

Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Pitts	Smith (MO)
Lummis	Pocan	Smith (NE)
Lynch	Poe (TX)	Smith (NJ)
Maloney, Carolyn	Poliquin	Smith (TX)
Maloney, Sean	Polis	Smith (WA)
Marchant	Pompeo	Speier
Marino	Posey	Stefanik
Matsui	Price (NC)	Stewart
McCarthy	Price, Tom	Stivers
McClintock	Rangel	Stutzman
McCollum	Ratcliffe	Swalwell (CA)
McDermott	Reed	Takai
McGovern	Reichert	Takano
McHenry	Renacci	Thompson (CA)
McKinley	Ribble	Thompson (MS)
McMorris	Rice (NY)	Thompson (PA)
Rodgers	Rice (SC)	Thornberry
McNerney	Richmond	Tiberi
McSally	Rigell	Tipton
Meadows	Roby	Titus
Meehan	Roe (TN)	Tonko
Meeks	Rogers (AL)	Trott
Meng	Rogers (KY)	Tsongas
Messer	Rohrabacher	Turner
Mica	Rokita	Upton
Miller (FL)	Rooney (FL)	Valadao
Miller (MI)	Ros-Lehtinen	Vargas
Moolenaar	Roskam	Veasey
Mooney (WV)	Ross	Vela
Moore	Rothfus	Velázquez
Moulton	Rouzer	Visclosky
Mullin	Roybal-Allard	Wagner
Mulvaney	Royce	Walberg
Murphy (FL)	Ruiz	Walden
Murphy (PA)	Ruppersberger	Walker
Nadler	Rush	Walorski
Napolitano	Russell	Walters, Mimi
Neal	Ryan (OH)	Walz
Neugebauer	Salmon	Waters, Maxine T.
Newhouse	Sánchez, Linda T.	Watson Coleman
Noem	Sanchez, Loretta	Weber (TX)
Nolan	Sanford	Webster (FL)
Norcross	Sarbanes	Welch
Nugent	Schalise	Wenstrup
Nunes	Schakowsky	Westerman
O'Rourke	Schiff	Whitfield
Olson	Schrader	Williams
Palazzo	Schweikert	Wilson (FL)
Pallone	Scott (VA)	Wilson (SC)
Palmer	Scott, Austin	Wittman
Pascrell	Scott, David	Womack
Paulsen	Sensenbrenner	Woodall
Payne	Serrano	Yarmuth
Pearce	Sessions	Yoder
Pelosi	Sherman	Yoho
Perlmutter	Shimkus	Young (AK)
Perry	Shuster	Young (IA)
Peters	Simpson	Young (IN)
Peterson	Sinema	Zeldin
Pingree	Sires	Zinke
	Slaughter	

NAYS—2

Amash

Massie

NOT VOTING—21

Amodoi	Issa	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Jackson Lee	Torres
Eshoo	Jones	Van Hollen
Fattah	Lawrence	Wasserman
Gohmert	MacArthur	Schultz
Gutiérrez	McCaul	Westmoreland
Hahn	Pittenger	
Hanna	Quigley	

□ 1733

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

Mr. McCaul. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, 2016, I missed the following votes:

H.R. 4923—American Manufacturing Competitiveness Act of 2016—“Yea.”

H.R. 699—Email Privacy Act—“Yea.”

S. 1890—Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016—“Yea.”

H.R. 4498—HALOS Act Amendment No. 1—“Nay.”

P.Q.—“Yea.”  
 Rule—“Yea.”  
 MTR—“Nay.”  
 Passage—“Yea.”  
 Had I been present for these votes, with the exception of H.R. 4498 Amendment No. 1 and MTR where I would have voted “nay”, I would have voted “yea” for each.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4901, SCHOLARSHIPS FOR OPPORTUNITY AND RESULTS RE-AUTHORIZATION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 88, DISAPPROVING DEPARTMENT OF LABOR RULE RELATED TO DEFINITION OF THE TERM “FIDUCIARY”; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MAY 2, 2016, THROUGH MAY 9, 2016

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-533) on the resolution (H. Res. 706) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4901) to reauthorize the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 88) disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to the definition of the term “Fiduciary”; and providing for proceedings during the period from May 2, 2016, through May 9, 2016, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

BONNIE SCOTT—PEACE CORPS VICTIM

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, targeted, bullied, and terrorized, these are the words that Bonnie Scott used to describe her dismissal from the Peace Corps.

One month after reported allegations that another U.S. Peace Corps member had harassed and sexually assaulted two local women, Scott was dismissed—interesting. This is not the first time that we have heard of these actions.

In 2015, a report found that one in five Peace Corps volunteers were victims of sexual assault. Half of the victims do not report their attacks. Many state that they were blamed by the Peace Corps for their sexual assaults.

Even though Congress has passed the Kate Puzey Peace Corps Volunteer Protection Act of 2011, the Peace Corps has work to do to protect these amazing ambassadors abroad.

Mr. Speaker, Peace Corps volunteers are the best America has. These volunteers must know that America will protect them overseas. If a crime occurs against them, America will stand by them, not abandon them. And if a crime is committed, they need to know the crime is not their fault; it is the fault of the perpetrator.

And that is just the way it is.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I was detained with a meeting off campus at the White House. I would like to indicate my vote on the Waters amendment. For the Waters amendment, I would have voted “aye”; for final passage of H.R. 4498, Helping Angels Lead Our Startups Act, I would have voted “no”; and for S. 1890, Defend Trade Secrets Act, I would have voted “aye.”

EL DIA DE LOS NINOS: CELEBRATING YOUNG AMERICANS

(Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize April 30 as El Dia de Los Ninos: Celebrating Young Americans.

This holiday serves to honor and celebrate the importance of children in our Nation. El Dia de Los Ninos, which when translated means Day of the Children, helps bring Hispanic families and other communities together nationwide to recognize the importance of literacy and education for all children.

Recognizing this day highlights the growing presence of Hispanic youth in the United States and the lasting impact of Hispanic Americans on the social, political, economic, and cultural fabric of this Nation.

This important holiday is celebrated by numerous countries and more than 130 cities across the United States. In order to support the many cities, counties, States, and communities that already celebrate El Dia de Los Ninos, I will introduce a resolution with Senator BOB MENENDEZ to recognize April 30 as El Dia de Los Ninos: Celebrating Young Americans.

Senator BOB MENENDEZ, Senator JACK REED, and Representative RUBÉN HINOJOSA began the movement to recognize El Dia de Los Ninos 17 years ago. I am committed to continuing their work.

I urge my colleagues to support this important holiday and to join me in co-sponsoring my resolution to recognize April 30 as El Dia de Los Ninos: Celebrating Young Americans.

UNAUTHORIZED SPENDING ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TROTT). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

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 tonight’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, I want to very quickly thank all of the Members who have volunteered their time to speak tonight. I know they are running on a tight schedule, as we all are.

With that in mind, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS), a tireless advocate for conservative values, whose bold leadership, tenacity, and kindness make her one of this body's greatest Members. I would like to thank her for introducing H.R. 4730, the Unauthorized Spending Accountability Act, that is a vitally important piece of legislation that will go a long way in helping to eliminate Federal programs that have not been authorized by Congress, yet somehow still come in to receive appropriations. I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation, and encourage all Members of the House to support it.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for bringing us together this evening. This is a very important discussion. It really goes to what is foundational about America in Article I and the authority that rests in Congress, as outlined in Article I.

I am looking forward to this Special Order and hope that we will continue this discussion in the weeks ahead. But a big thank you to the gentleman from Florida for his leadership and bringing us all together.

In the fall of 2014—so this was right after the Ice Bucket Challenge—Gail Gleason, who is a mom in my district in eastern Washington, had a meeting with me. She was almost in tears because CMS, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, was proposing new rules and regulations that would take away the important communication device for those who have lost their ability to speak, largely impacting a lot of ALS patients. Her son, Dave Gleason, is a football player, a football star. She came to me in desperation because CMS rules were going to take away his communication device.

Do you know what? This is just one of many examples where bureaucrats, arrogant and unaccountable so often and disconnected from their mission, are making rules and regulations outside of the Congress, outside of the vote and of the approval of the elected representatives of the people.

I think about the VA, the Veterans Administration. This is an agency that is dedicated to our veterans. So often our veterans feel like they get lost. Instead of having the red-carpet treatment, they feel like they are given the runaround. They have to wait weeks and weeks, even, just to schedule a simple doctor's appointment.

Recently, the FDA came out with new rules, 400-page menu labeling rules, that for a pizza restaurant would require them to somehow disclose on a menu board the 34 million combina-

tions of pizza. Land management, environmental regulations, threatening to regulate every mud puddle in America from Washington, D.C., and the list goes on and on.

Our Founding Fathers envisioned three branches of government—very important. There was the judicial branch, the legislative branch, and the executive branch. Each one has very important roles. No one person was to be making all of the decisions.

□ 1745

Part of the reason that people in this country are so frustrated today is due to 1600 Pennsylvania. The President has been delegitimizing us as an institution and in our role as Representatives on behalf of the people. Too often, Members of Congress feel like we are bystanders in the process as more and more rules and regulations are generated outside of our input and certainly outside of our approval.

It is interesting to note that the Capitol—the Congress—is really the center of Washington, D.C. Our Founding Fathers, I think, envisioned that this would be the center and that all other roads would lead from the Capitol. The White House is actually on a side street down on Pennsylvania.

How did we go so far from being what our Founders envisioned—a body that is closest to the people, most accountable to the people? How do we restore people's trust in this institution, which is the branch of government that is directly elected by them?

At the start is Article I of the Constitution—getting our government off of autopilot and restoring the decision-making that belongs in the House and in the Senate with the elected Representatives of the people.

There are many ideas out there as to how to restore the balance of powers, but I want to focus on one in particular—a way that we can be positive disruptors, can challenge the status quo, take back the power of the purse, and get the Federal Government off of autopilot. That is by tackling what we refer to as “unauthorized spending.”

There are hundreds of programs and departments that have stayed on the books despite the fact that their deadlines have come and gone. I like to refer to them as “zombie” government programs, potentially living beyond their intended lifespans because they have not been authorized in years and sometimes in decades. For example, the VA hasn't been authorized since 1996; the BLM hasn't been authorized since 1998, as well as other agencies, such as the Federal Election Commission. There is a long list. It is estimated that over \$300 billion in spending is in these unauthorized programs.

If we, the elected Representatives, committed to doing our jobs—reviewing, rethinking, possibly eliminating these programs if they have exceeded their lives—the people would be well served.

I recently introduced the USA Act, the Unauthorized Spending Account-

ability Act, to require these expired “zombie” programs to be renewed, to hold the bureaucrats accountable who have become disconnected from their missions. Programs and agencies should not receive taxpayer funding unless the people's Representatives—their voices in government—have authorized them to do so.

The demands on families, on businesses, and on institutions have changed. In some ways, the only place that hasn't changed is Congress. We need to rethink government from the top-down and restore the power of the purse. Article I is just as relevant today as it was at the founding of our country. Our Founders recognized that every individual is made in the image of God. We celebrate the potential of every individual, and our laws must reflect the will of the people. This is the genius of America.

Mr. YOHO. I thank the gentlewoman from Washington for her great words in preserving our Constitution and for the work that she is doing to bring Article I powers back to the House.

We get blamed a lot for the dysfunction in this country about what this body is not doing, and the gentlewoman is so right in bringing this power here; so I thank her for her leadership on that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to a stalwart from the great State of Utah, Mrs. MIA LOVE, who is leading a charge and is making quite a name for herself.

Mrs. LOVE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I am so excited to talk about Article I. Right now I am working on a project called the Article I Project in order to restore Article I back to the United States Congress.

Today I rise on behalf of all of the Utahans in my home State who have expressed frustration with our regulatory state. For decades, Congress has essentially delegated many responsibilities to executive agencies. As a result, unelected and unaccountable agencies have impacted American lives more than the decisions have of their elected officials. In this Congress, for example, 146 bills have been signed into law after going through the House and the Senate. Meanwhile 3,378 rules and regulations were finalized last year alone, joining thousands of others that ultimately cost the American economy \$4 trillion a year.

Our Constitution is designed to preserve individual liberty, but this government instead seeks to increase bureaucratic influence. The American people deserve better. They deserve Representatives of their choosing who are empowered to make decisions. They also deserve to know that if those Representatives fail, they can hold them accountable and bring about change. At the end of the day, that is what restoring constitutional powers is about—giving the American people a voice. It is for that cause, especially, I am proud to fight.

Mr. YOHO. I thank the gentlewoman from Utah, and I appreciate the work she is doing.

Keep it up. We only have a Nation to save.

Mr. Speaker, the United States Constitution is the supreme law of the United States of America. Ours is the shortest Constitution in existence and is the longest-serving—227 years since its ratification in 1789. Our Founders can have many things said of them, but one thing we can all agree on is, through divine guidance, they got this as near to perfection as a document can be.

Our Constitution has created the freest, the largest middle class, the most successful country on the planet. For the first time in recorded history, it has allowed people to become self-determining, it has allowed for personal freedoms never before seen in human history. It grants us unalienable rights, those being life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It allows for personal property rights.

These are the things that allow a Republic, as ours, to flourish and for ideas to be created and expanded upon because they allow for the possibility of that unlimited potential inside each and every human on the planet. It is our Constitution that allows for the way of life we have for which others will risk everything, including life, so as to have a chance at freedom.

So it is a document worth protecting, preserving. It is a document that should be revered by all so we can pass it on to our future generations, as well as the prosperity and the good fortune that was inherited by us, this generation. The price that has been paid came from the blood, sweat, and tears of our Founders, from the people who came before us, and from every military person, including their spouses and families; and each and every Member of Congress takes an oath and a pledge to uphold our Constitution.

Article I, section 1 reads: "All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

Article I, section 8 lists clearly that Congress has the power to lay and collect taxes, to provide for the common defense, to regulate commerce, to declare war, to establish a uniform rule of naturalization. It ends in section 8: "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof."

The President's responsibility, as delineated in Article II, section 3, reads that the President is to see that the Laws are faithfully executed. I want to repeat that. The President is to see that the Laws are faithfully executed. This is called the Take Care Clause.

I have only spent 3 years here, but in that time we have watched this body work multiple times to rein in not just the executive branch, but the administrative agencies. We have sued the

President and have won two times in the Supreme Court. We have had fights over the power of the purse. We have had Supreme Court fights whether it has been dealing with immigration laws and rules or not enforcing the laws on the books. We have fought the President just on enforcing the laws that are already on the books. We don't need any more laws. We just need to follow the ones we have.

This is not just this administration—this is previous administrations—but I fear where we are going in this next election. If we don't get our House in order, if we don't bring back Article I powers to this House, at that point, when we overstep the boundaries of our Constitution by an executive branch or by administrative agencies, it is too late to try to reel them in. Now it is urgent to do that. To put it off any longer would be buying fire insurance for your house after your house catches on fire. It is too late.

In addition, as I talked about, we have fought overstepping, out-of-control Federal agencies that are wreaking havoc on American businesses and are costing every American, according to the CBO estimates, approximately \$14,500.

If I look at the administration's rules and regulations that have come out since 1999 to 2008, there have been approximately 750 rules that have come out. From 2009 to 2015, there have been over 530 rules coming out just from the Obama administration. If I look at the final rules and regulations that were issued just under George Bush, the amount for his 8 years was 2,430. When I look at President Obama's rules and regulations—and we are only 4 months into his last year and term—to date, the Obama administration has had over 28,000 rules and regulations coming out, which are strangling and suffocating American businesses, paid for by the American taxpayers.

I recently introduced H. Res. 693, which asks for a permanent select committee to investigate not just this executive branch, but all future ones so that we can have in place a vehicle to rein in an overstepping administration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to a colleague and a classmate of mine from the State of Texas, Mr. RANDY WEBER, who has cosponsored H. Res. 693. I appreciate the gentleman's work on this important topic.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I thank my friend from Florida (Mr. YOHO) for yielding the floor and for leading this Special Order and introducing H. Res. 693.

Mr. Speaker, as of yesterday, the Obama Presidency was 90 percent over. So let's do a quick recap of just what has happened over these past 7½ years.

First, the President violated the Constitution by unilaterally changing sections of the Affordable Care Act at least 23 times without having congressional approval. That is Public Law 111-148. Even though he said, probably, on some 20 occasions that he didn't

have constitutional authority to do things, he still did them.

Two, the President and the Department of Justice were in direct violation of their constitutional responsibility to the Defense of Marriage Act, which is Public Law 104-199.

The President and his department of injustice continue to choose not to enforce Federal drug laws, which are Public Law 91-513, the Controlled Substances Act, and Public Law 100-690, the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1986.

The President violated the Constitution by making Presidential appointments to the National Labor Relations Board and to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau while Congress was not in session, so declared by him.

I have read the Constitution, Mr. Speaker. Only the Senate majority leader can decide when the Senate is in session, not the President. I might add that the President was slapped down by the Supreme Court 9-zip.

Further, the President and the department of injustice abused executive privilege in the Operation Fast and Furious scandal by refusing to comply with a subpoena that was issued by the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the United States House of Representatives, thereby violating section 192 of title II, United States Code.

The President violated the law, which is Public Law 89-236, by unilaterally changing our Nation's immigration laws with regard to deferred action, giving illegal aliens access to government programs and tax credits that are funded by our constituents, which is in contravention of our Constitution.

The President and the Department of Health and Human Services failed to enforce Federal law, which is Public Law 111-5, by illegally waiving the work requirement for welfare recipients.

Under this President, the IRS violated the First Amendment to the United States Constitution by targeting nonprofit organizations because of their religious or political beliefs.

The President and the Department of Defense knowingly violated the National Defense Authorization Act, the NDAA of 2014, which is Public Law 113-66, by not providing a 30-day notice to Congress prior to transporting five Guantanamo detainees to Qatar in a prisoner swap.

□ 1800

Some would say in military terms that the terrorists got five nuclear weapons and we got one conventional weapon, which turned out to be a dud.

The President and his administration continue to move forward with his plan to close the Guantanamo detention facility and move the detainees.

By the way, did you know that one out of three prisoners released rejoin their terrorist organizations and wind up at the front lines, seeking to kill yet more Americans?

Folks, it is the duty of the legislative branch to write and pass laws, the judicial branch to interpret those laws, and

the executive branch's duty to enforce those same laws.

The very success of our form of government comes from this simple balance of powers. This critically important founding principle is currently being trampled on by this President while most of our citizens may not even be aware of its damaging implications.

Our Nation's laws are not mere suggestions to be dismissed on a whim. Our laws are binding. If we in Congress allow this or any President to ignore the rule of law, then we allow the foundation of our Nation to be shattered.

I thank my colleague, Mr. YOHO, for introducing this resolution of which I am a proud cosponsor.

Mr. Speaker, there you have it. You know I am right.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER). I appreciate him standing up for the rule of law because, if we are not a Nation of law, everything falls apart, civil society falls apart.

Just last week in my district there was a fight over transgender bathrooms. It is a fight people want to have.

We came up here at the beginning of last week and spoke in front of the Supreme Court. They heard the argument on the President's Executive order on November 20, 2014, to waive our immigration laws and grant 4 to 5 million people here illegally resident status.

That case was heard last week, and there was a large group of proponents wanting the Supreme Court to side with the President. Our President has said over 22 times that he cannot change that law. He has admitted to that.

I thought it was ironic that the people in my district were arguing over transgender bathrooms and the group up here—and I know a lot of them were here illegally—were arguing in the United States of America in front of the Supreme Court, the freest country in the world. The only reason that they can come up and have a voice of dissent is because we have a Constitution.

Our Constitution, when it was formed, wasn't a Republican idea and wasn't a Democratic idea. It was something that came together after 1,000 years from the Magna Carta on up that formed a Constitution that formed the Republic that we have.

When I look at the people arguing—and, you know, it is the Republicans against the Democrats or the Conservatives against the Liberals or whatever group you want to put in there—the only reason we have those arguments is because we have a document that is an American document. It is American ideology that all parties should come together to preserve. That is why this argument is so important.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman, a freshman from the State of Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I commend Representative YOHO for

holding this Special Order on executive overreach.

As a lifelong healthcare professional and former businessowner, I believe the healthcare industry is flooded with examples of President Obama's administration overreaching its authority and either ignoring congressional intent or refusing to enforce laws enacted by Congress.

As recent as last Monday, April 18, the FDA issued new guidance related to the Drug Quality and Security Act and compounding pharmacists.

On November 27, 2013, President Obama signed the Drug Quality and Security Act, DQSA, into law. Within the DQSA, several important provisions were related to the oversight of compounding human medications.

In fact, DQSA created two types of compounding pharmacies, 503A pharmacies and 503B pharmacies. 503A compounding pharmacies are small, community pharmacies that only compound small quantities of medication to a very limited number of doctors and patients with very specific needs.

A perfect example of this is a servicemember who has lost a limb in war. Some servicemen and -women who have lost their limbs experience significant amounts of pain that regular medication does not adequately address. Compounded medication helps with this specialized need.

503B compounding facilities are those outsourcing facilities that manufacture compounded medications and ship them all over the country.

When Congress debated DQSA, many statements were made by both House and Senate congressional Members stating that there was no intent for this bill to restrict State pharmacy licensing boards and their local control of small, community pharmacies.

In fact, the FDA was directed by Congress that, in regards to inspection standards, 503B facilities would be the only ones subjected to good manufacturing inspection standards. You would think that that would make sense, that only manufacturing facilities would be subjected to good manufacturing practice standards.

In addition, congressional intent was clear that 503A community pharmacies could continue to provide office-use compounded medication as they had always done. Did FDA adhere to the obvious congressional intent of DQSA related to compounding? No.

FDA's recent guidance states that all medication that is compounded by small, community pharmacists needs to have a specific patient prescription.

Your local dermatologist, who keeps a local anesthetic in the office to remove skin to test for cancer, is going to have to write a prescription, have the patient go to the pharmacist, get their prescription filled, and then schedule another appointment before checking to see if they have skin cancer.

This goes against all congressional intent, to allow State pharmacy boards

to continue local control of their small pharmacies. Now, all State pharmacy boards that allow office use have had their powers taken away from them.

The FDA guidance also pointed out that, except under certain circumstances, good manufacturing inspection standards will always be used to inspect all compounding pharmacies.

So pharmacists who provide specialized compounded medication to one patient with a specific need will be subjected to large corporation inspection standards that will cost significant financial investments.

In essence, the FDA has ignored congressional intent related to the DQSA and has ultimately eliminated an entire sector of the healthcare industry that was providing specialized care to patients with special needs.

In fact, the HHS informed my office that, if we continue to pursue this matter and try to rein in the FDA's overreach, we, Congress, would be responsible for the next 100 deaths from compounded medication. This example is just one of many that I have experienced with this administration.

Recently, HHS instituted a rule that would require pharmacy benefit managers to update their maximum allowable cost list every 7 days. These MAC lists control what pharmacists are reimbursed. If they are not updated regularly, pharmacists lose business because they are not reimbursed by Medicare at the present market price.

A recent call with the inspector general of HHS informed my office that pharmacy benefit managers are not complying with this new rule because HHS has not designated anyone to ensure that pricing lists are updated every 7 days.

Mr. Speaker, let me rephrase that. HHS is not enforcing their rules on MAC price updating because no one is assigned to enforce this law. You would think that, if a rule was created, the agency would work to enforce that rule, but apparently not.

Over the last 7½ years, President Obama's administration has shown a complete disregard for Article I of our Constitution and the powers that our Founding Fathers wanted this institution to have.

They interpret enacted legislation against the intent of Congress, they refuse to enforce laws that were meant to bring transparency to the American people, and they choose when congressional direction is applicable law and when it is not.

This body should take a long, hard look at the actions of these agencies. They are not following the law and intent that was created by this body, and action should be taken to remove these bureaucrats so the American people can have the government they deserve.

Again I want to thank the gentleman, Representative YOHO, for bringing this to light. This is a very serious subject that needs to be addressed.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his comments, for his work, and for bringing this to light because, again, these issues that we are discussing are not Republican or Democrat.

This is about the rule of law and maintaining the uniqueness of this institution, and that is something all Americans benefit from. If we lose it, all Americans are going to be hurt by that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK), a friend and colleague.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. YOHO for organizing this Special Order hour.

You know, this is one of the reasons I ran for Congress. The abuse of power and executive overreach coming from the White House right now is completely unacceptable.

Like many of my colleagues here tonight, I am a firm believer in the Constitution. I believe it is the duty of the President to faithfully execute the law, not to willfully ignore it for political gain.

A President cannot implement legislation through Executive orders or agency rulemaking. Yet, we have witnessed this administration launch attacks against the Second Amendment, impose burdensome regulations through the EPA and other agencies, and enact many policies without the support of Congress or the American people.

I have spoken to a wide array of my constituents throughout the northern half of Michigan in the time I have been here in Congress. They are constantly telling me about some new regulation that some Federal agency is coming up with that doesn't seem to do anything as far as promoting welfare or improving the environment, but it is simply making it more difficult for businesses to remain open. It is really affecting their ability to hire people.

In my district, one of the big complaints we have had is the EPA attempting to limit the ability to have a wood stove. Well, it gets pretty cold in northern Michigan in the winter, and people save money by cutting their own wood and burning it in their homes. Then the EPA comes out saying that we can't have wood stoves that don't meet this criterion, and it doesn't make any sense for people in my district.

Furthermore, the EPA's waters of the U.S. proposal to regulate ditches to manmade ponds doesn't do one thing to truly protect our water resources. Instead, it overloads small farmers, loggers, and other businesses with needless red tape and compliance costs.

There is a reason that our Founding Fathers created separate, but equal, branches of government. The executive branch and agencies like the EPA are charged with carrying out the intent of Congress. We have made incredible strides in cleaning up our Nation's air and water.

However, what happens when these giant bureaucracies start to feel themselves becoming relevant? Unelected bureaucrats began writing onerous legislation to justify their own existence, and they do this with absolutely no regard for the practical effect that these regulations have on local families and businesses.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time.

I got a notice from the EPA when I first got up here. It was January 2014, and it was a pamphlet with their new regulations.

In that, what they were talking about is that their new rules and regulations would have minimal effect on air quality and human health, but they are going ahead anyway.

In the example you brought up about the wood-burning fireplaces, we have done a tremendous job of cleaning up the air quality in this country, as other countries need to do, but we shouldn't go after things that aren't going to really have a difference.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Florida.

In my district, although it has been several years, the EPA shut down the construction of a brand-new coal plant. Okay? This coal plant would have been the purest coal-fired power plant in the country.

It ran with new technology, and there is no reason for it being shut down. This plant would not even produce any CO<sub>2</sub>. That CO<sub>2</sub> was being captured by the coal plant and used by industry to create other products.

So this administration has taken on a proposal and used the EPA not to make our environment better, but to have a war on coal. I mean, the EPA and the President doesn't talk about making our atmosphere and our environment cleaner. It talks about a war on coal.

□ 1815

That is just the wrong attitude to have, and it really needs to be directed by Congress. It is unbelievable what we have gone through. It can cause economic damage to this country. Right now we are competing with the Chinese who don't have any significant pollution controls on their power plants, and we have invested billions as Americans, each one of us, by paying for more expensive power to really clean up our atmosphere.

How are the Chinese doing that?

Now that we have basically cleaned up our atmosphere, they want to impose even higher and higher standards that actually are causing our business to go down and steel production is going over there where they are polluting even worse.

Mr. YOHO. Reclaiming my time, I think you and I were in a meeting the other day in one of the committees. We had a fellow, he was an attorney who worked under the Reagan White House,

and he worked with the EPA. He was saying the EPA went from regulations to clean stuff up. Now it is regulations that you can't. You can't have coal-fired power plants, you can't do this, and it was an agency of can't. I think you were in that meeting. It shows, again, the overstepping of agencies, and it shows how administrations or executive branches rewrite laws or they legislate from the executive branch through the administrative agencies, and we have seen an increase in this.

Again, it is not just this administration, but I think President Obama, this administration has done us a favor by bringing this to light with the 24,000 regulations that are coming out that are crippling the American economy and businesses. If it is doing that, it is crushing the middle class and all Americans.

Mr. BENISHEK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOHO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, the things we are talking about here today really are examples of the Federal Government getting involved in things that they don't have the right to do. I think a lot of it comes from these bureaucrats that are just writing regulations that really you can't comply with, and that is basically the reason that these coal-fired power plants are going out of existence.

Most of these problems have been eliminated by the work that we have done on improving our environment, and I applaud that America has made the investment before any other country in making that happen, but to regulate us to the point that businesses are going overseas and polluting the planet worse because of our policies, because if we did the stuff here, we would do it cleaner.

The University of Michigan has had an environmental research station in northern Michigan in my district for the last 60, 70 years. The scientists at the University of Michigan tell me that most of the mercury that falls from the sky in Michigan comes from China and India, that we have essentially eliminated mercury as a problem in the environment from our industry here. But because we are not dealing with that problem of the Indians and the Chinese doing that, we are ignoring that and actually giving them the ability—by not having to comply with a lot of these rules, the ability to pollute the planet worse than we would if we were doing those things here.

Mr. YOHO. May I add to that?

Mr. BENISHEK. Sure.

Mr. YOHO. We went to a coal-fired power plant in our district, and they were saying in the old days a typical coal-fired power plant would put out approximately 50 pounds of mercury a year. Today it is less than 2 pounds. That is a significant difference from 50 to 2. That is a 48-pound reduction in mercury going into the atmosphere.

What is the significance and the benefit going from 2 pounds to 0, and at what cost do you go forward?

Being a veterinarian for 30 years, I have never treated an animal with mercury toxicity. I think you need to have common sense in regulations, and, of course, the worst place to go for that is government.

I will let you continue.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. YOHO for putting on this Special Order hour. I am very happy to be able to participate in it. I think that we really need to be sure the American people are aware of what is going on and that they make their decisions when they go to the polls based on this information. So thank you very much.

Mr. YOHO. I appreciate the gentleman's participation and his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a Republican or Democratic argument. That should not even weigh into this. It is not conservatives versus liberals. These are American ideologies that we all have to come together to preserve, and I can't think of one person more suited to talk about this than somebody I have a lot of admiration for who sits on the House Committee on Agriculture with me. He is from the State my wife is from, the State of Iowa.

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for pulling this Special Order together and for his generous introduction, and especially for Mr. YOHO's leadership on the restoration of article I authority and addressing the executive overreach that has become part and parcel of the Obama administration. It didn't begin there, but it needs to end with the next President of the United States and be slowed down in the last months of the Obama administration.

Mr. Speaker, I was just exercising a thought here as I was reviewing some of the executive overreach that we have seen from this President, and it occurred to me to take a look at the Declaration of Independence and review some of what I will call the lamentations of our Founding Fathers. It is to this effect, Mr. Speaker. When we get to the laments, these are the things, the wrongs that have been committed by the King of England.

It says in the Declaration: "The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations"—that sounds like the history of our current President of the United States—"all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. To prove this, let Facts be submitted to a candid world."

This is from our Declaration, Mr. Speaker. I will just quickly hit some of these.

"He has refused his Assent to Laws . . ."

"He has forbidden his Governors to pass Laws . . ."

"He has refused to pass other Laws for the Accommodation . . . of people . . ."

"He has called together Legislative Bodies at Places unusual . . ."

"He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly . . ."

"He has refused for a long Time, after such Dissolutions, to cause others to be elected; whereby"—summarizing that, hindering legislative activity elsewhere.

"He has endeavored to prevent the Population of these States; for that Purpose obstructing the Laws for Naturalization of Foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their Migrations hither . . ."

"He has obstructed the Administration of Justice . . ."

"He has made Judges dependent on his Will . . ."

"He has erected a Multitude of new Offices"—that would be his czars.

"He has kept among us, in Times of Peace, Standing Armies . . ."

Well, not quite, but rumors of them do exist.

We could go on and on and on, the grief that King George dished out on our original colonists here at the time of the Revolution, at the time of this Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, but I look at the present times, and it rings to be pretty close—along the way there are echoes of 1776—in the overreach of the President of the United States.

I mentioned them. This is a list from some testimony before the Executive Overreach Task Force, which I have the privilege to chair, and among this list are some of these:

He has appointed policy czars to high-level positions to avoid constitutionally required confirmation hearings—that could be lifted almost right out of the Declaration of Independence.

By modifying, delaying, and ignoring various provisions of ObamaCare, in violation of the law itself—that is a long list of things on ObamaCare that the President has altered outside of the law.

By attacking private citizens for engaging in constitutionally protected speech—utilizing the IRS to diminish that as well.

By issuing draconian regulations regarding sexual assault on campus.

By ignoring 100 years of legal rulings and the plain text of the Constitution and trying to get a vote in Congress for the D.C. Delegate—I had forgotten that one, actually.

By trying to enact massive immigration reform via an executive order, demanding that the Department of Homeland Security both refuse to enforce existing immigration law and provide work permits to millions of people residing in the U.S. illegally.

Now, these all ring like the laments, the charges that were laid against King George in 1776. It is the same tone. It is a similar message. It is going outside the law and outside the Constitution.

By imposing Common Core standards on the States via administrative fiat.

By ignoring bankruptcy law and arranging Chrysler's bankruptcy to ben-

efit labor unions at the expense of bondholders.

And I could continue.

Well, here is one that is of significant interest to my State and I think to Florida and many other States, and that is his imposition of a regulation called the Waters of the United States. That dropped on us on May 27, 2015.

The Waters of the United States said we are going to regulate all the navigable waters of the United States. Oh, and this ambiguous term that is called—let's see. It used to be "and waters hydrologically connected to them." That got litigated into being too ambiguous even for the courts to tolerate. They are the masters of ambiguity. But instead they put the language in that said "these waters of the United States shall be the navigable waters of the United States and waters that have a significant nexus to the waters of the United States."

Now, a significant nexus is going to be determined by the administration, another term of ambiguity.

I see some eagerness over here on the part of the gentleman from Florida. Does he have something to add?

Mr. YOHO. The interpretation we got: "and seasonably wet areas." I come from Florida. It is seasonably wet all year long. I mean, we get 57 to 60 inches of rain a year, so everything is seasonably wet in our great State, and they fall into that. The little puddle in my yard, when it rains, it might stand 3 or 4 inches. We are on a sandy soil. When it stops raining, it goes away in 5 minutes, but that could be interpreted as navigable waters, and I am probably 10 miles from a body of water. It is just amazing.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Well, to the gentleman from Florida, we may have a legitimate competition going on here. The Waters of the United States regulation would put 96.7 percent of my State under the EPA's regulatory jurisdiction. Florida would be a competitor to that number, I would think.

Mr. YOHO. Yes, it would be all of Florida.

Mr. KING of Iowa. All of Florida. I have said that once you regulate waters hydrologically connected to or once you get to define significant nexus, that goes all the way up to the kitchen sink. We know that soil itself, whether it is under water, it can be saturated with water, and just old black Iowa dirt can be 25 percent water, so they have got it all, this overreach of the Federal Government.

Our Founding Fathers envisioned that there would be a competition between the branches of government to sustain their constitutional authority in each branch. They wanted to draw as bright a line as possible between the three branches of government, with the courts being the weakest of the three. They expected that we would jealously guard the constitutional authority. Congress writes all the laws. The President is supposed to enforce all the laws. That should be pretty clear. But

the President has reached across that over and over and over again, as evidenced by this list of laments that I offer, Mr. Speaker.

Does the gentleman from Florida have something to add?

Mr. YOHO. As I traveled as a veterinarian, and I was talking to somebody, we got in a discussion about the Constitution, and they wanted to know why I was so hung up on it. I explained to them that the very people that are fighting to preserve our founding principles that our rights come from a Creator, not from government, that government is instituted by men and women to preserve those God-given rights, and that our core values of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, the unalienable rights of those things, that all men are created equal, and they are protected by the Constitution.

I said it is that very document that people are fighting to preserve that give people on the left a voice of dissension or people on the right a voice of dissension. I said: If we lose those very things that made America great, if we lose those, people will lose their voice of dissension. If you don't believe that, go to a country like Cuba, go to China, go to Iran and proselytize. It is not possible.

The amazing thing is that person called me about 30 minutes later and said: You know, we got thinking about that, and that really is what this is about. It is not Republican or Democrat. It is not conservative or liberal. Those are American ideologies that made this country great.

I would hope our friends on the other side of the aisle would come and say: You guys are right, we want to preserve the constitutional principles.

Does the gentleman from Iowa have anything else to add?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Florida for those timeless thoughts. Something that our Founding Fathers discovered was a concept that was relatively new to society at the time, and that is the concept of God-given liberty and God-given rights, natural rights, natural rights that did emerge with Locke, for example, in the United Kingdom, but they hadn't been implanted into culture and civilization until they were implanted in America.

Here we are in this country, everyone that serves in this Chamber takes an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States, as do all the Senators on the other end of this Capitol Building, as does everyone who puts on a uniform to defend our country, and many of them who serve within our executive branch as well. The President is a bit of an exception because he is required to deliver an oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and he is required to take care that the laws be faithfully executed.

□ 1830

And what he has done, instead, is turn himself into an independent legis-

lative body. He has said 22 times: I don't have the constitutional authority—and I am going to summarize here—to grant amnesty to millions of people in America. That is up to the legislature.

He taught the Constitution at the University of Chicago for 10 years as an adjunct professor teaching Con law. And that was the message, I am sure, that he taught in those classrooms; and it was a message he taught in a classroom out here at one of the high schools in D.C. shortly before he decided to reverse his position and impose this edict of amnesty on the United States, which went down through a long path of litigation for more than 2 years and a week ago last Monday was heard before the United States Supreme Court, at least in the DAPA case—the deferred action for parents of anchor babies is actually what that acronym stands for, in my view.

So I take this oath that I have to support and defend the Constitution seriously. I have the privilege of serving on the Constitution and Civil Justice Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee and of chairing this task force. I congratulate the gentleman from Florida for stepping up to the lead on this issue.

Mr. YOHO. If I may add to one of your comments, because you brought up the philosophers Locke and Howe, philosophers of old, when we look at the American period of time—227 years, roughly, the U.S. Constitution and a constitutional Republic as a country have been in existence, the longest time a republic has been in existence—when you go back to the beginning of human recorded history to today and you look at the American period where we are at today, it is but a dot on that timeline.

Yet that dot represents the largest middle class that has ever been allowed to happen. It is the first time there have been property rights that you can have and the right to pursue life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It is only possible because we had a Constitution that preserved those rights. So I would think we could all come together and protect those rights for the next generation, for the posterity of this Nation.

I would like to see if you had any thoughts on that, and then I will close.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I am looking at our job and our destiny here, and I think that our constitutional obligation is to restore the pillars of American exceptionalism. You can identify many of them in the Constitution itself. In the Bill of Rights it is pretty well summarized: freedom of speech, religion, the press, the freedom to peaceably assemble and petition the government for redress of grievances.

The Second Amendment rights, which are the property rights that the gentleman mentioned, I would point out that, in the Kelo decision, which happened about 10 years, the Supreme

Court ruled that they could amend the Constitution itself. Well, they didn't say they did, but that was the effect of their decision. "Nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation" is part of the Fifth Amendment. The Supreme Court ruled that private property could be taken for private use as long as there was just compensation. So they struck the three words "for public use" as a conditional clause out of the Fifth Amendment. We had a Supreme Court that amended the Constitution, effectively.

We have a Supreme Court last June that amended ObamaCare by writing words into it; "or Federal Government" would be the three words inserted there. And then, the next day, they decided they would create a new command in the Constitution, a command that all States shall conduct same-sex weddings and honor them from other States, as if somehow that were the will of the people or something done under the Constitution.

This is an appalling reach on the part of the Supreme Court. It is even more appalling on the part of the President of the United States, and it is our task to identify what needs to be done and start down that mission of restoring the constitutional authority and this balance between the branches of government.

I am happy to have a chance to say a few words.

Mr. YOHO. Today, in one of our committees, we were hearing about the Attorney General and how she stated that those who speak out against the administration's climate change policy possibly being a crime.

Think about that. They are examining if you speak out against something that is unfavorable to an administration. It is going against freedom of speech, our First Amendment, the very things that we fought for and that everybody who has come before us has fought for. I think this would be something that would scare everybody, if we are that close to losing the very document.

I hold in my hand—and you have seen me do this before—the Declaration of Independence, in total, and the U.S. Constitution, in total. I think we can all agree this is not an epic in volume. I can read this in a day. This is not an epic in volume, but yet it is an epic in ideology of what free men and women can do in a country that honors and reveres this document. It just so important that we come together.

As I stated earlier, I think Mr. Obama has done us a favor in showing us how weak we have become as an institution and how weak our rule of law is. And for us to succeed and continue as a constitutional Republic, we must—we have to—bring those Article I powers back to this body.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Florida for that statement. I absolutely believe that, deeply.

I think one of the important things is that we educate the young people on

what the Constitution says and what it means. We have a President of the United States who was a professional Constitution teacher, who we know knows the history and the text of the Constitution and takes his oath to preserve, protect, and defend it and take care that the laws be faithfully executed and explains it in stop after stop succinctly, in ways that I agree with this President, and then he turns around and, by his own definition—and by his definition is all I am referring to here, Mr. Speaker—breaks his own oath. So we are here now trying to restore the knowledge base of America.

Members of Congress arrive here as freshmen, and they take an oath to the Constitution. They don't know what it means anymore. The Supreme Court thinks they can amend the Constitution; they can manufacture new commands in the Constitution; they can violate Article I authority. And the President can do so at will.

But I would point out that, 13 times, the President of the United States' position has been unanimously reversed by the United States Supreme Court—President Obama, 13 times, unanimously reversed. Another 11 times, he has lost on a 5-4 decision.

So he has stretched this Constitution beyond that. Even his own appointees in the Supreme Court can't stomach it; that is how bad this is. But I want to see the right appointments to the Supreme Court so the whole Constitution is revered, respected, and we see cases go before the Court and, once again, we can predict the Court will rule on the Constitution rather than their political whims.

Mr. YOHO. I appreciate you bringing that up, because you bring up how many times it has been overstepped as of recent, but other administrations have done it in the past. But it sets a precedent from this point forward. If we don't rein it in now, when do you rein it in? Do you wait for the next candidate to come in? And we have had talks about that. If we don't do it now, it be would like buying fire insurance after your house catches on fire. It doesn't work.

So it is so important that we come together as a body. Again, the Constitution is not a product of Republicans or Democrats or conservatives or liberals. The Constitution is not a function of government. Government is a function of the Constitution.

When government steps over the boundaries of the Constitution, it is us—we, the people—the Representatives that were sent up here to hold and rein in the branches that are out of balance. This is all about bringing the three branches of government into balance.

Let me just wind up with this. Mr. Speaker, once again, I would like to thank all the Members who have joined me this evening. Restoring Article I powers is so vital to the survival of our constitutional Republic.

At this very moment, there are individuals seeking the highest office in

the land who have stated, if Congress disagrees with them, they have no qualms about taking action on their own, circumventing Congress and disregarding the founding principles enshrined in our Constitution. That should give concern to everybody.

The time has arrived for us to take action to restore this institution to the one the Founders envisioned. Granted, you can say what you want about our Founding Fathers, but they got this right—again, as you and have I have talked about, with divine intervention—and they put in place a way to amend it to make it better, not to get rid of it. It is time for us to stand up for this body, the people's House.

I will leave you with this reminder. All it takes for evil or tyranny to prevail or for our constitutional Republic to fail is for those good men and women to do nothing.

I, Mr. Speaker, and the people that have joined us tonight, our colleagues that participated, will not sit idly by when the very document that has allowed so many people to be free, to achieve beyond their beliefs to a level never before ever achieved in human history, is being marginalized by inaction.

I know my good friend from Iowa feels the same. And if you have any last remarks, you have got about 1 minute, if you want to wrap it up.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank, again, the gentleman from Florida. I appreciate you coming to the floor with this leadership that is here. If no one stepped forward in leadership and we just went along as if somehow the Constitution were going to be restored, it would never be restored. And I would remind people, Mr. Speaker, that it is one thing to give lip service to the Constitution; it is another to exercise it.

Freedom of speech is being exercised here right now. Freedom of assembly is being exercised across this country right now. The right to keep and bear arms, if it were never exercised, the liberals would define it away from us.

Any one of these rights that we have that come from God, defined by our Founding Fathers, is also something we have got to exercise and utilize; if not, over time, the enemies of freedom will find a way to say: Well, it is just an artifact of history.

If we stop exercising our right to keep and bear arms, in a matter of a generation, someone will say it is just an artifact of history. We are going to confiscate your guns. And after a while, they will zip your lip if you don't watch it. We can't let that happen.

So I appreciate this Special Order here tonight with the gentleman from Florida's leadership, and I appreciate my Constitution and the rights that come, especially from God.

Mr. YOHO. I thank my colleague from Iowa, and I want to thank everybody that participated.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are advised to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

#### CHILD NUTRITION

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revised and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, more than 60 years ago, Congress responded to the Defense Department's concern that so many children were malnourished, they would be unfit for military service, that they passed the National School Lunch Act as a measure of national security to safeguard the health and well-being of our Nation's children.

Through the enactment of the first Federal child nutrition program, Congress recognized that feeding hungry children is not just a moral imperative, it is vital to the health and security of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I serve as the ranking member of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce. Our committee is tasked with making sure that all children have an equal shot at success, so it is only fitting that child nutrition programs fall within our committee's jurisdiction.

Just as there is a Federal role in ensuring that all children have access to quality education, regardless of where they live, what they look like, or their family's income, there is also a Federal role in ensuring that every child has access to healthy and nutritious food.

Research has repeatedly shown us that a lack of adequate consumption of specific foods, especially fruits and vegetables, is associated with lower grades among students; and child obesity affects all aspects of a child's life, from their physical well-being to their academic success and self-confidence.

So we have a choice to make. We can put money into these programs now and support healthy eating in schools, or we can cut corners and spend more money down the road on chronic diseases and other social services, putting the well-being of our children and our Nation's future at risk.

Either way, we will spend the money. In fact, researchers estimate that \$19,000 was the incremental lifetime medical costs of an obese child relative to a normal weight child who maintains that normal weight throughout adulthood. So it is important to keep