



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, APRIL 18, 2016

No. 59

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 18, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MO BROOKS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2016, the Chair would now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Our Nation is singular and powerful by the very fact that Congress begins its workday with prayer, setting an example for all students and workers of this great land. It has done so from the very beginnings of Congress itself.

By seeking Your presence and wisdom in moments of prayer each day, we humbly lay before You our limitations and our hopes. We display our openness to Your creative light to guide us in the decisions that must be made to stay the course of government of Your free people.

Hear the prayers of this people's House, and call each Member to moral integrity and charitable, bipartisan political effort, that the course of government might roll forward toward advancements of the common good of our Nation.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania 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.

HIGH TAXES DESTROY JOBS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, today marks tax day, a day when Americans must file their taxes.

The broken Tax Code is nearly 75,000 pages and has excessive regulations, destroys jobs, and lacks certainty. The tax bill is too high for hardworking American families. This year Americans will collectively spend more on taxes than basic necessities like food, clothing, and housing combined.

New ObamaCare taxes destroy jobs. We must make the Tax Code fair and simple to allow hardworking American families and small businesses to keep more of their hard-earned tax dollars.

That is why I am grateful to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 27, Tax Code Termination Act, which would retire the old, burdensome Tax Code and replace it with a system that provides tax relief for working Americans, protects the rights of taxpayers, eliminates bias against saving, and creates jobs.

I will continue to work in Congress toward a commonsense solution that creates a fair and simple Tax Code for American families.

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

PARDON RAIF BADAWI

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I stand today on behalf of Saudi Arabian blogger Raif Badawi.

In 2014, Saudi Arabian authorities sentenced Raif to 10 years in prison and 1,000 lashes for his liberal writings and support for secularism. Today is Raif's 1,425th day in prison. He has been publicly flogged 50 times, and his wife and

□ 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.

H1769

children, fearful for their safety, have had to abandon their country for Canada.

But Raif is not a criminal. He is a champion of freedom of thought and expression in a kingdom whose rulers fear both.

This week President Obama will travel to Saudi Arabia to meet with leaders of the Gulf Cooperation Council. When the President sees King Salman, he should urge him to pardon Raif and allow him to join his wife and three children in Canada.

I seek the full support of Congress and the Obama administration in urging the Saudi Arabian Government to free Raif and all other prisoners of conscience like him, as befits any government with a seat on the U.N. Human Rights Council.

CONGRATULATING STATE COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER MELANIE LYNCH

(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 today to congratulate State College High School health education teacher Melanie Lynch, who was recently named one of six winners of the National Health Education Teacher of the Year Award by the Society of Health and Physical Educators.

Specifically, Melanie was recognized for designing and putting in place lesson plans which educate, motivate, and inspire high school students and their communities to take personal responsibility for improving their health habits.

Melanie's classes involve not only the academic knowledge of which nutrients are best for their diets, but also about topics such as peer pressure, bullying, eating disorders, and how to eat right once they graduate high school. Lynch is assisted in those efforts by the textbook she co-wrote entitled "Comprehensive Health."

Physical and health education is key to students across the Nation receiving a well-rounded school experience. I appreciate the efforts of teachers such as Melanie Lynch in bringing real-world lessons into the classroom.

HONORING SILVER STAR HERO FIRST LIEUTENANT ELMER JEBO

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

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor an extraordinary hero from Tupper Lake in my district.

First Lieutenant Elmer Jebo was drafted into the Army in 1940 where he would participate in military campaigns across Italy.

On February 21, 1944, during the Anzio invasion, his position was attacked by six enemy tanks. For his

bravery under siege and his courageous conduct to repel these attacks, he was awarded the Silver Star and the Purple Heart by the U.S. Army.

Unfortunately, because of significant wounds sustained in combat, Lieutenant Jebo spent many months recovering at Walter Reed Medical Center and never received his medal. He has since passed.

After his family reached out to our office, I am honored that we were able to play a small part in preserving the legacy of this north country hero.

This Thursday my office will host his family at a ceremony in Washington to present them with Lieutenant Jebo's much-deserved Silver Star.

Today I am honored to recognize Lieutenant Jebo's heroic service on the House floor.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 639, the Chair announces that an amicus brief was filed on April 4, 2016, in the United States Supreme Court in the matter of *United States v. Texas*.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4:00 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) at 4 o'clock p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY HEADQUARTERS CONSOLIDATION ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2015

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1638) to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit to Congress information on the Department of Homeland Security headquarters consolidation project in the National Capital Region, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1638

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Homeland Security Headquarters Consolidation Accountability Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. INFORMATION ON DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY HEADQUARTERS CONSOLIDATION PROJECT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress information on the implementation of the enhanced plan for the Department headquarters consolidation project within the National Capital Region, approved by the Office of Management and Budget and included in the budget of the President for fiscal year 2016 (as submitted to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code), that includes the following:

(1) A proposed occupancy plan for the consolidation project that includes specific information about which Department-wide operations, component operations, and support offices will be located at the site, the aggregate number of full time equivalent employees projected to occupy the site, the seat-to-staff ratio at the site, and schedule estimates for migrating operations to the site.

(2) A comprehensive assessment of the difference between the current real property and facilities needed by the Department in the National Capital Region in order to carry out the mission of the Department and the future needs of the Department.

(3) A current plan for construction of the headquarters consolidation at the St. Elizabeths campus that includes—

(A) the estimated costs and schedule for the current plan, which shall conform to relevant Federal guidance for cost and schedule estimates, consistent with the recommendation of the Government Accountability Office in the September 2014 report entitled "Federal Real Property: DHS and GSA Need to Strengthen the Management of DHS Headquarters Consolidation" (GAO-14-648); and

(B) any estimated cost savings associated with reducing the scope of the consolidation project and increasing the use of existing capacity developed under the project.

(4) A current plan for the leased portfolio of the Department in the National Capital Region that includes—

(A) an end-state vision that identifies which Department-wide operations, component operations, and support offices do not migrate to the St. Elizabeths campus and continue to operate at a property in the leased portfolio;

(B) for each year until the consolidation project is completed, the number of full-time equivalent employees who are expected to operate at each property, component, or office;

(C) the anticipated total rentable square feet leased per year during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on the date on which the consolidation project is completed; and

(D) timing and anticipated lease terms for leased space under the plan referred to in paragraph (3).

(5) An analysis that identifies the costs and benefits of leasing and construction alternatives for the remainder of the consolidation project that includes—

(A) a comparison of the long-term cost that would result from leasing as compared

to consolidating functions on Government-owned space; and

(B) the identification of any cost impacts in terms of premiums for short-term lease extensions or holdovers due to the uncertainty of funding for, or delays in, completing construction required for the consolidation.

(b) COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW.—

(1) REVIEW REQUIRED.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall review the cost and schedule estimates submitted under subsection (a) to evaluate the quality and reliability of the estimates.

(2) ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the submittal of the cost and schedule estimates under subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall report to the appropriate committees of Congress on the results of the review required under paragraph (1).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of General Services.

(2) The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

(3) The term “Department” means the Department of Homeland Security.

(4) The term “National Capital Region” has the meaning given the term under section 2674(f)(2) of title 10, United States Code.

(5) The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) and the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 1638.

Mr. Speaker, since construction began in 2006, the Department of Homeland Security’s consolidated headquarters on St. Elizabeth’s historic Washington, D.C. campus has been riddled with cost overruns and construction delays, at times estimated to be more than \$1 billion over budget and 12 years behind schedule.

As the former chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency, I conducted rigorous oversight of the project, including holding a hearing in September 2014. Having visited the site, I saw firsthand the immense challenges that lie ahead. While we are encouraged by the recently updated DHS St. Elizabeth’s plan, we still believe that increased oversight of the consolidation project

will help ensure accountability and the efficient use of taxpayer dollars, especially considering this project was fully funded through the fiscal year 2016 appropriations, and DHS alone has requested \$225 million for fiscal year 2017.

This bill that we are talking about today, the Department of Homeland Security Headquarters Consolidation Accountability Act, a companion to H.R. 1640, which was passed by the House unanimously in June of last year and of which I was a cosponsor, will require the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the administrator of General Services, to submit a report on the implementation of the updated plan for the headquarters consolidation, including estimated costs and occupancy plans of the project. With a project of this magnitude, improved oversight and increased transparency is paramount.

Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson once said that an educated citizenry is “the only sure reliance for the preservation of our liberty.” Our constituents expect their representatives to hold government accountable. S. 1638 does just that.

I wish to thank Senators JOHNSON and CARPER for their hard work passing this bill through the Senate. I urge all Members to join me in supporting this important bipartisan legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of S. 1638, the Department of Homeland Security Headquarters Consolidation Accountability Act of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, since the 2006 decision to establish the Department of Homeland Security’s headquarters at the former site of St. Elizabeth’s Hospital in Washington, the project has experienced significant shortfalls in cost and schedule performance.

The Government Accountability Office reported that between the start of construction at St. Elizabeth’s in fiscal year 2009 through the fiscal year 2014 appropriation, the project received \$1.6 billion less than the funding amendments requested over this period. The impact of this funding gap is far-reaching. In fact, GAO has found this gap resulted in cost escalations exceeding \$1 billion and schedule delays exceeding 10 years for the project.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate bill we consider today is the companion to H.R. 1640, a bill that the House approved by voice vote last June.

S. 1638 directs DHS and GSA to provide information to Congress within 120 days of enactment of this bill to establish that the data has been collected and analyzed to support the current direction for this high-profile investment.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, S. 1638 specifies that the information provided to Congress by DHS and GSA include updated cost and schedule estimates for the project.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, S. 1638 directs GAO to report to Congress on the quality and reliability of these estimates, not later than 90 days after they have been submitted to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, DHS headquarters operations currently are dispersed around the national capital region, in facilities that, in many cases, are inadequate—as is the case with the Nebraska Avenue Complex.

To support the government’s effective stewardship of public resources and to deliver a headquarters that DHS desperately needs, I would urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

S. 1638 is virtually identical to the House-passed legislation that my subcommittee advanced last year.

The bill’s provisions acknowledge the need for GSA to be engaged at a high level, as the construction manager for the Department’s headquarters consolidation project, and to help DHS develop realistic and achievable outcomes.

I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge that up to 69 percent of the Department’s commercial leases in the national capital region are slated to expire between fiscal years 2016 and 2020. As such, the Department will be forced to engage in the expensive process of recompeting and possibly relocating its operation and personnel.

It would behoove the Department and the GSA to move more of DHS’ headquarters activities to St. Elizabeth’s as soon as possible and, thus, avoid the costs associated with executing additional leasing in the expensive D.C. market.

Mr. Speaker, I do again urge the adoption of S. 1638.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I, once again, urge my colleagues to support S. 1638.

I thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey for her words of support. This is the right thing to do—being good stewards of taxpayer dollars and fulfilling our oversight role.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, I rise in strong support of S. 1638, the “Department of Homeland Security Headquarters Consolidation Accountability Act.”

I support this bipartisan legislation because it would move DHS forward in accomplishing the important objective of establishing a home for the Department’s many components and agencies.

Eleven days after the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, Pennsylvania Governor Tom Ridge was appointed as the first Director of the Office of Homeland Security in the White House.

In November 2002, I was proud to join my colleagues in voting to create a Department of Homeland Security.

On March 1, 2003, the Department of Homeland Security official became a Cabinet-level department charged with the responsibility of unifying national homeland security efforts.

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) was created through the integration of all or part of 22 different Federal departments and agencies into a unified, integrated Department.

S. 1638, directs the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), in coordination with the General Services Administration (GSA), to submit information on the implementation of the enhanced plan for the DHS headquarters consolidation project within the National Capital Region, approved by the Office of Management and Budget and included in the budget of the President for FY2016, that includes:

a proposed occupancy plan with specific information about which DHS-wide operations, component operations, and support offices will be located at the site, the aggregate number of full time equivalent employees projected to occupy the site, the seat-to-staff ratio at the site, and schedule estimates for migrating operations to the site;

a comprehensive assessment of the difference between the current real property and facilities needed by DHS in the Region to carry out its mission and its future needs;

an analysis of the difference between the current and needed capital assets and facilities of DHS;

a current plan for construction of the headquarters consolidation at the St. Elizabeths campus that includes the estimated costs and schedule for the current plan and any estimated cost savings associated with reducing the scope of the project and increasing the use of existing capacity developed under the project;

An important goal of S. 1638, is an evaluation of the current plan to determine the leased portfolio of DHS throughout the Region that includes an end-state vision that identifies which DHS-wide operations, component operations, and support offices do not migrate to the St. Elizabeths campus and continue to operate at a property in the leased portfolio.

The bill will result in real numbers regarding the total compliment of full-time equivalent employees who are expected to operate at each property, component, or office for each year until the consolidation project is completed.

S. 1638, identifies the costs and benefits of leasing and construction alternatives for the remainder of the consolidation project, including a comparison of the long-term cost that would result from leasing to the cost of consolidating functions on government-owned space and the identification of any cost impacts in terms of premiums for short-term lease extensions or holdovers due to the uncertainty of funding for, or delays in, completing construction required for the consolidation.

Mr. Speaker, since DHS initiated its headquarters consolidation in 2006, it has progressed despite changes in senior leadership and waning funding support from Congress.

As a result, in April 2015, DHS and GSA announced that the construction sequence and timetable for the headquarters consolida-

tion would be adjusted to reflect reduced funding by Congress.

DHS must now re-compete up to 69 percent of its commercial leases in the National Capital Region as they are scheduled to expire between 2016 and 2020.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in strong support of the suspension bill, S. 1638, the "Department of Homeland Security Headquarters Consolidation Accountability Act."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1638.

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.

SIDNEY OSLIN SMITH, JR. FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4618) to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 121 Spring Street SE in Gainesville, Georgia, as the "Sidney Oslin Smith, Jr. Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4618

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

SECTION 1. SIDNEY OSLIN SMITH, JR. FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Federal building and United States courthouse located at 121 Spring Street SE in Gainesville, Georgia, shall be known and designated as the "Sidney Oslin Smith, Jr. Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building and United States courthouse referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Sidney Oslin Smith, Jr. Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4618.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4618 would designate the Federal building and United

States Courthouse located at 121 Spring Street SE in Gainesville, Georgia, as the Sidney Oslin Smith, Jr. Federal Building and United States Courthouse.

Following his service in the United States Army during World War II, Judge Smith received his law degree and went into the private practice of law. In 1965, he was appointed to the Federal bench as a judge for the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia by President Johnson, and he served until his retirement in 1974.

Given his commitment and dedication to our Nation and the law, I think it is fitting to recognize his service by naming this courthouse after him.

I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for his leadership on this legislation.

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

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

I also support H.R. 4618, which designates the United States Courthouse in Gainesville, Georgia, as the Sidney Oslin Smith, Jr. Federal Building and United States Courthouse.

Judge Smith served as a Federal district court judge in the Northern District of Georgia and was a World War II veteran. Judge Smith graduated from Harvard University and the University of Georgia Law School. After graduating from law school, Judge Smith went into private practice, as was noted, and he practiced until 1962, and was later elected as a superior court judge in Georgia.

In 1965, Mr. Speaker, Judge Smith was appointed as a district court judge and was later elevated to chief judge. Judge Smith stepped down from the Federal bench in 1974, as was noted, and returned to private practice as a partner at an Atlanta law firm.

In addition to his very long and distinguished career, Judge Smith was an active member of the educational community in Georgia, serving as chairman of the Gainesville Board of Education, the chairman of the State Board of Regents, and as a trustee of Brenau University for 35 years.

Judge Smith was well respected in his community. It is very appropriate to name the building in Gainesville, Georgia, the Sidney Oslin Smith, Jr. Federal Building and United States Courthouse.

I also support this bill, Mr. Speaker, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this important piece of legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from Florida for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4618, legislation that I introduced to name the Federal building and

United States Courthouse in Gainesville, Georgia, after Judge Sidney Oslin Smith, or Sidney Smith as we knew him.

Judge Smith passed away, but his influence in my hometown of Gainesville is still felt. He was born and raised in Gainesville, and committed to the law and furthering education.

Judge Smith dedicated his life to serving the public. He joined the Army during World War II to serve his country. He later went on to have a distinguished legal career after receiving his law degree from the University of Florida. He was in private practice in Gainesville for many years, and served as a superior court judge prior to being appointed to the Federal bench by President Lyndon Johnson.

Judge Smith's appointment to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia included time as chief judge from 1968 to 1974.

□ 1615

After leaving the bench, Judge Smith served the community in many other ways. He served on the board of Brenau College—now Brenau University—and played a pivotal role in helping the school to obtain university status and become a doctoral granting institution.

Judge Smith's legacy is one that deserves to be honored. As the judge's son said, "serving others was his vocational calling."

The Federal building and courthouse in Gainesville is a symbol of public service and civic duty. Judge Smith dedicated his life to the high ideals of justice, honor, and family, and naming the courthouse after him will keep his legacy alive for years to come. It will serve as a reminder of the judge's commitment to his community, and I believe it will help inspire others to public service.

Mr. Speaker, as we have just heard from my two friends and colleagues here about this man, Judge Smith, it goes beyond the resume, and it starts to talk, really, about the law degree and the private practice and the superior court judge. In fact, my father, who was a Georgia State trooper, remembers Judge Smith before he was on the Federal bench.

I think what is most special for me in doing this and in working with my friends and fellow Senators from Georgia to name this building is not only did he do his service, but then he came back to the community. It was out of a duty that he served on the Federal bench. He then came back, once out of Federal practice, and he served in a law firm and helped in our educational community. Brenau University is known worldwide as a former women's college, but it has now expanded its program and reach to, literally, all across the world. It has recently expanded into China and has had an influence there and all over Georgia.

It is also that commitment to business and that commitment to his hometown. You see, when we name

buildings—and I don't take that lightly—it should be in honor of someone who touches all aspects, not just one's Federal service, not just, maybe, one's private service, but a combination of the two.

When we go into high schools—and, Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues do as well. We speak in high schools and elementary schools all the time—we talk about pride; we talk about public service. Judge Smith is one of those in my community to whom we can point and say: Here is someone who served his country, who served his fellow members of Georgia as a member of the bar, but who was also known at home. They knew him in the restaurants; they knew him in the town square. He is someone we can look to and take pride in saying: There is someone who identifies with the very ideals of American life.

For that reason, it is really easy for me to say this is something that we do in honor of someone who earned his honor while he was living. He earned it through his hard work, his dedication, and his commitment to his fellow man and to our beloved community in Gainesville.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation to recognize Judge Smith by naming this building in Gainesville the Sidney Oslin Smith, Jr. Federal Building and United States Courthouse.

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

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

I thank my colleagues for coming to the floor today in support of this legislation. Clearly, we are taking the opportunity—and the House has the opportunity before it—to honor a man who inspired his community, who served with honor, and who, quite frankly, was a role model to so many in the State of Georgia. I would respectfully ask all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4618.

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.

AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR GREATER WASHINGTON SOAP BOX DERBY

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 119) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 119

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

SECTION 1. USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR SOAP BOX DERBY RACES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Greater Washington Soap Box Derby Association (in this resolution referred to as the "sponsor") shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, soap box derby races (in this resolution referred to as the "event"), on the Capitol Grounds.

(b) DATE OF EVENT.—The event shall be held on June 18, 2016, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate jointly designate.

SEC. 2. TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board, the event shall be—

(1) free of admission charge and open to the public; and

(2) arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress.

(b) EXPENSES AND LIABILITIES.—The sponsor shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

SEC. 3. EVENT PREPARATIONS.

Subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, the sponsor is authorized to erect upon the Capitol Grounds such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment as may be required for the event.

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.

The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board are authorized to make such additional arrangements as may be required to carry out the event.

SEC. 5. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 5104(c) of title 40, United States Code, concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, with respect to the event.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 119.

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

There was no objection.

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

H. Con. Res. 119 would authorize the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby on June 18.

I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for introducing this resolution and for his long-time support of this event.

This annual event is designed to encourage children to show off their

work, ingenuity, and creativity as they compete for trophies. These races have been run nationally since 1934. Today, they are held throughout the country, and a few are held throughout the world. The winners of each division are then qualified to compete in the All-American Soap Box Derby in Akron, Ohio, in July.

I support the passage of this resolution.

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

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

I thank my good friend from Maryland, Representative HOYER, for introducing this resolution on behalf of the Washington regional delegation.

This annual competitive event, Mr. Speaker, encourages boys and girls, ages 9 through 16, to construct and operate their own soap box vehicles. The event has become a great tradition in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area over the last 20 years. It provides a terrific opportunity for children to appreciate the workmanship that is necessary to build vehicles and to enjoy the thrill of competition.

The Greater Washington Soap Box Derby organizers will work with the Architect of the Capitol and with the Capitol Police to ensure that the appropriate rules and regulations are in place and that the event remains free to the public.

I support this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation, because it is critically important for the future of our children.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank both Mr. CURBELO, the chairman of the subcommittee, and the ranking member for moving this resolution forward. I think this is the 25th year that I have sponsored this resolution, and I have had great support throughout. I thank them both.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in support of this resolution, which I sponsor each year on behalf of the Washington metropolitan delegation, to permit the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby Association to hold its annual race on the grounds of the Capitol Building.

This is a very special year for the soap box derby as it celebrates its 75th anniversary. For three-quarters of a century now, young people from across the Greater Washington, D.C., area have assembled at the Capitol for a fun, educational, and exciting event.

First run in 1938, when Norman Rocca sped past 223 of his fellow young racers on New Hampshire Avenue to capture the first soap box derby victory, the race brings together those between ages 8 and 17 to compete in three

divisions. Those divisions are Stock, Super Stock, and Masters. The winner of each division will qualify to race against the regional champions from across the country later this year at the All-American Soap Box Derby in Akron, Ohio. This year's race here in Washington will take place on June 18.

There is a reason, of course, the soap box derby has been called the "greatest amateur racing event in the world." It is not only because it is a thrill to watch on race day, but because of everything that happens before race day as well. For weeks in advance, the young drivers and their parents—and, yes, sometimes grandparents—gather in garages and basements to build, test, and improve their soap box racers together. It is a process that brings the generations together and teaches valuable lessons about hard work, science and engineering, sportsmanship, leadership, and pride of achievement. Many of the skills learned in building these soap box racers are the same ones that help students succeed in science, technology, engineering, and math—or the STEM subjects as we refer to them—which will prepare them for success in college and careers.

In addition to bringing families together, the soap box derby brings entire communities together with civic groups, police and fire departments, and service organizations that sponsor participants in whom they see the future leaders of their communities and of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I said before that this is the 75th anniversary of the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby. It also marks, as I said, the 25th year that I have had the honor of sponsoring this resolution. I have done so because I am incredibly proud of this tradition and of all of the young people from Maryland's Fifth District who have participated year after year. In fact, I say with some degree of pride that the Fifth District has been home to many soap box derby champions, including the winners of 2007, 2008, 2009, 2012, 2013, and 2014, which is to say, recently, we have done pretty well, Mr. Speaker. Our racers even brought home national championship victories in 2007 and in 2008.

I thank all of those who worked to make the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby possible. I also thank the cosponsors of this resolution: Representatives CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, GERRY CONNOLLY, DON BEYER, JOHN DELANEY, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, DONNA EDWARDS, and BARBARA COMSTOCK.

I hope the House will offer its strong support once again for this great American pastime and for all of those young people and their families who participate.

I thank the two gentlemen for their leadership.

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

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

I congratulate the gentleman from Maryland on the 25th anniversary of his bringing forward this resolution. The gentleman from Maryland is someone who respects the traditions of this House and who, through his example, teaches younger and newer Members to also respect the traditions of this House. I am proud to support this resolution today, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 119.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1630

100 YEARS OF WOMEN IN CONGRESS ACT

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4570) to amend the Department of Agriculture program for research and extension grants to increase participation by women and underrepresented minorities in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics to redesignate the program as the "Jeannette Rankin Women and Minorities in STEM Fields Program".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4570

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 "100 Years of Women in Congress Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The first woman elected to Congress, Representative Jeannette Rankin from Montana, was elected on November 7, 1916, almost four years prior to ratification of the 19th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution giving women the right to vote.

(2) Jeannette Rankin was not only a pioneer in national electoral politics, she was also a pioneer as a woman in science, graduating from the University of Montana in 1902 with a Bachelor of Science degree in biology.

(3) 100 years after the election of Jeannette Rankin, 108 women serve in the 114th Congress, more than at any other time in our Nation's history. While this improvement is commendable, women hold only 20 percent of the seats in Congress, far below their relative share of the American electorate.

(4) According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, women make up 47 percent of the total U.S. workforce. Gains have been made in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields over time, but women still comprise only 39 percent of chemists and material scientists, 28 percent of environmental scientists and

geoscientists, 16 percent of chemical engineers, and 12 percent of civil engineers.

(5) More must be done to encourage women to run for elected office and to enter STEM fields.

SEC. 3. JEANNETTE RANKIN WOMEN AND MINORITIES IN STEM FIELDS PROGRAM.

Paragraph (7) of section 1672(d) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5925(d)(7)) is amended to read as follows:

“(7) JEANNETTE RANKIN WOMEN AND MINORITIES IN STEM FIELDS PROGRAM.—Research and extension grants may be made under this section to increase participation by women and underrepresented minorities from rural areas in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, with priority given to eligible institutions that carry out continuing programs funded by the Secretary. Any grant made under this paragraph shall be known and designated as a ‘Jeannette Rankin Women and Minorities in STEM Fields Program Grant’.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) and the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4570, the 100 Years of Women in Congress Act. This legislation would honor a true pioneer of American politics by naming an important agricultural research program as the Jeannette Rankin Women and Minorities in STEM Fields Program.

This competitive research grants program is designed to increase participation by women and underrepresented minorities from rural areas in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

I can think of no better person to identify with this important program than former Representative Rankin, who was the first woman to serve in the United States House of Representatives, an achievement made even more significant by the fact that Ms. Rankin was elected to Congress several years prior to the ratification of the 19th Amendment granting women the right to vote.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELBENE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of H.R. 4570, the 100 Years of Women in Congress Act. This is bipartisan legis-

lation on a topic that is critical for our country and personally important to me.

This legislation would honor the first woman elected to Congress in 1916, Jeannette Rankin, by renaming USDA's Women and Minorities in STEM Fields Program as the Jeannette Rankin Women and Minorities in STEM Fields Grant Program.

Jeannette Rankin graduated with a degree in biology long before it was common for women to be scientists, and she was elected to Congress before women had the right to vote. As a fellow Pacific northwesterner, she continues to be an inspiration today.

There is no doubt that we need more women, especially more women leaders, in STEM fields. The year I graduated from college, women received 37 percent of the computer sciences degrees. Today it is below 20 percent.

One explanation for this is that, in the early days of PCs, computers were seen as toys and were marketed heavily to boys, not girls. Eventually, young women considered computer science and showed up on college campuses and found themselves alone in computer science classrooms dominated by men.

Before Congress, I had a long career in the technology sector and worked with a lot of developers in the early days of email, so I know what it is like to be the only woman in the room.

Thankfully, I had a strong female role model, my mother, who showed my sisters and me that we could do anything we wanted in our careers.

So I know firsthand how important it is that our kids develop the skills they need to have bright futures and help make sure the United States remains a leader in technology and innovation. Children, especially young women, need more role models like Jeannette Rankin so they can see themselves in STEM fields.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a brief moment to thank my colleague, Ms. DELBENE, for her kind comments and for helping to ensure that this great bill is going to make it through with a very bipartisan majority.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from the great State of Montana (Mr. ZINKE), my colleague who is one of the most courageous Members of Congress, somebody who served our Nation in our U.S. military for many years and deserves our thanks.

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the women of Montana to advocate for renaming the Women and Minorities in STEM Fields Grant Program to honor former Montana Congresswoman Jeannette Rankin. Yes, I do hold her seat and, yes, she held the first seat in Montana before women could vote.

I would like to also say that she was a true Montanan. She embodied the

pioneer spirit that we know and love. She led the way in so many different areas to include:

She was one of the first to graduate from the University of Montana with a degree in biology. She voted against both wars because she could not fight. Her spirit blazoned the trails and gave us leadership. She was also a gifted scientific mind and an early pioneer.

The grant program is an important tool for young women today to continue their education in STEM and possibly break new ground, like Jeannette Rankin, and blaze new trails for young women of tomorrow, today, and our future.

I would like to add that my own staffer, Ms. Jocelyn Galt, is a relative of Jeannette Rankin. She, too, demonstrates the tenacity and determination that made Jeannette Rankin successful and feared among her peers.

Renaming this program in Representative Rankin's honor is the right thing to do because it a reminder of those who had courage to break down the barriers, had the tenacity to not let go of their dreams, and the courage to be a mentor and an inspiration to us all.

I am happy to partner with Representative GRACE MENG on this important endeavor. I thank her for her leadership.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. MENG), the sponsor of this legislation.

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to be here today to celebrate the 100th anniversary of women serving in Congress. Thank you for allowing this legislation to come to the floor.

I also thank my friend and colleague, Representative ZINKE, for offering this legislation with me. His support has been instrumental in ensuring the consideration of this bill, and I am deeply grateful to him.

A hundred years ago this November, the people of Montana elected Jeannette Rankin to the United States House of Representatives. She was the first woman elected to Congress and was elected before passage of the 19th Amendment, which granted women the right to vote.

Jeannette Rankin was a trailblazer her entire life. In 1902, she graduated from the University of Montana with a degree in biology.

Afterward, she would become active in the women's suffrage movement, moving to New York City and assisting in the founding of the New York Woman Suffrage Party and working for the National American Woman Suffrage Party.

She would return to Montana and was elected to office in the congressional election of 1916. Upon winning, she declared: “I may be the first woman Member of Congress, but I won't be the last.”

I am happy to say she was right.

In recognition of Congresswoman Jeannette Rankin's many accomplishments and in celebration of the centennial anniversary of her election to Congress, Representative ZINKE and I introduced the 100 Years of Women in Congress Act.

Because Jeannette Rankin was a woman of science more than 100 years before our current push to have more women enter STEM fields, we felt it appropriate to rename the Department of Agriculture's Women and Minorities in STEM Fields Grant Program after her.

This program currently supports collaborative research projects at institutions of higher education, which seek to increase the participation of women and minorities from rural areas in STEM fields. It will continue to do so into the future, but now it will also recognize the many contributions Jeannette Rankin made to American life.

Mr. Speaker, thank you again for allowing this legislation to come to the floor today, and I thank Congressman ZINKE for partnering with me on it.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to join me and all of us here in support of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it has been 100 years since the first woman was elected to serve in this great institution, and now I am blessed to serve with so many great women on both sides of the aisle.

This is a recognition that is long overdue.

I urge all of my colleagues, along with those you have already heard today, to support this important piece of legislation to give Ms. Rankin the respect and the honor that she deserves when she walked here 100 years ago.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4570, the "100 Years of Women in Congress Act," which renames the existing Women and Minorities in STEM Fields Program, or WAMS program, through the U.S. Department of Agriculture, as the "Jeannette Rankin Women and Minorities in STEM Fields Program."

I commend Congresswoman MENG and Congressman ZINKE for introducing this bipartisan legislation which:

Highlights the importance and contributions of women Members in Congress;

Recognizes the importance of the Suffragette Movement in achieving opportunities for women;

Emphasizes the imperative of promoting education for women in STEM; and

Affirms our nation's commitment to expanding opportunities for rural women in my home state of Texas and across the country.

This year marks the 100th anniversary of the first woman being elected to Congress, Representative Jeannette Rankin of Montana.

This bill is a fitting way to honor Representative Rankin's legacy, and to celebrate the

many contributions of the female lawmakers who have succeeded her in this institution.

Jeannette Rankin was a trailblazer who broke barriers throughout her lifetime and whose example continues to inspire women the world over.

She graduated from the University of Montana with a biology degree in 1902.

She later became active in the women's suffrage movement, organizing the New York Women's Suffrage Party and working for the National American Woman Suffrage Association.

In 1916, Representative Rankin became the first woman elected to Congress, even before the ratification of the 19th Amendment, which guaranteed the right to vote to women.

For all of her contributions to women's rights, to political activism, and to this institution, it is only fitting to pay tribute to her achievements.

The USDA WAMS program was created specifically to encourage women and minorities from rural areas to participate in research and projects in the sciences.

Women and minorities have been and continue to be underrepresented in STEM fields.

Although women make up 47 percent of the total U.S. labor force, they comprise only 36 percent of the computing workforce, 24 percent of the engineering workforce, and 18 percent of the advanced manufacturing workforce.

Indeed, minority representation in STEM fields is even lower, with African-American and Latino workers comprising 29 percent of the general workforce, but only 15 percent of the computing workforce, 12 percent of the engineering workforce, and 6 percent of the advanced manufacturing workforce.

The WAMS program is one way that we can address these glaring disparities.

WAMS grants are awarded to universities and institutions of higher learning to distribute to eligible applicants, and they prioritize projects and programs of particular relevance to USDA.

Recipient institutions have used WAMS grants for worthy endeavors, such as: establishing a WAMS fellowship program for women and minority high school students in rural areas; providing mentorship and hands-on, service-based learning to high school students and undergraduates in particular STEM fields; and offering mentoring services to current undergraduates to help them successfully complete STEM-based degrees.

Because Representative Rankin is a graduate of the sciences from a rural area, renaming the WAMS program as the Jeannette Rankin Women and Minorities in STEM Fields Program is the perfect way to honor her legacy as a woman of the sciences and the first woman elected to Congress, and to encourage the next generation of women and minorities from rural areas to take up STEM fields.

I join my colleagues in support of this important measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4570.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

**CAPTAIN JOHN E. MORAN AND
CAPTAIN WILLIAM WYLIE GALT
ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER**

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 719) to rename the Armed Forces Reserve Center in Great Falls, Montana, the Captain John E. Moran and Captain William Wylie Galt Armed Forces Reserve Center.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 719

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

SECTION 1. RENAMING OF THE ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER IN GREAT FALLS, MONTANA, AS THE CAPTAIN JOHN E. MORAN AND CAPTAIN WILLIAM WYLIE GALT ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER.

(a) RENAMING.—The Armed Forces Reserve Center in Great Falls, Montana, shall hereafter be known and designated as the "Captain John E. Moran and Captain William Wylie Galt Armed Forces Reserve Center".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in any law, map, regulation, map, document, paper, other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be considered to be a reference to the Captain John E. Moran and Captain William Wylie Galt Armed Forces Reserve Center.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE) and the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ZINKE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 719 and my companion bill, H.R. 1521, to honor Montana Medal of Honor recipients Captain John E. Moran and Captain William Wylie Galt and rename the Armed Forces Reserve Center in Great Falls, Montana, in their honor.

Captain John E. Moran served in the Philippine-American war and was awarded the Medal of Honor in 1910 for fearlessly leading a small body of troops under severe fire and through waist-deep water in the attack against the enemy.

Captain William Wylie Galt served in World War II and was awarded the Medal of Honor in 1945 for gallantry above and beyond the call of duty.

Galt manned a machinegun on a tank destroyer at the front of the assault force, staying at his post in the vehicle's turret and continuing to lead his men despite intense hostile fire.

He was killed while manning his machinegun and, on February 1, 1945, was posthumously awarded the Medal of Honor. He was just 24 years old. I am proud to have a member of the Galt family on my staff.

Captain Galt and Captain Moran are an inspiration to every Montanan who was ever and will ever put on the uniform, myself included.

Montana has a strong heritage of military service, with more veterans per capita than almost any other state in the Nation, to include our Indian nations.

Both Captain Moran and Captain Galt received the Medal of Honor, this Nation's most distinguished honor, for displaying such personal bravery that went well beyond the call of duty.

As leaders, they deserve our respect and honor. Memorializing these two heroes by renaming the Armed Forces Reserve Center will provide a daily reminder to us all of the service and sacrifice these Montanans made to our country.

I thank my friends, Senator STEVE DAINES and Senator JON TESTER, for seeing this important bill through the Senate. I am proud to see this issue to completion.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of the Montana congressional delegation's legislation to rename the Armed Forces Reserve Center in Great Falls, Montana, to the Captain John E. Moran and Captain William Wylie Galt Armed Forces Reserve Center.

Captain Moran and Captain Galt were both awarded the Medal of Honor, the Nation's highest honor, for their bravery in combat during the Philippine-American war and World War II, respectively.

The recognition they earned through the sacrifices that they and their families made will be memorialized appropriately at the facility.

As the Congresswoman representing Guam here in Congress, I have a special appreciation for the service of our men and our women in uniform and their families.

Having welcomed the Marines in 1944 after 3 years of brutal Japanese occupation during World War II, our island has a history of service and one that demonstrates an understanding of our role in the American community.

□ 1645

Guam, like Montana, ranks in the top percentile for the servicemembers and veterans per capita, and our National Guard consistently maintains a force that is among the largest per capita in the Nation, a fact I am always proud to highlight.

I commend Congressman ZINKE and Senators TESTER and DAINES for their work in recognizing the contributions of two of Montana's own. I am pleased to support this bill and look forward to continuing to work to ensure that our brave servicemembers get the recognitions they deserve and have earned.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I encourage passage of this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 719.

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

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

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

APRIL 18, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: Pursuant to section 803(a) of the Congressional Recognition for Excellence in Arts Education Act (2 U.S.C. 803 (a)), I am pleased to appoint the Honorable Debbie Dingell of Michigan to the Congressional Award Board.

Thank you for your consideration of this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

FIRST LIEUTENANT SALVATORE S. CORMA II POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3866) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1265 Hurffville Road in Deptford Township, New Jersey, as the "First Lieutenant Salvatore S. Corma II Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3866

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

SECTION 1. FIRST LIEUTENANT SALVATORE S. CORMA II POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located 1265 Hurffville Road in Deptford Township, New Jersey, shall be known and designated as the "First Lieutenant Salvatore S. Corma II Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other

record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "First Lieutenant Salvatore S. Corma II Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLUM. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3866 introduced by Congressman DONALD NORCROSS of New Jersey. H.R. 3866 designates the post office located at 1265 Hurffville Road in Deptford Township, New Jersey, as the First Lieutenant Salvatore S. Corma II Post Office Building.

First Lieutenant Corma was an officer in the United States Army who gave his life while serving in Afghanistan during Operation Enduring Freedom.

Lieutenant Corma died on April 29, 2010, of wounds sustained from an improvised explosive device. This came only weeks after returning to Afghanistan from visiting his home on leave.

Lieutenant Corma was a dedicated soldier, a dedication that was evident throughout his life. He began martial arts at just 3 years old and continued with it throughout high school and college, even winning the silver medal for tae kwon do at the Junior National Olympics.

Lieutenant Corma was also an excellent student. He was on the honor roll from kindergarten through his senior year of high school. He was a 2008 graduate of the United States Military Academy at West Point, where he was captain of the tae kwon do karate team.

Mr. Speaker, Lieutenant Corma was a dedicated friend and fellow soldier. According to his mother, he would call and check on his men every day while he was on leave. Once he even mailed them 300 energy drinks. His dedication continued through his death, a death that came far too soon.

We will be forever grateful for the sacrifices First Lieutenant Salvatore Corma II made for his country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members to support this bill to name a post office to honor his life and his sacrifice.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in consideration of H.R. 3866 to designate the facility of the United

States Postal Service located at 1265 Hurffville Road in Deptford Township, New Jersey, as the First Lieutenant Salvatore S. Corma II Post Office Building.

Following his graduation from West Point in 2008, Salvatore Corma attained his Ranger badge, serving as a First Lieutenant in the U.S. Army's 82nd Airborne Division stationed at Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

First Lieutenant Corma was deployed to Afghanistan, where he served as a platoon leader. On April 29, 2010, First Lieutenant Corma tragically lost his life while marking an IED in Zabul, Afghanistan.

As his company commander noted when recommending First Lieutenant Corma for a valor award, marking IEDs is usually a soldier task, yet Salvatore Corma displayed not only his bravery, but also his leadership in knowingly putting himself in danger rather than his men. As he once told his mother: "You have to lead from the front. You can never lead from the back."

First Lieutenant Corma's selfless leadership should be commended. His military awards include the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart.

Mr. Speaker, we all should be pleased to pass this bill to honor the valiant actions and steadfast leadership of First Lieutenant Salvatore Corma, who put the lives of others before his own.

I urge passage of H.R. 3866.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS). This is his bill.

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative NORTON for yielding. I also thank Chairman CHAFFETZ and Ranking Member CUMMINGS for leadership and support for bringing this bill to the floor.

I take this opportunity to introduce you to a name that no one in this Chamber had likely ever known, but it is a name and a legacy you should know and you need to know. It is my honor to be the one to share it with you. It is one of the reasons why we stand here today enjoying the many freedoms that we sometimes take for granted.

The name is Army First Lieutenant Salvatore Corma II of Deptford Township, New Jersey. Sal grew up in south Jersey and even attended karate class with my own children before receiving a nomination to attend the U.S. Military Academy at West Point.

He graduated from West Point in 2008, and then it was on to Active Duty in the United States Army as a First Lieutenant in the Alpha Company, 1st Battalion, 508th Parachute Infantry Regiment, 4th Brigade Combat Team, 82nd Airborne Division out of Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

Sal only stood 5 foot 6, but his leadership made him a towering figure among his fellow soldiers. It was that

very leadership on that very dark day that stands out—far from the safety and security of his home in the south Jersey suburbs—in one of those most volatile places on the planet, Afghanistan. That day was April 29, 2010.

Sal was leading his company when they spotted an IED, an improvised explosive device. Sal ordered his soldiers to back off. As they retreated, the IED detonated. It would take the life of Salvatore Corma. He was just 24 years old.

Sal Corma is credited with saving as many as 17 of his fellow soldiers in that one heroic, selfless act. Many will tell you that Sal made history that day. We know he did, but it happens in ways that you will never know. Because of his heroism, those who survived that day will go on to protect the United States from threats and eliminate dangers around the world. Those soldiers will live on and continue to protect us. They continued the fight, carrying in their hearts the spirit of Sal Corma. They are all living tributes and a living history to his actions.

Many of those soldiers will come home after service and start the American Dream of a family. That is something that was denied Sal. He will never get to marry or have kids, but his actions ensured that others will get that opportunity, all because of his valor. Sal Corma II is undeniably an American hero.

What better way to pay tribute to his valor than with this legislation I present today, to rename the Deptford, New Jersey, post office as the First Lieutenant Salvatore S. Corma II Post Office Building.

Like all of our Active Duty servicemembers and veterans, Sal deserved this honor in life, not just in death. It is our duty to preserve his legacy to remind our fellow citizens and the world of his bravery. So every person that crosses that threshold in Deptford will see the name. If they don't know it, I hope they will take a moment to read about his life and his legacy and what he did for us as a country.

I respectfully ask for your unanimous support in my legislation to rename the Deptford post office the First Lieutenant Salvatore S. Corma II Post Office Building.

□ 1700

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

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3866.

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.

HAROLD GEORGE BENNETT POST OFFICE

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2928) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 B Street in Perryville, Arkansas, as the "Harold George Bennett Post Office".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2928

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

SECTION 1. HAROLD GEORGE BENNETT POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 B Street in Perryville, Arkansas, shall be known and designated as the "Harold George Bennett Post Office".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Harold George Bennett Post Office".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2928, introduced by Congressman FRENCH HILL of Arkansas. H.R. 2928 designates the post office located at 201 B Street in Perryville, Arkansas, as the Harold George Bennett Post Office.

Sergeant Harold George Bennett enlisted in the United States Army in 1957, and he served heroically in Vietnam. He was taken prisoner in that country, and on June 25, 1965, he became one of the first prisoners of war killed in Vietnam. Sergeant Bennett fought courageously, thinking not of himself, but thinking first and foremost of his colleagues.

I will ask my colleague and the sponsor of this bill, Representative FRENCH HILL, to share the incredible story of Sergeant Bennett; but for now, I urge Members to support this bill to name a post office after Sergeant Harold George Bennett.

Mr. Speaker, hearing his story inspires bravery in all of us, and I am hopeful that permanently naming a post office in remembrance of his sacrifice will serve to inspire generations to come.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 2928, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 B Street in Perryville, Arkansas, as the Harold George Bennett Post Office.

Born in Perryville, Arkansas, in 1940, Harold George Bennett followed in his father's footsteps by joining the Army. Sergeant Bennett served with the 82nd and the 101st Airborne Divisions and volunteered to serve in Vietnam in 1964. During his deployment, Sergeant Bennett acted as infantry adviser to South Vietnam's 33rd Ranger Battalion.

On December 29, 1964, Sergeant Bennett's unit was airlifted to Binh Gia, a village overrun by the Viet Cong. Upon landing, they were met by enemy forces and a firefight ensued. A selfless man, Sergeant Bennett called off two separate helicopter pilots who attempted to rescue him, refusing to put their lives in danger to save his.

With his unit overrun by Viet Cong, Sergeant Bennett was captured. He demonstrated courage and tenacity by participating in hunger strikes and attempting three times to escape captivity. Tragically, following his third attempt, Sergeant Bennett was executed, becoming the first American POW to be put to death during the Vietnam war.

Sergeant Bennett was posthumously awarded a Silver Star for his heroic actions, in addition to receiving a Prisoner of War Medal, Army Good Conduct Medal, and a Purple Heart.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to commemorate the great sacrifices Sergeant Harold George Bennett made for his country, as he selflessly and repeatedly put the lives of others before his own. I urge the passage of H.R. 2928.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, I had the pleasure of going to the 50th anniversary commemoration of the Vietnam war in Little Rock and to see all the hugs and emotion at that event. Truly, it was a tumultuous time in our world. It was so good to see the healing that those men and women experienced at that 50th anniversary. I looked at that table set for the POW/MIA ceremony, and, of course, I was thinking about Sergeant Harold George Bennett from Perryville, Arkansas.

Sergeant Bennett was born on October 16, 1940, in Thornburg, Arkansas, a very small town outside the beautiful Ouachita National Forest. A graduate of Perryville High School, he enlisted in the U.S. Army in 1957. He served as an airborne infantryman with the 82nd and 101st Airborne Divisions—no finer units. He completed Special Forces training in 1963. From there, Sergeant Bennett volunteered to go to South Vietnam as a Special Forces adviser

with the Military Assistance Command.

On December 29, 1964, his unit was airlifted to a small village after it had been overrun by the Viet Cong. Upon landing, Sergeant Bennett's unit was confronted by enemy forces. Twice, he refused extraction by military helicopters, as he was concerned for the pilots' safety and wanted to continue the fight against the enemy. After a furious and courageous battle, Sergeant Bennett was taken prisoner by the Viet Cong. Like so many of his colleagues, he spent 179 days as a POW and attempted to escape three times at great risk. His captors executed him on June 25, 1965.

Only 24 years old, Sergeant Bennett was the first American POW killed in Vietnam. And like so many other servicemen who lost their lives there, his remains have never returned home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman such time as he may consume.

Mr. HILL. After four decades, in 2004, Sergeant Bennett was inducted into the Ranger Hall of Fame at Fort Benning. In 2006, his family was presented with his Combat Infantryman's Badge, National Defense Service Medal, Vietnam Service Medal, Prisoner of War Medal, Army Good Conduct Medal, and the Purple Heart. In 2010, Sergeant Bennett's family was presented with his Silver Star.

Today, we honor Sergeant Bennett's heroism, bravery, and service by installing a permanent marker of his lasting contribution to his native State and to our Nation, both that he loved and served so ably.

Duty, honor, and country—his example is one all Americans and Arkansans can admire, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2928.

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.

SGT. 1ST CLASS TERRY L. PASKER POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4605) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 615 6th Avenue SE in Cedar Rapids, Iowa as the "Sgt. 1st Class Terry L. Pasker Post Office Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H. R. 4605

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

SECTION 1. SGT. 1ST CLASS TERRY L. PASKER POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 615 6th Avenue SE in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, shall be known and designated as the "Sgt. 1st Class Terry L. Pasker Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Sgt. 1st Class Terry L. Pasker Post Office Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a constituent of mine who paid the ultimate sacrifice for our freedom.

The bill before us would designate the post office located at 615 6th Avenue SE in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, as the Sgt. 1st Class Terry L. Pasker Post Office Building. This bill pays tribute to the life of Sergeant First Class Pasker, who was, unfortunately, killed in Afghanistan in 2011.

Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Pasker was born February 26, 1972, in Anamosa, Iowa, the son of David and Mary Pasker. He joined the Army in 1990, after graduating from Lisbon High School, transitioning to the National Guard in 1995.

Sergeant Pasker served in Afghanistan in 2004 and 2005, deploying again in 2011 with the 334th Brigade Support Battalion, 2nd Brigade Combat Team, 34th Infantry Division. He served in Panjshir province, where he was responsible for maintaining electronic equipment and mentoring Afghan police and military leaders.

Mr. Speaker, on July 9, 2011, Sergeant First Class Terry L. Pasker gave his last full measure of devotion to his country when he was killed at the age of 39 at a checkpoint, only days before the end of his combat tour.

He is survived by his wife, Erica; his parents, Mary and David; his brother, Andrew; and his two sisters, Christine and Rebecca. His family told me that he always said he would rather be a sermon than preach one, a belief that I believe he exemplified throughout his life.

Admired by his fellow soldiers, Pasker was known for his humility, his

sense of humor, and his willingness to selflessly serve others. Away from service, Terry was a homebuilder, taught karate, and was active in his local church. During his life, he would remind others that freedom is not free.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we honor the sacrifice of Sergeant First Class Pasker, I ask us to also remember the thousands of servicemembers who sacrifice their time, their relationships, and even their lives to protect the freedom of this great Nation. I urge Members to support this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in the consideration of H.R. 4605, a bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 615 6th Avenue SE in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, as the Sgt. 1st Class Terry L. Pasker Post Office Building.

Born in Anamosa, Iowa, Terry Pasker joined the Army in 1990, following his high school graduation. In 1995, he joined the Iowa National Guard, deploying to Afghanistan from 2004 to 2005. Six years later, Sergeant First Class Pasker decided to return for a second deployment with the 34th Infantry Division. During this tour, he mentored Afghan police forces and military leadership.

□ 1715

Tragically, Sergeant First Class Pasker was killed at a checkpoint in Panjshir province on July 9, 2011, just days before he was to return home from his combat duty. He was awarded a Bronze Star and a Purple Heart for his sacrifice.

Sergeant First Class Pasker is remembered as an active member of his church, who taught karate and served as a mentor to many in his community. A diligent, hardworking carpenter and owner of a contracting business, Terry Pasker had intended to return to his trade and start a family with his wife, Erica, whom he married in 2006.

Mr. Speaker, we should pass this bill to recognize Sergeant First Class Terry Pasker for the bravery, courage, and selflessness that he exhibited in his 20 years of honorable military service. I urge the passage of H.R. 4605.

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

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BLUM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4605.

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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1206, NO HIRES FOR THE DELINQUENT IRS ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4885, IRS OVERSIGHT WHILE ELIMINATING SPENDING (OWES) ACT OF 2016

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-502) on the resolution (H. Res. 687) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1206) to prohibit the hiring of additional Internal Revenue Service employees until the Secretary of the Treasury certifies that no employee of the Internal Revenue Service has a seriously delinquent tax debt, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4885) to require that user fees collected by the Internal Revenue Service be deposited into the general fund of the Treasury, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4890, BAN ON IRS BONUSES UNTIL SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY DEVELOPS COMPREHENSIVE CUSTOMER SERVICE STRATEGY, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3724, ENSURING INTEGRITY IN THE IRS WORKFORCE ACT OF 2015

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-503) on the Resolution (H. Res. 688) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4890) to impose a ban on the payment of bonuses to employees of the Internal Revenue Service until the Secretary of the Treasury develops and implements a comprehensive customer service strategy, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3724) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service from rehiring any employee of the Internal Revenue Service who was involuntarily separated from service for misconduct, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 4570, by the yeas and nays;

S. 719, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

100 YEARS OF WOMEN IN CONGRESS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4570) to amend the Department of Agriculture program for research and extension grants to increase participation by women and underrepresented minorities in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics to redesignate the program as the "Jeannette Rankin Women and Minorities in STEM Fields Program", on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 377, nays 6, answered "present" 2, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 153]

YEAS—377

Abraham	Castor (FL)	Denham
Adams	Castro (TX)	Dent
Aguilar	Chabot	DeSantis
Allen	Chaffetz	DeSaulnier
Amash	Chu, Judy	DesJarlais
Amodei	Ciulline	Deutch
Ashford	Clark (MA)	Diaz-Balart
Barletta	Clarke (NY)	Dingell
Barr	Clawson (FL)	Doggett
Bass	Clay	Dold
Beatty	Cleaver	Donovan
Becerra	Clyburn	Duckworth
Benishek	Duffy	Duffy
Bera	Cohen	Duncan (SC)
Bilirakis	Cole	Duncan (TN)
Bishop (GA)	Collins (GA)	Ellison
Bishop (MI)	Comstock	Ellmers (NC)
Black	Conaway	Emmer (MN)
Blackburn	Connolly	Engel
Blum	Conyers	Eshoo
Bonamici	Cook	Esty
Bost	Cooper	Farenthold
Boustany	Costa	Farr
Bridenstine	Costello (PA)	Fitzpatrick
Brooks (IN)	Courtney	Fleischmann
Brownley (CA)	Cramer	Fleming
Buchanan	Crawford	Forbes
Buck	Crenshaw	Fortenberry
Bucshon	Crowley	Foster
Burgess	Cuellar	Fox
Bustos	Culberson	Frankel (FL)
Butterfield	Cummings	Franks (AZ)
Byrne	Curbelo (FL)	Frelinghuysen
Calvert	Davis (CA)	Fudge
Capps	Davis, Danny	Gabbard
Cárdenas	Davis, Rodney	Gallego
Carney	DeFazio	Garamendi
Carson (IN)	DeGette	Garrett
Carter (GA)	Delaney	Gibbs
Carter (TX)	DeLauro	Gibson
Cartwright	DelBene	Gohmert

Goodlatte
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Holding
Honda
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey

Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mullin (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mullin (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen

Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

Abraham
Adams
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany

Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline

Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson

Doyle, Michael
F.
Edwards
Fattah
Fincher
Flores
Grijalva
Hastings
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Jackson Lee
Kirkpatrick
Lee

Lipinski
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Maloney,
Carolyn
Marino
Meeks
Olson
Payne
Pelosi
Poe (TX)
Rohrabacher
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta

Scott, David
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stutzman
Tiberi
Tipton
Van Hollen
Walker
Waters, Maxine
Wilson (FL)
Young (IN)

Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey

Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey

Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen

□ 1850
Messrs. BROOKS of Alabama and GOSAR changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CARSON of Indiana changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:
Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 153, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

CAPTAIN JOHN E. MORAN AND CAPTAIN WILLIAM WYLIE GALT ARMED FORCES RESERVE CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 719) to rename the Armed Forces Reserve Center in Great Falls, Montana, the Captain John E. Moran and Captain William Wylie Galt Armed Forces Reserve Center, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 387, nays 0, answered "present" 1, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 154]
YEAS—387

Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)

Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey

Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen

NAYS—6

Babin
Brat

Brooks (AL)
Gosar

Griffith
Grothman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Rice (SC) Sanford

NOT VOTING—48

Aderholt
Barton
Beyer
Bishop (UT)

Blumenauer
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)

Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Capuano
Collins (NY)

Weber (TX)	Wilson (FL)	Yoho
Webster (FL)	Wilson (SC)	Young (AK)
Welch	Wittman	Young (IA)
Wenstrup	Womack	Zeldin
Westerman	Woodall	Zinke
Westmoreland	Yarmuth	
Williams	Yoder	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Rice (SC)

NOT VOTING—45

Aderholt	Flores	Rohrabacher
Barton	Granger	Rush
Beyer	Grijalva	Sanchez, Loretta
Blumenauer	Hinojosa	Scott, David
Boyle, Brendan	Jackson Lee	Sires
F.	Kelly (IL)	Slaughter
Brady (PA)	Kirkpatrick	Speier
Brady (TX)	Lipinski	Stutzman
Brown (FL)	Lujan Grisham	Tiberi
Calvert	(NM)	Van Hollen
Capuano	Maloney,	Vela
Collins (NY)	Carolyn	Walker
Doyle, Michael	Marino	Waters, Maxine
F.	Meeks	Whitfield
Edwards	Olson	Young (IN)
Fattah	Pelosi	
Fincher	Poe (TX)	

□ 1858

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote Nos. 153 and 154. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on both.

□ 1900

HONORING THE LIFE OF
CONGRESSMAN RAY THORNTON

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

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues to honor the life of Congressman Ray Thornton, who was a pillar in Arkansas politics and a stalwart advocate and voice for the improvement of education in our great State of Arkansas.

Serving six terms in Congress, for over 23 years, Congressman Thornton served in two different congressional districts, the fourth and the second. Ray was committed to the people of Arkansas and supporting Arkansas ideals on the political stage.

His distinguished career included service in the United States Navy during the Korean war, leadership as president of both Arkansas State University and the University of Arkansas, an 8-year term on the Arkansas Supreme Court, and appointment as the first chairman of the Arkansas Lottery.

In 2013, Congressman Thornton donated his personal and professional papers to the University of Arkansas.

Though he will be greatly missed by many throughout our State, his countless contributions and legacy will live on and serve as an example of statesmanship and public service for all Arkansans.

HONORING THE LIFE OF RABBI
HERBERT BAUMGUARD

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in remembrance of Rabbi Herbert Baumguard, who passed away this past Friday, at the age of 95.

Rabbi Baumguard founded Temple Beth Am, which is an important institution in my congressional district that has brought the south Florida Jewish community together for over 60 years.

A native of Norfolk, Virginia, Rabbi Baumguard served as an assistant to a chaplain in World War II. He credited that experience with his motivation for becoming a rabbi.

One of Rabbi Baumguard's strongest ideals was the continuing friendship and alliance with the State of Israel. The Rabbi was committed to not only strengthening our ties with our great ally, but to seeing that the United States continues to support and defend the Jewish state, which is an idea that I shared with him.

I am so honored and privileged to have had the opportunity to represent Temple Beth Am and to experience all that Rabbi Baumguard has done to improve south Florida. May his memory be a blessing.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF CHIEF
DELL URBAN

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

Mr. DOLD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Dell Urban, the chief of the North Chicago Fire Department, who is retiring after spending more than 25 years on the force. Ms. Urban is the first female fire chief in Lake County, and one of only two female fire chiefs in the State of Illinois.

As fire chief, Ms. Urban was responsible for saving countless lives and did her duty protecting the community of North Chicago. We should all aspire to be as brave as the firemen who lay down their lives each and every day to ensure our safety.

In addition to performing her duties, Ms. Urban has been a mentor and a friend to many firefighters throughout her time as chief, and she is leaving the station far better off than before she was chief.

I want to thank Ms. Urban for her service and wish her all the best in her future endeavors.

FIREARMS TRANSFER
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. Madam Speaker, the Firearms Transfer Improvement Act,

which I introduced in Congress, would provide a significant boost to New Hampshire gun dealers, nearly all of them small-business owners, as well as the Granite State's tourism industry and larger economy.

At its foundation, this bill is meant to protect every American's right to bear arms, an essential freedom that is as important as it ever was.

My bill would extend the same Federal law that allows interstate long gun purchasing to handgun purchases. For instance, a Vermonter could purchase a handgun in New Hampshire, where no sales tax exists, and transport it home, as long as he or she follows his or her State's gun laws.

This bill would be a boon for States like New Hampshire that, in addition to enjoying greater Second Amendment freedom, would also enjoy greater economic freedom. Granite Staters stand to benefit immensely, as do sporting enthusiasts around the country.

I would like to thank the 18 original cosponsors for their support of this necessary legislation.

POTENTIAL DRAWDOWN OF LAND
FORCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. COMSTOCK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GIBSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include supporting material on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBSON. Madam Speaker, tonight I am speaking to gain support for H.R. 4534. This is the POSTURE Act. It stops the administration's drawdown of our land forces, the United States Marine Corps and the United States Army.

This is a bipartisan bill, myself and 52 others, 52 cosponsors, including 42 Republicans and 10 Democrats. I am proud to say that we are coming together to make sure that we keep our land forces strong.

This is also a bicameral bill. The language of this bill has also been introduced in the United States Senate.

Madam Speaker, the predicate here is a belief in peace through strength, a belief that what we want to do is deter potential adversaries; and to do that, we certainly need to restore our capability in our Armed Forces, deterrence really being capability and will.

Tonight I am focused in on the POSTURE Act. Of course, Madam Speaker, the coauthors and I, we certainly share deep concern for the entire joint force, but today we are particularly focused in on the land forces.

You will hear, across the evening here, five general points. They are:

Number one, that the drawdown plan currently from the administration is planned to continue into 2018, for several more years here; and at the culmination of that, our land forces will actually be at pre-World War II levels.

Given the very volatile, uncertain, ambiguous international environment that we live in, we believe, the authors, that this is very high risk; and, really, we want to change that and, essentially, preserve 67,000 troops in end strength in the United States Army and the United States Marine Corps. That is number one.

The second point is the assumptions that were made, Madam Speaker, when the administration initially made the decision on the drawdown, we believe that those assumptions are no longer valid. There has been much change in the world in the last several years, and you will hear some of that this evening.

The third point, which is very important, is that, with our land forces, this is not like a light switch where we can turn it on, turn it off, turn it back on. If we end up standing down these 67,000 troops, it could take 3 to 4 years to reconstitute that force level; and given the uncertainty we have in this international environment, we think that that is too much risk for us to take on.

Madam Speaker, the fourth point, and here I will speak from my personal experience of 29 years in the military, is that this planned drawdown also has consequence for our servicemen and -women. It has, certainly, consequence in terms of the op tempo, the operational tempo, of how many deployments they will go on and for how long, the duration of those deployments.

And also, we know the risk. The enemy's weapon of choice in this war is the improvised explosive device, and we know that that has led to significant challenge with traumatic brain injuries and also post-traumatic stress.

Certainly, there is wide bipartisan support in this Chamber to care for our servicemen and -women and their families, and that is why these bipartisan authors are also very concerned about end strength. That is point 4.

The fifth point is this: when we preserve this—because I believe we are gaining momentum and, ultimately, I like our chances; we are going to get this into law—it is very important that this end strength come with the necessary resources so that we do not hollow out this force.

So, Madam Speaker, we are going to have a series of speakers now, my co-authors on the bill. I want to begin with my original coauthor, and he is the highest ranking enlisted man to ever serve in this Chamber. He is a great American hero, TIM WALZ. He is a Democrat from Minnesota.

In 1989, he earned the title of Nebraska Citizen Soldier of the Year. After deployment to Italy with his Guard unit, as part of Operation En-

during Freedom, Sergeant Major WALZ retired from the Army National Guard and resumed teaching as a geography teacher and a football coach at Mankato West Senior High School.

He is a member of the Armed Services Committee, and he is also a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. WALZ), my good colleague and friend.

Mr. WALZ. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from New York. It is a phrase we sometimes throw around in here without a lot of authenticity behind it, but I can tell you, in this case, a gentleman who served this Nation three decades in uniform and has had a distinguished career here in Congress, I am proud to stand with you.

I think you heard the gentleman's comments on why we think now is not the right time to draw down this land force, and I say that with both of us coming out of that force.

The size of the force this Nation needs should not be predicated by a plan that is outdated. Since the time this plan was written and put into effect: the rise of ISIS, China has built a new island in the South China Sea and is landing aircraft on it now, and a belligerent Russia.

But more than that, we have seen the use of the military force as a deterrent, not just to aggression. We have seen it as a peaceful use, whether it be in Haiti to respond to natural disasters or to respond to Ebola in West Africa. The best trained, the most efficient and the most ready force to be able to use our diplomacy and our humanitarian assets is this land force.

I think for many of us, we were concerned about this, but this is not ideologically driven. The gentleman and I coauthored a piece of legislation that created the National Commission on the Future of the Army.

We said: Let's let the data speak for itself. If the experts can take this in and assess that this force is enough to do what needs to be done according to the strategic plan of this Nation by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the best thinkers, then that is the way it should be.

But they did not come back with that. They came about some alarming things that they talked about, and one of them, I think it is very clear we are heading down the wrong path, stripping it of manpower.

There is a belief in this Nation that we can solve all problems, especially security problems, with the use of technology. Our technological advantage is a huge positive force, but it will not be on the ground with Ebola. It will not be there when we have to have that defending force.

□ 1915

As everyone in this Chamber knows, 15 years of war puts an incredible stress on that. The gentleman used a great analogy.

He talked about turning on and off the lights. I use the one that I think a

lot of people think: This is like running the car out of gas. If we just need more, we will put more gas in it.

That is not true. It is running the car out of oil, which causes all kinds of problems. If we do not keep the force where it is at, keep it trained, and keep it ready to go, we will not be able to carry out those missions.

I would like to highlight a couple of other things that the Commission said about the integration of the National Guard to the active components and the use of the National Guard as an operational reserve, not a strategic reserve.

Those of us who lived through the years where the National Guard was an afterthought and we practiced artillery training with toilet paper rolls instead of real charges because we didn't have the capacity to train, that is the surest way to make sure our force is not ready to go. It is not a good use of taxpayer dollars, and it is simply immoral to train America's young warriors without the full capacity of what they need.

So I think, for many of us, this is not only a national security issue, it is a smart fiscal issue. We have paid dearly with treasure and blood to have this force. I can tell you, if the force shrinks too much—and we have seen this happen—the rotations happen very quickly.

All the speakers you are going to hear tonight, Madam Speaker, are going to tell you about this. It becomes very difficult both from the personal side for them to manage their relationships, but also the professional side of soldiering. You can't get to the schools you need. You can't develop the wider breadth that you need for all contingencies.

We have become very, very good at small missions that the same people get rotated into without the ability to look elsewhere. So as we pivot to the Pacific, those are new skill sets that need to be incorporated in.

What the gentleman is asking for is let's just pause in the drawdown, let's keep the force where the Commission and the GAO says it needs to be, let's give the force the ability to rotate out and to do what needs to be done to have them get back and ready to get in the fight again in a way that makes sense. We can do that.

Again, I want to be very clear. Those critics who say that we are asking to build up the military, we are just asking to stop a drawdown that we think gets dangerously close to putting this Nation in a predicament where it cannot carry out the missions that are asked of it.

We in this Chamber and the American public have a moral responsibility to never put a warrior in that position and never put those commanders in that position.

So I want to thank the gentleman for bringing this forward. I want to thank him for being willing to champion this forward. We know this is about educating not only our colleagues, but the

American public. It is about having a debate.

I think the gentleman from New York brought up a critical point. Numbers without the ability to train, equip, and do what is necessary to get them to the highest level of readiness is probably worse than nothing, and that is not what we are asking for.

I think, again, to highlight the gentleman's commitment to this, he is looking at ways to pay for it. He is looking at ways to make it work: repealing sequestration, pursuing waste, eliminating programs at the Pentagon, encouraging and assisting our allies and partners to beef up what they need to do to beef up, and ensure the next President has the force capable to not only address current, but future threats. That is our responsibility.

So I am proud to stand with the gentleman on the POSTURE Act. I think it is smart policy. It is predicated on data. It is predicated on decades of personal experience from the gentleman from New York and speakers you are going to hear coming up. It is what the thinkers are telling us.

Again, I think it does come back to the gentleman's opening comments. Those adversaries who think that this is the time to do something with this Nation need to be sent a strong message that we are as strong as ever, our commitment is as strong as ever, and our force will be as it always has been: the best trained and the best fighting force the world has ever seen. We are just asking to give them the numbers to do their job.

So, Madam Speaker, I would encourage my colleagues to take a look at this, to get on board, and to talk with the gentleman, myself, and the other cosponsors of this.

Let's put that next President in a position to be able to secure this Nation, to be able to forward project American power in the name of humanitarian or human rights, and continue to give our young warriors what they need.

Mr. GIBSON. I thank the gentleman. Madam Speaker, you just heard, I think, in really compelling terms and you saw witness to why it is that we have the finest fighting force in the world.

What separates us from the rest of the world is our noncommissioned officer corps. This is an incredible collection of professionals that provide advice, analysis, and recommendations. Really, I would put our noncommissioned officer corps up against any other noncommissioned officer corps in the world.

I want to say, beyond that, he is a phenomenal Representative here in the U.S. House. I want to thank the gentleman for that tremendous testimony and for his great leadership.

I now want to turn to another great warrior, Representative STEVE RUSSELL. STEVE RUSSELL is, Madam Speaker, an Airborne Ranger. He has served in airborne, light, and mechanized infantry assignments. His deployments

include deployment to Kosovo, Kuwait, Afghanistan, and Iraq.

Madam Speaker, in 2003, then-Lieutenant Colonel STEVE RUSSELL commanded the task force in Iraq that was instrumental in the hunt and capture of Saddam Hussein.

He is in his first term. He is already off to an amazing start. He is a member of the Armed Services Committee.

I yield to the gentleman from the State of Oklahoma, Mr. STEVE RUSSELL.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my brother, combat infantryman, warrior, and colleague from New York (Mr. GIBSON) for his leadership in this effort.

Madam Speaker, in 1940, our Nation faced tough decisions. Lawmakers in this Chamber debated over our constitutional requirement to defend our Republic.

Faced with a decade of depression, declining budgets, and enormous domestic needs, President Roosevelt recognized that the Nation was woefully unprepared to defend herself, given the alarming developments in Asia and Europe the previous 2 years.

Congress acted, and, although assured we could stay out of the war, this body passed the unprecedented Selective Service Act of 1940 to increase our defensive posture.

While some would call it prescient or even timely, we were still woefully unprepared for the horrific attacks on our naval, land, and air forces in 1941. When the blow fell, we had for the first time a sizeable forward-deployed force based in the Philippine Islands in December 1941.

That Allied force of 150,000 soldiers fought bravely for 5 months until their medical supplies, food, and, finally, ammunition were exhausted, prompting the largest surrender of U.S. forces in American history.

Tens of thousands of these Allied soldiers died in brutal captivity, all simply because our Nation could not get to them. While we had future capacity, we had forfeited our defensive posture through cost-cutting policies the previous decade and we had exhausted our time.

As unprepared as we were in 1940, it could have been even worse had the President and Congress not acted when they did. But here is something to ponder: our current land forces are actually 30 percent smaller today than they were in 1940 when you compare them to a percentage of our per capita population. If we lived today in an atmosphere of peace, maybe we could take such gambles.

Instead, we see Russians reigniting the cold war, Iranians destabilizing the Middle East, North Koreans firing nuclear missiles with the aim to range the United States, and Islamic jihadist death-cult extremists committing acts of barbarity akin to the Middle Ages. We also see tensions rising with our trading partner, China, and the seeds of potential unrest in the Pacific.

What does the President and this Congress intend to do if we do not act to prepare for this dangerous world? This year it would cut the United States Army by 30,000 more soldiers and our Marines by another 8,000. Instead, our bipartisan answer to these cuts in this Congress is a resounding no.

Whatever savings we might imagine we safeguard, whatever tension we may imagine we could trim, whatever goodwill we deceive ourselves of that would go after, we assuredly would be eroded by an unexpected attack on our Nation as she has voluntarily chained herself down into a weakened condition.

Rather than slacken our posture, we must slacken our chains. We stand together with much work ahead, but this bipartisan effort is a refusal to see our Nation further diminished.

As we pass this measure into law, let's do it with the echo of these sobering words from novelist, historian, and Nobel Laureate Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, a survivor of torture and tyranny:

I would like to call upon America to be more careful with its trust and prevent those who because of shortsightedness and still others out of self-interest from falsely using the struggle for peace and for social justice to lead you down a false road. Because they are trying to weaken you. They are trying to disarm your strong and magnificent country in the face of this fearful threat. I call upon you ordinary working men of America. Do not let yourselves become weak.

Pass the POSTURE Act and prevent some horrific blow from berthing in our future.

Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. GIBSON for his outstanding leadership on this issue.

Mr. GIBSON. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL).

What we heard, Madam Speaker, just moments ago here is what I mentioned at the outset. We were talking about the changed assumptions when the administration first made these decisions.

Of course, they were working based on the 2012 Defense Strategic Guidance, the 2013 Strategic Choices and Management Review, and also the 2014 QDR.

Madam Speaker, I think we just heard very persuasive argumentation how just in the last several years so much has changed and the reason why this Chamber is coming together in a bipartisan way to move forward on this POSTURE Act.

Now, Madam Speaker, I want to turn to Representative RENEE ELLMERS. RENEE is not on the Committee on Armed Services, but this lady works incredibly hard for our Nation and for our servicemen and -women. She studies all the time. I have had countless discussions with her.

She is always wanting to know the details to make sure that the servicemen and -women who serve at Fort Bragg get all the resources that they need. She takes their combat readiness so very seriously because she knows that their lives are on the line there.

Fort Bragg could not ask for a stronger advocate. I am very impressed and am very thankful for her support in going above and beyond, not being on the committee and jurisdiction, to be here tonight and, really, to make her voice be heard all throughout this land on why we need to get behind the POSTURE Act.

So I will just say last before I turn it over to her that part of what I know that Representative ELLMERS is working on is a very important supporting element for our land forces, the 440th, which is based out of Fort Bragg and Pope Army Air Base. I know from first-hand experience this is an incredible outfit. We are concerned about some decisions that are being taken here.

I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS)

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. GIBSON. I just want to start right off by saying, Madam Speaker, that our colleague, Mr. GIBSON, has been a tireless voice for our military and certainly has been a resource for me and has always been more than open and honest with me when it comes to decisions that are facing our military and national security.

Again, I just want to thank the gentleman for his service and, also, for coming to Washington to serve our country yet again, to be such an advocate for the military, and to be such a support for the rest of us who are trying to help in that capacity as well.

I am here tonight to discuss in this Special Order the introduction of the POSTURE Act, and I thank the gentleman for this great piece of legislation.

The POSTURE Act is an important piece of legislation that will prevent further troop reductions and improve military readiness. As the Representative of Fort Bragg based in North Carolina, I have the unique perspective to see how this troop drawdown is directly impacting our national security.

It is my top priority to ensure that we restore our military's end strength not only to serve as a deterrent, but also so that our military can appropriately and effectively respond to any threat represented to our country or our allies. The POSTURE Act will ensure that our troops are ready and prepared to defend our Nation at a moment's notice.

I would also like to thank Mr. GIBSON for his help raising awareness about the serious issues facing Fort Bragg, including the deactivation of the 440th Airlift Wing.

The 440th Airlift Wing provides unparalleled support to Fort Bragg paratroopers, more specifically, the famed 82nd Airborne's Global Response Force, a unit Mr. GIBSON knows all too well, as he was the commander of this force just a few years back.

Because of the potential deactivation of the 440th Airlift Wing, I have been having this very discussion about maintaining military readiness and

maintaining sufficient troop levels for the last 2-plus years.

This certainly is not the first time I have stepped foot onto the House floor to rail against the Air Force's ill-conceived decision to deactivate the 440th. In fact, I have stood in this very spot and stressed my concerns about the threats their decision poses to the readiness of the Fort Bragg paratroopers.

Unfortunately, what I thought was going to happen is indeed taking place as we speak. While the Air Force has promised they would continue to provide necessary airlift support for Fort Bragg, the Air Force is already falling well short of this promise.

□ 1930

Fort Bragg aims to complete 10,000 jumps a month to prepare troops for combat, but the Air Force's decision to prematurely hollow out this wing has prevented them from meeting this jump goal. Last month, only 6,100 paratroopers jumped from Air Force planes. In fact, the Air Force has even fallen short on Fort Bragg's 8,000-jump minimum—a number they consider to be their threshold for proficiency.

This is yet another consequence and, unfortunately, it is a concrete example of how drawdown can and will affect military readiness and training. Not only have I met with Fort Bragg leadership, but I have also met with our Nation's top military officials and still, to this day, I do not understand why the Air Force insists on making decisions based on zero strategic merit.

To make matters worse, deactivation of the 440th is happening at a time when the 18th Airborne Corps was recently called upon to lead the fight against the Islamic extremist group ISIS. Members of the 18th Airborne Corps are set to deploy this summer. Meanwhile, we are on the track to have the smallest size Army since the end of World War II.

Russia has become increasingly aggressive and China's military presence continues to grow in southeast Asia—all the while our President insists on drawing down our military and cutting its funding. This is not the time to be cutting our military. This is the time to strengthen it.

Mr. GIBSON's bill ensures that we will have appropriate end strength to keep our Nation and our allies safe and secure. I look forward to continuing to work with Mr. GIBSON and standing by him in this capacity, as I believe that strengthening our military is one of the most important issues facing Congress to date.

Mr. GIBSON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman. I want to thank her for her strong voice, and I want to thank her for the attention to detail that she puts into this. This is so critically important. It is very instrumental in the momentum that we have had—your great voice, your staff's hard work, and your hard work.

We are going to continue to push forward with this with the POSTURE Act,

and continue to make sure that the entire installation at Fort Bragg has the necessary resources to deliver and to get its mission done and to look after and take care of its servicemen and -women, those paratroopers, and also the families.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT). Representative KNIGHT is also a veteran of our Armed Forces. He was born at Edwards Air Force Base in Antelope Valley, California. He served in the United States Army from 1985 to 1987. He was a track systems mechanic in Freiburg, Germany. When his tour ended, he served in the United States Army Reserve. His total military service spanned from 1985 to 1993. He is a member of the House Armed Services Committee. Also, within his district, he has Air Force Plant 42 and the Edwards Air Force Base.

Mr. KNIGHT. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. GIBSON for taking a leadership role in making sure that the military has a voice, and that is exactly what he has done in his tenure here in Congress.

I rise in support of H.R. 4534. The POSTURE Act is not just something that we are asking for. It is basically the bare necessities. We are getting down to the limits.

I can say, just on personal experience, when I enlisted in 1985 as a young person graduating high school and enlisting into the Army, I expected that we had such a great military and we had all of these things that were going to help me in my endeavors. As I went to Germany, my job was if something happened, if the Russians were going to come over, we were supposed to guard what was known as the Fulda Gap. I know that anyone who has ever served in the Army in the '80s knows what the Fulda Gap is. It was basically that line where we were going to stop the Russian Army.

Unfortunately, they told us that we were going to be outrun about 11 to 1 at that time from the Russian Army. That is not something that an 18-year-old wants to know, is that the very first assignment that might happen in the cold war is you are going to go to a spot and you are going to be up against an 11-to-1 army. At that time, we had about 781,000 active Army folks.

If we fast forward to today, we are sending people in rotations every 12 months or every 18 months. We are sending these people two, three, or four different rotations during their 4- or 6-year enlistments, and we have such a smaller active Army. I know that now folks out there will be talking about the total Army structure and the total structure. I think that is great that we have the Reserves and National Guard as part of the total structure. I believe in that. I think that is something that absolutely should happen.

But if we are just doing apples to apples from 1986 to today, we go from about 780,000 to less than 500,000. That is getting down to a point where, can

we fight on two fronts, can we help, can we do all of the missions that the Army has done for the last 200 years?

I would say that we are getting down to that point where if we don't pass the POSTURE Act, we will go underneath that level and we will not be able to send our warriors into combat and into humanitarian situations with our best effort, with our best foot forward. I would say that this is the absolute—the absolute—end to where we should draw down.

Let's look at what we are looking at today. We are not looking at some of the larger countries, but we are also looking at rogue states. Russia and China, obviously, are out there and they are, obviously, doing things that we keep our eye on. Their technology has advanced, their amount of money that they spend on the military has jumped dramatically over the last 20 years. Some of the things that they are bringing forward are as technologically advanced as we have.

I would say that if we went back 20 years, we would never say that. We would say technologically we are ahead every step of the way. Today we can't say that. Today we also have rogue nations and rogue leaders out there that want to do things to us and to our allies.

So I say at a time where we are drawing down and continuing to draw down, where we have these types of rogue nations, where we have these types of superpowers out there, and we have these types of groups that want to do bad things to us and to our allies, is this actually the time that we should draw down to an unsafe level?

I would like to thank Mr. GIBSON for everything that he has done in his tenure here in Congress and what he has done for the United States of America because, honestly, he is a true hero. But in this regard, he is trying to unite all of Congress behind what he has believed and what he has done for his entire life.

I think that Congress should listen, I think that Congress should say, yes, we absolutely have these levels, and we can't go below them. In fact, as we are watching everything that is happening on the news on a daily basis, we would say that maybe those levels are too low, too. So I would like to thank Mr. GIBSON for his leadership.

Mr. GIBSON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I thank him for his service to our Nation, and also thank him for his great work on the House Armed Services Committee. He is truly making a difference, and his voice here tonight is very compelling and very significant.

Madam Speaker, I am now going to recap and move to close. I appreciate very much the time in a busy schedule and colleagues here tonight. We are here tonight, again, for H.R. 4534, the POSTURE Act, which stops the Obama administration's drawdown of our land forces—our Army and our Marine Corps.

As I mentioned, this is a bipartisan bill—myself and 52 others here in this Chamber, including 42 Republicans and 10 Democrats, led so ably by Sergeant Major Retired Representative TIM WALZ, a Democrat from Minnesota.

I also want to say that Chairman TURNER was not able to be here today, but he has been instrumental in not only help craft this, but actually help build support for it for these past several months.

As I mentioned, Madam Speaker, tonight you heard five points why it is so important that we put the POSTURE Act into law and that we stop this drawdown.

In the first point we gave some historical figures and some context of where we are today. We know that at present our land forces are about at the same size that we were on the 11th of September of 2001. Of course, during the surge, we saw a ramp-up of our land forces, and now we have seen a re-setting of that where we are about at 11th of September of 2001 levels.

However, the plan now from the administration is to continue that drawdown all the way down to pre-World War II levels. That would be done by 2018. That takes an additional 67,000 troops out of the formations.

Madam Speaker, we heard, I think, some very significant testimony tonight from some of the speakers. We know that we have senior leaders in our Armed Forces now that have described this as a very serious risk, very significant risk. And you also heard from Representative WALZ when he talked about the Commission on the Future of the Army, which Representative WALZ, a humble man, was actually the author for that, the brain for that. We are here today because of his work on that score.

The results of that commission, I believe, Madam Speaker, really need to be paid attention to. It was here that not only were we able to get a better understanding of this risk, but also we helped bring together all components of the Army—the regular Army, the National Guard, and the Army Reserve. The Commission on the Future of the Army helped.

I also want to reinforce how important leadership is—our Chief of Staff of the Army, our Secretary of the Army, our Acting Secretary of the Army right now. They have put a major priority on really pulling together everyone that serves in the Army. The same goes for our Secretary of the Navy and for our Commandant of the Marine Corps because this is truly a team effort all the way across. That commission helped chart the way forward.

Madam Speaker, the General Accounting Office, the GAO's report that came out just last week, documented what our research has also shown over these several months. That is that there is just too much risk in continuing this drawdown to pre-World War II levels. That was point one.

In point two, we talked about the assumptions—we heard from all the

speakers. Particularly, Mr. RUSSELL focused in on that—how much of the world has changed. We can understand why the administration brought forward an argument back initially, but so much has changed since that time. It is clear to all of us that we need to pay attention to that and to adopt the POSTURE Act.

We also pointed out this evening that this is not like a light switch. It is not something that we can turn on and turn off. If we decide to move forward with the 67,000 troops, taking them out of the formations, we know that we are looking at 3 to 4 years just to get back to where we are today, Madam Speaker. That would, I think, really signal to our potential adversaries the wrong message.

The fourth point is—and we heard from a couple of the speakers—how important it is that we have the right size formations because that impacts on how often they get sent over into the combat zone and how long they stay. All of this has impacts on families, it has impacts on traumatic brain injury potential, and also posttraumatic stress. That is certainly something that this Chamber is absolutely unified in doing everything we can to support our servicemen and -women. By enacting the POSTURE Act, we are also supporting our currently serving members and our veterans.

The last point—and this has been really made very clear to us by all the leadership in both the Army and the Marine Corps—is how important it is that by preserving this end strength, it has to come with the necessary resources so that they are manned, equipped, and trained, and that we look towards the modernization of the force and look towards the future.

We have heard from the Congressional Budget Office, the CBO. The CBO initially assesses this at \$600 million. We understand that there may be a new assessment coming forward shortly. But as was also mentioned by Sergeant Major Walz, Representative WALZ, our committee is also very keenly going through the budget, a budget of over \$600 billion, when you look at the Department of Defense and Department of Energy, the Overseas Contingency Fund. We are looking for ways to make sure we do this in the best way possible for the taxpayer.

Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD a series of letters of support that we are getting from the Association of the United States Army, the National Guard Association, and the Reserve Officers Association. We deeply appreciate their support.

ASSOCIATION OF THE
UNITED STATES ARMY,
Arlington, Virginia, 3 March 2016.

Hon. CHRIS GIBSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. GIBSON: On behalf of the members of the Association of the United States Army (AUSA), I write to support your introduction of H.R. 4534, the "Protecting Our Security Through Utilizing Right-Sized End-

Strength Act of 2016” or the “POSTURE Act.” At a time when our Army is confronting growing threats and increasing operational demands, it would be wise to pause the current budget-driven force reductions and allow the next administration time to assess land force capabilities and needs before determining troop levels.

Under current plans, the Regular Army is expected to fall to 475,000 Soldiers by 1 October 2016, and then further decrease to 450,000 Soldiers by 1 October 2018. These same plans will also reduce the end strength of our Army National Guard and the Army Reserve. Such a reduction in our landpower capability does not make sense in a time of increased threats and global instability.

While the POSTURE Act puts the brakes on budget-driven force reductions, the Army will also face negative consequences if the additional end strength is not funded. During a recent hearing on the Army’s Fiscal Year 2017 budget, Army Chief of Staff GEN Mark Kinney told the Senate Appropriations Committee that stopping the drop in Army end strength without providing funding to cover the additional costs would undermine readiness and potentially result in a hollow Army.

AUSA looks forward to working with you to advance the POSTURE Act, but urges you to consider ways to provide the additional resources to prepare our Army to face a dangerous and increasingly unstable world.

Sincerely,

GORDON R. SULLIVAN,
General, USA Retired.

NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION OF
THE UNITED STATES, INC.
Washington, DC, February 26, 2016.

Hon. CHRIS GIBSON,
*House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

On behalf of the nearly 45,000 members of the National Guard Association of the United States and the approximately 450,000 soldiers and airmen of the National Guard, please accept our sincere thanks for your leadership in introducing the Protecting Our Security Through Utilizing Right-Sized End-Strength (POSTURE) Act of 2016 (H.R. 4534), a bill that would stop the drawdown of U.S. Land Forces.

NGAUS strongly supports your legislation. The National Commission on the Future of the Army (NCF A) recommended a minimally sufficient Total Army of 980,000 soldiers; however, it provided no optimal end-strength level. NGAUS testified before the NCF A that the Total Army was at the risk of becoming dangerously small given the current threat environment.

Given the velocity of instability, the demand for U.S. Land Forces will likely only increase for the foreseeable future. U.S. Land Forces must be sized to address these threats without putting undue stress on our soldiers and marines.

We look forward to continuing to work with you to ensure this important legislation becomes law. Thank you, as always, for your continued support for members of the National Guard.

Sincerely,

GUS HARGETT,
Major General (Ret), USA, President.

RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,
1 March 2016.

Hon. CHRIS GIBSON,
*House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GIBSON: The Reserve Officers Association (ROA) supports your bill H.R. 4534, “Protecting Our Security Through Utilizing Right-Sized End-Strength Act of 2016” or the “POSTURE Act.” This bill recognizes the vital contributions of the Reserve Components and the need to ensure

they have the right Fiscal Year 2016 end strength authorized.

Since 9/11, more than 900,000 Reserve Component members have been activated to support Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, and other contingencies. Despite increased use of the Guard and Reserve, the Congressional Research Service, identified end strength reductions between FY2001 and FY2015.

“Between FY2001 and FY2015, the largest shifts in authorized end strength have occurred in the Navy Reserve (–31,600 or –35.5%), Air Force Reserve (–7,258 or –9.8%), and Coast Guard Reserve (–1,000 or –12.5%). A smaller change occurred in the Air National Guard (–3,022 or –2.8%) and Army Reserve (–3,300 or –1.6%), while the authorized end strength for the Army National Guard (–326 or –0.1%) and the Marine Corps Reserve (–358 or –0.9%) have been largely unchanged during this period, (FY2016 National Defense Authorization Act: Selected Military Personnel Issues, R44120).”

As stated in the bill, passing this legislation will ensure Guard and Reserve members are available, “. . . to deter threats, shape the international security 15 environment, respond to emergent situations and crises, and, if necessary, to fight and win the Nation’s war, . . .”

ROA has a membership of 50,000, which represents all the uniformed services of the United States who would be favorably affected by your bill. Thank you for your efforts on this issue, and past support to the Military.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY E. PHILLIPS,
Executive Director.

Mr. GIBSON. Lastly, Madam Speaker, the legislative strategy here is that we have been building out support. Our hope is that when the mark for the national security policy bill, which will be unveiled here in the next couple of weeks, that this bill will be included in the underlying bill because we think it is just so critically important that we get this done this year.

Madam Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity to come together with my colleagues to talk about such an important issue for the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1945

CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS—
ROAD TO RUIN: HOUSE REPUBLICANS FAIL ON THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege, once again, to come to the House floor on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus and join with my distinguished colleague

from Ohio, Representative JOYCE BEATTY, as we anchor this Congressional Black Caucus Special Order—the CBC hour of power—where, for 60 minutes, we get an opportunity to talk to the American people about issues of great importance to the African American community, to our democracy, and, certainly, to our country at large.

Today, we are here to discuss, tragically, the House GOP’s continued failure to demonstrate the ability to govern in a basic fashion—that is to pass a budget, which is required by statutory law, as of April 15. That deadline has come and gone, and we are still waiting for the House majority to present a budget to this body for our consideration.

We were told for years by people, including by the current Speaker of this great House, that the most fundamental tenet of governing is the passage of a budget. Yet, even with Republicans in firm control of both the House and the Senate, it seems that this Congress is still unable to get its act together. It is a stunning act of legislative abdication of basic responsibilities. We are going to explore that tonight, not just from a procedural standpoint, but from a standpoint of how this is indicative of this majority’s unwillingness and inability to do the business of the American people.

It is now my honor and my privilege to yield to my distinguished colleague, my coanchor, my classmate—the always eloquent and effervescent gentlewoman from the great city of Columbus in the great State of Ohio, Representative JOYCE BEATTY.

Mrs. BEATTY. I thank the gentleman.

I always look forward to engaging in our Congressional Black Caucus’ Special Order hour and, tonight, for our dialogue, for our debate, on the House Republicans’ repeated failure to pass a budget.

First, let me say, as your classmate and colleague, being able to be the voice for your constituents and my constituents and America at large, it is an honor. I think it is so important, when we think about how important the work of this Congress is, for us to take on challenging the House Republicans’ road to ruin.

Madam Speaker, tonight, the Congressional Black Caucus is going to discuss the importance of why we should pass a budget. Not only that, I am sure Mr. JEFFRIES and I will have a dialogue about the value and the importance of having a budget. As Members of Congress and, especially, as members of the Congressional Black Caucus, we know specifically that a budget creates jobs and that it raises the paychecks of hardworking American people while reducing the deficit in a balanced and responsible way.

Madam Speaker, let me just take a moment to point out that this is not

the first time that the Congressional Black Caucus has held a Special Order hour on the subject of the Republicans' inaction. Earlier this year, the Congressional Black Caucus came to this House floor and implored the Republican leadership to do its job—the job America wants us to do—and that was to enact commonsense gun control legislation. To date, Madam Speaker, Republicans have continued to fail the American people by putting forth or by bringing forth commonsense gun control legislation. It is still hanging out there, waiting for action.

Now, again, here in the House of Representatives, the people's House, we are faced with another instance of Republican failure. Under law, as spelled out in title III of the Congressional Budget Act, Congress is directed to complete actions on the concurrent resolution on the budget by April 15, as we heard Mr. JEFFRIES remind us. A concurrent resolution on the budget means it is supposed to pass both the Senate and the House, again, by April 15. At this date, neither Chamber has considered a budget resolution for 2017.

Madam Speaker, I don't know about your constituents, but in my district, Ohio's Third Congressional District, my constituents expect Congress to work; so let's take a look at it.

What happens when people refuse to do their jobs?

If postal workers don't deliver, you don't get your mail. If farmers don't farm, people don't eat. If teachers don't show up, our children don't learn. People all over America take their jobs seriously, and they expect us, as their elected officials, to also do that. It is time for House Republicans to get America off the road to ruin and back on the path to prosperity.

When Speaker RYAN took office—this is worth repeating, and Congressman JEFFRIES mentioned this earlier. When Speaker RYAN took office, House Republicans stated that passing a budget was a basic function of government. However, the statutory deadline of passing a budget resolution by April 15 has come and gone, although House Republicans made passing a budget a top priority for this year. In the Republicans' own words, they can't even accomplish the basic functions of government—their job.

Madam Speaker, why do we care that we don't have a budget? Let me give you the answer.

The importance of setting a budget is that it lays out the blueprint for the appropriations process. It outlines government spending for the year. Without a budget, we have 12 appropriations bills that are working their way through Congress without there being guiding principles on overall spending. If we cannot as a Congress perform the basic functions of governing, how are we going to tackle the much more complicated issues, such as income inequality, education quality, tuition affordability, tax reform, and so many others?

Once again, House Republicans have demonstrated the degree to which the sharp division within their Conference is impeding Congress' ability to work for the American people. Instead of coming together with Democrats to pass a budget resolution that will create jobs and grow the paychecks of hardworking American families, they have just decided not to pass a budget.

This decision was made despite the fact that President Obama submitted his budget request to Congress back in February. As you may remember, Madam Speaker, the Republican majority here in the House of Representatives and the Republican-controlled Senate took the unprecedented step of refusing to receive the OMB Director for a formal hearing so as to present the President's budget.

Madam Speaker, how did that turn out for us? We all know how it turned out. The Republican Conference failed the American people, and it set us on a road to ruin by not passing a budget.

Mr. JEFFRIES, I look forward to our continuing this dialogue tonight with other members of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank Congresswoman BEATTY for a very thorough presentation and for pointing out that the Speaker, himself, and the Republican majority have indicated that they should be judged based on their capacity to complete the basics of their job responsibilities, which include the passage of a budget resolution. In fact, it was then-Congressman RYAN who, in 2012, stated that failing to enact a budget has serious consequences for American families.

There are at least three current health crises that we are trying to deal with in America and throughout the world, but Republicans have abdicated their responsibility: the Zika virus, the Flint water crisis, and the opioid addiction that is ravaging communities in the inner cities, in suburban America, and all throughout the rural parts of this country; yet House Republicans have failed not just to put forth a budget that would provide a roadmap to deal with these issues, but they have chosen to simply ignore these crises in a manner that represents such a stunning departure of what responsible Members of Congress should be doing at this particular point in time.

I am thankful that we have been joined by the distinguished gentlewoman from the great Lone Star State, who has always been thoughtful and eloquent on issues of importance not just to her district, which is anchored in Houston, Texas, but through her membership and leadership on the Homeland Security Committee as well as on the House Judiciary Committee. She has been so thoughtful and effective on a great many issues in the context of our safety, of our well-being, of criminal justice reform, of course, and of the protection of civil liberties—all issues that are fundamental to our democracy in the same way that a budgetary roadmap is fundamental to our democracy.

Let me yield to Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank my colleagues for their eloquence but, more importantly, for the Congressional Black Caucus in its taking up the mantle of the moral compass of justice.

One would argue that justice is tied to our committee, the Judiciary Committee; but as I look at this Congress and as I look at a very small document called the Constitution, one can anchor the responsibilities of this body—of both the House and the Senate—Mr. JEFFRIES, in the Bill of Rights. I would like to just, very briefly, take us on a journey that indicates that our moral compass is broken because a budget that was supposed to be passed on April 15, by midnight, was not.

To the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands, let me thank her. She will have her own distinctive story, in her eloquence, about the fairness to the territories.

I listened, as I came in, to the presentation by the gentlewoman from Ohio, who knows full well that we need a budget to ensure that there is full employment in America. Then I work extensively with my colleague on the Judiciary Committee, and we will not pass or fund prison reform without a budget.

I rise today, however, to weave in and out of my comments about the moral compass that is broken to indicate that my district—the 18th Congressional District in Houston, Texas, and Harris County—is under a terrible emergency disaster. We are underwater. We are again facing an enormous rainfall that has been listed as historic and, possibly, as catastrophic.

Let me acknowledge my mayor, Mayor Turner, and county judge, Judge Emmett, for the work that has been done so far; and let me indicate two pastors with whom I have just gotten off the phone, Bishop Dixon and Bishop Bady, who are watching hungry people come to a site, looking for food.

□ 2000

As I was speaking to the emergency leadership, they are indicating they were evacuating babies from apartments and people were being displaced.

So what does that have to do with where we are today and no budget? Well, we know that the President introduced his budget a few months ago.

Because of his responsibility, we know that Homeland Security was provided funding and FEMA was provided funding to deal with emergency declarations of a disaster.

My district now needs it more than they have ever needed it. They need it in terms of providing for those immediate needs of vulnerable people without the resources to have stocked food, medical care, clothing, and also those who may be off work now because of the disaster.

So we don't have a budget. We are not moving along to ensure that

FEMA, which has seen a lot of disasters over the last 2 years, has the necessary funding to do their job. That is a broken moral compass.

It also reflects the Constitution because we are owed an equal treatment under the law and due process under the Fifth Amendment. There is no due process when I hear that one area is under water and we are not able to get help.

Let me also say that, as I watch a broken moral system, I also look at the predicament that we will be in with the Zika virus.

Congressman JEFFRIES has mentioned the opioid crisis, and we cannot forget the water crisis in Flint, but there is also the water crisis across the Nation. There is hard work that is being done by the Members in Michigan and Mr. KILDEE.

They need a budget to be able to fund the crisis or to help repair the crisis, restorative dollars, that a budget does to give a roadmap to the appropriators.

I also know that we are facing another potential epidemic, if you will, the Zika virus that is taking control of places like Puerto Rico and other places in the Caribbean, places that we have not yet fully documented. I can assure you that the Gulf Coast States of Florida, Louisiana, and Texas are in the eye of the storm.

The President a couple of months ago dutifully and responsibly introduced to this Congress a request of \$1.9 billion—no, I didn't say trillions. I didn't say 5 billion. I said 1.9 billion—so that the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention can do their job.

Mr. JEFFRIES, colleagues, if we are not doing our job, we need those who have the distinctive responsibility for issues of health and epidemics in this country to be able to do their job.

We have now been told by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention that it is not just in the prestages of pregnancy that the Zika virus can have a severe impact.

It is throughout the pregnancy. We also know that they have just determined that it will be severe brain damage that will come about.

So how irresponsible can it be to not put forward the emergency supplemental of \$1.9 billion? I have sent letters to Secretary Burwell. I have sent letters to, obviously, the President of the United States in supporting his efforts. I have sent letters to our leader, NANCY PELOSI, who has been a champion on these issues of Zika funding. And I have sent a letter to Speaker PAUL RYAN.

Might I speak to the Speaker and certainly ask that a half-baked, if I might say, contribution to fighting the Zika virus is not going to work because any taking of monies from other places is going to damage the funding of malaria, tuberculosis, and a universal flu vaccine. Yes, it is going to undermine our needed and continued effort of fighting Ebola.

Let me finish by simply saying this: Along with the idea of the Zika virus

and other crises, when we hear headlines like this that indicate Americans still don't see a vibrant labor market, then you know what else is needed under this budget? We need a budget to be able to fully fund the retraining of Americans.

I have introduced legislation that will train middle-age or middle-management workers and others and give them a stipend while they are being retrained for the 21st century jobs. We cannot do that with a budget not passed and an assessment not being made on how we would fund job training.

Lastly, the Supreme Court heard a case today dealing with the issues of executive orders and immigration. I would argue that Texas and the other States do not have standing because they are not required to give driver's licenses or anything else, as the President provides a prioritization of who should be deported.

I will say to you that, over the years, we have said over and over again to pass comprehensive immigration reform, which could have been a key element of a budget revenue to be able to help this country move along.

Without a budget and an intelligent discussion about what comprehensive immigration reform would do as an added revenue for this country, here we are mumbling along while Houston remains under water, needing resources from FEMA, while the Zika virus is in distress with no monies and while a number of other important issues are not addressed.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. JEFFRIES for allowing me to spend a moment to at least tie in the Bill of Rights that deal with the very core values of this country.

We have let down that basic document that guarantees equal protection, guarantees a certain freedom to be protected, guarantees that Americans have due process, if you will, and certainly guarantees the freedom of expression so that Americans can speak and be heard. They are speaking, but they are not being heard. What a shame that this budget has not been passed.

I am grateful to the Congressional Black Caucus. Let me acknowledge the chairman and say: Let us keep our fight going because we have reason to provide that kind of comfort to the American people.

Madam Speaker, Last week, House Republicans blew past the statutory deadline for Congress to enact a budget—reflecting apparently the belief of the Leadership that their already severe budget proposal was not radical enough to pass through a Republican Majority.

The Do-Nothing Republican Congress is back.

Instead of coming together with Democrats to pass a budget resolution that will create jobs and grow the paychecks of hard-working American families, Republicans have decided not to pass a budget at all.

The Republican-led Budget Committee, at the direction of the House GOP Leadership,

put forward the most devastating 'Road to Ruin' budget in history, but the Republican majority has rejected the plan as insufficiently severe.

Here's what was too weak to satisfy the radical forces that have seized control of the Republican Party; a budget that would:

1. End the Medicare guarantee for seniors;
2. Make \$6.5 trillion in cuts—the sharpest cuts ever proposed by the House Budget Committee;
3. Devastate investments in good-paying jobs, education, and American infrastructure;
4. Repeal the Affordable Care Act and dismantle the affordable health care of 20 million Americans.

Republicans have failed to keep their promise to pass a budget but their goal is still clear: to take us back to the radical trickle-down agenda that shattered our economy and hollowed out the wages of middle-class Americans.

At the same time, House Republicans have done nothing to help the thousands of Americans struggling to protect their families from the three public health emergencies of the Zika virus, opioid addiction and the Flint Water Crisis:

1. As the House Democratic Leadership wrote to Speaker RYAN last month, these public health crises require swift and decisive Congressional action.

2. Also last week, Democrats on the Appropriations Committee wrote to Chairman HAL ROGERS (R-KY), requesting an immediate hearing on the Administration's \$1.9 billion emergency supplemental request for Zika, pointing out that "The Zika virus is a true public health emergency that has the potential to affect millions of Americans this summer, including more than two million pregnant women."

3. But House Republicans have responded with nothing but inaction and indifference.

Instead of taking action to pass a budget or address urgent public health crises, House Republicans are now wasting a full week grandstanding on the IRS.

That's just the kind of hollow, meaningless posturing the American people have come to expect from the Do-Nothing Republican Congress.

As NPR notes:

Under Republican leadership, the 114th Congress has been "short on meaty legislation and short on weeks in session . . . But there seems to be plenty of time to think about other things. Last month, one House member introduced a measure that would nationally recognized magic as an art form."

Hard-working families deserve a Congress that invests in their future, protects safety, and creates a level-playing field for them and their children to succeed.

Democrats will continue to press for a budget that creates jobs and raises the paychecks of the American people, while reducing the deficit in a balanced and responsible way.

Today, the Supreme Court heard oral arguments in its review of the President's Immigration Executive Actions, which, as a result of congressional Republicans' inaction, address our Nation's broken immigration system and set important priorities in enforcing our immigration laws.

The President's executive actions fall well within both the clear legal authority provided by Congress and the Constitution, and the

well-established precedents of immigration actions by every Democrat and Republican President for the last 50 years.

1. Six Republican presidents have used the same clear authority to make our immigration enforcement priorities better fit our values as a people and our needs as a nation;

2. Past presidents have routinely acted in the face of Congressional inaction;

3. Numerous noted legal scholars have found that the President's actions are well within his legal authority.

The Immigration Executive Actions follow the same constitutional and legal precedent used by every Administration—Republican and Democratic—since President Eisenhower.

Just as Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush did before him, President Obama took executive action to make our immigration system better meet the needs of our country and better reflect our values as Americans.

As former Republican Senator Richard Lugar wrote in the *New York Times*:

“... whether or not you like President Obama's actions, he has operated under longstanding provisions of law that give the executive branch discretion in enforcement. This presidential prerogative has been recognized explicitly by the Supreme Court.”

Democrats stand for restoring sense to our utterly broken immigration system—so that we stop tearing apart families and separating parents from their children.

Last month, House and Senate Democrats filed our own amicus brief with the Supreme Court in support of the President's Immigration Executive Actions.

We are confident that the Supreme Court will affirm these vital immigration reforms and allow the President's steps to start fixing our immigration system to move forward.

While Republicans stand with Donald Trump's incendiary anti-immigrant agenda, Democrats will continue to champion the comprehensive immigration reform our nation needs.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas. She raises several important points.

One of the things that has struck me during my time here in Congress is that, under Republican reign, we have consistently seen government by crisis on one issue after the next.

From the group of people that spend so much time messaging the point to the American people that they believe in fiscal responsibility, where is the fiscal responsibility in failing to put forth a budget consistent with the law that you supported?

The other thing that amazes me—and the gentlewoman from Texas raised the point about the Supreme Court case that was argued earlier today on the immigration executive order issued by the President—I sit on the Judiciary Committee along with the Honorable SHEILA JACKSON LEE and we hear almost every week about how lawless this President allegedly has been in terms of his time in office.

Now, it is interesting to consistently hear the lectures about how lawless this President has allegedly been from people who believe that President

Barack Obama exceeded his authority on January 20, 2009, the moment that he took the oath of office because there are folks who still cannot believe that this man is the President and leader of the free world. So I never buy that lawlessness argument.

This is a group now that supports essentially undermining the Constitution over in the other house of this Congress. The President has done his job in putting forth the Supreme Court nominee, who is clearly qualified not according to Members of the Congressional Black Caucus, but according to ORRIN HATCH himself, one of the leading Members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, amongst others.

The lawlessness is not taking place at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. It is taking place right here in the United States Congress under the leadership of House and Senate Republicans.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JEFFRIES. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me just finish my point by saying that the reason why the budget is not here is because they could not muster the votes of the majority and they could not muster them even though their budget ended Medicare, it took \$6.5 trillion in cuts from the overall budget, it devastated good-paying jobs, education, American infrastructure, and, again, it repealed the Affordable Care Act and dismantled the Affordable Care Act for 20 million people.

Even with those poison pills to draw in support for some kind of budget that would fit within the law, their responsibility or the responsibility of Congress—they are in the majority—they could not pass or get on the floor a budget.

Clearly, the moral compass is broken. More importantly, it denies equal protection under the law, in my interpretation, of millions of Americans depending on this Congress doing its job.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the thoughtful observations of the gentlewoman from Texas.

I think we want to bring Representative STACY PLASKETT into this conversation in terms of the stunning inability to present a budget.

As Representative JACKSON LEE said, what else is there to do in terms of satisfying the extreme elements of your party? Privatize Social Security and throw older people out of their homes across the country? What else can you do?

We are going to explore some of these draconian cuts that were in a budget that apparently is not extreme enough.

I yield to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT), my good friend and colleague by way of Brooklyn, New York, I point out. We are so thankful for her presence here in the Congress. It is my honor now to yield to her.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman JEFFRIES and I

thank the Congressional Black Caucus for giving us this opportunity to always be the conscience of this Congress.

I want to thank the gentleman for his tireless efforts to raise awareness on not just the Committee on the Judiciary, but all of the work that he does.

This group has come together this evening to talk about the fact that once again the Republicans have created a road to ruin in their budget failure.

We talked about the fact that this Republican Congress has blown past the statutory deadline to enact a budget last week, reflecting, apparently, the belief of the leadership that their already severe budget proposal was not even radical enough to pass through this Republican majority.

The gentleman talked about some of the draconian measures that were already in the budget that they had proposed, which seems to have not been sufficient enough for their caucus.

At the direction of the House GOP leadership, the Budget Committee put forth one of the most devastating budgets in history and the majority rejected that plan as insufficient, which can only lead us to believe that it was not even severe enough for them.

Some of the things that were in that budget were an end to a Medicare guarantee for seniors, makes \$6.5 trillion in cuts—the sharpest cuts ever proposed by the House Budget Committee—devastates investments in good-paying jobs, education, and American infrastructure, repeals the Affordable Care Act and dismantling the affordable health care of 20 million Americans.

Now, as expressed by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY), in February, the administration, our President, requested support for Americans through the budget that he submitted to this Congress, which provided support for education, job training support, bolstering our obligation to seniors, real tools for growth for the territories in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and others by inclusion in the Affordable Care Act and expansion of Medicare.

But it seems that the Republicans have failed their promise to pass a budget, never mind even listen to or hear the head of OMB on that budget.

Their goal is still clear, to take us back to radical, trickle-down agenda that shattered our economy in the past and hollowed out the wages of middle-class Americans.

At that same time, House Republicans have done nothing to help the thousands of Americans struggling to protect their families from the three public health crises the chief spoke of: Zika, the opioid addict addictions, and the Flint water crisis. In Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, Florida, and now even Texas, this is a real crisis concerns the Zika virus.

Last week, Democrats on the Appropriations Committee wrote to Chairman HAL ROGERS requesting an immediate hearing on the administration's

1.9 billion emergency supplemental request for Zika, pointing out that: “The Zika virus is a true public health emergency that has the potential to affect millions of Americans this summer, including more than 2 million pregnant women.”

What did that committee do? Absolutely nothing. Not even the respect of a hearing. They have not responded to anything but just their inaction and indifference.

□ 2015

Instead of taking action to pass a budget or address urgent public health crises, the House Republicans are now wasting a full week grandstanding on the IRS. That is just the kind of hollow, meaningless posturing the American people have come to expect from this Congress.

Hardworking families deserve a Congress that invests in their future, protects their safety, creates a level playing field for them and their children to succeed. Democrats will continue to press for a budget that creates jobs, raises the paychecks, creates opportunities for American people while reducing the deficit in a balanced and responsible way.

I look forward to hearing, with the rest of my colleagues, their thoughts on this budget process and even possibly solutions for us as American people to come away with a clear budget that creates growth and opportunities for Americans.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative PLASKETT. She raised several important points. She noted that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to embrace this notion of trickle-down economics, which is sort of the foundation of many of the slash-and-burn cuts that are contained in at least a budget document that has been passed in prior years and the document that was put forth by the Committee on the Budget this year, this belief that if you lower the tax rate for millionaires and billionaires, that it will result in some residual benefit to the American people. But there is an irony in the embrace even of that term, “trickle-down economics.”

With the leadership of Representative BOBBY SCOTT and others, the CBC has consistently put forth a budget designed to open the floodgates of prosperity for working class Americans and middle class folks all throughout this country, but what the Republicans want to do is trickle-down economics. The only thing that you get with that philosophy, you may get a trickle, but you are guaranteed to stay down.

We are thankful that Representative SCOTT for so many years has consistently put forth through his leadership a budget from the Congressional Black Caucus designed to be both fiscally responsible and consistent with our ideals as a country that looks out for the least of those amongst us.

Let me now yield to the distinguished representative from the Com-

monwealth of Virginia, Mr. BOBBY SCOTT.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for getting the title of our State correct. I thank the gentleman from New York and the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding and organizing tonight’s Special Order.

Last week, the House of Representatives failed to pass a budget by the statutorily mandated date of April 15. This failure is unfortunate for our budget process, but perhaps not unfortunate for the American people because no budget is better than the proposed Republican budget that would have been brought to the floor.

Our Nation’s budget reflects priorities, but the Republican budget only highlights the wrong priorities. The budget the House Republicans wanted to bring to the floor would be even more devastating to students, working families, and seniors than their previous proposals.

The Republican budget would end the Medicare guarantee for seniors by converting Medicare into a voucher payment that would not keep pace with medical inflation, shifting billions of dollars in medical costs onto our senior citizens.

The Republican budget would repeal the Affordable Care Act and would jeopardize the health insurance for millions of Americans, even though the budget assumes all of the revenue collected by the Affordable Care Act to pay for the Affordable Care Act, all of those taxes remain in the budget.

The Republican budget includes a total of \$6.5 trillion in spending cuts, largely unspecified. If this level of cuts were ever made, it would devastate our investments and jobs, education, research, and would essentially eliminate any new transportation projects.

On top of these devastating cuts to vital programs that support and uplift hardworking American families, the Republican budget calls for trillions of dollars in tax cuts that would primarily benefit millionaires and billionaires, and then they claim the tax cuts would be revenue neutral, suggesting that we are to believe that trillions of dollars in new taxes would be imposed to pay for those tax cuts for the wealthy. But despite this, the Republican budget is not a credible plan.

Are we really going to dismantle Medicare? Are we really going to cut hundreds of billions of dollars out of education and job training and transportation? Are we really going to raise trillions of dollars in new taxes to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy?

I don’t think so. But the House leadership couldn’t even secure enough votes for this budget proposal because a faction of their conference wanted even deeper, unrealistic spending cuts. Budgeting is about making tough choices, and the only choice the Republicans seem to have made with the budget proposal is that we can only balance the budget on the backs of stu-

dents, workers, seniors, the disabled, and vulnerable communities across the Nation while cutting taxes for the wealthy.

The Congressional Black Caucus knows that is not the right choice. That is why, as we have done for the last 30 years, we have diligently prepared our own budget alternative to the Republican budget, which we would have offered as an amendment to the Republican budget if they had brought up their proposal.

The CBC budget chooses to invest in programs that we know will grow our economy and ensure that every American family is able to prosper. Our budget proposes a comprehensive jobs program, totaling \$500 billion over 3 years that will accelerate our economic recovery and ensure that it reaches virtually every community in America while also investing in what will guarantee America’s long-term economic competitiveness.

This jobs plan includes funding for direct jobs creation programs, school modernization, jobs for teachers and first responders, immediate investments in our Nation’s crumbling infrastructure, assistance for neighborhoods and families still reeling from the housing crisis, job training programs, and summer jobs.

Our budget calls for significant and sustained investments—approximately \$300 billion over the next decade—above the President’s request for programs that have been instrumental in lifting millions of Americans out of poverty. Some of these proposals include restoration of cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, expanding access to affordable housing, increasing access to quality and affordable education, increasing funding for job training and Trade Adjustment Assistance, adjusting the earned income tax credit and child tax credit to inflation, as well as decreasing the age where you can benefit for the earned income tax credit down to 21 years of age.

Thanks to the leadership of Congressman JIM CLYBURN, our budget also ensures that Federal resources are targeted more efficiently toward eradicating poverty by targeting Federal spending toward persistent areas of poverty through the 10–20–30 formula.

Our budget also includes more than \$340 billion above the President’s request for education over the next decade. This additional money will help make college more affordable by increasing the Pell grant, fully funding the President’s free community college program, reducing interest rates on student loans, and financing other proposals to ensure that no student graduates from college saddled with unmanageable debt.

The CBC budget also provides much-needed funding for families of Flint, Michigan, to help address the short-term and long-term cognitive and behavioral development of children exposed to high lead levels. However, the

Congressional Black Caucus appreciates, unfortunately, that Flint is not the only community in America impacted by lead exposure. This is why our budget includes funds to help not only Flint, but also other communities across the Nation deal with the effects of lead exposure.

Unlike the Republican budget, the CBC budget clearly shows how we pay for these additional investments. Our budget sets a new revenue target of \$4 trillion over the next 10 years above the current revenue baseline. To demonstrate how this is achievable and realistic, our budget suggests several specific alternatives, totaling \$7 trillion, that the House and Senate committees can choose from to reach that target.

We ask for \$4 trillion in new additional and specifically outline at least \$7 trillion to choose from. We do this by specifically talking about closing specific corporate loopholes, treating capital gains and dividends as regular income, a reasonable fee for financial transactions, restoring the estate tax to levels paid over a few years ago, specific items where you can choose from and, in fact, if we just cancel the Bush-era tax cuts, we would have almost \$4 trillion in new revenue right there.

At the end of the day, our budget realistically reduces the deficit by approximately \$3.2 trillion over the next decade compared to the Congressional Budget Office's March 2016 baseline. The CBC budget chooses investments in America's children and workers, protects our most vulnerable communities, and changes the wrong choices offered by the Republican majority.

I hope that we will have an opportunity to debate these issues if the House Republicans are ever able to bring their road-to-ruin budget to a full House vote.

Again, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Would the gentleman indulge one question?

It was mentioned during that very thorough presentation of what is contained in the CBC budget the 10-20-30 program, and of course 10-20-30, an initiative that has been championed by the CBC through the leadership of Representative JIM CLYBURN, would put forth a formula where 10 percent of the funding allocation would go to counties where 20 percent of the population has been living below the poverty line for 30 or more years. Is that correct?

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. That is correct. If you look at that, those counties and areas are spread all over the country, and if we are ever going to eradicate poverty, we have to target it to the high poverty areas, and 10-20-30 does exactly that.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentleman. In fact, what Representative CLYBURN has consistently pointed out, which I think is important in an era where we are trying to find common ground and deal with the problems confronting the American people, if you look at a breakdown of

persistently poor counties across the country and overlay that with congressional districts, a majority of those counties are actually represented by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

This is something that we believe should be embraced by the Speaker and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, as it would benefit, by the numbers, the constituents that they represent even more so than those of us within the CBC or on this side of the aisle.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. That is exactly true. I thank the gentleman very much for pointing that out.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative SCOTT.

Let me now ask my colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY), to just react to some of what we have heard.

One of the things that I thought was interesting in the presentation related to this budget is that if you look at the numbers, they are so extreme. I was on the Committee on the Budget during my first 2 years in Congress, but these numbers are even more extreme than what I remember in the 113th Congress. The budget apparently will cut \$157 billion from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program over a 10-year period.

The Republican budget that came out of the committee would cut roughly \$2 trillion from Medicaid. When I was on the committee, the number was \$700 million. I thought that was out of control, \$700 million. Now we are at \$2 trillion over a 10-year period apparently.

And then we have got cuts in higher education. The proposal is \$185 billion over 10 years.

You have to ask the question: Why would anyone propose such draconian cuts?

The answer is clear. This is not something that is often talked about, but the objective is to create a situation where you can dramatically lower the tax rates for the wealthiest amongst us. The top tax rate right now is 39.6 percent, but what the budget that has been put forth by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would do is that it would create two tax rates, one at 10 and the other at 25 percent. So what you will see is a tax cut that goes from 39.6 percent to 25 percent.

The way that you balance a budget and pay for it is on the backs of working families, the middle class, senior citizens, children, the disabled, the poor, the afflicted, and everybody else who doesn't fall into the category of millionaire or billionaire.

□ 2030

Now, you wonder how it could be possible that anyone could think that they could get away with such a draconian budget. Well, again, the argument is trickle-down economics.

But what I found fascinating—and maybe you could react to this, Representative BEATTY—is that if you ac-

tually look at a side-by-side comparison of the economy 8 years under President Clinton with a side-by-side comparison of the economy 8 years under George W. Bush, and then a side-by-side comparison of the economy 8 years under President Obama, I think it is pretty clear who actually has been the responsible fiscal stewards.

There were 20.3 million jobs created under the Clinton Presidency. America lost 650,000 jobs in 8 years under the Bush Presidency. America has now gained more than 14 million private sector jobs under 8 years of the Obama Presidency.

What has been demonstrated is that the argument that if you lower tax rates, you create economic prosperity, is phony. Because Bill Clinton raised the top tax rate to 39.6 percent. It didn't seem to adversely impact the economy. In fact, it was humming between 1992 and 2000. George Bush comes to office, lowers the tax rate for high-income earners from 39.6 percent to 35 percent. We had the greatest recession in the history of modern America; the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression.

President Obama comes into office and he raises the top tax rate again from 35 to 39.6, more than 14 million jobs are created, the unemployment rate has dropped under his tenure from over 10 percent to 5 percent, the deficit has been reduced by more than a trillion dollars. The stock market has gone from 6,000 to over 16,000. Now it is up to 18,000. I haven't been in the 401(k) system as long as Congressman SCOTT, who clearly is monitoring the situation. So the prosperity numbers have been phenomenal.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) for her reaction.

Mrs. BEATTY. I think Mr. JEFFRIES and our other colleagues have said it so well, but here is what I am afraid of.

I think the Republicans—the GOP—want to take us down to the radical trickle-down agenda that shattered our economy and hollowed out the wages of middle class, hardworking Americans.

You said it all with that comparison from Clinton to Bush to now President Obama. And I could add to that long list: some 18 million people with health insurance; women having some of the best healthcare opportunities, getting mammograms for those who are under- and uninsured. We are able to have college students stay on their parent's insurance.

So I think when we look at what is happening, there are billions of dollars that they want to do away with in programs. And we can add to that: the \$185 billion from Federal college aid for low-income students or the \$150 billion from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP. Many of my constituents refer to that as their food stamps. And certainly, but for the Congressional Black Caucus, those members on the Agriculture Committee, those Members in leadership fighting for us to restore those dollars, I think it is quite simple.

I think what we are hearing tonight from our members of the Congressional Black Caucus is that they are trying to take us back in history. They are trying to take us back to an era of time, and we are not going to let them do that. We have too much at stake. We have gained so much.

Someone may ask us tonight: Why are we here? Why are we the conscience of the Congress, Mr. Speaker? Why are we here tonight talking about the road to ruin and destruction by not having a congressional budget?

I think the facts speak for themselves. I think that the American public needs to know that this is not something that just affects the Congressional Black Caucus. I want that to be clear. This affects America.

You mentioned it with Mr. CLYBURN's 10-20-30. The fact is more individuals who don't look like members of the Congressional Black Caucus will benefit. And that is the difference between Democrats and Republicans. We care about all people.

They profess to have hearings on poverty, and then when you look at the results of their own budget and what they are doing to those individuals who live in poverty—chuckle we may, clear our voice, Mr. Speaker, as we may—the facts speak for themselves. They are not creating programs that will help us eliminate poverty. And it is as simple as that.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank you for laying that out. And I think history can be judged by objective observers as it relates to fiscal responsibility. But a few facts that perhaps some in the Chamber may have had amnesia about, but maybe it bears going through.

Sequestration and painful budget cuts as it relates to the extreme agenda of some here in the Congress have been brought to us in a manner that has cost us both jobs and the ability to experience accelerated financial growth.

We saw in the aftermath of a severe economic shock the approach that was taken by our friends over in Europe of extreme austerity did not bear financial fruit. It was the stimulus package that was put forth—with not a single vote from anyone on the other side of the aisle—that was actually the financially responsible approach taken to help deal with the train wreck that President Obama inherited and to get the economy back on track.

But, of course, the objective from the very beginning—not my words, but the words of the Senate majority leader on the other side of the Capitol—was to make the President a one-term President.

I just don't even understand the philosophy of a President who takes office, inherits the worst economy since the Great Depression, and the number one agenda is to make sure that he is a one-term President. But that was an unsuccessful political endeavor. He gets a second term.

The first thing that some of my good friends on the other side of the aisle de-

cide to do, as we approach the end of the fiscal year in 2013, was to shut down the government for 16 days. It cost us \$24 billion in lost economic productivity. That is not hyperbole. Those are facts.

And what was it all for?

Because there is this obsession—perhaps clinical in nature—with the Affordable Care Act. This is why we voted more than 50 times to destroy it, defeat it, delay it, and do everything possible to stop it.

What could be possibly wrong with making sure that preexisting conditions don't prevent someone here in the greatest country in the history of the world from being able to get adequate medical care? What is wrong with more than 20 million previously uninsured Americans actually having health care?

Yet, in the budget that apparently is not extreme enough, we would take away the Affordable Care Act.

So these are just some of the facts. I wish we had some more time to explore it. That is not hyperbole. Historians will judge this Presidency and this Congress. I, of course, am of the belief that many will conclude that this is a Congress that has majored in obstruction, minored in dysfunction, and done everything possible to pursue a degree in legislative malpractice to the detriment of the American people. And I am hopeful that we can just get back on track and try to find common ground to do the business of the American people, which is why each and every one of us was sent here to the people's House.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Republican controlled House has once again missed a key deadline when it failed to pass a budget resolution before April 15. Despite promises to the contrary, House Speaker PAUL RYAN has been unable to bring a budget resolution to the floor in a timely fashion. This is simply unacceptable.

Completing a budget resolution is an important step in the budget process that will lay out Congress' spending priorities and create a unified vision for a more prosperous nation. While Democrats have endeavored to work cooperatively with Republicans to pass a comprehensive budget resolution, Speaker RYAN has insisted on pushing a budget that divides our country while further slashing critical investments aimed at strengthening our economy. The Republican budget reflects the needs of only a select few instead of the views and priorities of every American and places the burden of deficit reduction squarely on the backs of middle and working class Americans.

It is clear that our most vulnerable segments of the population—the elderly, minorities, low-income earners, and others—have been most impacted by the Great Recession. Yet this latest Republican budget resolution continues to reflect the failed economic worldview that wealth will trickle down when we give massive tax breaks to the wealthy. Time and time again, history has demonstrated that this is simply untrue.

It is unfortunate that the Republican-controlled Congress today is subjecting millions of

hard-working families to even greater pressures to work longer hours for less pay, while we continue to prop up the wealthiest earners and biggest corporations with tax breaks and other loopholes. The Republican budget exemplifies these principles and drives the wedge deeper between the wealthy and our most vulnerable.

Mr. Speaker, I believe our nation is on a dangerous path under this Republican leadership. Congress should be working to create jobs and increase pay for hard-working American families, not giving additional tax breaks to the wealthy and cutting spending for key social programs. The Republicans have long abandoned their commitment to pass a budget resolution that reflects the needs of all Americans. Thus, I am strongly urging my colleagues to support fiscally sound and morally responsible budget alternatives that will create a level playing field and new opportunities for every American.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK). The Chair would remind Members that remarks in debate may not engage in personalities toward the President, including by repeating remarks made elsewhere that would be improper if spoken in the Member's own words.

RESTORING ARTICLE I CONSTITUTIONAL POWER TO CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on this evening's Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, if Congress does not assert its constitutional authority, we risk becoming obsolete in the eyes of an Executive that would prefer to legislate with a phone and a pen as a replacement for this body.

Thank you to all my colleagues who join me this evening, and may God bless America.

Every day, before Members of Congress meet to conduct official business, we gather to recite the Pledge of Allegiance to the United States of America. We place our right hand over our hearts and promise to our colleagues, our constituents, and all Americans that we will uphold the rule of law.

This very law is the very vehicle that has ensured liberty and justice for all even being a possibility: the rule of law. Unfortunately, this administration seems intent on operating outside the rule of law. It insists upon circumventing Congress by changing laws and legislating from the Oval Office, not from Capitol Hill.

Time and again, the American people have had to bear witness to the blatant disrespect this administration has for

our Constitution. In my heart, I believe this disrespect is on full display in the embattled fight Congress and the American people find themselves in today with the executive branch at the Supreme Court.

This morning, the Supreme Court heard oral arguments in the United States v. Texas case, including 25 other States. To some, this case is simply an argument over whether or not you are pro-illegal immigration. Let me repeat that. You are pro-illegal immigration or not. To others, this case is about keeping families together. To many, like myself, it is about protecting the dignity of our Constitution and the balance of powers within the three branches of government.

The United States v. Texas is about the rule of law and defending the integrity of our great institution of government. We are a constitutional Republic. And yet, the President's mass deferred action on deportation of individuals residing within our country illegally would make it seem more like we are living in a dictatorship.

The Constitution is clear on the issues of legislation. Article I, section 1 explicitly states: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives."

Let that sink in for a moment. "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives."

Article I, section 8, clause 4: "to establish a uniform rule of naturalization." That is solely the responsibility of this body. Take notice of the absence of any reference to the executive office, executive branch, or judicial branch.

Article II, section 3, however, states that the President "shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed." It is referred to as the Take Care Clause. That the laws be faithfully executed, not established, not rewritten, not selectively enforce portions of law, but to take care that the laws are faithfully executed.

□ 2045

That power is still delegated to Congress just as it was over two centuries ago.

If the Supreme Court upholds the administrative executive action, I fear that our Republic—that is the United States—will die. We will see an end of a Nation that started by fending off tyranny. We will see the end of a Nation which has withstood a civil war, two world wars, and countless terrorist attacks.

Terrorists hate the United States simply because of the manner through which we have prospered under the freedoms enshrined in the Constitution.

Again, the success of our Nation is because we are a land and a Nation of laws. I urge all of my colleagues in the

House and the Senate to not falter in their defense of the founding principles upon which this great Nation was built.

Interesting, today, at the Supreme Court, I was there to speak on these very topics. Many pro-illegal immigrants were present, and I found it very interesting they were shouting, demonstrating, exercising freedom of speech, freedom of speech and demonstrating in America, simply because we have a Constitution that protects that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BRAT), my good friend and colleague.

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to discuss the case being heard before the Supreme Court, United States v. Texas, and the President's unconstitutional executive actions on immigration and the need for the restoration of the balance of powers between the branches of government. This case is the challenge to President Obama's executive actions for illegal immigrants, the so-called Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents, otherwise known as DAPA, an expansion of the earlier Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, otherwise known as DACA. The lawsuit was brought by Governors and attorneys general from the Texas Supreme Court and 25 other States. That is significant, in and of itself.

Under these unconstitutional programs, President Obama claims the right to, by executive fiat, make an illegal immigrant "lawfully present." Let me say that again real slow. The President claims, by right, by executive fiat, to make an illegal immigrant "lawfully present" in the United States and eligible to receive a work permit after an application is reviewed and a fee is paid. This is straight out of "1984."

The language is upside down. The government is handing out work permits and making illegal immigrants eligible to work in the United States as well as receive Social Security, unemployment, and disability benefits. But this only hurts American citizens and taxpayers.

What has Congress done about this? Not enough.

The real issue in this case is not discretion, but whether or not there is any limit at all on Presidential power.

The Founders recognized these distinctions, and they made Congress the first branch among equals of the Federal Government and the most accountable branch to the American people—and thus, Article I, not II. The Congress is Article I.

The Founders created a system of checks and balances to ensure no individual could gain absolute power within the government without a check, not even George Washington, whom they all loved.

Under our Constitution, the Congress is entrusted with "all legislative powers"—all, including the power "to establish a uniform rule of naturalization."

The Founders drafted the Constitution to clearly state that it is not the President who writes the laws; Congress does. Much of the President's job is to faithfully execute these laws passed by Congress. In fact, neither any immigration law nor the Constitution empowers the Executive to authorize, let alone facilitate, the violation of the laws passed by Congress. The President even acknowledged this 22 times on TV before using his pen and phone to act alone without Congress.

This imbalance of powers is a threat to self-government itself. Our inaction, time and again, has expanded the administrative state and left the American people without a voice in Washington. The Presidential elections on both sides of the aisle are making this abundantly clear.

For starters, we can advocate for reforms in four principled areas: reclaiming Congress' power of the purse, reforming executive-empowering legislative "cliffs," restoring congressional authority over regulations and regulators, and reining in executive discretion.

I have sponsored simple legislation to do just that: return power back to Congress. I introduced a bill to reform this process with the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, USCIS, the primary agency for implementing the President's immigration executive order.

USCIS funds itself through application fees, which insulates it from the will of the American people as expressed through their Representatives in Congress. Congress cannot effectively exercise its powers through the appropriations process to perform basic oversight functions and ensure the agency is executing the laws faithfully.

My proposal, the Use Spending for Congressional Immigration Supervision, USCIS, Act, will make unaccountable agencies like the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services accountable to Congress and, therefore, accountable to the American people. Putting USCIS on appropriations ensures that unelected bureaucrats are held accountable and provides transparency for how the Federal Government is raising and spending your money.

Congress needs to reassert its power of the purse by making agency budgets subject to appropriations, but we cannot stop there. There is more Congress has to do to restore Congress' power to hold the executive branch accountable. The Constitution still gives Congress all its powers. It is up to Congress to step up and start using them.

Mr. YOHO. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. King).

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Florida for organizing this Special Order, for his leadership, for his constitutional convictions, and for the opportunity to address you tonight, Mr. Speaker, here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I am listening to this dialogue that is taking place here on the floor, and this thought occurred to me that, several years ago, our borders are so open and our borders are so porous, and we have a President who has refused to enforce the law. In fact, he sends the message through his executive branch, if you are determined to enforce the law and you are a member of the Border Patrol, you had better find another job. I mean, that came out of the President and his leadership team all the way on down to our Border Patrol agents.

I have been down to the border a good number of times, and I have watched as people come across the border in broad daylight, float across there in a raft. They get unloaded, stand there on the grass on our side of the river, and wait for the Border Patrol to come down with a welcome wagon and say: Would you like to apply for asylum?

And, by the way, one of them was a pregnant lady, and so I am sure by now she has her asylum, or at least that baby is an American citizen.

Our borders are so porous that, in order to illustrate how bad they are, we had James O'Keefe, who went down and put on an Osama bin Laden mask and walked across the border. Nobody bothered him.

There was another individual that thought: I will make a bigger show of it, I will hire a mariachi band, and he rode a circus elephant across the Rio Grande River. That is how bad our border is.

Now, here is how bad our law and our Constitution are. The mariachi band was serenading the Supreme Court today, Mr. Speaker, to try to convince them that we ought to see the Supreme Court rewrite law that Congress has written, that has been signed by a previous President, and every President since then has taken the oath to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

This constitutional balance that we have has seen a Supreme Court rewrite ObamaCare. So now they have the audacity to rewrite the law, and they are the ones that are deciding today, with eight Justices, sadly—sadly, not 9—as to whether or not the President of the United States can do what the Supreme Court did, in other words, rewrite the law.

The President of the United States, 22 times, as the previous speaker, Mr. BRAT, said, told America he doesn't have the constitutional authority to grant the amnesty, the executive amnesty that he did, whether it be DACA or whether it be DAPA. But then, after he deliberated for awhile, he checked his conscience. That didn't bother him. We shouldn't be amazed at that, Mr. Speaker. He already knew the Constitution. He lectured it to us. But what he checked was his politics, and his question was: Can he get away with it? Is there an enforcement capacity that could stop him?

Well, he hadn't met yet Judge Hanen in Texas who, if these Justices in the Supreme Court deadlock 4-4, the President's executive amnesty, at least for DAPA, is going to be stalled for the duration of his administration.

And so this prosecutorial discretion argument before the Court today that the Obama administration very well knew was the center of this case—and that prosecutorial discretion can be conferred on an individual basis only. That was the testimony of Janet Napolitano; and in the first Morton memo document, there were multiple references to an individual basis only. Her testimony was an individual basis only. But even the first document set out four categories, groups of people, whom the law would be waived for, and that is what we are talking about here.

Who writes the law? If the President writes the law, how could we write one that would restrain this President that is out of line? Let's preserve our Constitution, and let's look forward to an appointment to the Supreme Court that actually means it when they take their oath as we do ours.

Mr. YOHO. I thank my colleague from Iowa for such great remarks and your passion and your leadership. It was great to see you in front of the Supreme Court today speaking passionately about this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend from the great State of South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for doing this. I think it is such an important issue.

I think that, as has been mentioned by a couple of speakers now, what is really at play here is a constitutional issue. The Founding Fathers were so emphatically clear that there were to be three different pieces of pie. There was to be an executive branch that administered the law, a legislative branch that created it, and a judicial branch that interpreted it.

There is this amazing reservoir of common sense that exists out there with the American public. So what people told me back home is this is not about being against somebody from some other place. This is not about being against Hispanics. This is, in fact, about the rule of law and a system that our Founding Fathers gave us more than 200 years ago and how we preserve it. And how we preserve it is by actually sticking to it. Ultimately, the issue has less to do with immigration than it does to do with this larger notion of common sense and rule of law.

I would also stress the common sense part. I remember back in the O.J. Simpson trial, there was this whole notion of, if the glove doesn't fit, you can't acquit. In this case, the glove doesn't fit from the standpoint of common sense.

I actually had my staff pull up a couple of numbers this afternoon, and I think that they are fascinating, and here is what I mean by that. The num-

bers don't fit with the scale of every other amnesty that has been done for more than the last 50 years.

Think about this. The amnesties that this President has proposed, in total, are about 5½ million people. That is more than all of the cumulative amnesties for the last 53 years, going back all the way to the time of Eisenhower. In fact, the average amnesty was about 32,000 people in size.

We have all always been a Nation that has been welcoming; we have included other people. So if you look back at the El Salvadorans that Clinton and Bush allowed in, based on civic conflict and real civil war down that way, if you look at the Persian Gulf evacuees, if you look at the—my eyesight is getting so bad, I need to get glasses. If you look at the Chinese, after Tiananmen Square, if you were to look at Soviet refugees, if you look at the Ethiopians, the Lithuanians, even going back to the war orphans at the time of Eisenhower, there has been a remarkable case when amnesties were judged okay by this Congress, okay by the American people, okay by the President because of scale, 32,000 people, on average, per amnesty, for 53 years.

Again, this President's amnesty dwarfs the total amnesties of all Presidents over the last 53 years, and, for that reason, the American public has reacted as it has saying this just doesn't fit.

The other thing that I think is interesting, going back to the notion of sheer scale and the ways in which this particular amnesty that the President has proposed is at odds with every other for the last 53 years, is, if you were to add up the cumulative amnesties of this President, you would be in the top 20 States in the United States of America—5.5 million people. That is well above the population of South Carolina; it is well above the population of Alabama. Or go down about another 30 States, wherein you would have a de facto new State added that would be more than midway in the graph of all States in this country. It doesn't fit.

A third point that I would make, and I think this is a fascinating one that my staff pulled, is that if you look at all those amnesties I was just talking about over the last 53 years, they have really fallen into a couple of baskets, the one big amnesty being back in 1986 which, ultimately, went through this Congress. It was, in fact, as a consequence of the act of Congress and the will of the American public. That was a big one. But the other one was the Adjustment Act of 1966, which goes back to the plight of the Cuban people and trying to do something about that.

The other one has been a basket of natural disaster, of political strife, of family reunification. That has been a basket. And then there has been a basket for refugees. But never before have we had a basket that was about a political objective as opposed to a reaction

to an external event. We have had a long list of external events over 53 years that is at odds with what we see taking place.

So not only is this important from the standpoint of the Constitution and the rule of law, as has been so eloquently stated thus far, it is something that doesn't fit common sense from the standpoint of scale.

And there is one last point. There is a financial cost to this. The Cato Institute estimated that you are looking at about \$14,000 per household. If you multiply that times the number of refugees that the President is talking about here, you are looking at about \$19 billion in cost. That is about two-thirds of the dustup we have had over the budget. You are talking about \$30 billion. Is the number 1070 or 1040? A \$30 billion difference. In this case, two-thirds of that total would be taken care of just with this question of amnesty that is before us tonight which you, again, have brought, and I very, very much appreciate you doing so.

Mr. YOHO. I thank my colleague from the great State of South Carolina for those—I mean, those are great numbers that really illustrate the significance and the large amount of numbers that we are dealing with.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from the State of Arizona, Dr. PAUL GOSAR.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO) for his leadership on this issue and for organizing this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken many times right here on the House Floor about upholding the rule of law. Whether it be about a lawless Attorney General who tried to cover up a gunrunning operation, or a rogue IRS Director illegally targeting innocent Americans, or a President attempting to enact amnesty by executive action, ensuring that the Federal Government is held accountable for its lawlessness has been one of my top priorities as an elected Representative to the people's House. And while the concept of equal application of the law may not seem like it needs any explanation, I would like to speak to the heart of why upholding the rule of law is so fundamental.

Our laws seek to incentivize Americans to behave responsibly and to impose consequences when they don't. This is the fundamental contract woven into the fabric of our Republic. It is a concept envisioned by our Founding Fathers, not only to protect the individual rights of every man, woman, and child, but also to prohibit executive overreach from an intrusive Federal Government.

Former Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis captured these principles best when he stated: "In a government of laws, existence of the government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. Our Government is the potent, the omnipresent teacher. For good or for ill, it teaches the whole

people by its example. Crime is contagious. If the Government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for the law; it invites every man to become a law unto himself; it invites anarchy."

Sadly, we are witnessing what happens when the Federal Government becomes a lawbreaker and breeds contempt for the law—anarchy. The Obama administration has created an immigration crisis as a result of its failure to enforce Federal immigration laws on the books.

The nonpartisan Congressional Research Service reported just last week that 2016 could set another record for the number of unaccompanied alien children crossing our southern border, and that from 2011 to 2014, unaccompanied alien children increased by 1,200 percent. Also last week, 1,000 Cuban aliens stormed the Costa Rica-Panama border demanding to pass so they could continue their journey to enter the United States illegally.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution gives Congress clear jurisdiction on immigration matters, and President Obama's executive actions on immigration clearly infringe on that authority. The President even admitted that fact 22 times previously when he stated he did not have the authority to take the executive actions he ultimately ended up taking.

□ 2100

Justice Kennedy rightfully pointed out today that DAPA is a legislative act, not an administrative act. Thus, its creation is unconstitutional, and the Supreme Court should uphold the lower court's ruling that halted Obama's illegal actions.

What incentive do Americans have to follow the rule of law themselves if they have no faith that their government will do the same? How can lawmakers ask immigrants seeking to migrate lawfully to our country to follow these rules when this President so blatantly violates those same rules?

Unfortunately, if we don't take bold action now to hold the President accountable for his lawlessness, we risk permanently damaging the integrity of all our laws beyond all repair.

The good news is there is a solution. The House must utilize our power of the purse to block any and all funding for the President's executive amnesty orders.

I am attempting to do just that and recently spearheaded an appropriations rider supported by 35 of my colleagues to block funding for all executive actions on immigration dating back to 2011.

Returning to the rule of law begins with the House enforcing its own constitutional power of the purse. We must fundamentally reject the President's legacy of lawlessness and renew the faith that we all place in the rule of law.

Mr. YOHO. I thank my colleague for such wise words of wisdom.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from the State of Colorado, Mr. KEN BUCK.

Mr. BUCK. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration somehow missed the class in civics about separation of powers, checks and balances, and so many other issues from our Constitution. Thankfully, the Supreme Court can offer some remedial education when it decides the case *United States v. Texas*.

The facts of the case are simple. The President's executive action on immigration is downright illegal. He bypassed Congress, even though the Constitution explicitly states that the legislative branch has the power to establish a uniform rule of naturalization.

This administration uses the excuse of prosecutorial discretion. As a prosecutor for 25 years, I can tell you this isn't true. When his executive order creates a new special class for millions of people in the United States, this isn't a case-by-case use of discretion. It is a blanket rulemaking, and it is rulemaking that directly contradicts the wishes of Congress.

All three branches of government agree that these actions are illegal. Courts have already issued an injunction against the rule.

Congress submitted a friend-of-the-court brief highlighting its proper role, and the President himself knows it would be unconstitutional to bypass Congress and create his own immigration laws. He said so many times. For some reason, he still went ahead and issued the executive order.

Real people feel real consequences when we put the Constitution through the paper shredder. The President's actions will lead to devastating new costs for States. Our healthcare system, our judicial and law enforcement systems, and our education system will all be strained as they try to accommodate the President's unconstitutional orders.

The judicial branch has a chance to stand up to executive overreach in this case and reassert congressional power. I hope the Court rules correctly because the fate of the Republic hangs in the balance.

Mr. YOHO. Words spoken so true, and I appreciate that. The Constitution and the sovereignty of this Nation is what is at stake here, along with the institution itself.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend, Mr. JODY B. HICE from the State of Georgia.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. I am grateful to my colleague from Florida for yielding this time.

Mr. Speaker, today the United States Supreme Court heard oral arguments on what certainly has every potential of being one of the most important cases of our time. Of course, we are talking about a case involving an unprecedented and inexplicable expansion of powers by the President.

We all remember in November 2014 when President Obama, fresh from, I might add, losing midterm elections, announced his executive decision to

grant amnesty to some 5 million illegal immigrants.

Immediately 26 States, my home State of Georgia being one of them, quickly moved to challenge this President's decision in the courts.

Those States rightly and correctly argued that they were being forced by the Federal Government to bear the costly burden of this President's abuse of power.

So after months of legal wrangling in the lower courts, now we watch United States v. Texas being considered in the High Court.

We watched this being put on in the Supreme Court, and I am hopeful, as many of my colleagues, all of us here tonight, that the rulings from the lower courts will stand and that, ultimately, this President's executive amnesty will be ruled for what it is, a clear violation of the Constitution.

That is what we are dealing with tonight, a violation of the Constitution, specifically article II, section 3, the faithful execution clause.

Many ask: What is that? Basically, that clause requires the President to enforce the laws of the land. Is it too much to ask for the President to enforce the laws of the land as written by Congress and interpreted by the courts?

This President has turned that upside down. He has turned our Constitution on its head with his own legislative policies from the executive office and the abuse of executive authority.

Many of us here have voted multiple times to oppose many of the President's unconstitutional actions, and I have cosponsored many bills trying to deal specifically with his planned amnesty program.

Going forward, now we have the Supreme Court case before us, and we all hope that they will see that what the President has done is a direct, gross violation of our Constitution.

Again, I want to thank my friend from Florida, Congressman YOHO, for putting together this Special Order.

Mr. YOHO. I would like to thank my colleague from Georgia for participating.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, our institution of law is threatened more today than ever before. All evil or tyranny needs to succeed or for a constitutional republic to fail is for good men and women to be complacent and do nothing.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friends, as led by our

friend, Congressman TED YOHO from Florida, and our friend from Georgia, Brother Hice. We heard great comments from Dr. GOSAR and our friend, STEVE KING, from Iowa.

These are deeply troubling times, and the Supreme Court taking up United States v. Texas really accentuates that issue. Sometimes it is nice to just pause and pay tribute to folks, for example, a beautiful couple here.

It is a pastor. His name is Pastor Jesse Estrada Sabillon and his wife, Maria Sabillon. They are with their granddaughter in this picture. They are a beautiful couple. You can feel the love emanating from the picture.

Pastor Jesse Estrada Sabillon was a Baptist minister at Nuevo Amanecer Baptist Church of Houston in the Cloverleaf area. He was an excellent carpenter. He owned a home remodeling business, J J & Sons Remodeling. His wife, Maria,—you can tell she loves her granddaughter—was a retired home caregiver for children with special needs. They were a beautiful couple.

Mr. Sabillon never accepted a salary from the church and instead relied upon his job as a carpenter to feed his family. So it appears that Pastor Sabillon was working and acting in the vein of the Apostles Peter and Paul. Particularly Paul didn't want to be a burden to others. So he made tents, sewed, and did whatever he needed to so that he wasn't a burden to others.

Instead of being a burden to others, Pastor Sabillon and his wife, Maria, were a blessing to Texas. They were a blessing to the Houston area and to so many whom they helped, the special needs kids that Maria helped with.

□ 2115

It appears that Jesse, Pastor Sabillon, was doing what Jesus said to do, to be a light to others, to be salt to the world, to administer to others' needs, or as Jesus told Peter, "If you love me, you will tend my flock." Well, Pastor Sabillon did that and, apparently, did that very well.

This story, April 15: "Alexis De Larosa Sosa, 21, is a Mexican national who entered the United States illegally, HCSO"—apparently Harris County Sheriff's Office—"public information officer Ryan Sullivan confirmed in a phone interview with Breitbart Texas.

"His intake"—by this he means, Alexis De Larosa Sosa—"form says: U.S. citizen, no; alien status, illegal . . . De Larosa Sosa was wanted in connection with a street racing crash where Pastor Jesse Estrada Sabillon, and his wife, Maria Sabillon, were killed. The couple was driving home Tuesday night after visiting their niece who had just given birth to a baby when they were struck by the truck.

"The suspect is reported to have fled the scene following the crash and did not turn himself in until Friday morning about 10 a.m. local time.

"He was allegedly driving a 2006 Chevy pickup truck and was said to be

racing with a dark-colored Dodge Challenger or Charger, the Houston Chronicle reported on Wednesday. The two vehicles were said to be racing along the Sam Houston Tollway feeder road when De Larosa Sosa is reported to have run a red light, striking the 2004 BMW 330 driven by Sabillon. The couple were both pronounced dead at the scene of the crash. De Larosa Sosa is said to have fled the scene on foot. The driver of the Dodge fled the scene in his vehicle.

"Officials with the Harris County Sheriff's Office quickly notified the family of the pastor who expressed relief at the news," talking about the apprehension of the suspect.

"De Larosa Sosa is currently processing into the Harris County jail and has not yet made a court appearance. He is expected to be charged in connection with the two homicides and fleeing the scene of the fatal accident."

We know there are some wonderful people who have come into this country illegally. There have been. But there is no question that criminals have taken advantage of the situation to cross our border, since it has been porous, and to inflict crime on people of the United States. There should be little doubt about that.

And then we have this story from the Washington Free Beacon: "Number of Children Illegally Crossing Border Up 1,200 Percent Between 2011 and 2014." Ironically, it just happens to be, as people were finding out south of our border and in other parts of the world, that if you make it into the United States illegally, then you are probably going to stay. Odds are 97 percent you will stay.

As border patrolmen have told me, drug cartels across our southern border call our Border Patrol, our Homeland Security, the logistics, and they laughingly say if they get people illegally into the country, then Homeland Security is the logistics that ships them wherever they want them to go in the country.

As I have seen a number of times in the middle of the night as people are being processed, and like, for example, the one older lady who was asked how much she paid, some would say \$6,000, some would say \$7,000, \$5,000, or \$8,000.

On a number of occasions, a border patrolman has challenged them: Where did you get that kind of money? You don't have that kind of money.

It normally took repeated questioning to elicit an answer: Well, I paid \$1,800 from family in this place, some people sent \$2,000 from the United States, and I am going to pay the rest by working it off in the United States.

They tell them where they want to go. Amazingly, Homeland Security has shipped people that have come into the country illegally all over the country. We have reports about Mexican drug distribution in all of our major cities. When you know that Homeland Security is shipping people that still owe the drug cartels money into different

cities, it is not hard to figure out how they are getting some of their less than happy workers helping them with their drug distribution.

This article from Adam Kredo says in this Washington Free Beacon: “The number of children apprehended on the U.S. border attempting to immigrate illegally has surged more than 1,200 percent since 2011, and the number of these children crossing the border during 2016 could be another record, according to a newly released government report.

“The number of unaccompanied alien children (UACs) illegally crossing the U.S. border ‘has increased sharply’ since 2011, with a surge of more than 1,200 percent just between 2011 and 2014, according to the Congressional Research Service. The agency also disclosed that the flow is increasing significantly in the first 5 months of fiscal 2016.

“The illegal immigration of these children hit record-breaking numbers in 2014, with U.S. officials apprehending more than 52,000 alien children. Nearly 20,000 have been apprehended within the first 5 months of 2016, setting the stage for another potentially record-breaking year.

“This unexpected surge of children strained U.S. Government resources and created a complex crisis of humanitarian implications,” the report said. “They increased in the first 5 months of FY 2016, however, and experts warn that significant migration flows will continue until policymakers in the countries of origin and the international community address the poor socioeconomic and security conditions driving Central Americans to leave their homes.”

That is interesting, but I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that actually they will continue to surge as long as they are led to believe by the administration, and the evidence continues to indicate, that they will be allowed to stay in America, we will send them where they may claim to have relatives or where the drug cartels tell them to request to be sent.

Just in the last few weeks, spending some days and nights on our border, our southern border, it is heart-breaking what you see because there are people that clearly want a better way of life. They are leaving the country of origin because their countries do not enforce the rule of law. There is graft, there is corruption, and the rule of law, the law is not evenly and fairly supported and enforced across the board. Therefore, the jobs aren't there.

There are more opportunities here in the United States. Although we have breakdowns, we do try to enforce the law more evenly than, I would submit, anywhere in the world, at least until more recently when this administration makes exceptions of millions of people who are assured that they can violate the law with impunity and will be awarded for it.

People come from countries where there is no equality under the law and

they come to this country, as soon as they get here, for those of us that were out in front of the Supreme Court today, being shouted down by people who are angry, many of them shouting in Spanish—fine—but we were told that people in their positions were all in the shadows.

Now, I did see some people lounging around under a few trees, but most of them were not in the shadows. They were, in fact, on the steps of the Supreme Court right there in front yelling and screaming and showing disrespect for the U.S. national anthem and yelling, trying to prevent freedom of speech.

It is just really interesting, seeing posters like “Jesus was an immigrant.” Well, sort of, but he never violated the law. He never encouraged anyone else to violate the law. In fact, he urged people to go forth and do wrong no more, but that is not the case.

The great and really tragic irony of what is taking place is people coming to America illegally demanding that the laws not be properly enforced, not be fairly enforced. Sure, there have been millions and millions and millions and millions of Americans who have come through our system legally, but we are the millions that did not come legally and we demand to have the same treatment as if we did come legally.

If we do that, it will not be long before we will be in the same shape as the countries these people fled from because there is not adequate opportunities. Since there is not adequate room for the billion or so that we have been told may want to come to America around the world, it would be far better to encourage their nations to end graft and corruption, to treat people fairly across the board.

Here is an article from the Center for Immigration Studies. It says: “The criminal aliens released by ICE in these years, who had already been convicted of thousands of crimes, are responsible for a significant crime spree in American communities, including 124 aliens charged with 135 new homicides. Inexplicably, ICE is choosing to release some criminal aliens multiple times.”

These are people that not only came into the country illegally, but have committed crimes multiple times, many of them, while they are here. At least they have certainly been charged with them.

“A total of 121 criminal aliens who were freed by ICE over the 5-year period between 2010 and 2014 were subsequently charged with homicide-related crimes within that time frame. Three more were charged in 2015. These 121 accused murderers were associated with 250 different communities in the United States, with the most clustered in California, New York, and Texas.

“These aliens were charged with a total of 135 homicide-related crimes after release. Two of them had homi-

cide-related convictions even before they were released. These aliens had 464 criminal convictions prior to release by ICE.

“Another three aliens who were released by ICE during that time were charged with homicides during the first 10 months of FY 2015 . . . this tally does not include aliens who were released by sanctuary jurisdictions, nor those aliens that were released by local law enforcement agencies after ICE declined to take them into custody due to Obama administration prioritization policies. This list includes only those aliens that ICE arrested and then released.”

□ 2130

“The names of the criminal aliens were redacted by the Judiciary Committee, but the list presumably includes murderers like Apolinar Altamirano, an illegal alien who was arrested by ICE in 2013 following his conviction on local charges involving a burglary and abduction, but who was released on a \$10,000 bond and permitted to remain free and elect to have deportation proceedings that would take years to complete. In January 2015, Altamirano shot and killed 21-year-old Grant Ronnebeck while he was working at a convenience store where Altamirano had come to buy cigarettes.

“ICE has previously disclosed that 75 percent of the homicidal criminal aliens were released due to court orders, including the so-called Zadvydas cases in which the aliens’ home countries would not take them back. The rest were released by ICE’s choice.”

The article also points out: “In 2014, ICE released a total of 30,558 criminal aliens from its custody. These aliens had already been convicted of 92,347 crimes before they were released by ICE.

“As of July 25, 2015, a total of 1,895 aliens have been charged with a crime after being freed by ICE.

“In a separate communication, ICE provided a list of countries that currently are uncooperative in accepting their deported citizens: Afghanistan, Algeria, Burundi, Cape Verde, China, Cuba, Eritrea, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Sudan, and Zimbabwe.”

We have the power to force these countries to either take back their citizens who have come illegally into this country or who are illegally in this country—particularly if they have committed crimes in this country—or have consequences. Instead, this administration chooses to provide benefits to countries like Iran and Afghanistan. For goodness sake. Make sure they are running Christians and Jews out of Afghanistan, but shouldn't they at least take back their own people?

I was told by one of the leaders in Afghanistan—this is a few years ago—that their budget was around \$12 billion a year. They only provided about

\$1.5 billion. All the rest came from other countries, and most of that was from the United States. If they won't take their people back, then shut the government down. They will take their people back. This is ridiculous.

Also, an important point was made in this article.

"As of July 25, 2015, only about 3 percent of the 30,558 criminal aliens freed by ICE in 2014 have been removed . . . ICE reports that 28,017 still had a pending immigration case as of July 25, 2015," but some of them don't show up for their hearings. Many don't. The largest percentage do not. They are just given notices to appear.

"Recent National Gang Unit-led operations include—" and this is from a different article, from the article: "ICE Arrests More Than 1,100 in Operation Targeting Gangs." It talks about all of the efforts to capture gangs. Let's see. "Of the 1,133 arrests, 915 were gang members and associates; 1,001 were charged with criminal offenses; and 132 were arrested . . ." It is just more and more numbers of drugs, firearms, currency. Again, about 3 percent, apparently, is all they are removing of those who are committing crimes in the country.

Jessica Vaughan, from a year ago, had an article from May 28: "The Non-Deported: ICE Still Releasing Criminal Aliens at a Rapid Pace."

She documents, according to this article: "The majority of convicted criminal releases occurred because of Obama administration policies that require ICE officers to let the offenders go. In some cases, judges will allow aliens to be released after a bond hearing, but the conditions are usually set by ICE, and ICE attorneys say that they have been instructed not to vigorously contest an alien's request for release," which brings us back to the Sabillons. My Christian brother and my Christian sister are gone; and we don't enforce our immigration laws as the oath taken by those in this administration require.

I want to finish up by mentioning again about my being on the border. I was so struck. Texas has utilized and provided massive amounts of money to try to help us defend our border. The number one area through which people are coming into the United States moved some years back from Arizona to the McAllen corridor into Texas. I had occasion to be on a DPS boat with fantastic DPS officers. They had fantastic equipment that they were able to utilize to spot people who were clearly getting ready—behind bushes and whatnot—to cross the Rio Grande, from the Mexico side, into the U.S. It appeared, clearly, that some of them were just people who were going to be brought across, and some were carrying things. Maybe they were drugs. We don't really know.

After we had spotted these folks when we were cruising down the river on the DPS boat—and there were a couple of Border Patrol boats that were

much smaller, and there were other assets that allowed them to focus once we identified where these people were so that the Federal Border Patrol would know—and after we stayed silent for a while, we finally got a radio message from the Border Patrol that asked us to go ahead and return back to the dock way on down the river so that they could try to intercept these folks. Fine, because I know, if the Department of Public Safety sees a raft coming across, they will stop them. They do destroy the raft, which, as I understand, gets the coyote in trouble with the drug lord who sent him with the raft with people who had paid money to get them across. So the DPS would do that.

They said: Why don't you go ahead. They are waiting for you to leave the area. Then we can interdict. We can catch them red-handed.

It turns out that is exactly what they did. We spent massive amounts of money and effort in spotting people before they came across the river illegally. Whether it was bringing drugs, whether it was people coming across, we knew where they were. We spotted them, and we directed the Border Patrol to them. I say "we." It is our Department of Public Safety people in Texas. We got word: That is exactly what they were waiting for. They came across after you left the area, and now we are in-processing them into the United States.

We have the power to secure our border, but this administration has no will, and that is why unaccompanied children are up 1,200 percent. I have seen tiny, little girls, who couldn't have been more than 3 or 4, just in the last trip down, in the days I spent down there. Girls like them say: Oh, I am unaccompanied.

I guarantee you they did not cross that river unaccompanied. They did not come 1,000 miles unaccompanied across Mexico. They were accompanied. Thank God they were not sold into sex trafficking as so many have been.

When we in the United States, as I have been told by African friends—some of whom I have seen in the last month—say we are the hope of the world and when we don't follow the law, when we don't enforce the law, when we don't enforce our own laws, the world suffers. As Christians in Africa have told me: We know where we go when we die, but our only hope of having a peaceful life is if America stays strong.

We haven't done that. Christians are now being persecuted in greater numbers than ever in history. Jews are being persecuted again as if we are headed toward a new holocaust.

It is time for American leaders who have taken an oath to the United States Constitution and to this country to realize: to whom much is given, from them much will be required. There is going to be a day of judgment on America if we don't rise to the occa-

sion and use what we have been blessed with.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. JACKSON LEE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in the district.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of unforeseen circumstances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 284. An act to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons responsible for gross violations of internationally recognized human rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs; 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.

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. 1670. An act to direct the Architect of the Capitol to place in the United States Capitol a chair honoring American Prisoners of War/Missing in Action.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 19, 2016, 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:

5057. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Sanitary Transportation of Human and Animal Food [Docket No.: FDA-2013-N-0013] (RIN: 0910-AG98) received April 14, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5058. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final order — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of AH-7921 into Schedule I [Docket No.: DEA-432] received April 13, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5059. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Administrative Actions for Noncompliance; Lesser Administrative Actions [Docket No.: FDA-2015-N-5052] received April 14, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5060. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's Revision 0 to Regulatory Guide 3.75 — Corrective Action Programs for Fuel Cycle Facilities received April 14, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5061. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's Revision 2 of Regulatory Guide 8.20 — Applications of Bioassay for Radioiodine received April 14, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5062. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's Revision 2 of Regulatory Guide 8.22 — Bioassay at Uranium Mills received April 14, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5063. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's Revision 3 to Regulatory Guide 4.7 — General Site Suitability Criteria for Nuclear Power Stations received April 14, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5064. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's Revision 2 to Regulatory Guide 3.50 — Standard Format and Content for a Specific License Application for an Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation or Monitored Retrievable Storage Facility received April 14, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5065. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment and Class D and Class E Airspace; Wilmington, OH [Docket No.: FAA-2015-7486; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AGL-26] received April 13, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5066. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Rule To List Eleven Distinct Population Segments of the Green Sea Turtle (*Chelonia mydas*) as Endangered or Threatened and Revision of Current Listings Under the Endan-

gered Species Act [Docket No.: 120425024-6232-06] (RIN: 0648-XB089) received April 14, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5067. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Rapid City, SD [Docket No.: FAA-2015-7492; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AGL-27] received April 13, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5068. 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 Michigan towns; Alpena, MI; and Muskegon, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2015-7483; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AGL-23] received April 13, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5069. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International Inc. (Type Certificate Previously Held by AlliedSignal Inc., Garrett Turbine Engine Company) Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2015-2208; Directorate Identifier 2015-NE-19-AD; Amendment 39-18447; AD 2016-07-02] received April 13, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5070. 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-2015-6537; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-154-AD; Amendment 39-18457; AD 2016-07-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 13, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5071. 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-2014-1047; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-157-AD; Amendment 39-18449; AD 2016-07-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 13, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5072. 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-2016-5038; Directorate Identifier 2016-NM-029-AD; Amendment 39-18455; AD 2016-07-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 13, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5073. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Weatherly Aircraft Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-5422; Directorate Identifier 2016-CE-011-AD; Amendment 39-18456; AD 2016-07-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 13, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5074. 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-2015-3983; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-141-AD; Amendment 39-18448; AD 2016-07-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 13, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5075. 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-2016-5033; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-118-AD; Amendment 39-18450; AD 2016-07-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 13, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5076. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation (Sikorsky) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3942; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-064-AD; Amendment 39-18446; AD 2016-07-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 13, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5077. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-4212; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-010-AD; Amendment 39-18451; AD 2016-07-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 13, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5078. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D Airspace for Bartow, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2016-4239; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ASO-4] received April 13, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5079. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class D and Class E Airspace, and Amendment of Class E Airspace; Lake City, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2015-4010; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ASO-11] received April 13, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5080. 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-2012-0187; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-094-AD; Amendment 39-18452; AD 2016-07-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 13, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5081. 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-2016-5036; Directorate Identifier

2015-NM-180-AD; Amendment 39-18453; AD 2016-07-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 13, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5082. A letter from the Staff Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Glazing Standards [Docket No.: FRA-2012-0103, Notice No. 2] (RIN: 2130-AC43) received April 13, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); 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. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4885. A bill to require that user fees collected by the Internal Revenue Service be deposited into the general fund of the Treasury; with an amendment (Rept. 114-498). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1206. A bill to prohibit the hiring of additional Internal Revenue Service employees until the Secretary of the Treasury certifies that no employee of the Internal Revenue Service has a seriously delinquent tax debt; with an amendment (Rept. 114-499). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 3724. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service from rehiring any employee of the Internal Revenue Service who was involuntarily separated from service for misconduct; with an amendment (Rept. 114-500). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BRADY of Texas: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4890. A bill to impose a ban on the payment of bonuses to employees of the Internal Revenue Service until the Secretary of the Treasury develops and implements a comprehensive customer service strategy; with an amendment (Rept. 114-501). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STIVERS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 687. A Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1206) to prohibit the hiring of additional Internal Revenue Service employees until the Secretary of the Treasury certifies that no employee of the Internal Revenue Service has a seriously delinquent tax debt, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4885) to require that user fees collected by the Internal Revenue Service be deposited into the general fund of the Treasury (Rept. 114-502). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 688. A Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4890) to impose a ban on the payment of bonuses to employees of the Internal Revenue Service until the Secretary of the Treasury develops and implements a comprehensive customer service strategy, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3724) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service who was involuntarily separated from service for misconduct (Rept. 114-503). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ASHFORD (for himself, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 4975. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5720 South 142nd Street in Omaha, Nebraska, as the "Petty Officer 1st Class Caleb A. Nelson Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself and Mr. LANCE):

H.R. 4976. A bill to require the Commissioner of Food and Drugs to seek recommendations from an advisory committee of the Food and Drug Administration before approval of certain new drugs that are opioids without abuse-deterrent properties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 4977. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure that each medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs complies with requirements relating to scheduling veterans for health care appointments, to improve the uniform application of directives of the Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia (for himself, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. POLIQUIN, and Mr. WOMACK):

H.R. 4978. A bill to require the Government Accountability Office to submit to Congress a report on neonatal abstinence syndrome (NAS) in the United States and its treatment under Medicaid; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 4979. A bill to foster civilian research and development of advanced nuclear energy technologies and enhance the licensing and commercial deployment of such technologies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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. EMMER of Minnesota (for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. COOK, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 4980. A bill to require the National Instant Criminal Background Check System to make a final disposition of requests to correct its records within 60 days, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCSHON (for himself and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 4981. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to improve access to opioid use disorder treatment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 4982. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to evaluate and

report on the in-patient and outpatient treatment capacity, availability, and needs of the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 4983. A bill to provide information to prescribers in Federally qualified health centers and facilities of the Indian Health Service on best practices for prescribing naloxone; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 4984. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit the Secretary of the Army to produce, treat, manage, and use natural gas located under Fort Knox, Kentucky, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself and Miss RICE of New York):

H.R. 4985. A bill to amend the Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act to protect classified information in Federal court challenges; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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 Ms. MCCOLLUM (for herself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 4986. A bill to establish the Sewall-Beimont House National Historic Site as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. YOHO, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. MICA, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. JOLLY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CUREBELO of Florida, and Ms. ROSLEHTINEN):

H.R. 4987. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3957 2nd Avenue in Laurel Hill, Florida, as the "Sergeant First Class William 'Kelly' Lacey Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 4988. A bill to restore protections for Social Security, Railroad retirement, and Black Lung benefits from administrative offset; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ROSLEHTINEN (for herself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 4989. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require States to provide cranial prostheses under the Medicaid program when a physician finds such treatment necessary for individuals affected by diseases and medical conditions that cause hair loss; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 4990. A bill to improve transparency in charity regulation; to the Committee on

Ways and Means, 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. TURNER (for himself and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 4991. A bill to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice to establish the offense of retaliation, to improve military justice case management, data collection, and the accessibility of such data, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. LEE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H. Res. 686. A resolution expressing support for efforts to enhance Israeli security and create the conditions for progress toward a negotiated two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Mr. DONOVAN):

H. Res. 689. A resolution expressing condolences to and support for the people of Ecuador following the devastating earthquake on April 16, 2016; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HONDA:

H. Res. 690. A resolution recognizing and celebrating April as "National Bilingual/Multilingual Learner Advocacy Month"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ASHFORD:

H.R. 4975.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7: "The Congress shall have power . . . to establish Post Offices and Post Roads."

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 4976.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 4977.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia:

H.R. 4978.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 4979.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. EMMER of Minnesota:

H.R. 4980.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Due Process clause of the Fifth Amendment.

Additional authority derives from Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (The Congress shall have Power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States and within the Indian Tribes"), Article I, Section 8, 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"), and Article III, Section 1 ("The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good Behaviour, and shall, at stated Times, receive for their Services, a Compensation, which shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office.")

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 4981.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 4982.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 4983.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 4984.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 12: "The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the common Defence" and "To raise and support Armies."

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 4985.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 4986.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the power "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers."

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 4987.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 4988.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 4989.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 4990.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 4991.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 12, 13, 14, and 18 of the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 140: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 228: Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 303: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. GALLEG0.

H.R. 333: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 402: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 428: Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 556: Mr. BRIDENSTONE.

H.R. 563: Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 592: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 649: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 664: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. TAKAI, and Mr. HINES.

H.R. 793: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 836: Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 865: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 885: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 911: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 921: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. JOYCE.

H.R. 923: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.

H.R. 953: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 954: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 969: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 1116: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 1130: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1151: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 1197: Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 1200: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1220: Mr. JONES, Mr. YOHO, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. TAKAI, and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 1331: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 1336: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 1399: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 1427: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. SARBANES, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1488: Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 1538: Mr. MASSIE.

H.R. 1594: Mr. GALLEG0.

H.R. 1655: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. BLUM.

H.R. 1769: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 1859: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TONKO, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 2189: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 2197: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 2218: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2257: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 2350: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2368: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2404: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 2461: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 2500: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2654: Mr. PALLONE and Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 2658: Mr. POLIQUIN and Mr. MCKINLEY.

H.R. 2694: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 2698: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 2726: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TAKAI, and Mr. KING of New York.

- H.R. 2739: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
- H.R. 2799: Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. KEATING.
- H.R. 2817: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. WALZ.
- H.R. 2848: Mr. YOHO.
- H.R. 2894: Mr. CAPUANO.
- H.R. 2903: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. MCCAUL.
- H.R. 2962: Mr. HUFFMAN.
- H.R. 2993: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. HUFFMAN.
- H.R. 3012: Mr. BOUSTANY
- H.R. 3029: Mrs. DINGELL.
- H.R. 3099: Mr. LIPINSKI.
- H.R. 3117: Ms. MOORE and Mr. CONYERS.
- H.R. 3119: Mr. DELANEY, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. BOUSTANY.
- H.R. 3209: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. BOUSTANY.
- H.R. 3235: Mr. COHEN and Mr. DENT.
- H.R. 3280: Mrs. DINGELL.
- H.R. 3308: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. WALZ.
- H.R. 3323: Mr. POCAN.
- H.R. 3326: Mr. HIMES, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BEYER, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. KILMER.
- H.R. 3366: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
- H.R. 3423: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
- H.R. 3463: Mr. COHEN and Mr. LONG.
- H.R. 3487: Mr. VARGAS and Mr. CONYERS.
- H.R. 3643: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
- H.R. 3673: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 3706: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
- H.R. 3742: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 3793: Ms. MOORE and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
- H.R. 3799: Mr. WENSTRUP.
- H.R. 3815: Mr. LYNCH.
- H.R. 3817: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mrs. BEATTY.
- H.R. 3846: Mr. PAULSEN and Ms. DELBENE.
- H.R. 3860: Mr. ALLEN.
- H.R. 3865: Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 3870: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mrs. TORRES.
- H.R. 3948: Mr. DESAULNIER.
- H.R. 3953: Mr. POSEY, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. ROSS, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. GRAHAM, and Mr. DESANTIS.
- H.R. 3978: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
- H.R. 4019: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
- H.R. 4065: Mr. JOLLY and Mr. POSEY.
- H.R. 4144: Ms. ESTY.
- H.R. 4184: Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 4262: Mr. CRAMER.
- H.R. 4278: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. RUSH.
- H.R. 4320: Miss RICE of New York.
- H.R. 4365: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
- H.R. 4374: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 4375: Mr. MASSIE.
- H.R. 4399: Mr. YARMUTH.
- H.R. 4456: Mr. DENT.
- H.R. 4460: Mr. NADLER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. CROWLEY.
- H.R. 4469: Mr. CHAFFETZ.
- H.R. 4481: Mr. CRENSHAW.
- H.R. 4486: Mr. BARR.
- H.R. 4498: Mr. BARR, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. POLIS.
- H.R. 4499: Mr. KEATING and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
- H.R. 4514: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan and Mr. DUFFY.
- H.R. 4519: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
- H.R. 4543: Ms. MOORE.
- H.R. 4553: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
- H.R. 4555: Mr. HUDSON.
- H.R. 4570: Mr. COHEN, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. KILMER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. KEATING.
- H.R. 4575: Mr. MESSER.
- H.R. 4584: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
- H.R. 4586: Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 4599: Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 4614: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. HILL.
- H.R. 4625: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. HASTINGS.
- H.R. 4640: Mr. DOLD.
- H.R. 4653: Mr. HONDA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. POCAN.
- H.R. 4702: Mr. RIGELL.
- H.R. 4708: Mr. DONOVAN and Mr. CICILLINE.
- H.R. 4715: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. BARR, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. PITTENGER.
- H.R. 4740: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
- H.R. 4762: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
- H.R. 4764: Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. HANNA, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. MCCAUL.
- H.R. 4766: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mrs. DINGELL.
- H.R. 4773: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. TROTT, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. LONG, Mr. BUCK, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DENT, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. LATTA.
- H.R. 4775: Mr. GOSAR.
- H.R. 4776: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
- H.R. 4790: Mr. POLIS.
- H.R. 4796: Mrs. CAPPs and Ms. MOORE.
- H.R. 4807: Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 4820: Mr. ROSS.
- H.R. 4860: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. LAMBORN.
- H.R. 4879: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. BASS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mrs. BEATTY.
- H.R. 4893: Ms. LEE.
- H.R. 4897: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
- H.R. 4904: Ms. NORTON, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. MULVANEY.
- H.R. 4907: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
- H.R. 4924: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, and Mr. ROSKAM.
- H.R. 4932: Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 4939: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. LEE.
- H.R. 4941: Mr. GOODLATTE.
- H.R. 4956: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. OLSON, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. MULVANEY.
- H.R. 4961: Mr. ZELDIN.
- H.R. 4963: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
- H.R. 4969: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
- H. Con. Res. 88: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. COOK, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. YOHO.
- H. Con. Res. 105: Mr. WENSTRUP.
- H. Res. 290: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
- H. Res. 561: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
- H. Res. 567: Mr. KING of New York.
- H. Res. 591: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
- H. Res. 650: Mr. RUIZ, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ISSA, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. FATTAH.
- H. Res. 660: Mr. KEATING, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. COOK, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KILMER, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
- H. Res. 679: Mr. COHEN and Miss RICE of New York.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative BRADY, or a designee, to H.R. 4890, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.