to have the great prestige and quality that we have always known it to have.

I want to salute Mr. DENNY HECK. He is just remarkable. In 24 hours, he had 187 cosponsors of his bill earlier this year. That is so remarkable. Then in a short time after that, he had even more. Thank you for all the work that you have done to bring us to today.

To the Republicans who are supporting this, to Mr. FINCHER, thank you for your leadership and your courage to give us this opportunity today.

I want to thank MAXINE WATERS. This has been a long haul, as many of

you know. Over that period of time, for one reason or another, there were not hearings in the committee of jurisdiction that could focus on the advantages of the Ex-Im Bank. So she had roundtable after roundtable, bringing in experts on what this meant to our economy, listening to the public, hearing from small businesses about what this meant to them.

Who would have ever thought that MAXINE WATERS, the ranking member on the Financial Services Committee, would be the champion for big-, moderate-, and small-sized businesses in our company? We would have thought it, and now the world knows.

So, MAXINE, thank you for your perseverance. You really did such a wonderful job keeping this issue alive. I recognize the great leadership we have at the Ex-Im Bank with Mr. Hochberg and the others who were there, the other hardworking people who are there who know about markets.

This is important because many banks that small businesses might go to for a loan or loan guarantees, they are not used to dealing with markets abroad and that is why this is such an important link between entrepreneurship, creativity, innovation in our country, and how to expand markets for all of that throughout the world.

So I am really happy. Congratulations to the House of Representatives. Today, we are creating good-paying jobs. We are reducing the deficit. We are honoring entrepreneurship, and we are doing it in a bipartisan way.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The gentleman from Texas has 8½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from California has 13 minutes remaining.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our distinguished whip.

Whip HOYER has a long record of advocating on behalf of our Nation's exporters and their workers. With his leadership, we are here today on the verge of finally passing legislation to reopen the Ex-Im Bank.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I listen to this welfare-state rhetoric. The American public ought to know that 147 Republicans voted to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank just a few years ago under the leadership of Mr. Cantor and myself.

It was not until the ideological—how do I say what has happened in the House of Representatives—when we retreated from bipartisanship and working together, we retreated from pragmatism and we repaired to ideological hideboundness. Those are pretty tough words, I understand that.

You have 147 Republicans and every Democrat, 330 Members of the House of Representatives, voting to reauthorize

this bill just a few years ago. This rhetoric that I hear now that somehow this is selling out to the welfare state is a little difficult for me to believe.

I know it has become an issue for some hardline groups, and this is not just for big business or medium business or small business. This is for American jobs, the little people.

Do big people provide jobs for little people? Yes, they do. Do we want that done? Yes, we do. Should we, therefore, be competitive with the rest of the world who offers subsidies so their corporations, so their medium-sized businesses, so their small businesses can create jobs for people?

Mr. Speaker, 330 of us voted to reauthorize this just 3 years ago, but we have had some immaculate awareness that this is somehow preening to the welfare state.

Let us come together as practical people with common sense who want to be competitive with the rest of the world. Let's pass this bill. The House is for it. The majority is for it. It has been bottled up, which has not allowed the majority to work its will.

Today, through the courage of Mr. LUCAS, Mr. FINCHER, and others, the majority will work its will. Isn't that wonderful?

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Export-Import Bank means jobs in the United States of America. From 2007 to 2015, in Ohio, it supported 363 exporters, 263 small businesses, and more than \$3 billion in value of Ohio exports. Superior Holdings, First Solar, Port Clinton Manufacturing, A.J. Rose Manufacturing, and so many other Ohio companies want to export. They require Ex-Im to do so.

Frankly, in today's world markets, no serious nation can compete without the Export-Import Bank. More than 50 countries have an Export-Import Bank: China, Japan, Germany, India, Korea, France, Brazil, and other competitors.

I support reauthorizing the Ex-Im Bank. It means jobs, and it means business for the USA.

□ 1545

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, one of America's greatest promises is the promise that, if you work hard and play fair, your opportunities are endless. Thousands of business owners throughout this country have lived by this mantra and sought new opportunities abroad.

When Congress allowed the charter of the Export-Import Bank to expire over

the summer, we took away an important tool for American business owners and their employees. They depend upon it. This is about jobs.

Many small companies throughout my region and in my district have relied on Ex-Im Bank. I will name one: Number 9 Hay in a small town called Ellensburg in eastern Washington. A hay company in Ellensburg, Washington, with the support of Ex-Im Bank, was able to expand its business, hire employees, and sell in foreign markets. Otherwise not.

This story is a story of success, of jobs for the small hardworking businesses of America that create 85 percent of our jobs. If we don't act, businesses of all sizes and the people they employ will be threatened.

I support this measure.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 8½ minutes remaining.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MACARTHUR).

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, before I came here, I spent 30 years in the private sector and built a business from about 100-odd people to today about 6,000. I learned that you need capital to grow a business. The Ex-Im Bank provides just that.

Now, if the private sector could provide that, well, this would be a different discussion, but the private sector doesn't. The Ex-Im Bank provides a necessary resource for companies doing business overseas. In fact, I have had lenders tell me they will not loan if the Ex-Im Bank is not already involved.

The Ex-Im Bank supported \$27.5 billion worth of U.S. exports last year and 164,000 jobs. To not reauthorize it is to be shortsighted. I urge my colleagues to remember this is a Republican bill. It deserves our support.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the reauthorization of the Ex-Im Bank. The Ex-Im Bank is a critical resource for Rhode Island manufacturers looking to expand into new markets.

Over the last 8 years, the Ex-Im Bank has provided more than \$20 million to Rhode Island companies for insured shipments, guaranteed credit, and disbursed loans.

I am pleased that, after 4 months of inaction, the House is finally voting to reauthorize this critical institution. I thank my colleagues for their support.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I certainly rise in support of this legislation that would reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. In my district alone, the Bank's activities have supported thousands of jobs and over \$600 million in export sales.

The financing provided by the Ex-Im has provided critical support to a wide array of industries in Pennsylvania, ensuring that products ranging from major energy components to help LNG exports, to locomotives, to cement equipment, to computers, to electronics, to aircraft are able to continue to be manufactured by Pennsylvania workers.

Developing countries, as we know, don't have very well formed capital markets, and they need this financing to help them buy American products. As our sole credit agency, the Bank provides the security U.S. firms need to access burgeoning markets. It strengthens our trade balance, and it helps to sustain our global market share. It does all this while still returning money back to the U.S. Treasury.

Importantly, this bill incorporates essential reforms that will significantly improve the Bank's risk management and transparency and provide our small businesses with an even greater share of lending support.

For those who talk about Ex-Im Bank creating winners and losers, I would argue that, by letting the Bank's authority lapse, we have indeed created winners and losers. The losers are now American job creators. The winners are countries like China, Germany, France, Brazil, and the U.K. that continue to support their exporters and welcome the opportunity to increase their market share and domestic manufacturing base in the absence of U.S. competition.

Let's not unilaterally disarm our ability to assist our exporters. Let's show the American people that we continue to govern in a bipartisan and rational manner. Let's pass this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge we support this legislation.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY), another important member of the House Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of talk so far today about the Bank, about what the Bank does. We have heard a lot of talk about small business, a lot of talk about the Bank leveling the playing field, a lot of talk about the Bank being that lender of last resort when no one else will step into the breach to help American businesses. Supposedly, that is what this is all about.

That is not what this is about. We had a discussion in the committee earlier this year where I actually sug-

gested amendments that would focus the Export-Import Bank on small business, that would allow the Export-Import Bank to expand its use as a lender of last resort, but that would limit the Bank to true uses to level the playing field, when we really were competing with export credit facilities overseas.

A representative of the United States Chamber of Commerce sat in our committee and said he would oppose every single one of those amendments. Small business is not what this is about. Leveling the playing field is not what this is about. Being a lender of last resort is not what this is about. This is about doing the bidding of the very, very large corporations that have a very, very large lobbying presence in Washington, D.C. That is what this is about. I am just surprised to see who is for it.

We had a chance to actually fix the Bank. No amendments were allowed today. We had a chance to actually focus on small business, a chance to focus on the Bank's role as a lender of last resort, a focus on what the Bank should be doing.

But we will miss that, Mr. Speaker, because we are doing the bidding of other folks. Vote as you will, but let's be honest about what this is and what this is not.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD).

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FINCHER), my good friend, for his leadership on this bill.

Coming from Illinois' 10th Congressional District, we are the fourth largest manufacturing district in the Nation. The Export-Import Bank is a bank that does finance many small businesses. In fact, 86 percent of the loans that happen in Illinois' 10th Congressional District in the Export-Import Bank go to small businesses.

Yes, Boeing does utilize the Export-Import Bank, and they say, whenever a Boeing plane lands, 19,000 small businesses land with them. There is no question that we talk about jobs and the economy. I hear it constantly. I know my colleagues do all across this body because I have had the opportunity to talk to them. They are talking to their constituents. It is still about jobs and the economy and the uncertainty that is out there.

I had a conversation with a small-business owner who said, "You know what? I can't go to my local community bank and get financing for a tractor that I want to send over to France or Germany."

Consequently, if we don't reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, they are going to take those jobs and they are going to move them overseas. That is the last thing in the world we want, Mr. Speaker.

We want to talk about good, high-paying jobs right here at home. We want to talk about manufacturers that have the ability to be able to create products right here at home, create

more jobs right here at home, and send those products all over the world. The Export-Import Bank allows us to do that.

We need to level the playing field and not unilaterally disarm. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Export-Import Bank and "yes" to American jobs.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to give my support to this valiant effort to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank in an effort that I believe puts first the best interests of American manufacturers, innovators, and entrepreneurs.

We had a vote this year on the TPA, the trade promotion authority. Many of my colleagues that are arguing against the Ex-Im Bank unapologetically stated their intent to give the President new, expansive authority to export U.S. jobs overseas, this amounting to millions of jobs sent overseas, all in the name of trade and globalization.

If you want to talk big business, I ask my friends that are against the Ex-Im Bank to look at that vote. Many of those in that contingent who voted for the trade promotion authority—and are going to vote for the big trade deal we have coming up—are now trying to say there is something inherently wrong with trying to underwrite U.S. exports through the Ex-Im Bank, although the vast majority of Bank loans support small business.

In my district alone, in eastern San Diego, you have nine companies—no Boeings, no GE's. Over 400 jobs, \$60 million in exports, all underwritten by the Ex-Im Bank.

I have heard a lot of people quoting Ronald Reagan. Here is what he said about the Ex-Im Bank:

"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."

I urge my colleagues to support this effort.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER).

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank everybody on both sides of the aisle for their hard work in getting this very important thing done.

I flew to Ethiopia about 6 months ago, and I flew on a Boeing airliner—there is a lot of talk about Boeing here—but I didn't fly on an Airbus. What that represented to me was a lot of jobs that Boeing provides to people, but a lot of jobs in my district of small

suppliers that supply to Boeing. I think that is something that has been lost in this whole debate.

There has been a lot of negativity, a lot of negative talk. I want to tell you about something positive, and that is the thousands of people who work in my district who don't have to worry about getting a pink slip tomorrow or the next day because they know that their manufacturing job is secure because of our future and our powerful ability to export around the globe.

While I know this has been a controversial process and I have respect for everybody on all sides of this issue, I would beg my colleagues, let's move forward in a bipartisan way. Let's reauthorize Ex-Im Bank, and let's go ahead and move ahead with the business of the American people.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to quote President Ronald Reagan on March 23, 1985:

"Why won't the Congress stop its export subsidies to a handful of corporations which account for less than 2 percent of US exports?"

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Export-Import Bank, which supports hundreds of thousands of American jobs, returns a profit to the United States Treasury, and ensures U.S. exporters can compete on a level playing field in the global market.

I came to Washington as a small-business owner, dedicated to expanding job opportunities for western New Yorkers. Unfortunately, due to misinformation and misguided outside interests, Bank opponents have shut down a government program that directly aids American jobs.

The Export-Import Bank supports thousands of jobs in western New York and numerous small businesses in the 27th Congressional District. These companies provide real jobs in western New York, good-paying jobs that will be lost if the Ex-Im Bank is not reauthorized soon.

The fact is exports drive job growth in the United States. When a company sells abroad, their employees, suppliers, and communities grow at home. Reauthorizing the Ex-Im Bank is vital for manufacturers of all sizes to grow and prosper in a competitive world economy. That is why I fully support reauthorizing the Ex-Im Bank and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 6¾ minutes remaining.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my

time to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FINCHER), a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

I want to just take time to thank him and Representative LUCAS for their courage and their leadership in making this vote possible today.

□ 1600

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding. A lot of times we don't see eye to eye, but we have a fair and spirited debate. This time we do, and I appreciate her willingness to support me in this effort.

We have talked a lot today about many different things, but I am going to end on the note of facts. And so many times in Washington, the facts get lost.

A few minutes ago, my colleague from Wisconsin, a friend of mine, one of my colleagues from Wisconsin, who probably will be the next Speaker of the House, stood up and, really, spoke against our efforts in trying to save the Export-Import Bank.

I was reminded of just a few years ago, of a couple of very serious votes that happened in the House: one was the automotive bailout, and one was TARP.

I have a quote from the gentleman from Wisconsin:

The TARP vote was necessary in order to preserve this free enterprise system. If we fail to do the right thing, heaven help us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say, none of us are perfect. I am a long way from perfect. You ask my wife and she will tell you.

But we are here to make the government work better, make it more accountable, make it smaller, and make sure the environment in the country is better for job creation and the job creators to create jobs. That is what the Export-Import Bank does.

The facts are, it doesn't cost the taxpayer a dime. The facts are, it returns money to the Treasury every year. The facts are, this is a Republican reform bill. We are fixing almost everything that has been—almost every problem that has been raised we are addressing in this reform bill.

Those are the facts, Mr. Speaker. Eighty years old; 60 other countries have them. This is about us being competitive all around the world and making sure that we keep American jobs here at home.

I urge my colleagues today, on both sides of the aisle, let's put American workers first. Let's make sure that we are working for the folks back home in our districts. Let's put these politics aside for today and put the country forward.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

We had a rather spirited debate here between those who believe the Ex-Im Bank is about economic development

and trade, and those who believe it is about corporate welfare, cronyism, and an unfair economy.

For those who claim that the Ex-Im Bank creates jobs, the Congressional Research Service would tend to beg to disagree and citing economists who say they largely rearrange jobs. We know for a fact they have rearranged jobs away from Delta because they have said they have lost jobs when the Ex-Im Bank subsidizes Air India.

Valero Refining, in my native Texas, has said they lose jobs in America when the Ex-Im Bank will subsidize a Turkish competitor.

Cliffs Natural Resources of Cleveland, Ohio, will say they lose jobs when the Ex-Im Bank subsidizes an Australian competitor, which has caused economist Donald Boudreaux to say, at best, the Ex-Im Bank creates jobs in export industries by destroying jobs in non-export industries.

How is that fair? How is that fair, Mr. Speaker?

We are told that the Ex-Im Bank makes money for the taxpayers. Well, yes, if you use special insider Washington accounting rules. But if you use fair value accounting, something that the rest of America has to use, the Congressional Budget Office says that it actually loses money, and in fact, it has received an actual bailout from the Federal taxpayers before.

We are told they help small business. And you know what? That is true in a number of cases. But yet two-thirds of the benefits go to Fortune 50 companies like Boeing, like GE. They are great companies with great people doing great things.

I just wonder why they have to receive taxpayer subsidies?

And 40 percent goes to benefit one company, Boeing; that is why it is affectionately called the "Bank of Boeing."

So I know it helps some small businesses, but other small businesses aren't too fond of the Ex-Im Bank.

We hear from the chairman of Michael Lewis Company in McCook, Illinois: "Over the long run, Ex-Im subsidies for foreign carriers creates a tilted playing field that means fewer U.S. airlines jobs—which translates into economic pain for thousands of businesses like ours and our employees."

That is the voice of small business.

Chris Rufer, founder of the Morning Star Company: "When a company profits from the Bank's support, it pockets the money. If it defaults, taxpayers' pockets gets picked . . . it is private gain at the expense of public pain."

That too, is the voice of small business.

We are told that as long as global competitors do this, well, we have to do it. I mean, that is an argument I hear from my children: everybody else is doing it, so we have to do it.

But the truth is, almost two-thirds of the Ex-Im Bank book has nothing to do with a countervailing duty. And almost 99 percent of all U.S. exports, Mr.

Speaker, are financed without the Ex-Im Bank.

So we need to help our exporters. We need to help our small businesses. But the way we do that is through expanded trade. It is through fundamental tax reform that the National Association of Manufacturers has said is 50 percent of our competitive disadvantage.

Let's make a fairer, flatter, simpler Tax Code. Let's have regulatory reform with the REINS Act. Let's pass the Keystone pipeline and drive energy prices down and become more competitive that way.

So the arguments of those who propose to support the Ex-Im Bank—and these are good people, and I know they believe in their hearts and heads in what they are doing. But I don't think their arguments bear scrutiny. They don't stand up to the light of day because the true face of the Ex-Im Bank is about cronyism. It is about misplaced priorities. It is about foreign aid. It is about corruption.

Again, this is a bank that benefits a handful of Fortune 50 companies that lobby and lobby well. Now, I would defend their First Amendment right to do it. I just wish they would lobby for more competition and more freedom and not subsidy and special privilege.

We know that so much of this support, Mr. Speaker, ends up in countries like China and Russia. We asked the chairman of the Export-Import Bank: So we are supposed to compete with China by subsidizing China?

And, Mr. Speaker, you know what his answer was? Well, it is complicated.

No, Mr. Speaker, it is not complicated; it is stupid. It is stupid for us to subsidize China in the thought that somehow we are going to compete with China.

Almost \$1 billion to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which Freedom House says is the third worst human rights offender in the world.

The cronyism, money to Solyndra, money to Enron, \$33 million to a Spanish green energy company that Bill Richardson, former Energy Secretary, sat on the advisory board of the Ex-Im Bank and then sat on the advisory board of the Spanish green energy company.

How cozy. The Fannie and Freddie business model.

Corruption, the last 6 years, 75 years total prison time, 90 criminal indictments, 49 criminal judgments. One employee just recently pleaded guilty to 19 counts of bribery.

Mr. Speaker, the genius of our system, the fairness of our system is about the free enterprise system. It is not about crony capitalism. Your success in America should depend upon how smart you work and how hard you work on Main Street, not who you know in Washington.

Crony capitalism is a threat to our free enterprise system. This is America. If you dream big dreams, if you play by the rules, you can make it on

Main Street. But not in this Washington insider economy. And there is no better poster child of the Washington crony economy and corporate welfare than the Export-Import Bank.

So I have no doubt that an overwhelming number of Democrats are going to support the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. They are always happy to allocate credit and our economy as part of a political process. They are always happy to subsidize corporate America, as long as they can also regulate and control it. But that is not fair to the people on Main Street.

It is the free enterprise system which is fair. It is the free enterprise system which is moral. It is the free enterprise system which is based on merit. It is the free enterprise system which is empowering to people. It is the only economic system that frees ordinary people to achieve extraordinary results.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is what this debate is all about. It is about a fair economy for everybody in America: those who can't afford the high-priced lobbyist in Washington, D.C., and those who want to work hard and play by the rules.

It is time for us to say "no" to crony capitalism, say "yes" to free enterprise, say "yes" to a fair economy, and reject the Export-Import Bank.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 450, 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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Ms. NORTON. I am.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Norton moves to recommit the bill H.R. 597 to the Committee on Financial Services.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from the District of Columbia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to claim time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Texas seek recognition?

Mr. HENSARLING. Yes, I wish to seek time in opposition.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma will state his point of order.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, in order to seek time in opposition, wouldn't the gentleman or gentlewoman have to be opposed to the motion to recommit?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Time in opposition is reserved for an opponent.

Mr. LUCAS. So, Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to reaffirm that whoever ultimately claims the time is, indeed, in opposition to the motion to recommit?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would ascertain that before granting recognition.

Does the gentleman from Texas seek recognition in opposition to the motion to recommit?

Mr. HENSARLING. Yes, I have sought time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Oklahoma, another valuable member of the House Financial Services Committee, who I know we are on opposite sides of this issue, if the gentleman would like time to speak, I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the gentleman yield for a brief response?

Mr. HENSARLING. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the opportunity to respond. I think that probably it is better that you finish the discussion.

Mr. HENSARLING. Okay. The gentleman declines.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman wish to yield back?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. MULVANEY. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. HENSARLING. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina for his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MULVANEY. If this is not dilatory, what is the effect of passing this motion to recommit?

I so often hear the preface, "This doesn't send it back to committee; it doesn't kill the bill."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If adopted, the motion would recommit the bill back to committee.

Mr. MULVANEY. So passing this motion to recommit would send this bill back to committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. MULVANEY. For how long?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion does not put a time limit on the committee to consider the bill.

□ 1615

Mr. MULVANEY. Fair enough.

Further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MULVANEY. Does the person offering this motion represent to this body that they are in favor of this motion in order to qualify?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman qualified by stating her opposition to the bill.

Mr. MULVANEY. Fair enough.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas may continue.

Mr. HENSARLING. Again, Mr. Speaker, I would say we are having a debate on the underlying bill that has been vigorously debated on both sides.

The motion to recommit, if people are genuinely interested in looking for an opportunity for an amendment process that was denied as the discharge petition came to the floor.

I have served under many committee chairmen on the Financial Services Committee. I have never known one to bring a bill through committee that was not supported by a majority of their members, and I did not bring this bill because it was not supported by a majority of Republican members.

I understand the ability to use this discharge petition; and if people are looking for opportunities to amend, I wish it would have been done in the discharge petition.

But if it is the will of the House to send this to committee, the committee has had three different hearings on the Ex-Im Bank already—a couple of them in conjunction with the Oversight and Government Reform Committee—and I would be happy to have even more hearings on the subject and listen to the new points that have been brought about by this debate.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of making another parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MULVANEY. The reason I am confused is, I do so often hear that introduction, the MTRs won't kill; it won't send it to committee; it will proceed immediately forthwith to the House for a vote.

So here is my question on a parliamentary inquiry basis. If the MTR is passed, I understand from your previous ruling that the bill goes back to committee. Is it amendable in committee? Or does it immediately return forthwith to the House for a vote?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill would return to the committee for its consideration.

Mr. MULVANEY. And the committee has full control over that piece of legislation?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The committee would have the bill before it again.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, again, I appreciate the gentleman from South Carolina making his parliamentary inquiries. I think it has helped clarify the matter.

At this point, if it is the will of the House to send this back to committee, I look forward to the vote and would be very happy to reconsider this in committee.

I yield back the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

I wish the Chair would clarify that there will be a vote taken on the motion to recommit and that, should that fail, this will not go back to the committee under any circumstances. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the motion is not adopted, the bill will not return to committee.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Well, if I may, you just said what I said in reverse. And I just wanted it to be clear.

As the chairman of the committee tried to state that he would be willing to hold hearings and do what he has not done as we have tried to consider this, that if, in fact, this body does not support it going back to committee, he has no opportunity to try to do what he has not done in the process. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the motion is not adopted, the Chair plans to proceed. The next step would be the question of passage of the bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. 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 and the order of the House of today, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

VACATING DEMAND FOR YEAS AND NAYS ON MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for the yeas and nays on the motion to recommit to the end that the motion stand disposed of by the voice vote thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the ordering of the yeas and nays is vacated, and pursuant to the earlier vote by voice, the motion is not adopted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. 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.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HENSARLING. Since I withdrew the request for the yeas and nays on the motion to recommit, then would it be possible for the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California, to withdraw her request for the yeas and nays on the underlying bill, should she so choose?

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, that is wishful thinking on the part of the chairman. I will not.

RETAIL INVESTOR PROTECTION ACT

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 491, I call up the bill (H.R. 1090) to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide protections for retail customers, and for other purposes, 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 491, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-31 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 1090

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 "Retail Investor Protection Act".

SEC. 2. STAY ON RULES DEFINING CERTAIN FIDUCIARIES.

After the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall not prescribe any regulation under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) defining the circumstances under which an individual is considered a fiduciary until the date that is 60 days after the Securities and Exchange Commission issues a final rule relating to standards of conduct for brokers and dealers pursuant to the second subsection (k) of section 15 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o(k)).

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.

The second subsection (k) of section 15 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o(k)), as added by section 913(g)(1) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.), is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(3) REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO RULEMAKING.—The Commission shall not promulgate a rule pursuant to paragraph (1) before—

"(A) providing a report to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate describing whether—

"(i) retail investors (and such other customers as the Commission may provide) are being harmed due to brokers or dealers operating under different standards of conduct than those that apply to investment advisors under section 211 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-11);

"(ii) alternative remedies will reduce any confusion or harm to retail investors due to brokers or dealers operating under different standards of conduct than those standards that apply to investment advisors under section 211 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. 80b-11), including—

"(I) simplifying the titles used by brokers, dealers, and investment advisers; and

"(II) enhancing disclosure surrounding the different standards of conduct currently applicable to brokers, dealers, and investment advisers;

"(iii) the adoption of a uniform fiduciary standard of conduct for brokers, dealers, and investment advisors would adversely impact the commissions of brokers and dealers, the availability of proprietary products offered by brokers and dealers, and the ability of brokers and dealers to engage in principal transactions with customers; and

"(iv) the adoption of a uniform fiduciary standard of conduct for brokers or dealers and investment advisors would adversely impact retail investor access to personalized and cost-effective investment advice, recommendations about securities, or the availability of such advice and recommendations.

"(4) ECONOMIC ANALYSIS.—The Commission's conclusions contained in the report described in paragraph (3) shall be supported by economic analysis.

"(5) REQUIREMENTS FOR PROMULGATING A RULE.—The Commission shall publish in the Federal Register alongside the rule promulgated pursuant to paragraph (1) formal findings that such rule would reduce confusion or harm to retail customers (and such other customers as the Commission may by rule provide) due to different standards of conduct applicable to brokers, dealers, and investment advisers.

"(6) REQUIREMENTS UNDER INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT OF 1940.—In proposing rules under paragraph (1) for brokers or dealers, the Commission shall consider the differences in the registration, supervision, and examination requirements applicable to brokers, dealers, and investment advisers."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in House Report 114-313, if offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH), or his designee, which shall be considered read, and shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and submit extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume simply to say, Mr. Speaker, at one time this administration told us, if you liked your doctor, you could keep them. Now this same administration is telling us, if you like your financial adviser, you can keep them. The first promise was broken, and now they are in the process of breaking the second promise due to something called the Department of Labor fiduciary rule.

It will take away investment advice from hundreds of thousands, if not millions of low- and moderate-income people all around the Nation who rely upon this advice to save for retirement. This is something that should be considered by the Securities and Exchange Commission, and there has been outstanding work by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) who has been at the forefront of protecting retail investors, the small moms and pops planning for their retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

□ 1630

Mrs. WAGNER. I would like to thank Chairman HENSARLING and Subcommittee Chair GARRETT for their support on this tremendous issue.

Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to stand before the House as the sponsor of H.R. 1090, the Retail Investor Protection Act. This important legislation that I have sponsored and worked on for 3 long years now came about after my colleagues on the Financial Services Committee and I, along with Member of Congress on both sides of the aisle saw the potential negative effects that this rulemaking from the Department of Labor could have on millions of Americans seeking advice on how to invest their retirement savings.

For that reason, we felt it was important to put the Securities and Exchange Commission—the primary and expert regulator for these financial professionals—in charge of studying and writing the rules on this issue. This isn't such a radical idea. In fact, this is what Congress intended when they included section 913 in the Dodd-Frank financial reform bill.

Mr. Speaker, the same legislation received the support of 30 House Democrats last Congress, and, once again, I hope that they heed the concerns and the warnings that their constituents have provided them about the dire consequences this rule will have on Americans' retirement savings.

Make no mistake. There is a savings crisis in this country. About half of all households age 55 and over have no retirement savings at all. How does this happen?

Unfortunately, for many people, like that single mother of two who gets paid on the 15th and 30th of each

month, there is just too much month at the end of the money after paying for mortgages, groceries, medical bills, and other expenses, and saving for retirement ultimately gets pushed off until the next month and the next month and so on.

For many American households, a trusted financial adviser is the key link to helping them see the benefits in saving early and helping them realize how to save and grow their investment. The vast majority of those financial professionals already provide advice and recommendations that are in the best interest—the best interest—of their clients.

Unfortunately, this rulemaking from the Department of Labor could potentially cut access, limit choice, and raise costs for that kind of financial advice, putting the goal of retirement even further out of reach.

The Department of Labor states that this rule simply would require financial advisers to act in the best interests of their customers. Well, who would argue with that? Unfortunately, when you start to get into the over 1,000 pages of regulatory text with the exemptions and addendums, it becomes clear that it isn't quite that simple.

The increased compliance burdens and further legal liability that will be required under this regulation will make it very difficult for many brokers to continue servicing small accounts, which predominantly belong to low- and middle-income Americans who are just starting to save and haven't built up their retirement nest egg.

Mr. Speaker, 98 percent of all IRAs with less than \$25,000 are in a brokerage relationship today. For that reason, this rule will actually hurt the very people that it aims to protect. We must not play politics with their retirement savings, and that is what this administration is doing.

We have already seen this happen in the United Kingdom. They enacted a similar regulation in 2013, and we have seen since then over 300,000 clients dropped by their financial advisers because their account balances were too small.

Now the U.K. Government is launching an investigation into the "advice gap" that exists for those people who do not have significant wealth. With this regulation from the Department of Labor, the same thing will happen here in the United States of America where there will be two different classes of investors, those who can afford financial advice and those who cannot.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a Wall Street issue. This is as Main Street as it gets. Washington should not be making it more difficult for Americans to save for retirement. Instead, we need to empower people to earn more and save more and have choices for where to get their help in making their financial decisions. Unfortunately, the Department of Labor is following along with everything else we have seen under the Obama administration, a top-down,

Washington-knows-best-for-you government, whether it is what you see in your health care that you need, the food that you can eat, and now whom you can talk to for the financial advice for your retirement savings.

According to President Obama, Senator ELIZABETH WARREN, and now even Secretary Hillary Clinton—who are all big supporters of this DOL fiduciary rule—the only person whom you actually need to be protected from ultimately is yourself. I strongly disagree. I give the American people a lot more credit than that, and I refuse to stand by and let this administration advance another onerous regulation that ultimately takes your freedoms, makes decisions for you, and brings us closer to a government-planned life.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 1090, the Retail Investor Protection Act, and I urge its passage.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1090 would halt the Department of Labor's ongoing efforts to protect American retirement savers from investment advice that conflicts with their best interests.

The bill would prohibit the Department from promulgating any rule on the issue until 60 days after the Securities and Exchange Commission finalizes its own fiduciary rule for investment advisers and broker dealers.

The bill would then delay the SEC's long overdue rulemaking by requiring the Commission to first report to Congress a separate economic analysis that, among other things, considers how a new standard would affect a broker's profit.

These delays are unacceptable and ignore the real issue that the Department is trying to address: conflicted retirement investment advice that costs our Nation's workers and retirees an estimated \$17 billion a year.

The Department's rulemaking would do so by requiring persons providing retirement advice to put the interests of their clients ahead of their own and abide by a fiduciary duty, the same duty that we expect from our doctors, lawyers, and trustees.

Simply put, a financial adviser should not be paid more for recommending one product over another, but should abide by a fiduciary standard of care. Would you be comfortable if your doctor was paid more for an office visit for recommending one drug over another or for a lawyer to be paid more for interpreting the law one way or the other? No, of course not. Yet, we allow these same conflicts to exist with those that are providing millions of hardworking Americans with advice on their retirement savings.

These conflicts encourage investors to, for example, push a 70-year-old retiree to invest more of her savings in a stock fund rather than a less risky short-term bond fund simply because the adviser receives 150 percent more for making the riskier recommendation.

Such a commonsense update in the law to address these conflicts is long overdue and, indeed, at the Department, is over 5 years in the making. During that time, the Department has published an initial 2010 proposal, solicited feedback, held public hearings on that proposal, and issued even a reproposal this past spring.

Since that reproposal was published, the public and interested stakeholders have had 164 days of public comment, 4 full days of multi-panel public hearings, and ample opportunity to meet with the Department, which held over 100 meetings with interested stakeholders, not including meetings with Members of Congress.

Thanks to the Department's diligence and willingness to listen to stakeholder concerns, the proposal now enjoys broad support, including support from 95 financial services groups, public interest, civil rights, and consumer organizations, labor unions, and many investment advisers who are already providing advice to savers under a fiduciary standard. These groups range from the AARP, Public Citizen, the Consumer Federation of America, to the Financial Planning Coalition, among many others.

All this points to the Department's tangible efforts to take a balanced, measured approach to developing a rule that works. I fully support their efforts to continue to work towards its completion not only because it is necessary, but because it just makes common sense.

What is more, the need to update the law quickly is urgent. Hardworking Americans lose an estimated \$17 billion per year—or \$47 million per day—to conflicted retirement investment advice.

While we should clearly encourage the Securities and Exchange Commission to also update its own rules on investment advice over securities, we should not make retirement savers wait any longer for protection by hinging the DOL's rulemaking to the SEC's, as H.R. 1090 would do.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Labor Department's efforts to finalize a rule and urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 1090.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), the distinguished chairman of our Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises Subcommittee.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

I thank Mrs. WAGNER as well.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Labor's fiduciary rule is built upon faulty assumptions, faulty analysis, and faulty understanding basically of how the retirement system actually works in this country. It is really consistent with other policies of this administration.

This rule will have a disparate impact and a negative impact upon middle class Americans and minorities in

this country, many of whom will find it difficult, if not impossible, to receive guidance from a financial professional for their retirement.

This is not me saying this. The Department of Labor's own analysis shows that investors who do not work with a professional will risk making mistakes that cost them up to \$100 billion.

So today, Mr. Speaker, Congress has an opportunity to stand up on behalf of struggling American families and support this legislation.

We have proof to show that this legislation really is necessary because we had folks coming to Washington to testify about it who supported the DOL rule. They said do not worry. They said that, if the traditional brokerage firms can't live with a simple fiduciary standard and refuse to serve modest savers, so be it. Other financial professionals such as them on and off the Web who embrace the client-first approach stand ready to help Americans prepare for a secure retirement. Well, that was Rebalance IRA.

Someone went to that company, a modest American, and said, "Will you service us?" This was their response: "If you have scheduled a call with us, I want you to be aware that, as much as we would enjoy discussing your retirement goals, until you have at least \$100,000 in a retirement account, our service at this time is not really the best solution for you. Our fees will absorb too much of your investment return, which runs counter to our mandate to help you to retire."

So, Mr. Speaker, the very same people who say the system will work under the DOL guidelines prove that, when people of modest means—Americans who are simply trying to scrape by each week and each month and put a little bit away—will not have that investment advice which their very own Department of Labor says is necessary to get by and to fulfill the American Dream.

The Retail Investor Protection Act will restore regulation to the market to where it belongs: with the SEC. It will prevent the Department of Labor from worsening the retirement savings crisis that our country is facing. I say support the American Dream. Support this legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), the ranking member of the Monetary Policy and Trade Subcommittee on the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. MOORE. I thank you so much, Madam Ranking Member.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1090. I must say to Representative WAGNER she is correct when she says that there were 30 Democrats—I am one of them—who supported similar legislation, but that was before the Department of Labor repropoed the conflict of interest rules, gave us sort of an unprecedented 164-day comment period during the reproposal, and they

withdrew the original 2010 proposal and put forward the repropoed rule in 2015, 5 years. As we discussed it, they have committed to making considerable improvements.

Now, the SEC has yet to begin the process of a related rulemaking 5 years after the Department of Labor began the process, and they have made it really clear that they don't think they will get to it.

I do want to point out—since I have 3 whole minutes here—that it has been very difficult to get the majority party to agree to providing the SEC with the needed resources that would, in fact, enable them to undertake the work that the Department of Labor has already put forward on this. So I don't think we should wait until after the SEC acts to issue a rule. And this legislation before us would only delay these important consumer protections.

The Department of Labor has received a lot of feedback, especially from me. Mr. Speaker, I have been extremely vocal in highlighting areas, some of them which you have heard on the other side mentioned here today—very vocal on the repropoed rule where I think it needs to be improved and, in fact, led a letter to the Department of Labor with 96 Democratic colleagues signing on to that letter.

□ 1645

However, I do think that the time is now for Congress to partner with the DOL, with industry, and with retirement savers toward the best possible final rule to encourage and protect retirement savings.

Now, I want to mention that the overwhelming majority of advisers are good people with their clients' best interest at heart. In fact, no one in this debate is suggesting that we don't support policy which puts the best interest of the client first and foremost. But when financial advisers are unscrupulous, they have a devastating impact on retirement savers.

Further, when advisers are responding to skewed incentives that encourage conflicts and put clients in products, that may be okay for the client, but placement in these products are driven primarily by the adviser's bonus.

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. MOORE. The DOL rule that is being repropoed seeks to mitigate these conflicts of interest so that the best advisers in companies get clients and compensation based on the best interest and the outcomes for their clients.

I think that this is a backdoor approach to kill the rule, any rule, and it will leave gaping loopholes in Federal laws.

My advice to my colleagues is that we defeat this bill.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from

Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), chairman of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, we, before this debate, were having a debate on the Ex-Im Bank, and I made a point about my friends across the aisle standing up for big businesses, the cynicism between big government and Big Business. In this debate, they have a chance now to stand with small investors, the men and women around this country who put a little bit away every paycheck to hopefully have a little nest egg for their retirement, to stand with those people to make sure that when they get to their retirement, they have a nest egg that is worth something, and to make sure that those folks have advice along the way.

The way the Department of Labor rule is structured is that most Americans aren't going to be able to get advice from a financial adviser; they are going to be driven to a robo-adviser. What that means is they are going to have to go to a Web site, answer about 6 to 10 questions, and the Web site will pump out a generic investment suggestion for them. No personally tailored advice from a financial adviser.

That also has another effect. Think last month or 2 months ago in August when we had market movement. A lot of people get freaked out and they sell. But if you have an adviser, they say: Hold on. No, no, no, we have a long-term plan here. Don't sell, don't sell. Hold on. We are going to weather this storm together.

But is a robo-adviser, the text from the computer, going to calm your nerves so that you don't sell your portfolio? This doesn't work for the American people.

What the Department of Labor is doing is saying: If you are wealthy, if you have a lot of money, if you have a big nest egg, then you can get advice. But if you are poor or middle class, a middle-income American, you are not entitled to the same advice of the wealthy and the powerful.

I am mostly concerned about one other point here, is that if this rule goes into effect and less Americans save and have less return on their investment, when they get to their retirement years, they are going to be more reliant on the government. We want people less reliant. We want people to take more responsibility so they have a nest egg to fund their retirement years, pay for themselves. The way this is structured, you will have less people doing that and more people looking to the government for care. I guess that is a greater debate that we have in this institution: Do we want more people relying on the government?

I think the only conclusion I can draw with your support for this rule is, absolutely, yes. That is a wrong approach. We come from a long line of people who believe in self-reliance, in

taking care of ourselves and our family. This rule from the Department of Labor is bad. Let's fix it with this bill.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets of the Financial Services Committee.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding and for her leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD over 95 investor protection and consumer protection groups who adamantly support the position of the Department of Labor rule that protects investors and consumers.

SAVE OUR RETIREMENT,
October 26, 2015.

OPPOSE H.R. 1090, THE MISNAMED "RETAIL INVESTOR PROTECTION ACT"

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE We are writing as organizations that strongly support the Department of Labor's (DOL) efforts to strengthen protections for working families and retirees by requiring the financial professionals they turn to for retirement investment advice to act in their best interests. As such, we oppose H.R. 1090, the misnamed "Retail Investor Protection Act," and urge you to vote NO when the bill is considered on the House floor.

H.R. 1090 is a clear attempt to thwart DOL action by making the Department wait for years and possibly indefinitely until after the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) finalizes a rule under securities laws—a process that the SEC has not yet initiated. And, to further delay action, the bill imposes on the SEC new requirements to engage in further economic analysis, beyond the extensive analysis it has already conducted, and make formal findings before promulgating a rule. By impeding DOL's efforts, this bill would in no way protect retail investors; instead, it would protect those financial professionals who take advantage of loopholes in the law to profit at their clients' expense.

This approach would effectively cripple DOL's ability to fulfill its unique and critical regulatory role under ERISA. When Congress enacted ERISA, it intentionally set a higher standard for protecting retirement assets than applies to other investments. There are good reasons to do so. Retirement assets are special, as evidenced by the fact that they are heavily subsidized by the government through the tax code. These tax subsidies should flow to individuals, not financial firms, and should not be depleted by conflicts of interest.

Retirement savers who are struggling to fund an independent and secure retirement need financial advice they can trust is in their best interest. Today, neither our securities regulations nor the rules under ERISA provide that assurance. Instead, both sets of regulations expose retirement savers to recommendations from conflicted advisers who are free to recommend products based on their own financial interests rather than those of their customers. The DOL proposal—which combines a best interest standard with meaningful restrictions on the practices that undermine that standard—offers significant progress toward addressing this problem. There is no reason to force the DOL to wait for the SEC, since only the DOL has the authority and expertise to close the loopholes in the ERISA rules.

DOL has succeeded in crafting a balanced rule that provides much needed new protec-

tions for retirement savers while providing the flexibility necessary to enable firms operating under a variety of business models to comply. While adjustments can and doubtless will be made to clarify and streamline certain of the rule's operational requirements, the rule's overall framework is sound. Contrary to the misinformation that has swirled around the DOL proposal, it actually will help, not hurt, small savers. They need the protections of the best interest standard more than any other workers and retirees, since they can least afford high fees and poor returns on their savings. And if some advisers really do pull back, there are plenty of advisers happy to provide affordable, best interest advice to clients at all income levels.

We can only hope that the SEC eventually will follow DOL's lead and craft a similarly strong and effective rule for non-retirement accounts. But in a nation that faces a retirement crisis, and with DOL ready to act, we cannot afford to wait. We therefore urge you to reject H.R. 1090—or any legislation that would stall, derail or interfere with the DOL rulemaking, which is proceeding under an appropriate deliberative process—and instead support DOL's efforts to finalize a rule based on the sound regulatory approach it has proposed.

Sincerely,

AARP, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), Alliance for a Just Society, Alliance for Retired Americans, American Association for Justice, American Association of University Women, Americans for Financial Reform, Association of University Centers on Disabilities, Better Markets, Center for Community Change Action, Center for Global Policy Solutions, Center for Responsible Lending.

The Committee for the Fiduciary Standard, Consumer Action, Consumer Federation of America, Consumers Union, Fund Democracy, International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Union, Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, Lynn Turner, former chief accountant, SEC, Main Street Alliance.

Metal Trades Department, AFL-CIO, National Active and Retired Federal Employees Association (NARFE), National Council of LaRaza, National LGBTQ Task Force Action Fund, National Organization for Women, Pension Rights Center, Public Citizen, Public Investors Arbitration Bar Association, Service Employees International Union (SEIU), United Auto Workers, United Steelworkers, Paper and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers International Union (USW), U.S. PIRG, Wider Opportunities for Women.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Labor's fiduciary duty rule advances a very simple principle: If you are giving advice to retirement savers and you are being compensated for your advice, then you have to put your customers' interests first.

It is worth noting that most investors already think that this is the law, even though it isn't.

So the Department of Labor's rule is a much-needed update of the rules governing investment advice to retirement savers. I would say we have a particular responsibility as legislators to protect retirement savers, which is what the DOL rule does.

While the proposed rule is not perfect, no rule ever is. The Department

has been incredibly responsive, very responsive to legitimate concerns that have been raised. They have been more than willing to engage with Congress and with industry and with investors to come up with better solutions.

But this bill before us would effectively stop the Department of Labor's rule in its tracks, which is the completely wrong thing to do if you want to protect investors.

This bill is also redundant, unnecessary, and really reflects a misunderstanding of the law.

One of the core principles of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, or ERISA, was that investments made for the purpose of retirement security should enjoy special protections under the law. That is what this DOL rule does. This, by definition, means that the protections under ERISA are supposed to be different than the protections under ordinary securities laws. They should be more protective of the retirement investor.

As a result, the SEC and the Department of Labor have different responsibilities. When two agencies have different responsibilities, it is completely appropriate for them to move separately and even to write different rules.

This bill would also require the SEC to conduct yet another study—or I would call it a delay—on a uniform fiduciary standard for broker-dealers. We already required the SEC to conduct a study on this issue in Dodd-Frank, and the SEC staff's recommendation in that study was that the SEC should, in fact, adopt a uniform fiduciary standard for broker-dealers.

Requiring the SEC to conduct largely the same study that they already conducted in 2011—I believe they can move ahead with their own fiduciary rule—is pointless and shows that the true intent of the bill, the underlying bill, is to delay both the Department of Labor's rule and any future SEC rule which ultimately is there to protect the retirement saver and investor.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, and I urge them to vote for investor protections and to protect consumers. I urge a very strong "no" vote.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Retail Investor Protection Act.

The Department of Labor's proposal here is going to harm the very working class Americans that the administration claims that it is supporting.

This is not hyperbole, this is not a hypothetical. I want to give you the real results of what happened in the United Kingdom when it enacted similar regulation in 2013. Here are the disastrous results: 310,000 clients were dropped; 60,000 new investors were rejected; an estimated 11 million potential savers were priced out of advice.

In the face of these facts, the Department of Labor continues to insist on

applying the failed philosophy of “government knows best” to retirement savings.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri for her leadership on this, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1090, the so-called Retail Investor Protection Act.

This bill puts an effective end to the Department of Labor’s responsible effort to modernize a fiduciary standard under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, or ERISA, that was implemented 40 years ago.

As we all know, our country’s retirement savings landscape has changed significantly since that time. Forty years ago, the majority of retirement assets were held in defined benefit plans and managed by professionals. Forty years ago, employer-based 401(k) plans did not exist and IRAs had just been established.

Today, Americans have more than \$12 trillion invested in 401(k) plans and IRAs, and they have to make their own financial decisions. Many workers and their families don’t have the expertise in managing investment portfolios and so they often have to rely on financial advisers to help them save for retirement.

While many of those advisers do right by their clients, others do not. There is a lot of different financial products that Americans can purchase. Some have extremely high fees, while comparable products—and perhaps even better ones—have lower fees. This current standard allows for unscrupulous advisers to give conflicted advice and push a financial product from which they will reap a bigger profit even if the product is not in the best interest of their client.

It is individuals with modest retirement savings—many of our constituents—who stand to lose the most from receiving conflicted advice. National Public Radio recently conducted a series that in part highlighted how Americans are losing billions of dollars every year out of their retirement accounts because they are paying excessive fees.

As a hypothetical example, NPR cited a person who invests \$10,000 and that investment makes a 7 percent return every year. Over 40 years, that investment would be worth almost \$150,000. But if you have invested in a fund that charges a 2-percent annual fee, now you have cut the return down from 7 percent down to 5 percent. Over 40 years, your investment would be worth about \$70,000, not almost \$150,000. That is, obviously, a big difference, and that is the kind of insidious erosion of retirement savings that the Department is working to end with their rule.

Since April, the Department of Labor has been engaged in this necessary rulemaking process. The Department has informed us that over that time, it provided the American public a total of 164 days to submit comments; they conducted 4 full days of public hearings; and convened over 100 meetings. That total doesn’t account for meetings they have held with Members of Congress.

Now the Department is completing its work on the rule and is taking into account the thousands of comments it received. Here in Congress, we should just let them finish their job.

Millions of Americans rely on financial advisers for advice on how to protect their hard-earned retirement savings, and it is about time that we ensure that those Americans are provided advice consistent with their best interest, not with what would ultimately be in the best interest and profit for the adviser.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to defeat this legislation.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN), a very important member of the House Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

Today, I rise in support of legislation that will protect hard-working Americans’ access to retirement advice.

The Labor Department is aggressively pushing a flawed rule which might be a political win for the Obama administration but would come at the expense of Americans trying to save for retirement. This is why I cosponsored the Retail Investor Protection Act.

The administration claims the plan that they have put forward will help people trying to save for retirement. Instead, it would hurt many of them.

The Labor Department has proposed restricting retirement advice and reducing options for what financial instruments can be used to save for the future.

Most concerning, the regulatory costs would hit those who have had difficulty saving the hardest. One firm in my district with dozens of offices that serve more than 30,000 customers told me that they fear the Labor Department proposal will make it impossible to offer quality services to low- and middle-income customers.

□ 1700

Clearly, the administration has no concept of what these rules will mean for Main Street investors, and they have chosen to ignore the benefits provided by retirement advisers. My constituents tell me they save more because of the advice they get. Relatively simple advice, such as not making irrational decisions in volatile markets, is incredibly valuable, especially for less sophisticated investors. Furthermore, the Department’s proposal mentions annuities 172 times, but the Regulatory Impact Analysis does not examine the impact on these financial products.

The Department of Labor is choosing to ignore Congress and the people it claims to protect. On July 29, I sent two separate letters to Secretary Perez. It has now been almost 3 months, and he has done nothing to address the concerns of my constituents.

There are now at least 51 of my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, who share my concerns that listed options would no longer be permissible in retirement accounts. The Labor Department claims that they are working closely with the SEC, but during a hearing last Friday, a key witness from the SEC could not provide me with one example of when the Labor Department had included any SEC input.

It is time for the administration to stop restricting where and how Americans choose to pursue financial stability and security. Vote “yes.”

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations on the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. I thank the ranking member for her outstanding work and efforts in this area. The gentlewoman has truly been a champion for people—the very little people who some people have styled we are talking about today.

Mr. Speaker, the best way, without question, to get the SEC to act would be to allow the DOL to act. If the DOL is allowed to promulgate its rules, I guarantee you the SEC will move with an additional amount of deliberate speed.

Currently, the DOL is simply attempting to cause people who act as financial advisers to have fidelity to their clients above their own personal interests. What is so unusual about the concept is the person who is working for you having fidelity that benefits you as opposed to the person who is working for you.

Right now, as the laws exist, a person acting as a financial adviser can become a financial predatory adviser. Not all are. I am not accusing the industry of anything. I am just making a point about what can happen. When this happens, the person who is to give you advice—for a fee, I might add—can sell you a product for a higher fee and that has a higher risk as opposed to a similar product with a lower fee and that carries a lower risk. The higher fee is the temptation that will cause predatory financial advisers to manifest themselves and take actions against the best interests of the clients, who are paying them to represent them and benefit them.

We ought not allow this kind of action to be sanctioned by the Congress of the United States of America. What the President is attempting to do by and through the DOL is to simply say: If you are going to represent your client, you are going to put your interest beneath the client’s interest. You will

subordinate your interest to your client's interest. You will not allow yourself to yield to the temptation to take a higher amount of money for yourself and put your client at a greater amount of risk.

That is all this rule is about.

Let's allow the rule to come into existence. If we want to debate it thereafter and amend it, we can. But let's not prevent it from ever manifesting itself by causing some to believe that the SEC will do what the DOL will not, because the evidence is not there to support the notion that we are going to get faster results from the SEC.

Finally, this: in a righteous world, we would be calling some of this activity fraud.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR), another valued member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Retail Investor Protection Act, legislation that will ensure investor access to personalized and cost-effective investment advice.

The Department of Labor's proposed fiduciary rule will make it more difficult for hard-working Americans to access financial advice and to save for retirement.

Time and again, I have heard from constituents throughout my central Kentucky district of how this massive, 1,000-page rule will negatively affect them: Private employers and not-for-profit organizations will no longer be able to bring in financial advisers to provide educational information about retirement plans to their employees. Investors with small accounts will no longer be able to receive advice for their 401(k) plans. Middle class investors will lose access to professional advice, and financial products like annuities will no longer be available. More and more Americans will be forced to seek information on the Internet or from robo-advisers.

Let's get this straight, Mr. Speaker. This rule will replace flesh and blood professional advisers with a computer. As one of my constituents said to me, if you think professional advice is expensive, wait until you see the cost of amateur advice. In short, the Department of Labor's rule will hurt the very people it is supposed to protect.

On July 29, Representatives WAGNER, SCOTT, CLAY, and I sent a bipartisan letter, signed by 21 Members, to Secretary Perez, asking for the DOL to stop these disruptive changes and repropose the rule in light of the many negative comments. Secretary Perez replied that the DOL would not entertain the request. That is why it is necessary for Congress to take action and pass this legislation.

Look, we all agree that financial advisers should act in the best interests of their clients, but heightened consumer protections in the investment space should apply broadly and should not create two classes of investors. It

should not bifurcate the industry to those who can afford advisers and those who cannot. The result will be less choice for consumers and a lack of access for retail investors to sound financial advice. The best consumer protection is not central planning from Washington. It is choice and competition.

I thank Representative WAGNER for her leadership on this issue, and I encourage my colleagues to vote for competition and choice, to vote for access to professional financial advice, and to defeat this rule.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the ranking member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I thank Ranking Member WATERS for yielding, and I thank her for her excellent and compassionate leadership not only on this issue but on so many others.

I rise today to oppose H.R. 1090, the so-called Retail Investor Protection Act, which is anything but a protection for investors.

Rather than protecting our constituents' investments, this Act would prevent the Department of Labor from finalizing a rule to establish a fiduciary standard for investment advisers until the Securities and Exchange Commission finalizes a rule first.

In essence, the bill before us would prevent the Labor Department from finalizing any rule at all. The administration has already indicated it would veto this measure if it is passed by Congress.

This past March, Senator ELIZABETH WARREN and I held a forum as part of our Middle Class Prosperity Project to consider the need for a strong fiduciary standard to protect Americans who are saving for retirement. We heard directly from Americans who had lost tens of thousands of dollars because they did not receive advice that was in their best interests.

In some cases, people may not even realize they have placed their trust in advisers who are not fiduciaries and who have no obligation to act in their best interests. One study found that Americans who are saving for retirement lose more than \$43 billion, on average, each year because advisers don't act in their clients' best interests.

The real solution, as we learned in our forum, is to have a strong conflict of interest rule to ensure the advice Americans receive—advice they receive as paying customers—directs their hard-earned retirement savings to investments that will work in their best interests.

This House should not put roadblocks in the way of this commonsense reform, which would protect our constituents' money. I urge all of the Members of the House to oppose H.R. 1090.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER), another valued member of the committee.

Mr. MESSER. I thank the chairman.

I thank Mrs. WAGNER for her leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Retail Investor Protection Act.

Let me be clear. We all agree that investment advisers should act in the best interests of their clients, and we all want to ensure that low- and middle-income investors get good financial advice. But in life and in the world of public debate, we are not just responsible for our intentions; we are also responsible for our results.

That is the problem with the Department of Labor's fiduciary rule. Whatever their intentions, the results of this administration's policy will hurt the very people they are saying they are trying to help. Here is why: The rule will increase the cost of financial advice and force working class investors to pay higher fees. The fact is that most investors can't afford these fees. As a result, millions of investors will get no advice at all. That is not good for anybody.

The bill today will delay the implementation of the new so-called "fiduciary rule" and ensure that investors continue to have access to sound financial advice.

I urge my colleagues to protect lower and middle class investors and stop this administration's so-called "fiduciary rule."

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the name of this bill is the Retail Investor Protection Act. If you didn't know better, you would think it was a bill designed to protect the retail investor. But, in fact, it does the opposite of that because it blocks the Department of Labor from putting in place commonsense rules that would make sure that retirement investment advisers handle their clients with care and with a fiduciary duty.

The Department of Labor wants to update rules that are now 40 years old, and that, again, makes common sense. Here is what happens: A retiree wants to take his 401(k) plan and make a decision about where to invest it. The retirement adviser comes along and offers up that advice. Meanwhile, the retiree does not realize that that person may be getting a commission from the very funds to which that retiree is being directed.

That is a conflict of interest, pure and simple.

If you asked the average retiree, "Do you think we need a rule that would protect retirees and other investors from this kind of conflict of interest, that would put some kind of fiduciary duty in place so the retirement investor is acting in the interest of the client," if you said, "Do you think we need a rule," the average retiree would ask, "Do you mean we don't already have that rule in place?" He wouldn't

believe it. He wouldn't believe this conflict of interest is structurally built into the system and is resulting in billions of dollars being taken from workers' retirement savings every single year.

So why is the Congress taking this up? Why are we trying to block the DOL?

I fear that what is happening is Congress is getting pushed around again by Wall Street and by wealthy special interests. We heard a lot about crony capitalism when talking about the last bill. That is what is going on here. There is a letter in the RECORD from the Koch Brothers and their gang, Americans for Prosperity and FreedomWorks. They are in here trying to block the Department of Labor's bill.

So Big Money is cascading into Washington. It is affecting the way we make policy. It is going to keep coming. The fix is in. I hope my colleagues will come to the floor today and vote against this, but I am not optimistic.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA), another great member of the House Financial Services Committee.

Mr. GUINTA. I thank Chairman HENSARLING.

Mr. Speaker, I stand today in strong support of H.R. 1090, the Retail Investor Protection Act.

This isn't about the Koch Brothers. This is about low- and middle-income families, seniors, people who try to take a little bit of their life savings and put it away over time. You heard speakers earlier talking about 98 percent of the people who have IRAs have under \$25,000 in them. They are who we are aiming to protect. They are the people who are coming to us, asking—begging—for assistance, and they are who we stand with because this is America.

□ 1715

This is not a place where Washington, D.C., is supposed to stand firm and dictate policy for everyone. We are supposed to be about limited government. We are supposed to be in this Nation about putting our trust and our faith in individuals.

This proposed legislation by the DOL does the exact opposite. It takes power away from the individual. It takes power away from the individual to talk to their financial adviser and gain educational opportunities to make informed decisions about their long-term investments.

My wife and I have two kids, 10 and 12. We are thinking about their financial stability. We want to encourage them to have long-term investments, like my folks suggested to me, so they can make informed decisions. But, no, Washington is going to decide that they can't, that I can't, that my folks can't, that the people I represent can't, all in the name of ensuring that Washington knows better.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I put my faith in the people. I do not put my faith in bureaucrats who think they know better.

I think that Representative WAGNER's leadership is tremendous on this particular issue because she feels just as passionately as the rest of us. We are not only talking about the lack of ability, but the compliance cost, which is going to get pushed onto that same individual.

So I encourage my colleagues, I implore my colleagues, to vote for this bill and support H.R. 1090.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1090, the misnamed Retail Investor Protection Act, which essentially ends the progress made by the Department of Labor on releasing an updated conflict-of-interest rule that seeks to protect our constituents' hard-earned savings and strengthen the ability for those in the middle class to save for retirement.

In June, I had the opportunity to speak with Secretary Perez in a hearing held by the Education and the Workforce Committee on the Department's work to draft a comprehensive rule and, importantly, a rule that is developed by working with diverse stakeholders and based on feedback from senior advocacy groups, civil rights groups, and the industry that provides these services.

This is the process that is currently underway. H.R. 1090 would stop this process. Secretary Perez is on record saying he is listening to feedback and incorporating changes. Let's allow the process to go forward, not stop it.

I have met with families and individuals across Oregon who are struggling to get ahead, and I know the sacrifice that is involved in each and every dollar they set aside to contribute to their future retirement. I am disappointed by the efforts today to stop this rule.

We need a level playing field to allow our constituents to take advantage of the many opportunities that exist to grow and protect their investment.

Finally, as a former consumer protection attorney, I learned and know that strong rules can empower consumers and bring transparency to the marketplace. This is what the Department of Labor is working toward, and I am disappointed in this bill's attempt to stop their important work to finish this rule.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposition to H.R. 1090.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), another outstanding member of the House Financial Services Committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, President Obama would have us believe that the American people are incapable of making our own choices, that we are just not smart enough. From health care to education, to now personal re-

tirement accounts, the Obama administration thinks government knows best.

Remember when Obamacare architect Jonathan Gruber claimed "the stupidity of the American voter"? A recent administration ruling by the Department of Labor demonstrated this arrogance again when it said Americans "seldom have the training or specialized expertise necessary to prudently manage retirement assets on their own." This is unbelievable because the government can't even manage the taxpayers' dollars.

So their solution to our apparent stupidity is an \$80 billion ruling that will increase costs for low- to middle-income investors and limit access to quality investment advice. Some solution this is.

Mr. Speaker, there are already measures in place to provide incentives for advisers to act in their client's best interest, measures that are far less costly and far less restrictive.

To Jonathan Gruber, President Obama, and members of this administration who think they know better than the average American, let this bipartisan opposition illustrate how wrong they are.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the Retail Investor Protection Act. In God we trust.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, there are comments on this floor that said we had to listen to those who came. I want to stand and listen to the hardworking Americans who ultimately will retire.

I am tired of blocking good measures that protect them, such as the Labor Department's efforts to strengthen protections for working families and retirees by requiring their financial professionals who provide retirement investment advice be treated as fiduciaries under ERISA laws.

It is important to note that this is a simple requirement. It does not undermine the responsibilities or the profits of broker-dealers and others. It just simply says that they must be held to a standard to protect those retirees who have worked so very hard.

I oppose the underlying bill, H.R. 1090.

I am also glad to stand on the floor and support, however, H.R. 597, the Export-Import Bank Reform Reauthorization Act, finally to open the Bank and create jobs and opportunities for so many.

Again, let me say that I am standing with those workers who are not here, retirees who have worked, hardworking Americans who will have their investments protected, by making sure that those who give them advice are regulated and held to very high standards.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1090, the Retail Investor Protection Act.

I oppose this bill, because it would undermine efforts to curb conflicts of interest in the marketing and development of retirement investments, particularly for retail investors.

I support the efforts of individuals and businesses to succeed in the American economy.

Unfortunately for too long the success of some is coming at the total disregard for the rights of workers and their families.

Investments in a home, savings placed in retirement accounts or into 401ks are ways for working people to ensure that they will not live in poverty when they retire.

This bill would prevent the Department of Labor from addressing disparities in how the rights of investors are protected.

Broker-dealers trade securities for themselves or on behalf of their customers, and they typically charge a commission fee for each transaction and may also be compensated with a commission from the company whose securities they trade.

In making recommendations to clients and conducting transactions, they must adhere to "suitability" standards that ensure that their recommendations are suitable to the client's financial situation and objectives.

Investment advisers, meanwhile, who manage the employee retirement and benefit plans for private companies, must under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA; PL 93-406) adhere to higher "fiduciary" standards and take actions that are in the best interests of the participants.

Among other things, such investment advisers must act solely for the interests of participants and beneficiaries and for the exclusive purpose of providing benefits and paying plan expenses.

They also must act prudently and avoid conflicts of interest. Investment advisers are paid through an annual flat fee for managing the investments, which is based on the size of the plan.

Broker-dealers are regulated by the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) and the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority (FINRA) under the suitability standard, while investment advisers are regulated more directly by the SEC under the higher fiduciary standard.

While employee retirement benefit plans are managed by investment advisers, individuals also invest on their own for retirement and other purposes and often use either investment advisers or broker-dealers to help them decide on investments and to perform the trades in stock or investment instruments.

The 2010 Dodd-Frank Act required the SEC in Section 913 of the act to report on the standards of care applicable to broker-dealers and investment advisers, and it authorized the SEC to issue rules to extend the fiduciary standard now applicable to investment advisers to broker-dealers when providing any advice about securities to retail customers.

According to the Financial Services Committee, in 2011 the SEC released a staff study recommending that both broker-dealers and investment advisers be held to a fiduciary standard "no less stringent than currently applied to investment advisers."

This past April, the Labor Department, acting under ERISA, proposed new rules regarding who is covered by ERISA's fiduciary standard and how that standard would be applied, saying that more needed to be done to protect individuals who are trying to invest and save for retirement.

The proposed rule would treat all financial advisers who provide retirement investment recommendations and make trades on behalf

of clients—including broker-dealers dealing with individual IRAs, 401(k) plan and other retirement investments—as fiduciaries under ERISA.

Under the proposal, financial advisers would be required to provide investment advice that is in the best interest of the retirement investor "without regard to the financial or other interests" of the financial institution, adviser or other party.

The SEC Rule allows retirement advisers to be paid in various ways as long as they are willing to put the interests of their customers first, in certain cases allowing advisers to receive common types of fees that fiduciaries otherwise can't receive under the law, such as commissions and revenue sharing.

The Labor Department is currently reviewing public comments received on its proposed rule and has not indicated when the final rule will be issued.

Supporters of the bill argue that it is needed to prevent a potentially harmful rule from going into effect.

The proposed Labor Department rule would be very costly to broker-dealers, requiring them to meet two separate standards when advising clients: the fiduciary standard when advising on retirement issues and the suitability standard for other investment matters.

The resulting high compliance and potential liability costs, they say, could drive many smaller broker-dealers out of the market for providing retirement advice or lead them to service only larger dollar accounts, thereby limiting access to professional retirement planning and guidance for those retail investors who need it most and likely resulting in a reduction in the overall level of retirement savings for American workers.

They note that the United Kingdom in 2013 implemented a similar rule, which has created an "advice gap" for 60,000 investors with smaller accounts.

The Dodd-Frank law, they say, gave the SEC the lead role in setting the fiduciary standards, and they argue that the SEC, not the Labor Department, is the better choice for developing those rules because it is much more familiar with investment markets.

In fact, they contend that the proposed Labor rule is confusing and actually conflicts with existing rules and securities market trading practices, and that it could disrupt the carefully considered regulatory regime applicable to broker-dealers and investment advisers that is administered by the SEC and FINRA.

Broker-dealers and others operating under the lower "suitability" standard often have a direct conflict of interest, directing their customers to higher-cost investments that have hidden fees or from which the advisers get backdoor payments.

We say this behavior in the predatory lending activity that led to the economic collapse in 2008.

Home purchasers who could qualify for lower fixed rates for new home purchases were only shown loans that had high interest triggers that would double or triple mortgages a few years after they were purchased.

The conflicts of interests in investment programs, the White House Council of Economic Advisers estimates, result in annual losses for affected U.S. investors of about 1 percentage point, or about \$17 billion per year in total.

The Labor Department's proposed fiduciary rule would require all retirement investors to

instead put their clients' best interests before their own profits.

Blocking the Labor Department from issuing its rule until the SEC acts on a standard-of-conduct rule for broker-dealers could effectively kill the critical consumer protections that would be provided by the Labor rule, since the bill does not require the SEC to ever issue its rule.

While the SEC should similarly update its rules governing investment advice related to securities, they argue that Congress should not hinge the Labor Department's efforts on the SEC's ability to do so.

Labor's rule was thoughtfully developed and would not cause disruptions in the market, they say, noting that the department worked with the SEC in developing the rule and that it has taken into account the concerns of stakeholders.

This bill prohibits the Labor Department from implementing a final rule on fiduciary standards for retirement investment advisers until after the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) conducts a study and issues a final rule setting standards of conduct for broker-dealers.

Specifically, the Labor Department could not exercise its authority under ERISA to define the circumstances under which an individual is considered a fiduciary until 60 days after the SEC issues a final rule regarding standards of conduct for broker-dealers pursuant to Section 913 of the Dodd-Frank Act.

The bill would not, however, require the SEC to issue a rule.

Prior to issuing a rule, the SEC must complete a study and report to Congress on whether retail investors are being harmed by the lower standard of care under which brokers and dealers operate, and offer alternate remedies to reduce confusion or harm to retail investors due to that different standard.

It also must investigate whether the adoption of a uniform fiduciary standard would adversely affect the commissions of brokers and dealers, the availability of proprietary products and the ability of brokers and dealers to engage with customers, as well as whether a uniform fiduciary standard would adversely affect access by retail investors to investment advice.

The conclusions in the report must be supported by economic analysis.

In developing a rule, the SEC would be required to consider differences in the registration, supervision and examination requirements applicable to brokers, dealers and investment advisers and publish formal findings that the rule would reduce confusion or harm to retail customers caused by the different standards of conduct.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposition to this bill and protect the little that workers have from their shrinking wages to protect against falling into poverty once their work years have been spent in increasing the profits of employers.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 10 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), one of the hardest

working members on the House Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, in a chamber where we have no shortage of hyperbole and sanctimony, certainly this bill is no exception as I listen to the opposition.

Today I rise in strong support of H.R. 1090, the Retail Investor Protection Act. I want to thank Representative WAGNER for her leadership and the chairman for this time.

We are down to the bottom of the barrel if we are quoting NPR as a source of economic research. There is no credible research that justifies what the Department of Labor is doing.

Having worked in this industry for three decades, I can speak to this on a very personal basis.

Instead of working in harmony and complying with Dodd-Frank, the DOL is preempting the SEC and the FINRA and moving ahead with its own agenda.

As we have said today, there is broad consensus that financial advisers should act in the best interest of their customers, and they do. Any bad actors should be punished. There are existing rules and requirements for broker-dealers and investment managers to deal fairly and provide recommendations that are suitable for their customers and disclose conflicts of interest.

We have left the appearance in this room hanging that prices are skewed. In fact, most retail investment products are sold by a prospectus with fixed prices that are fully disclosed to retail investors.

We have heard today that this proposal is an improvement over previous efforts by the Department of Labor. In fact, that is not true, Mr. Speaker. This pending rule is not an improvement.

It turns its back on best practices of new account openings and includes a dispute resolution that turns its back on dispute resolution practices in the industry that will increase litigation and hurt retail investors and brokers alike.

Representative SCOTT of Georgia calls this proposal a straightjacket for modest investors. I could not summarize it better.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1090 and protecting sound retirement advice for retail investors.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire whether Mr. HENSARLING has any more speakers.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I have at least three more speakers.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), who is last, but not least, on the House Financial Services Committee.

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, since this Congress was sworn in last January, I have received more

calls and emails and I have had more meetings with constituents and consumers of financial services about the Department of Labor's proposed fiduciary rule than perhaps any other issue that has faced us in Congress.

Why? Because the Department of Labor's proposed fiduciary rule, if it is ever fully implemented, will actually harm the very people that it is purported to protect, middle- and low-income investors.

Mr. Speaker, I came to Washington to fight against out-of-control, top-down government bureaucracies, and this DOL rule is their latest mad creation. We should look for ways to increase access to affordable, transparent, and high-growth financial products that meet the needs of all Americans, not limit them.

According to a recent study by Oliver Wyman, an international management consulting firm, the proposed rule will increase costs for investors by an average of 73 percent. This increase will harm the ability of millions of Americans to get professional financial advice.

This is particularly disturbing, considering research shows that assistance from a financial professional consistently leads to better retirement planning. For example, according to the same report: Advised individuals aged 35 to 54 years making less than \$100,000 per year had 51 percent more assets than similar nonadvised investors.

Nearly 60,000 of my constituents make a living supporting the financial services industry. How does this rule help them or the people they assist? I recently heard from a financial adviser in my district, Ken, from Blaine, Minnesota, who told me that this DOL rule is a solution in search of a problem and that it will adversely affect his clients.

Hardworking Minnesotans are gravely concerned that this rule will cause many financial advisers to severely limit the types of products that customers want, need, and desire or, even worse, it will force advisers out of the business.

I thank our friend, Mrs. WAGNER, for her leadership on this issue.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to protect middle- and low-income investors by supporting the Retail Investor Protection Act.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, it was mentioned earlier about a hearing that we sat through in the Committee on Education and the Workforce on this rule, which frankly I couldn't believe.

The American people want choice, not another top-down government rule where you take away their choice. That is why I rise today in support of H.R. 1090, the Retail Investor Protection Act, to block the Department of Labor's misguided fiduciary rule.

All across Georgia's 12th District people depend on their trusted financial advisers to help manage their hard-earned savings and plan for future retirement.

As drafted, the Department of Labor's 1,000-page rule is simply unworkable. Unaltered, this burdensome regulation would harm the very people it is designed to protect the most by substantially limiting access and increasing costs of retirement planning.

The Federal Government has no right to prevent low- and middle-income families and small businesses from accessing affordable financial planning advice.

I urge my colleagues to stand up to the Department of Labor by supporting H.R. 1090.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1090. I think that we don't have to go back too far to look at what is happening here right now.

It is almost a message to the American people: You poor, poor people. You can't possibly understand how to handle your physical health decisions. The government is going to have to step in and tell you how to handle your financial decisions because you just can't do it on your own.

So we attack those people who make a living of giving good advice to people who don't have the ability to navigate a very difficult terrain when it comes to their retirement.

□ 1730

So who is always there to step in? That knight in shining armor, that parasitic leviathan that just can't wait to gobble up every single asset that the American people have.

We talk about fiduciary responsibility. I would say that also falls in the House. Really, if you are acting in the best interests of those folks who you represent or those people whose problems you handle, you will probably get a chance to come back here. If you handle their retirement accounts the right way, they will probably keep you as their retirement adviser, and they will also refer you to other people who are having the same problem.

Isn't it amazing that it always comes down to the government because they know so much better than everyday Americans about the way things should be done. When we have to go after some group, what we do is we raise the bar so high, we put so much responsibility on them that at the end of the day, they say: You know what? I can't pony up in this game anymore. I can't ante up. I am going to get out of here. Then who is left? Oh, my goodness, thank God for this safety net of a Federal Government that has done such a marvelous job with Social Security, that does

such a marvelous job of protecting everyday Americans.

This is not a Republican initiative, and thank God for the gentlewoman from Missouri, the Show Me State, to show us what is happening here right now. The Department of Labor does not have to get involved in this. As has already been said, this is a solution hunting for a problem.

Why don't we just use good common sense? When it comes to lower income people and lower middle-income people, they look to those folks who do financial advising to help them get through that night, that dark night and get ready for retirement. Why in the world would we turn our back on the people who generate all this revenue?

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think it is important for me to correct the RECORD about the U.K. investment advice experience. In predicting the worst outcome from the Department of Labor's rulemaking, my Republican colleagues frequently cite the United Kingdom. They argue small investors will lose access to their investment advice.

Let me set the record straight. According to outside consultants for the U.K. Financial Conduct Authority: Eliminating commissions has reduced investment bias and has contributed to an improvement in the quality of advice.

There is now more competitive pressure and lower product costs, and far from having an advice gap, there is excess capacity of about 5,000 advisers in the U.K. market today according to an analysis by Towers Watson. There is no evidence that consumers have been forced to go without advice as a result of the regulation.

I fear that we are comparing apples to oranges. That is because—unlike the U.K. regulation—the DOL proposal is a modest update that does not ban commissions. Rather, the proposal seeks to simply ensure that persons providing retirement investment advice put the interests of their clients ahead of their own.

This debate touches on a fundamental disagreement we continue to have in our respective parties. On the one hand, Democrats are acting on the belief that government should be the guardian of the interests of the people. It is a belief grounded in a fundamental truth: that our economy thrives with a rapidly growing and diverse middle class. For the middle class to grow, the American public must have confidence in our markets and be protected from bad actors.

On the other hand, Republicans continue to act to protect the interests of a free market, driven by profit, even if

it comes at the expense of the retirement savings of hardworking Americans. But we have seen the impact of the Republican free market on our economy, most recently in 2008, when the big banks on Wall Street, left to their own devices, caused the worst economic collapse in a generation, one that destroyed nearly \$16 trillion in household wealth and 9 million jobs, displaced 11 million Americans from their homes, and doubled the unemployment rate.

And yet my colleagues insist on advancing measures like H.R. 1090, which would encourage the continued exploitation of American workers and retirees on behalf of some financial advisers who put their own interests in profits first.

The current rules governing the provision of retirement investment advice allow conflicts that harm everyday Americans working hard to ensure that they can retire with dignity. Every moment we delay in updating those rules, unscrupulous advisers benefit \$1.4 billion a month at the expense of those everyday Americans.

With such large industry profits at stake, this issue will continue to be a prime target for the Republican majority. But I encourage my colleagues to resist those who are more interested in lining their pockets than protecting the interests of American retirees and workers.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "no" on H.R. 1090.

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

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

Again, let me remind all that the administration that told the American people, "If you like your doctor, you can keep them" is now telling us, "If you like your financial adviser, you can keep them." Not—not—in the face of the Department of Labor fiduciary rule.

The ranking member just brought up the U.K. experience. Well, it is funny, we heard something completely different from what she described in our hearing. What we heard was, "In the wake of the U.K. commission ban"—which, Mr. Speaker, is similar to what the DOL fiduciary rule is—"the largest banks have significantly raised the minimum account balances required before they will offer financial advice to investors."

The number of advisers serving retail accounts plunged by 23 percent. Tens of thousands are going without financial advice because their accounts aren't large enough. What my friends on the other side of the aisle would do by backing this DOL rule is take it away. You don't count. You are not rich enough to get any financial advice. You can't grow your savings.

How ironic, Mr. Speaker, that the very same Department of Labor has come out with a study saying that investors who do not use investment ad-

vice are losing \$114 billion a year. And yet what do my friends on the other side of the aisle do in cahoots with the Department of Labor? They take away—they take away—their professional advice.

Here is a radical idea—and I admit it is radical—it is called freedom. Why don't we let the customer have the freedom of choice? My friends on the other side of the aisle use a red herring about disclosure and conflict of interest.

There already are rules on the books. FINRA has disclosure rules, conflict of interest rules. We believe them. They ought to be enforced. If they are not obeyed, broker-dealers can have fines, they can lose their license. If they are fraudulent, the Department of Justice can criminally prosecute. That is a complete red herring.

The issue here today is whether or not low- and moderate-income people can get access to financial advice under a commission-based model in order to grow their retirement accounts, so they can have the safety and security that so many Members of Congress already enjoy. Mr. Speaker, isn't that what is fair? Isn't that what is right? Why don't we have disclosure, and then why don't we let people choose?

I just want to come here urging all Members to support H.R. 1090. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER). She has been at the forefront of this battle all over the Nation. She should be recognized as the hero she is in fighting for working Americans' retirement security.

I would urge that we all support this bill. It is so critical to the future retirement security of all those who struggle every day.

We have got a case study right now in the U.K. We do not want to repeat this. Let's protect them. Let's enact H.R. 1090, the Retail Investor Protection Act.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, today's legislation is very similar to a bill introduced by Rep. WAGNER in the last Congress. I opposed that bill then, and for essentially the same reasons will oppose this bill now.

As I indicated last year, I support consumer choice and believe there is room for a variety of different business models in the financial services marketplace. I also believe consumers have a right to full transparency regarding compensation arrangements and to recommendations from financial services professionals that are based on the consumers' best interests.

In my judgment, the Department of Labor shares these convictions and has proposed a workable Fiduciary Rule that embodies both of these principles. Moreover, whenever our office has raised specific issues that we believed warranted further clarification or adjustment—from so-called level-to-level funding, to the appropriate distinction between education and advice, to the role of annuities and other insurance products in Americans' retirement security—we have found the Department both

knowledgeable about, and responsive to, the concerns being raised.

While I support the Securities and Exchange Commission promulgating its own Fiduciary Rule, I do not believe the Department of Labor—or the retirement security of millions of Americans—can or should wait on action by the SEC. Accordingly, I oppose this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amend section 2 to read as follows:

SEC. 2. RULES DEFINING CERTAIN FIDUCIARIES.

(a) RULEMAKING.—The Securities and Exchange Commission shall issue a new or revised rule relating to standards of conduct for brokers and dealers pursuant to the second subsection (k) of section 15 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78o) not later than the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date that the Secretary of Labor issued a final rule based on the ERISA fiduciary rule.

(b) COORDINATION REQUIRED.—In issuing a rule described under subsection (a), the Securities and Exchange Commission shall coordinate with the Secretary of Labor.

(c) ERISA FIDUCIARY RULE DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term “ERISA fiduciary rule” means the proposed rule of the Department of Labor titled “Definition of the Term ‘Fiduciary’; Conflict of Interest Rule—Retirement Investment Advice; Proposed Rule”, published April 20, 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 491, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 1090, the so-called Retail Investor Protection Act.

Mr. Speaker, if adopted, my amendment would allow the Department of Labor to complete and adopt a rule to require that investment advisers act solely in the best interest of the workers and retirees who rely upon them in making financial decisions regarding their retirement.

I bet most Americans think that financial advisers are already required to act in the retirees’ best interest. Unfortunately, the bad news is that that is not the state of the law today. The good news, however, is that, hopefully, if we can defeat H.R. 1090—and the President has promised to veto this bill—that situation may be about to change.

At the outset, it is important to remember that this issue concerns the retirement security of all Americans. It is important that we get this right.

Congress, in its wisdom—obviously, this was a previous Congress—gave the DOL exclusive jurisdiction regarding retirement plans under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974. In doing so, Congress recognized that retirement is different.

Previous Congresses realized the importance of protecting workers and retirees by imposing a higher standard of care and loyalty upon financial advisers who offer services and sell stocks or bonds or other assets to be included in retirement plans. Again, that is because retirement is different.

The basic idea of retirement plans works like this: if the average worker sets aside a small amount of wages regularly over 30 or 35 years that they are in the workforce and that amount is invested prudently and allowed to grow, then through proper investment and the miracle of compound interest, that worker will likely have a sizable nest egg upon which they can rely in retirement.

Investing for retirement is also different in another context. It has grave consequences if it is done improperly or neglected. There is no second chance if you are at the end of your working life. You can’t go back. This is your nest egg. It is tough to go out and get another job when you are at the age of retirement. You are out of time. So workers have a lot at stake.

There are huge risks for workers if their retirement contributions over 30 years are not invested in a way that is in their best interest. They should be able to rely on the fact that their sacrifice, that their savings have been invested in a way that is in their best interest, not in the best interest of the financial adviser or the investment company. Again, however, that is not the case of the law today.

Right now, most—but not all—financial advisers are often paid extra money, extra fees, a higher commission to offer a retiree or a worker particular advice or a particular product that are in the financial adviser’s best interests because they carry higher fees or larger commissions, but those products and services may not be in the worker’s or retiree’s best interest.

It is a basic law of economics. If financial advisers are paid more for recommending a particular fund over another, they will recommend that fund that they get paid more to recommend, even though it may not be in the client’s best interest. That presents a classic example of conflict of interest.

Now, I support rulemaking for a fiduciary standard by the DOL, and I agree that the SEC should thereafter harmonize its rules. Investment advisers should be held to a standard of care and loyalty to workers and retirees which requires that the adviser must act solely in the best interest of the worker who is investing for their retirement. However, H.R. 1090, in its current form, would harm people saving for retirement by blocking the DOL’s rule and allowing financial advisers to act in their own financial interest instead of their client’s best interests.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. All investment advisers must be held to an essential standard of care and loyalty

when providing advice to their clients, particularly clients who are saving for retirement.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, this amendment essentially guts the Retail Investor Protection Act and puts the Department of Labor, once again, in the driver’s seat to deny potentially millions of our fellow countrymen, low- and moderate-income people, the right to have their own financial adviser, the right to have financial advice on a commission basis.

In many respects, the gentleman’s amendment just gives us an opportunity to vote on the same matter twice, so I am not sure exactly what is being attempted to be achieved with this.

□ 1745

Again, Mr. Speaker, it is competition, it is innovation that has brought us something called the \$7 trade. And my guess is, Warren Buffett doesn’t necessarily need a \$7 trade, but there are a lot of good folks, small business people, factory workers in Mesquite, farmers out near Mineola, Texas, good folks in the Fifth Congressional District, when they are planning for their retirement security, when they are trying to preserve their 401(k), their IRAs, they need that.

Again, if we adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts, we are right back to where we are—denying the ability for low and moderate-income people to have a choice in how they receive their financial advice, even if they will receive it. That is unacceptable, and I would urge a rejection of this amendment.

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

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY). The gentleman from Massachusetts has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, the heart of this matter is that my amendment just changes the standard upon which that advice needs to be made. The advice that we have in financial advisers giving to retirees and workers who desperately need the opportunity to invest, you know, these IRAs and retirement vehicles are a blessing to us. All it does is require that that advice be given without any conflict, that it be given in the best interest of the retiree or the worker who is making that investment. That is the only change here that is required.

I think it is a good change. It is a necessary change. It is one for the American worker.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The gentleman from Texas has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER), the author of H.R. 1090, the Retail Investor Protection Act.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman again for his support and all my colleagues who have come down here to the floor to speak on behalf of those low- and middle-income investors that need good, sound advice when it comes to their financial security and their retirement.

We all agree that every American who is saving for the future deserves to have the very, very best advice based on the needs for their retirement investments and savings for the future.

With all due respect to the gentleman from Massachusetts, what his amendment does is completely flip-flop the Retail Investor Protection Act. It says that the DOL should go ahead of the SEC.

The Department of Labor is completely out of its lane when it comes to this particular matter. It is the Security and Exchange Commission that is absolutely the expert when it comes to promulgating any kind of rule, regulation, or oversight in this area.

We have laws and rules already on the books, through FINRA, through the SEC, to make sure that savers are getting the best advice they possibly can for the future.

It is clear in Dodd-Frank—and I find it almost impossible to believe that the minority thinks that somehow that Section 913 of Dodd-Frank, which says specifically that the SEC should take care of this space, should be promulgating rules and regulations and deciding how to go forward in this space, that somehow they now think that the Department of Labor should be allowed to promulgate, including addendums and exemptions, another thousand-page rule on the American people.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are tired of this “Washington knows best, top-down government.” It is wrong. We have heard it from the chairman and others, whether it had to do with food, energy, or health care.

I believe in freedom. I believe in the American people that they can choose their investment advice, their savings advice themselves, and they are entitled to that freedom and to their right.

We do not need another government-promulgated, “Washington knows best” rule from the Department of Labor that is going to put access people, choice people, and cost those low- and middle-income investors out of this entire savings retirement future.

So I implore my colleagues to reject the amendment from my colleague, Congressman LYNCH, and to support the Retail Investor Protection Act, H.R. 1090.

I thank the chairman for his time and effort and the entire committee

and, again, all the colleagues, those who even wanted to come to the floor to speak on this issue because their constituents are so very concerned about their personal retirement savings and freedom.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I would just urge all Members to vote for freedom, to vote for opportunity, to vote for empowerment of the farmers, the factory workers, the low- and moderate-income people, the single moms, all building a retirement security.

Reject the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and vote for H.R. 1090, the Retail Investor Protection Act from the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

The question is on the amendment by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the amendment will be followed by 5-minute votes on a motion to recommit, if ordered; passage of the bill, if ordered; and passage of H.R. 597.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 184, nays 246, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 574]

YEAS—184

Adams	Davis, Danny	Jackson Lee
Aguilar	DeFazio	Jeffries
Bass	DeGette	Johnson (GA)
Beatty	Delaney	Johnson, E. B.
Becerra	DeLauro	Jones
Bera	DelBene	Kaptur
Beyer	DeSaulnier	Keating
Bishop (GA)	Deutch	Kelly (IL)
Blumenauer	Dingell	Kennedy
Bonamici	Doggett	Kildee
Boyle, Brendan F.	Doyle, Michael F.	Kilmer
Brady (PA)	Duckworth	Kind
Brown (FL)	Edwards	Kirkpatrick
Brownley (CA)	Ellison	Kuster
Bustos	Engel	Langevin
Butterfield	Eshoo	Larsen (WA)
Capps	Esty	Larson (CT)
Capuano	Farr	Lawrence
Cárdenas	Fattah	Lee
Carney	Foster	Levin
Carson (IN)	Frankel (FL)	Lewis
Cartwright	Fudge	Lieu, Ted
Castor (FL)	Gabbard	Lipinski
Castro (TX)	Gallego	Loeb
Chu, Judy	Garamendi	Loftgren
Ciциlline	Graham	Lowenthal
Clark (MA)	Grayson	Lowe
Clarke (NY)	Green, Al	Lujan Grisham (NM)
Clay	Green, Gene	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Cleaver	Grijalva	Lynch
Clyburn	Gutiérrez	Maloney
Cohen	Hahn	Carolyne
Connolly	Hastings	Maloney, Sean
Conyers	Heck (WA)	Matsui
Cooper	Higgins	McCollum
Costa	Himes	McDermott
Courtney	Hinojosa	McGovern
Crowley	Honda	McNerney
Cuellar	Hoyer	Meeks
Cummings	Huffman	Meng
Davis (CA)	Israel	

Moore	Rice (NY)	Takano
Moulton	Richmond	Thompson (CA)
Murphy (FL)	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (MS)
Nadler	Ruiz	Titus
Napolitano	Ruppersberger	Tonko
Neal	Rush	Torres
Nolan	Ryan (OH)	Tsongas
Norcross	Sánchez, Linda T.	Van Hollen
O'Rourke	Sanchez, Loretta	Vargas
Pallone	Schakowsky	Veasey
Pascrell	Schiff	Vela
Payne	Schrader	Velázquez
Pelosi	Scott (VA)	Visclosky
Perlmutter	Serrano	Walz
Peters	Sewell (AL)	Wasserman
Peterson	Sherman	Schultz
Pingree	Sires	Waters, Maxine
Pocan	Polis	Watson Coleman
Polis	Slaughter	Welch
Price (NC)	Smith (WA)	Wilson (FL)
Quigley	Speler	Yarmuth
Rangel	Swalwell (CA)	

NAYS—246

Abraham	Goodlatte	Miller (MI)
Aderholt	Gosar	Moolenaar
Allen	Gowdy	Mooney (WV)
Amash	Granger	Mullin
Amodei	Graves (GA)	Mulvaney
Ashford	Graves (LA)	Murphy (PA)
Babin	Graves (MO)	Neugebauer
Barletta	Griffith	Newhouse
Barr	Grothman	Noem
Barton	Guinta	Nugent
Benishek	Guthrie	Nunes
Bilirakis	Hanna	Olson
Bishop (MI)	Hardy	Palazzo
Bishop (UT)	Harper	Palmer
Black	Harris	Paulsen
Blackburn	Hartzler	Pearce
Blum	Heck (NV)	Perry
Bost	Hensarling	Pittenger
Boustany	Herrera Beutler	Pitts
Brady (TX)	Hice, Jody B.	Poe (TX)
Brat	Hill	Poliquin
Bridenstine	Holding	Pompeo
Brooks (AL)	Hudson	Posey
Brooks (IN)	Huelskamp	Price, Tom
Buchanan	Huizenga (MI)	Ratcliffe
Buck	Hultgren	Reed
Bucshon	Hunter	Reichert
Burgess	Hurd (TX)	Renacci
Byrne	Hurt (VA)	Ribble
Calvert	Issa	Rice (SC)
Carter (GA)	Jenkins (KS)	Rigell
Carter (TX)	Jenkins (WV)	Roby
Chabot	Johnson (OH)	Roe (TN)
Chaffetz	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Clawson (FL)	Jolly	Rogers (KY)
Coffman	Jordan	Rohrabacher
Cole	Joyce	Rokita
Collins (GA)	Katko	Rooney (FL)
Collins (NY)	Kelly (MS)	Ros-Lehtinen
Conaway	Kelly (PA)	Ross
Cook	King (IA)	Rothfus
Costello (PA)	King (NY)	Rouzer
Cramer	Kinzinger (IL)	Royce
Crawford	Kline	Russell
Crenshaw	Knight	Ryan (WI)
Culberson	Labrador	Salmon
Curbelo (FL)	LaHood	Sanford
Davis, Rodney	LaMalfa	Scalise
Denham	Lamborn	Schweikert
Dent	Lance	Scott, Austin
DeSantis	Latta	Scott, David
DesJarlais	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner
Diaz-Balart	Long	Sessions
Dold	Loudermilk	Shimkus
Donovan	Love	Shuster
Duffy	Lucas	Simpson
Duncan (SC)	Luetkemeyer	Sinema
Duncan (TN)	Lummis	Smith (MO)
Ellmers (NC)	MacArthur	Smith (NE)
Emmer (MN)	Marchant	Smith (NJ)
Farenthold	Marino	Smith (TX)
Fincher	Massie	Stefanik
Fitzpatrick	McCarthy	Stewart
Fleischmann	McCauley	Stivers
Fleming	McClintock	Stutzman
Flores	McHenry	Thompson (PA)
Forbes	McKinley	Thornberry
Fortenberry	McMorris	Tiberi
Fox	Rodgers	Tipton
Franks (AZ)	McSally	Trott
Frelinghuysen	Meadows	Turner
Garrett	Meehan	Upton
Gibbs	Messer	Valadao
Gibson	Mica	Wagner
Gohmert	Miller (FL)	Walberg

Walden Westmoreland Yoho
Walker Whitfield Young (AK)
Walorski Williams Young (IA)
Walters, Mimi Wilson (SC)
Weber (TX) Wittman Young (IN)
Webster (FL) Womack Zinke
Wenstrup Woodall
Westerman Yoder

NOT VOTING—4

Comstock Sarbanes
Roskam Takai

□ 1817

Messrs. MEEHAN, GOHMERT, ROHRABACHER, and SAM JOHNSON of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Ms. BASS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 245, nays 186, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 575]

YEAS—245

Abraham Crawford Hanna
Aderholt Crenshaw Hardy
Allen Cuellar Harper
Amash Culberson Harris
Amodi Curbelo (FL) Hartzler
Ashford Davis, Rodney Heck (NV)
Babin Denham Hensarling
Barletta Dent Herrera Beutler
Barr DeSantis Hice, Jody B.
Barton DesJarlais Hill
Benishek DesJarlais Holding
Bilirakis Dold Hudson
Bishop (MI) Donovan Huelskamp
Bishop (UT) Duffy Huizenga (MI)
Black Duncan (SC) Hultgren
Blackburn Duncan (TN) Hunter
Blum Ellmers (NC) Hurd (TX)
Bost Emmer (MN) Hurt (VA)
Boustany Farenthold Issa
Brady (TX) Fincher Jenkins (KS)
Brat Fitzpatrick Jenkins (WV)
Bridenstine Fleischmann Johnson (OH)
Brooks (AL) Fleming Johnson, Sam
Brooks (IN) Flores Jolly
Buchanan Forbes Jordan
Buck Fortenberry Joyce
Buechon Foxx Katko
Burgess Franks (AZ) Kelly (MS)
Byrne Frelinghuysen Kelly (PA)
Calvert Garrett King (IA)
Carter (GA) Gibbs King (NY)
Carter (TX) Gibson Kinzinger (IL)
Chabot Gohmert Kline
Chaffetz Goodlatte Knight
Clawson (FL) Gosar Labrador
Coffman Gowdy LaHood
Cole Granger LaMalfa
Collins (GA) Graves (GA) Lamborn
Collins (NY) Graves (LA) Lance
Comstock Graves (MO) Latta
Conaway Griffith LoBiando
Cook Grothman Long
Costello (PA) Guinta Loudermilk
Cramer Guthrie Love

Lucas Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Brownley (CA)
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
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Fleming
Gabbard
Gallo
Garamendi
Gibbs
Gibson
Graham
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Kuster
LaHood
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb
Loftgren
Lofgren
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean

NAYS—186

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 (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Kunz
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb
Loftgren
Lofgren
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean

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
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—3

Roskam Takai Whitfield

□ 1825

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REFORM AND REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 597) to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 313, nays 118, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 576]

YEAS—313

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Amodi
Ashford
Barletta
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buechon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Duckworth
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibbs
Gibson
Graham
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
LaHood
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence

Lee	Pascrell	Shuster
Levin	Paulsen	Simpson
Lewis	Payne	Sinema
Lieu, Ted	Pearce	Sires
Lipinski	Pelosi	Slaughter
LoBiondo	Perlmutter	Smith (MO)
Loeback	Peters	Smith (NJ)
Lofgren	Peterson	Smith (WA)
Long	Pingree	Speier
Lowenthal	Pitts	Stefanik
Lowey	Pocan	Stivers
Lucas	Poe (TX)	Swalwell (CA)
Luetkemeyer	Poliquin	Takano
Lujan Grisham	Polis	Thompson (CA)
(NM)	Price (NC)	Thompson (MS)
Luján, Ben Ray	Quigley	Thompson (PA)
(NM)	Rangel	Thornberry
Lynch	Reed	Tiberi
MacArthur	Reichert	Titus
Maloney,	Renacci	Tonko
Carolyn	Ribble	Torres
Maloney, Sean	Rice (NY)	Trott
Marino	Rice (SC)	Tsongas
Matsui	Richmond	Turner
McCollum	Rigell	Upton
McDermott	Roby	Valadao
McGovern	Rogers (AL)	Van Hollen
McMorris	Rogers (KY)	Vargas
Rodgers	Rooney (FL)	Veasey
McNerney	Ros-Lehtinen	Vela
McSally	Roybal-Allard	Velázquez
Meehan	Ruiz	Visclosky
Meeks	Ruppersberger	Wagner
Meng	Rush	Walden
Mica	Russell	Walorski
Miller (MI)	Ryan (OH)	Walters, Mimi
Moolenaar	Salmon	Walz
Moore	Sánchez, Linda	Wasserman
Moulton	T.	Schultz
Mullin	Sanchez, Loretta	Waters, Maxine
Murphy (FL)	Sanford	Watson Coleman
Murphy (PA)	Sarbanes	Weber (TX)
Nadler	Schakowsky	Welch
Napolitano	Schiff	Wilson (FL)
Neal	Schrader	Wilson (SC)
Newhouse	Scott (VA)	Womack
Nolan	Scott, David	Woodall
Norcross	Serrano	Yarmuth
Nunes	Sessions	Yoder
O'Rourke	Sewell (AL)	Young (AK)
Palazzo	Sherman	Zeldin
Pallone	Shimkus	Zinke

NAYS—118

Abraham	Gowdy	Noem
Allen	Graves (GA)	Nugent
Amash	Grayson	Olson
Babin	Guthrie	Palmer
Barr	Harris	Perry
Bilirakis	Heck (NV)	Pittenger
Bishop (MI)	Hensarling	Pompeo
Bishop (UT)	Hice, Jody B.	Posey
Black	Hill	Price, Tom
Blackburn	Holding	Ratcliffe
Blum	Hudson	Roe (TN)
Brat	Huelskamp	Rohrabacher
Buck	Huizenga (MI)	Rokita
Burgess	Hurt (VA)	Ross
Carter (TX)	Jenkins (KS)	Rothfus
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Rouzer
Chaffetz	Jones	Royce
Clawson (FL)	Jordan	Ryan (WI)
Coffman	King (IA)	Scalise
Collins (GA)	Labrador	Schweikert
Conaway	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Crawford	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Culberson	Lance	Smith (NE)
DeSantis	Latta	Smith (TX)
DesJarlais	Loudermilk	Stewart
Duffy	Love	Stutzman
Duncan (SC)	Lummis	Tipton
Duncan (TN)	Marchant	Walberg
Emmer (MN)	Massie	Walker
Farenthold	McCarthy	Webster (FL)
Fleischmann	McCaul	Wenstrup
Fleming	McClintock	Westerman
Flores	McHenry	Westmoreland
Forbes	McKinley	Williams
Fox	Meadows	Wittman
Franks (AZ)	Messer	Yoho
Garrett	Miller (FL)	Young (IA)
Gohmert	Mooney (WV)	Young (IN)
Goodlatte	Mulvaney	
Gosar	Neugebauer	

NOT VOTING—3

Roskam	Takai	Whitfield
--------	-------	-----------

□ 1832

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL DEFENSE
AUTHORIZATION ACT

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, last week, President Obama vetoed the National Defense Authorization Act, which sets funding levels for our military operations.

The bipartisan NDAA contains a number of positive components. The bill funds our troops' pay increases, health care and retirement benefits. It funds the ongoing effort to defeat ISIS and our effort to Afghanistan. This measure blocks the President's plan to close Guantanamo Bay, which would move the terrorists here to U.S. prisons if it was shut down. And it continues funding for the A-10, a very important close air support aircraft so effective that it is leading the fight against ISIS.

This isn't one of the controversial issues we debate here. It is about the basic responsibility of funding our military while our Armed Forces are engaged overseas.

With ISIS, Syria, Iran, South China Sea, Ukraine, Afghanistan, and also our allies like Israel watching and wondering what we are doing here, we need to do a lot better than that. We need to override the President's veto.

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE
HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

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

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, today, Congress was faced with a 22-day extension for the reauthorization of the highway trust fund. We have been in this situation before, and every time Republican leadership has chosen to kick the can down the road.

Mr. Speaker, it has to end here. This needs to be the last time. If Congress is going to take 22 days, then we need to use the time to come together and focus on a long-term solution, one that is measured in years, not months.

Our roads, rails, and bridges are the foundation of our economy. They transport our goods, get working moms and dads to and from work, and they connect our towns and cities to States and to the global economy.

We cannot afford to gamble with our transportation and infrastructure, which Inland Empire families in my area and millions throughout the country rely on every day.

If we are able to do this extension, then let's stop governing by crisis.

Short-term Band-Aid solutions prevent cities and towns from being able to plan and accommodate for future projects.

Today, I ask my colleagues to come together and take these 22 days to put through a responsible, long-term solution so Inland Empire families and throughout this Nation have safe and sustainable infrastructure to support their growing homes and businesses.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS
MONTH

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a former judge and prosecutor, I saw the impact of domestic violence firsthand.

As co-founders of the Victims' Rights Caucus, with my friend JIM COSTA from California, we believe that it is important to recognize October as Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

My grandmother used to always say, "You never hurt someone you claim you love." Yet, in 2014 alone, 132 women were killed in domestic violence-related incidents in Texas.

After a history of spousal abuse, 27-year-old Candace Williams Deckard of Houston, Texas, was murdered by her husband on July 17, 2014. She had three children. Her toddler was in the room when she was murdered. Another one of her children, a 7-year-old, ran down the street for help. All of these children will grow up without their mother.

Domestic violence, Mr. Speaker, is not a family issue; it is a national health issue, and it is a criminal justice issue. Domestic violence is a scourge on our national culture. We must not tolerate those who would destroy a family by abuse and murder. We must protect victims.

After all, Mr. Speaker, you never hurt someone you claim you love.

And that is just the way it is.

RETAIL INVESTOR PROTECTION
ACT

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1090, the Retail Investor Protection Act, which just passed the House.

This bill would delay the Labor Department's regulation defining when an individual would be considered a fiduciary under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, or ERISA.

As a member of the House Education and the Workforce Committee, I have expressed serious concerns that the proposal to expand the definition of "fiduciary" will limit investor choice, prohibit access to investor guidance, and raise the costs of savings for retirement.

In July, I signed a comment letter, led by Chairman KLINE and Chairman

ROE, stressing that this proposal would cut off vital financial advice for many low- and middle-income families and small business owners. We also shared concerns that this regulation would conflict with Securities and Exchange Commission rulemakings authorized in Dodd-Frank.

I want to thank my colleague, Mrs. WAGNER, for introducing this important legislation that will provide certainty in ensuring that adequate financial planning products are available for all my constituents in south Florida, and I stand ready to work with Chairman KLINE to further address this issue at the Education and the Workforce Committee.

NATIONAL FARM TO SCHOOL MONTH

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Farm to School Month.

During the month of October, thousands of local food producers in schools across the country have been working together to promote food and agriculture education.

Since Farm to School Month was established in 2010, the National Farm to School Network has worked to highlight the importance of teaching kids the benefits of healthy food choices and the advantages for our local economies when we buy them from local producers.

The Farm to School Network provides kids with hands-on nutrition education through projects like community gardens and farm field trips.

Earlier this year, members of my staff worked at a community garden in Springfield, Illinois, sponsored by genHkids, a nonprofit organization that strives to educate children about the importance of healthy eating.

I am a cosponsor of H.R. 1061, the Farm to School Act, which expands USDA grant funding to schools, agricultural producers, and nonprofits to improve access to local foods for programs that serve our communities, such as the School Breakfast Program, the Summer Food Service Program, and the Child and Adult Care Food Program.

Our local food producers play an integral role in feeding central and southern Illinois families. In celebration of National Farm to School Month, thank you to all our farmers and schools that bring healthy, local foods to the table for our kids.

□ 1845

SPEAKER JOHN BOEHNER AND HIS SERVICE TO AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gen-

tleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing the time this evening with the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), who will handle the Democratic Members who are interested in speaking, and I think there may be some language up there that the Chair may want to read into the RECORD at the appropriate time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that all time yielded to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) will be yielded through the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, in having represented a neighboring district to JOHN BOEHNER's for 19 of the last 21 years, I have come to know JOHN pretty well. I consider him not just a colleague and the leader of the House, but a friend.

It is not just our time in Congress in representing neighboring districts that we share. We have had a lot in common throughout our lives, and we have often talked about those similarities.

We have both lived in the Cincinnati area our entire lives. We were born and grew up in Reading, a small, blue-collar neighborhood just to the north of the city of Cincinnati, although my family moved to Cincinnati's west side when I was 6 years old.

We were both second-born children, although I am the second of 4 and JOHN is the second of 12 children. We were both raised—and still are—Catholic. So I know just how important having Pope Francis speak to a joint session of Congress was for Speaker JOHN BOEHNER.

We both played football in rival Catholic high schools in the GCL, the Greater Cincinnati League, which is an incredibly competitive league in a football-crazy State: Ohio. We both played defense.

In fact, we both had ties to former head coaches at Notre Dame. JOHN played for Gerry Faust at Moeller High School, and I was recruited to William & Mary by Lou Holtz, both of whom, of course, became head coaches at Notre Dame.

We both worked to put ourselves through school as janitors. Later we both ran small businesses, JOHN with a packaging and plastics business and I with a very small law practice.

We both served in local politics in the Cincinnati area in the 1980s before being elected to Congress. So in many ways I understand the challenges that JOHN has overcome, probably, more than most.

Make no mistake. JOHN BOEHNER's story is incredible. It is the American Dream personified.

A couple of my colleagues, I know, would like to speak here this evening. So, first, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS).

Mr. GIBBS. I thank the gentleman from southern Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to speak today to recognize outgoing Speaker BOEHNER, whom I got to know a little bit better in 2010, when I ran for Congress. So many of us are here today serving and had difficult races that year, and the Speaker's commitment to us was a big morale boost in that long campaign.

I remember the last days of the 2010 election when we had two standing room only rallies in Zanesville and Chillicothe, Ohio. On the eve of those historic victories, I was proud to stand with Speaker BOEHNER and lay out the vision for the Republican House.

Mr. Speaker, I have a picture of the Zanesville rally hanging on the wall in my home. As you begin your retirement, I hope that you will continue to look back on those chilly October rallies in 2010 as fondly as I do.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the years of service to the people of western Ohio and the country and your confidence in me and in so many other candidates in 2010. I congratulate you on your retirement, and I wish you and your family nothing but the best.

Godspeed.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for his very kind remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR). I might note that she is the most senior now of the 16 Members from Ohio and is the longest serving woman in the entire House of Representatives.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman from Cincinnati, Congressman CHABOT, for organizing this important hour of recognition, and I thank all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have taken the time to be here to thank Speaker JOHN BOEHNER for his service to America.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN has served the people of Ohio ably for well more than two decades, having begun his career in the Ohio legislature, but he has served here in the Congress now for more than two decades.

If we think about that period of time, we think about the various situations that he has faced as a Member and then later as Speaker, certainly, in the late 1990s, being part of a broad coalition to balance the budget when President Clinton was President. Literally, we were able to balance the budget by the end of the 1990s and begin paying back America's long-term debt.

That all changed with the dawn of war in the 21st century, with the 9/11 attack on our country, subsequent military conflicts, and then the 2008–2009 economic crash, which we are still digging our way out of. We look at the more recent, sad invasion by Russia of

Ukraine and at the ensuing conflict in the Middle East that has now spilled over into Syria.

I would say that this period of Speaker BOEHNER's service, both as Speaker and then prior, as a Member, has been a very difficult time for America.

If I think about some of my favorite memories of the Speaker, certainly it would be one of our most recent experiences as a Congress, with Pope Francis coming here and the Speaker's handkerchief being very wet during that period, but I know of his utter joy at having worked so hard to invite the Pope here to address us. For the first time in American history, a Pope addressed the Congress as the head of state.

Another memory I have of the Speaker—and, I think, Congressman CHABOT shared—was with Ohio State and the victors over here in the Speaker's Lobby. Over in the Rayburn Room, all of us were posing, Republican and Democrat alike. We were very proud of our Ohio Buckeyes. Some of our colleagues, like Congressman JOYCE, was handing out Buckeyes to every Member, which his wife made. There were moments of joy as well.

There were the Speaker's many accomplishments, such as the Speaker requiring bills to be posted 3 days online before we voted on them. He had many accomplishments and built a legacy in his own right, as a reasonable voice for his party, despite presiding over a fractious membership that has become more fractious with the ensuing years. He consistently worked to find a way forward during a period as contentious as any, that I recall, in the history of this Congress, even when compromise seemed out of reach.

I would have to say, without question, Speaker BOEHNER's departure is a huge loss to our Buckeye State. The House is a place where seniority and the ability to balance competing and sometimes intractable demands matter, and we as Ohioans are very, very grateful for his service.

As the most senior member of Ohio's Buckeye delegation, I thank the Speaker for his dutiful and patriotic service to the people of the United States and to this House for 25 years. His respectful and moderating presence—often with a smile—in this House will be missed.

May he and his family enjoy the years ahead as he returns home to Ohio and, I think, to some other locations to get some deserved R&R after the very difficult period during which he has served.

We have several speakers on this side, Congressman CHABOT, and we await your yielding us time in order to recognize them in due order. I thank you so much.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for her kind words.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RENACCI), whom I happened to defeat in the Ohio delegation fantasy football league this past weekend.

Mr. RENACCI. I thank the gentleman. I did not know we were going to talk about that tonight.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I join my colleagues in voicing my appreciation for the years of dedicated service of our Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER.

Speaker BOEHNER has been a strong leader through some very difficult and unique times. He has faced many challenging situations and decisions, but he has also celebrated many great accomplishments.

He arranged for Congress to hear from great foreign leaders during pivotal times in our Nation, such as Israel's Prime Minister and the Ukrainian President. Most recently, he orchestrated the historic visit of the head of the Roman Catholic Church, Pope Francis, to address a joint session of Congress.

He has been a leader on improving our education system and the lives of all children. It has been an honor and a privilege to serve alongside him in this Chamber and with the Ohio delegation.

Mr. Speaker, one fun fact about Speaker BOEHNER and I: We both love to play golf, and I have played a lot of courses with him, but never in the same foursome.

So, Speaker BOEHNER, I look forward to one day joining you for a friendly round of 18.

Again, I want to thank Speaker BOEHNER and his family for their years of service and dedication to our country.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Chicago, Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the public service commitment and dedication of Speaker JOHN BOEHNER.

The Speaker has much to be proud of, and we all should be thankful for his service to his constituents, to the House, and to our Nation.

While we all can find issues on which we didn't agree with him, I appreciate that Speaker BOEHNER did his utmost best to keep the House functioning in a vital branch of government—yes, in some very, very difficult times—but I think history will really show that JOHN BOEHNER did a fantastic job in getting us through these times.

Speaker BOEHNER, we all know, has a big heart. I guess it is not demonstrated in his profane way that he likes to address his friends, but it is demonstrated well by all of the time and effort he has put into a scholarship program for disadvantaged children in Washington, D.C., to go to Catholic schools. He knew the advantages that he had in going to Catholic school, and he wanted to give those advantages to others. I think that really says much more about JOHN BOEHNER than anything else, probably, that he has done.

So thank you, Speaker BOEHNER, for your service and the sacrifices you, your wife Debbie, and your entire family have made.

I would also like to acknowledge the Speaker's staff, who are a great reflection of the Speaker. I especially want to acknowledge his Chief of Staff, Mike Sommers; his floor leader, Jo-Marie St. Martin; his former Chief of Staff, Barry Jackson; Katherine Haley; Maria Lohmeyer; Tommy Andrews; and so many others who really helped this place to run.

Thank you for all of your service, and I wish all of you the very best.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. Thank you very much. I appreciate Chairman CHABOT for yielding and for the Special Order tonight to honor Speaker BOEHNER.

Mr. Speaker, this is a time of reflection when you kind of remember some of the first times you actually meet people and have met people, and this is one of the things I remember about JOHN BOEHNER.

I was in the Ohio General Assembly. What a couple of our colleagues and some of my fellow Members here tonight will remember very well are Senators White and Nein.

We were walking across the street in front of the State House in Columbus, and I said, "Hey, why don't you come over with us. We are going to have a meeting with JOHN BOEHNER, who is in the U.S. House, and talk about some of the things that he is doing on education."

That is the first time I met the Speaker, and I can still remember how impassioned he was at that time when you were talking about education and about the youth of America.

The next time I really got to know the Speaker was during my special election back in 2007. After it was all over, I can still remember that my wife and I got a call from the Clerk's Office here. It was around 11 p.m. on election night.

They said, "We need to know when you are going to come down and get sworn in."

I said, "I need to talk to my wife about that." I said, "Don't we need to worry about the Secretary of State?"

"Oh, no. We see that as no problem at all."

So we started talking about it because we wanted to make sure our daughters were here to see me get sworn in. We had this all planned out that we would come down the following Monday.

I was pulling into the State House's parking garage the very next morning, at about 9 a.m., because I was still a member of the State General Assembly and had to vote that day. Just as I am pulling in, my phone rings.

I say, "Hello," and it is JOHN BOEHNER.

He asked, "LATTA, when are you coming down here?"

I said, "You know, it is funny. I just got off the phone. I was talking with my wife about that." I said, "I think we can get there on Monday."

He said, "You will be here tomorrow."

And I said, "Leader, we will see you tomorrow."

But he has always been very, very accessible. The Members here in the House have always been very appreciative of that. There has never been a time that I have been denied an opportunity to sit down with him in his office to go over the issues that are important to me and to the people of my district.

□ 1900

It is also important that, as the chairman said a little earlier about being from the same area, well, the Speaker and I share a county in northwest Ohio, which is Mercer County. The people there speak so highly of him.

So with all these years that have gone by, I just want to wish the Speaker, Debbie, and his whole family all the best and a great retirement.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for his kind words for the Speaker.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

I would just like to say that one of the features I like best about JOHN BOEHNER is that he wanted to be Speaker of the House. He didn't want to be President. He didn't want to head over to the other body. He didn't want a Supreme Court nomination.

He really loved this House, and that matters. That matters to all of us who continue to serve, and that matters to the historical record.

We appreciate all of the substance that he has given. Whether you agreed with him on issues or not, he definitely was a man of the House.

Mr. CHABOT. I yield to the gentlewoman from northeastern Ohio (MARCIA FUDGE), representing Cleveland down to Akron.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand with the Ohio delegation this evening to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your 24 years in the U.S. House of Representatives and for your lifetime of public service. You have served this Nation and the people of Ohio with distinction.

For 24 years, you have honored and respected this institution. You have worked arduously to get things done. As Speaker, you have been a leader willing to listen to all sides and address the complex issues of our time. We applaud your commitment and dedication to the House and will be forever grateful for your statesmanship and courtesy.

While we may not have always agreed, your door was always open. I could always come to you and discuss problems and issues. I respect your opinion and consider you a friend.

I speak for everyone when I say you will be missed in this House. You are a gentleman and a scholar, and it has been a pleasure and a privilege to have served with you. I wish you well in your retirement.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentlewoman for her kind words.

I mentioned before in my opening statement that there are a number of rival GCL, Greater Cincinnati League, high schools. They are rivals in all sports, in academics and everything really, but especially in football.

As I mentioned, Speaker BOEHNER went to Moeller, one of those GCL schools. I went to LaSalle. Elder is another school. The fourth school, not necessarily in order because they beat LaSalle this year and for the last 5 years, is St. Xavier High School.

The next gentleman who will be sharing in this tribute to our Speaker is a graduate of St. Xavier High School, and that is BRAD WENSTRUP.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. Well, I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to recognize the gentleman from Reading, Ohio. It is a town in my district full of hard-working people and committed families.

Now, this man from Reading grew up in a big and very faithful family. He learned the value of hard work sweeping the floors of his father's bar and worked his way through Xavier University in Cincinnati.

When he came to Washington, he was a reformer from day one. The last man standing from the Gang of Seven, he worked to clean up corruption from the House bank in the 1990s to banning earmarks today.

For the first time in half a century, the House of Representatives decreased discretionary spending for 2 years in a row.

Mr. Speaker, with all of your service in mind, I am reminded of a Teddy Roosevelt quote. It says: "It is not the critic who counts; not the man who points out how the strong man stumbles, or where the doer of deeds could have done better. The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena." And that is you.

JOHN BOEHNER attended Moeller High School, as Representative CHABOT mentioned, a school in Cincinnati that I am proud to say is a rival to my high school, St. Xavier. We beat Moeller this year, and, Mr. CHABOT, we beat LaSalle this year.

You know, through that Catholic schooling, JOHN BOEHNER committed himself to thousands of children that seek a real education and values in their lives. His support for educational choice has opened pathways of opportunity for thousands of children locked in poverty, fighting to give all students a chance to choose their own future.

For over a decade, JOHN BOEHNER has held fundraisers for scholarships for D.C. children seeking a chance in life through education at D.C. Catholic schools that otherwise they could not get.

I hope that these acts of kindness will be permanently engraved in the legacy of Speaker JOHN BOEHNER.

So thank you, Mr. Speaker, not only on behalf of the largest Republican majority since 1928, but on behalf of my family and for your and Debbie's personal kindness and guidance to us.

Good luck, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for his very kind words.

I yield to the esteemed gentleman from New York City (Mr. RANGEL).

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

Mr. RANGEL. Well, I am not only going to miss Speaker JOHN BOEHNER, but I am going to miss when I leave next year the Congress that JOHN BOEHNER and I have loved so much.

If Republicans think that they had a problem with JOHN BOEHNER, they should have known Jack Kemp because it was Jack Kemp who introduced me to JOHN BOEHNER. And at that time, we acknowledged that there were Democrats and Republicans, but the whole idea that you could be vindictive enough to attempt to destroy someone politically or not work together as JOHN did with George Miller in bringing Leave No Child Behind—the work that I have done on Ways and Means with trade and was so open in dealing with JOHN, who represented, not an ideology, but represented what he thought was best for the country.

To me, JOHN BOEHNER was, as so many people have said, just a regular guy, the first one in his family, like so many of us, that went to college. He entered public service and through a variety of things became the Speaker of the House, which has to be just one of the greatest sense of pride that any American could ever have.

The whole idea that there were people in this partisan time that would believe that they would want him to leave even more than Democrats would want him to leave is something that would have to be explained by history.

Of course, things are strange today. There is a Black doctor brain surgeon who is now leading for President for the Republican Party. And Donald Trump, a favorite with Saturday Night Live, is right behind him for President. There is a big battle as to who will replace JOHN.

These are things that are just so unusual so that, while I miss JOHN, I am just missing the days when we used to come to this floor in this Congress to decide how many votes do we need to get something passed. We hoped that we would be in the majority, but the most exciting thing would be being able to work with the other side and being able to sit with the President or stand with the President and to truly feel that you were not a Democrat or Republican, but you got legislation passed.

We never called it compromise. I guess we called it just working together and enjoying working together, and that is gone. I don't know whether it will come back.

It would seem to me that JOHN is always going to be remembered as somebody that cared more about his country, his family, and this Congress than he did about being Speaker. And that is the way I want to remember him.

Thank you, Congressman CHABOT and Congresswoman KAPTUR, for giving me this opportunity.

Mr. CHABOT. I appreciate the gentleman's words. He has been around here a long time. He is a very distinguished gentleman, a Korean war veteran, and we respect you greatly.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI).

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, what a journey. What a journey. It is a journey that I got to join after I was elected to the House in November of 2000.

My first real interaction with you, Mr. Speaker, you might remember, you were the incoming chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

As freshmen, we were putting together our requests to decide what our top committee assignments would be. Education and the Workforce wasn't one of mine, but apparently it is one of yours, not just for you as chairman but for me as freshman because you came by and you saw my list and said, "I don't know why you are doing that. You are going to be on the Education and the Workforce Committee." I said, "No, I am not." Yes, I was and, yes, I did. And it was an unbelievable experience. It was one which I did not expect. And as Chairman RANGEL said, it was one that made history with George Miller and the late Senator Ted Kennedy and President George W. Bush. It wouldn't have happened without the leadership of then-Chairman BOEHNER.

Boy, could he run a committee. It was really his forte, and most Americans don't even know what a great committee chairman he was. He was a committee chairman's chairman, quite frankly.

He, as leader, as Speaker, will go down in history as one who cherished that process. That process was not always what he liked or what he wanted, but he sure understood it, he sure respected it, and he sure loved it. As Mr. RANGEL knows, he was sure good at it in a bipartisan way.

In early 2006, we had an opening for majority leader. I harken back to a dinner that I was able to attend back in 2002 when I heard then-Chairman BOEHNER say, "You know, some day I would like to be back in leadership."

I looked at him like he was crazy. You are kidding me? How could he do that?

Do you know what he did? He just worked hard. He did the right things. He played the long game. He helped people. When the opening that nobody saw came in 2006, he won an upset race on the second ballot to become our majority leader.

The die was already cast, and we lost that election in November of 2006. The Democrats took the majority, and

JOHN was our minority leader. He worked hard. Many thought that we would never see that majority again.

On November, the day before the election in 2010, I had lunch with then-Leader BOEHNER, and he said: "We are going to take the majority back, and it is going to happen tomorrow."

Ladies and gentlemen, history all changed when Pope Francis came. It changed because Pope Francis was here, but it changed the history of JOHN BOEHNER's speakership. I am confident history will show that JOHN BOEHNER was one of the best Speakers in the history of our country.

Mr. Speaker, Godspeed. We will miss you.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman very much. Very inspiring.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, next will be Congresswoman JOYCE BEATTY, who had served as the minority leader of the Ohio Senate prior to arriving here has just arrived with such capacity, and I know she has served with JOHN BOEHNER and knows him very well.

Thank you for being here this evening, Congresswoman BEATTY.

Mr. CHABOT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. Thank you to my friend, Congresswoman MARCY KAPTUR, and Congressman CHABOT for managing tonight's Special Order.

I am proud to join my colleagues as we salute Speaker JOHN ANDREW BOEHNER for his almost 25 years of service and being elected this January to his third term as Speaker of the House.

Tonight my remarks are personal. I have had the pleasure of knowing JOHN BOEHNER for more than three decades. Although at different times we both served in the Ohio House of Representatives, he and my spouse, Otto, served and worked on many things together.

□ 1915

When I came to Congress, he invited me into his office for a cup of coffee. It is not bad to have the Speaker, the third most powerful person in the country, call you by your first name and, when we are back home, to say to others in my district that I am his friend.

As a freshman, I learned, as most of you know, that seniority is very important in this House. Well, I said, I was a freshman, so that equals no seniority. Nelson Mandela died, and I learned that there was going to be an opportunity for Members to go to South Africa to Nelson Mandela's funeral. Wow. Yes, I wanted to go.

All my colleagues said: There is one problem, Congresswoman BEATTY, and that word again appeared—seniority. I will always be so grateful for Speaker BOEHNER approving the recommendation from Leader PELOSI. Yes, I went to Nelson Mandela's funeral.

Tonight I am proud to join my colleagues in saying that Speaker BOEHNER served as a great statesman for

Ohio and the Nation. The great State of Ohio has benefited greatly through his leadership.

While there are things, certainly, that we have not agreed on, we have always managed to not be disagreeable in a way that was negative for Ohio or the Nation. But there were some things that we did agree on.

There is one quote that was a very proud moment for me, as a Member of this United States Congress, when Speaker BOEHNER said: "It was beginning to become a political football, and I just thought it was time to stop. Let's have a discussion with responsible Members of Congress to try to bring some resolution to this."

But in his own view, Mr. Speaker, there should be no debate because, he said: "In my view, the issue is settled. The flag should be gone." And, Mr. Speaker, that flag was the Confederate flag. So I say thank you, Mr. BOEHNER, for that.

Thank you, Congresswoman KAPTUR, for a recent article that I read that you wrote about Speaker BOEHNER. I think you said it all when you talked about his life here in Congress, and you said we all have benefited in our State from the great work that he has done. I agree with you.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for always taking my calls. Thank you for always having an open door. I leave you with these words, the words of Nelson Mandela: "It always seems impossible until it is done."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Job well done.

Mr. CHABOT. Reclaiming my time, the gentlewoman referred to having been given the opportunity to attend the funeral of the great Nelson Mandela. The Speaker actually made it possible for me to also go on a bipartisan delegation to the funeral of Pope John Paul II, and it was one of those experiences that is kind of a once-in-a-lifetime thing. It was a sad occasion, but nonetheless one that was very inspirational for me and a lot of other Members who went as well.

I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS).

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman CHABOT for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor a fellow Ohioan who has done so much for our country. I didn't really know JOHN BOEHNER when Congresswoman Deborah Pryce, my predecessor once removed, decided to retire. He started calling me, and I got to know him a little better. He convinced me to run for Congress to make America better and make America stronger.

The other thing I will always remember is he was very honest during that recruiting process. I remember talking to him about, "Gee, I would like to get on the Committee on Energy and Commerce." He took a big drag of his cigarette, and he said, "Not gonna happen."

He never misled me. He never said anything that he didn't back up. I will

always respect that about him and the way he has acted his entire time for 25 years in this House. I know he will be happy to spend more time with the things and people that are important to him. He is going to spend more time with his wife, Debbie, his children, his brandnew grandson, and of course he will spend more time with his golf clubs and probably a bottle of wine.

I think it goes without saying that we will miss JOHN BOEHNER more than he will miss us. He has always been the responsible adult in the room. He has always done what is right for America, regardless of the personal cost. He has a lasting legacy in this institution, from simple traditions like the Boehner birthday song that we will sing in this institution for a very long time to policy matters, like looking after at-risk kids, both here in Washington and all around this country, enacting meaningful entitlement reform, and banning earmarks.

He also had political accomplishments: winning back a Republican majority in the House and growing that majority. His legacy will be lasting indeed. I am a better Representative for having worked with JOHN BOEHNER.

They say Washington changes you, but after 25 years in Washington, D.C., JOHN BOEHNER has never forgotten where he came from. His roots are that big, Catholic family, running a local bar in a blue collar part of Cincinnati. That background grounded him and gave him the right perspective on both life and public service. Losing JOHN BOEHNER is bad for Ohio, and I believe it is bad for America, but it is probably good for JOHN BOEHNER.

Speaker BOEHNER, on behalf of my constituents, let me say thank you for your selfless service to this country, and good luck in the future. Please don't be a stranger.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman. Does the gentleman from Ohio have any further speakers?

Ms. KAPTUR. Congressman CHABOT, I have no further speakers, but I would just like to add this if I might.

Mr. CHABOT. Absolutely.

Ms. KAPTUR. That is, the circumstances that have led to Speaker BOEHNER's decision to depart this Chamber trouble me a great deal. History will report on everything that happened that has led to this point, but how sad is it that someone with that experience from our part of the country—the Great Lakes region doesn't have all that much here in terms of leadership positions—would do this for what he views as the good of the country because certain individuals seem not to be able to work as a team. If we can't work as a team, team America, then I think that really harms our entire Republic.

Speaking as the dean of our delegation, Ohio will lose a great deal by the Speaker's departure. Many times I have said in my career: How is it that the State that produced John Glenn and Neil Armstrong to both orbit the

globe and land on the Moon, why do we have the smallest NASA center in the country?

There are real regional pulls inside this institution, and JOHN BOEHNER put his sword in the ground for our Great Lakes region. I worry a lot about what this means for us as other parts of the country weigh in more heavily.

As an Ohioan, understanding that there are so many things we don't have from this Federal Government, we don't have a major research center from the national energy labs; other than Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, we really don't have bases, as other parts of the country do, to the same extent, when you look at the Federal establishment in Ohio; if you look at the National Park Service and what it does west of the Mississippi versus what it does east of the Mississippi. We actually had a voice for our part of the country, so I take his leaving very personally in terms of what it means to us as a State.

I want to thank him for allowing the Ukraine Freedom Support Act to move to the floor late last year. It was one of the last agenda items of that session of Congress. I know, without his intervention, we wouldn't be where we are today in terms of trying to be relevant at liberty's edge.

I thank him for his service. As third in line to the Presidency of this country, most Americans will never know some of the burden that he bore, with knowledge that most of the rest of this Chamber does not have, but for certain he did, and he held that close to himself.

I thank him for all those quiet moments when perhaps the burden seemed almost overwhelming. I thank him for his service. I assume he will continue to be involved in some ways in the days and years ahead. He loves politics too much to just walk away from it.

I thank him on behalf of the people of Ohio for representing our State, our region, in his dutiful service to the United States of America.

Thank you, Speaker JOHN BOEHNER, from Ohio, from the heartland.

I thank Congressman CHABOT, the dean on his side of the aisle, for yielding to me.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for participating this evening. We really do appreciate making this a bipartisan event.

Although our next speaker is not from Ohio, she is the next best thing, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS), and that is no offense to our next door neighbors in Kentucky or Pennsylvania.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio for spearheading this Special Order tonight and giving us the opportunity to honor Speaker BOEHNER.

Part of his legacy and what I was told about Speaker BOEHNER before I arrived here was his incredible honesty—honesty to all of us with whom

he worked and honesty to the American people—his humility, his sense of humor, and his incredible patience.

I remember first coming into Congress in the 113th Congress and, in fact, it was the Speaker's wife, Debbie Boehner, who became the mentor to my husband, as a new congressional spouse. I was, quite frankly, a bit terrified of the thought of my husband being assigned to the Speaker's wife. However, they were perfect. They both enjoy an incredible sense of humor, but they also ground us, and they remind us what is important in life. I would like to thank Debbie Boehner for sharing her husband and for sharing the father of their children with the country all of these many years.

What the Speaker shared with all of us is he shared and taught all of us about the importance of this institution, its rich history, and how to serve the people of our districts with distinction and honor. Although I am a Miami of Ohio grad, I have to admit, I enjoyed a common bond with the Speaker in that my daughter played soccer for Xavier University, and so it was fun to share that love of Xavier University with him as well.

I would like to mention probably his last codel, or his last congressional trip, and I was very honored to be asked to be a part of it. It was this summer, and it was a codel to Eastern Europe, to Lithuania, Finland, and Poland, most notably, and we ended in Ireland. However, while we were in Eastern Europe, it was because of Speaker BOEHNER that he showed the Eastern European countries how vitally important it was that we stand with our allies against Russian aggression.

It was an honor to be a part of that trip because he demonstrated America's leadership and commitment to freedom and ensuring that we would stand with our friends and allies. It was an incredible learning experience for me and the others on the trip.

When I think about the Speaker, he probably has worked harder than anyone I will ever know to protect this institution. Although it is not for much longer that we will call him Mr. Speaker, I will always admire his steadfast commitment to protecting the American public and serving our country.

I must share that one of the unique aspects of his leadership and that of his terrific team which has surrounded him is they have done an incredible job sharing his experience as leader with the American public. Whether we have watched on YouTube or other ways a morning trip to the diner for breakfast, fixing his lawnmower at home, carving the turkey or, most importantly to him, the historic visit from Pope Francis, he and his staff have done an excellent job of giving the American public and the American people an inside look at the life of JOHN BOEHNER, the Speaker of the House.

He embodies the qualities of an American patriot. It has truly been an

honor to serve with him in the United States Congress. I am now so pleased he will have the opportunity to enjoy being a new grandfather and enjoy his children, Lindsay and Tricia, and of course his wife, Debbie. He will very much be missed.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your commitment to our country.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for her kind words. She mentioned she is a Miami of Ohio graduate. I would just note for the RECORD that our son Randy is a graduate, and my younger brother Dave is also a graduate of that great college. I almost went there myself.

I now yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO).

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the Ohio delegation for giving us this very special opportunity to honor a man whom we all admire and appreciate.

I am not from Ohio. I am from the State of Florida. I haven't known JOHN BOEHNER nearly as long as many of my friends who have spoken here tonight. However, I can say this, Mr. Speaker: For many of us who are still relatively new here in Congress, for many of us who represent a younger generation of leaders who have come here to serve, JOHN BOEHNER is a great example—an example of decency, of sincerity, of integrity, and of profound caring for every single American and for all of us.

□ 1930

I am moved by JOHN BOEHNER's work in education, which is clearly one of his great passions. As a school board member in Miami-Dade County, I saw firsthand the difference that JOHN BOEHNER's work in education made in the lives of children, oftentimes poor children, low-income children, who would not be counted had JOHN BOEHNER not done such wonderful work in the Committee on Education and the Workforce when he was chairman.

The legislation that JOHN BOEHNER and those who served with him advanced made sure that every child counted and that no child would be counted out, no matter where they lived, the color of their skin, or where their parents came from.

So today I just say thank you to JOHN BOEHNER. I say thank you to his family.

Like the Speaker, I am the father of two girls. I know exactly how much they have sacrificed for him, for his colleagues, and for our country.

Mr. Speaker, I am a better man for having served with JOHN BOEHNER. This institution is a better institution for his service. Tonight we and the American people thank him.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from American Samoa (Mrs. RADEWAGEN).

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the unwavering dedication and years of

exemplary service of House Speaker JOHN BOEHNER to our great Nation.

As the Delegate to the United States of House of Representatives from American Samoa, I am always honored to address the Chamber, even more so today, so that I can acknowledge the sincerity, kindness, and years of hard work of a man that I have known for over 20 years.

As a man who has gone from the humble beginnings of a night janitor to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, Mr. BOEHNER is the perfect example of the American Dream fulfilled. It demonstrates that, with hard work, dedication, and a strong moral compass, one can achieve great things in our great Nation.

From the humble beginnings of a child of 12 who used to sweep floors to second in line to the Presidency, not too shabby.

I believe that the fact that he rose from very humble beginnings to the Speakership has made him the man and leader he is today, one who always made even the lowest ranking freshman feel at ease and included, and I thank him for that.

While we all know of the many achievements that this man of the people has accomplished during his illustrious career and recognize his unquestionable dedication to our Nation, many do not realize just how kind, modest, and caring he truly is as a person.

During a recent GOP retreat, I was able to spend a few minutes with the Speaker—or should I say my granddaughter Ella did. I had brought Ella, who is 2 years old, with me to the retreat so that I could spend some time with her during the breaks in between the activities.

Well, let me tell you, Ella was mesmerized by the Speaker, and I am pretty sure he felt the same. They had a conversation that only the two of them seemed to understand, and Ella was just fascinated with this very funny man who was so kindly entertaining her. This short, but memorable, interaction is one that I know Ella will be proud to recount when she is older.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House rise and join me in saluting the 53rd Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, JOHN BOEHNER, and also thank him for his unwavering dedication and outstanding service to our grateful Nation.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for her kind and inspiring remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mrs. COMSTOCK).

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Speaker JOHN BOEHNER, a hardworking, dedicated gentleman who has served this institution with dignity and diligence.

His perseverance in this role has been a true service to the Nation. He is a class act whose respect for the institution and his love of country are extraordinary.

I have been privileged to work with Speaker BOEHNER, first when I was a congressional staffer on Capitol Hill back in the nineties, when I worked for my predecessor. At that time, Republicans took a historic majority in 1994 and Speaker BOEHNER then was in the leadership.

Then this year I was able to join, as a Member of Congress myself, with the largest Republican majority since the 1920s and serve with Speaker BOEHNER once again.

I know from that experience, both as a staffer as well as a Member, the incredible, great treatment he always gave his staff, how we all know the legendary "Boehnerland," and how he has always been so wonderful to work with. All of them continue to keep in touch with him.

Speaker BOEHNER has taken on each of these tasks, when he was a Member, when he was a Gang of Seven member, when he was a chairman, when he was a leader, and now a Speaker, with an energy and willingness, regardless of the headwinds.

He is an honorable man of faith and conviction who has always served his constituents and the American people, particularly children and the most vulnerable, in a faithful and consistent way.

I particularly appreciate the Speaker bringing this year the Prime Minister of Israel, Mr. Netanyahu, and Pope Francis to this body to make historic addresses to Congress, addresses that we will always remember and that were just inspiring this year. I so appreciate his leadership in insisting on having us hear from those wonderful leaders of the world.

He has always served as a patriot committed to our founding principles. He will be missed by many on both sides of the aisle, although I know he welcomes this new chapter in his life. I am very happy that he will be able to spend more time with his beloved new grandson and his family.

I thank Speaker BOEHNER for his service to this country, and I wish him well again as he begins this new chapter in his life.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman very much for her remarks this evening, and I thank all the Members who came here, on both sides of the aisle, to speak.

I want to particularly thank Ms. KAPTUR for participating in this tribute to Speaker BOEHNER so that it was truly bipartisan this evening.

I have some concluding remarks. I don't think there are any more speakers following that. I think we have just about enough time.

I already said a few things about JOHN, but let me continue. JOHN BOEHNER was born in 1949. He was the second of 12 children, 9 boys and 3 girls. His parents, Mary Anne and Earl Henry Boehner, ran the family business, Andy's Bar, in Carthage, which is a neighborhood in my district. JOHN's grandfather opened that bar back in 1938.

JOHN grew up in a two-bedroom house in Reading, with JOHN sharing one bedroom with three brothers, while his sister had the other. His parents slept on the pull-out couch.

Although his father would later build a three-bedroom addition to the house, JOHN still had to share a single bathroom with his 11 brothers and sisters. So he learned how to manage conflict early in his life.

Also, as the second oldest, he had to help his parents out not only around the house with his younger brothers and sisters, but also with the family business.

At age 8, JOHN began to work at Andy's Bar, starting by mopping floors. Later he would wait on tables. In doing so, JOHN learned the value of a dollar and the importance of hard work.

JOHN attended Moeller High School, as we have mentioned a few times this evening, and he played linebacker for future Notre Dame Head Coach Gerry Faust at Moeller. Playing in the GCL for Coach Faust, JOHN learned that you can achieve any goal in life if you are willing to work hard and to make the necessary sacrifices.

As hard as it is for a LaSalle Lancer like myself to praise a Moeller Crusader, it is clear to me that JOHN learned that lesson well, and his life and career are a testament to that message.

After graduating from high school in 1968, JOHN enlisted in the Navy while America was heavily involved in Vietnam. He was later honorably discharged due to a bad back, an injury he had suffered as a teenager working at the family bar.

After holding several entry-level jobs, JOHN then set his sights on a college degree. With the encouragement of William Smith, a professor at Xavier University and high school football referee who was mentoring him about refereeing local sports, JOHN decided to attend Xavier.

Throughout his time at Xavier University, JOHN juggled numerous jobs, although his primary job was as a janitor for a Reading company. His hard work paid off, and he graduated from Xavier in 1977, becoming the first person in his family to graduate from college.

But his work as a janitor had another more important reward. He met his wife of 42 years, Debbie, who worked in the accounting department at the same company. They would marry in 1973, the same year my wife and I were married, and raised two daughters, Lindsay and Tricia, and now a grandson, Alistair. My wife and I also have two children, a daughter and a son, and one grandson so far.

After graduating from Xavier, JOHN was hired as a salesman for a small packaging and plastics company. Through hard work and determination, he steadily worked his way up the company ladder, ultimately serving as president of the company. He resigned from that position when he was elected to Congress in 1990.

In that job, JOHN learned what it takes to survive in a small business and he learned all too well how difficult it is for small businesses to deal with the regulatory and tax burdens imposed by the government. He brought that understanding to Washington, where he has fought for smaller, less-intrusive government.

JOHN got his start in politics by getting involved in his local homeowners association. That experience led him to run for Township Trustee in Butler County's Union Township, now called West Chester Township, in part, to distinguish it from 27 other Union Townships in Ohio, including one in my district, where he served from 1981 to 1984.

In 1984, he was elected to the Ohio House of Representatives, where Republicans were heavily outnumbered by Democrats at the time. In 1990, he won a four-person Republican primary for Ohio's Eighth Congressional District.

Although his victory was somewhat surprising in local political circles at the time, looking back now, it is more surprising that he wasn't the favorite.

Upon his election to Congress, JOHN became a member of the so-called Gang of Seven, a group of Republicans who regularly battled with congressional leadership. Sounds like something around here in modern times.

The Gang of Seven played a pivotal role in exposing the House Bank and post office scandals.

Early on in his congressional career, JOHN also worked closely with Newt Gingrich and helped to draft the Contract with America, a set of principles to which Republican candidates from all over the country agreed, including myself.

It was those principles that propelled the Republican wave in 1994 and led to the first Republican majority in the House of Representatives in 40 years.

Throughout his time in Congress, JOHN has advocated commonsense reforms in the House and in the broader government. In addition to fighting to close the House Bank as part of the Contract with America, he also pushed for the requirement that Congress live by the same rules it imposes on the rest of the American people.

Later, to help promote transparency in the appropriations process, JOHN enacted the first ban on earmarks in the House.

Although he will be remembered for many things, these reforms may have the most enduring impact on the credibility and integrity of this institution, the House of Representatives, the people's House.

However, knowing JOHN like I know him, I would guess that his fondest memory will be Pope Francis' visit to Washington and his address to Congress right here in this very room. It was truly a historic and monumental event, as Pope Francis became the first sitting pontiff to address a joint session of Congress ever.

Millions of Americans, myself included, were moved by the Pope's mes-

sage about a spiritual path to a better future, particularly his call on all of us to strengthen our families, protect the sanctity of life, and help the less fortunate among us.

It was an amazing moment for this House and this country, and it wouldn't have been possible without Speaker JOHN BOEHNER. I know it has been one of his top goals since he was in the Republican leadership back in the nineties, and I think it is a fitting finale to a very distinguished career.

Ultimately, I hope that JOHN BOEHNER is remembered like he would say, as a regular guy who rose from humble beginnings to become the leader of the people's House, as a leader who never stopped believing that the American people can overcome any obstacles, and as a crusader who fought for a smaller, less-intrusive, and more accountable government.

Of course, I will always remember him as a friend.

Thank you, JOHN, for your service to our Nation.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 0013

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STIVERS) at 12 o'clock and 13 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1314, ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT

Mr. COLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-315) on the resolution (H. Res. 495) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1314) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ROSKAM (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for October 26 and today on account of a matter requiring his personal attention in the 6th Congressional District of Illinois.

Mr. TAKAI (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for October 26 and today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 313. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide leave to any new Federal employee who is a veteran with a service-connected disability rated at 30 percent or more for purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disability, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on October 26, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 774. To strengthen enforcement mechanisms to stop illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing, to amend the Tuna Conventions Act of 1950 to implement the Antigua Convention, and for other purposes.

H.R. 323. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 55 Grasso Plaza in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "Sgt. Amanda N. Pinson Post Office."

H.R. 324. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11662 Gravois Road in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "Lt. Daniel P. Riordan Post Office."

H.R. 558. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 55 South Pioneer Boulevard in Springboro, Ohio, as the "Richard 'Dick' Chenault Post Office Building."

H.R. 1442. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 90 Cornell Street in Kingston, New York, as the "Staff Sergeant Robert H. Dietz Post Office Building."

H.R. 1884. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 206 West Commercial Street in East Rochester, New York, as the "Officer Daryl R. Pierson Memorial Post Office Building."

H.R. 3059. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4500 SE 28th Street, Del City, Oklahoma, as the James Robert Kalsu Post Office Building.

H.R. 322. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 16105 Swingley Ridge Road in Chesterfield, Missouri, as the "Sgt. Zachary M. Fisher Post Office."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 14 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, October 28, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3257. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing three officers to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, in accord-

ance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3258. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report covering the period from June 15, 2015 to August 14, 2015, pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-243) and the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 1991 (Pub. L. 102-1); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3259. A letter from the Clerk, United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, transmitting an opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, C.A. No. 14-1387, G.L.; et al. v. Ligonier Valley School District Authority, Appellant (September 22, 2015); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3260. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-4203; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-142-AD; Amendment 39-18299; AD 2015-21-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3261. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada Corp. Turbo-prop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1059; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-36-AD; Amendment 39-17896; AD 2014-14-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3262. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; CFM International S.A. Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0277; Directorate Identifier 2015-NE-05-AD; Amendment 39-18262; AD 2015-18-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3263. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Viking Air Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0684; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-215-AD; Amendment 39-18285; AD 2015-20-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3264. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Schempp-Hirth Flugzeugbau GmbH Sailplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3224; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-026-AD; Amendment 39-18290; AD 2015-20-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3265. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-1046; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-021-AD; Amendment 39-18286; AD 2015-20-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October

23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3266. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3877; Directorate Identifier 2015-SW-039-AD; Amendment 39-18284; AD 2015-18-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3267. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada Corp. Turbo-prop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-1059; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-36-AD; Amendment 39-17896; AD 2014-14-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3268. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0128; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-133-AD; Amendment 39-18278; AD 2015-19-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3269. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Lockheed Martin Corporation/Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0493; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-184-AD; Amendment 39-18283; AD 2015-20-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3270. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-4085; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-033-AD; Amendment 39-18292; AD 2015-20-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3271. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3981; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-126-AD; Amendment 39-18280; AD 2015-20-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3272. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Sheridan, AR [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1388; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ASW-3] received October 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3273. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan

Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2008-0808; Directorate Identifier 2008-NE-18-AD; Amendment 39-18288; AD 2015-20-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3274. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Springfield, MO [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0559; Airspace Docket No.: 14-ACE-6] received October 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3275. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airspace Designations; Incorporation by Reference Amendments [Docket No.: 2015-3375; Amendment No.: 71-47] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received October 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3276. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0108; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-049-AD; Amendment 39-18215; AD 2015-15-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3277. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace for the following Iowa towns: Audubon, IA; Corning, IA; Cresco, IA; Eagle Grove, IA; Guthrie Center, IA; Hampton, IA; Harlan, IA; Iowa Falls, IA; Knoxville, IA; Oelwein, IA; and Red Oak, IA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0368; Airspace Docket No.: 14-ACE-9] received October 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3278. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Ponce, PR [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0967; Airspace Docket No.: 14-ASO-19] received October 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3279. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Stockton, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1622; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AWP-9] received October 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3280. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification to Restricted Areas R-3602A & R-3602B; Manhattan, KS [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3758; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ACE-1] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received October 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3281. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Depart-

ment's final rule — Modification to Restricted Areas R-3601A & R-3601B; Brookville, KS [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3780; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ACE-5] received October 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3282. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Newport, NH [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0037; Airspace Docket No.: 14-ANE-3] received October 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3283. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Marshall, AR [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1833; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ASW-7] received October 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3284. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Cottonwood, AZ [Docket No.: FAA-2015-2270; Airspace Docket No.: 12-AWP-11] received October 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3285. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Ashland, VA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0252; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AEA-1] received October 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3286. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Class D Airspace; Springfield, OH [Docket No.: FAA-2014-1071; Airspace Docket No.: 14-AGL-15] received October 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3287. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace, Revocation of Class E Airspace; Mountain Home, ID [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1136; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ANM-12] received October 23, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2212. A bill to take certain Federal lands located in Lassen County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Susanville Indian Rancheria, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-314). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the state of the Union.

[October 28 (legislative day, October 27), 2015]

Mr. COLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 495. Resolution providing for con-

sideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1314) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations. (Rept. 114-315). 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 Mrs. LAWRENCE (for herself and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 3834. A bill to amend GEAR UP to require that schools receiving funding under the program provide students with access to academic and mental health counseling services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama:

H.R. 3835. A bill to increase the statutory limit on the public debt by \$1 trillion upon the adoption by Congress of a balanced budget Constitutional amendment and by an additional \$1 trillion upon ratification by the States of that amendment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself, Ms. BASS, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 3836. A bill to require a report on diversity recruitment, employment, retention, and promotion at the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself and Mr. LEWIS):

H.R. 3837. A bill to strengthen the current protections available under the National Labor Relations Act by providing a private right of action for certain violations of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. JEFFRIES (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CLAY, Ms. LEE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. BASS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. PLASKETT, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 3838. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide that individuals in prison shall, for the purposes of a decennial census, be attributed to the last place of residence before incarceration; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 3839. A bill to transfer administrative jurisdiction over certain Bureau of Land Management land from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for inclusion in the Black Hills National Cemetery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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 Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3840. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to prohibiting the use of electronic cigarettes on passenger

flights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. RICHMOND, and Ms. BORDALLO):

H.R. 3841. A bill to promote the economic security and safety of survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Ways and Means, and 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. CHAFFETZ (for himself, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. PALMER, Mr. WALKER, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. AMASH, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. MASSIE):

H. Res. 494. A resolution impeaching John Andrew Koskinen, Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, for high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 496. A resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Department of Computer Science at Carnegie Mellon University; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H. Res. 497. A resolution congratulating Army Reserve Major Lisa Jaster on her graduation from the Army Ranger School; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mrs. DINGELL):

H. Res. 498. A resolution expressing support for designation of October 2015 as "National Breast Cancer Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PIERLUISI (for himself, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. BORDALLO):

H. Res. 499. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to allow Delegates and the Resident Commissioner to file, sign, and call up discharge petitions; to the Committee on Rules.

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 Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 3834.

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; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama:

H.R. 3835.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8. The Congress shall have Power. . . to pay debts. . .

Article V. The Congress, whenever two thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution. . .

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 3836.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Constitutional Authority—Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I, Sec. 8, Clause 18)

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 3837.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 3838.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 3839.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2, relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3840.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 3841.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 67: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
 H.R. 415: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. MENG.
 H.R. 452: Ms. MOORE.
 H.R. 540: Mr. TAKANO.
 H.R. 563: Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H.R. 592: Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
 H.R. 602: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
 H.R. 663: Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 740: Mr. ASHFORD.
 H.R. 769: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
 H.R. 836: Mr. NUNES and Mr. WOODALL.
 H.R. 845: Mr. Cárdenas.
 H.R. 870: Ms. BASS.
 H.R. 953: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. O'ROURKE.
 H.R. 1027: Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 1145: Mr. GUINTA and Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 1197: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. POMPEO.
 H.R. 1209: Mr. MACARTHUR.
 H.R. 1220: Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. MULLIN.
 H.R. 1221: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 1247: Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 1258: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 1288: Mr. GOODLATTE.
 H.R. 1301: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1309: Mr. ROKITA.
 H.R. 1312: Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 1343: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. CULBERSON.
 H.R. 1427: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1439: Mr. JEFFRIES and Mrs. BEATTY.
 H.R. 1441: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
 H.R. 1453: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.
 H.R. 1550: Mr. FINCHER.
 H.R. 1567: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HONDA, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 1604: Mr. HUELSKAMP.
 H.R. 1625: Mr. BEYER and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
 H.R. 1671: Mrs. WAGNER.
 H.R. 1728: Ms. KUSTER and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 1745: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 1751: Ms. MOORE.
 H.R. 1763: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
 H.R. 1769: Mr. HANNA.
 H.R. 1779: Ms. BASS.
 H.R. 1786: Mr. ROTHFUS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. CLYBURN.
 H.R. 1853: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. TITUS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. MENG, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WALKER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mrs. WAGNER.
 H.R. 1984: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
 H.R. 2065: Miss RICE of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 2224: Mr. NOLAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 2355: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 2400: Mr. DENT and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
 H.R. 2643: Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 2646: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Mr. MEEHAN.
 H.R. 2692: Mr. NOLAN.
 H.R. 2710: Mr. MESSER and Mr. BARLETTA.
 H.R. 2759: Mr. KATKO.
 H.R. 2764: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. HASTINGS.
 H.R. 2798: Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 2813: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. DEUTCH.
 H.R. 2880: Mr. POLLS.
 H.R. 2894: Ms. TITUS.
 H.R. 2902: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. ESTY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. KEATING, Ms. LEE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SPIER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. FARR, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. KUSTER, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 2903: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
 H.R. 2939: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. DEUTCH.
 H.R. 3032: Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 3046: Mr. VARGAS.
 H.R. 3055: Mr. CRAWFORD.
 H.R. 3067: Mr. HASTINGS.
 H.R. 3071: Ms. MENG.
 H.R. 3110: Mr. JOLLY.
 H.R. 3119: Mr. ROSS and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

- H.R. 3126: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
 H.R. 3159: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
 H.R. 3238: Mr. CRAMER.
 H.R. 3250: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. GUTHRIE.
 H.R. 3257: Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H.R. 3279: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. TROTT.
 H.R. 3309: Mr. RUSSELL.
 H.R. 3312: Mr. MACARTHUR.
 H.R. 3314: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. YOHO, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mr. ABRAHAM.
 H.R. 3323: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 3339: Mr. POLQUIN.
 H.R. 3351: Mr. WELCH, Mr. COHEN, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
 H.R. 3355: Mr. BURGESS.
 H.R. 3364: Mr. PETERS and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 3381: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 3406: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 3411: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
 H.R. 3427: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H.R. 3459: Mr. HANNA, Mrs. BLACK, and Mrs. ROBY.
 H.R. 3471: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
 H.R. 3488: Mr. TIPTON.
 H.R. 3520: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 3532: Mr. GARAMENDI.
- H.R. 3546: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, and Ms. MCSALLY.
 H.R. 3582: Mr. LOEBSACK.
 H.R. 3680: Mr. BUCSHON.
 H.R. 3686: Mr. LATTA.
 H.R. 3687: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WOODALL, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H.R. 3696: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. AGUILAR.
 H.R. 3700: Mr. PEARCE.
 H.R. 3706: Mr. JOLLY.
 H.R. 3727: Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 3743: Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 3745: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
 H.R. 3776: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
 H.R. 3780: Mr. BENISHEK.
 H.R. 3785: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. HOYER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Ms. ESTY.
 H.R. 3793: Mr. PETERS and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
 H.R. 3799: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. BUCK.
- H.R. 3801: Mr. BEYER and Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 3802: Mr. BARR.
 H.R. 3807: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. CONNOLLY.
 H.R. 3818: Mr. BENISHEK.
 H.R. 3830: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FARR, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 3831: Ms. SINEMA.
 H. J. Res. 14: Mr. POMPEO and Mr. MASSIE.
 H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. BECERRA and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H. Con. Res. 65: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
 H. Res. 14: Mr. ROHRBACHER.
 H. Res. 112: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
 H. Res. 354: Mr. MACARTHUR, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
 H. Res. 396: Mr. DEFAZIO.
 H. Res. 416: Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H. Res. 428: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H. Res. 432: Mr. COFFMAN.
 H. Res. 451: Mr. JOYCE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. OLSON.
 H. Res. 485: Mr. KLINE and Mr. HUDSON.
 H. Res. 492: Mr. COSTA.