United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JANUARY 8, 2016 *No. 5*

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, January 11, 2016, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, JANUARY 8, 2016

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

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

God of mercy, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

At the beginning of another day, we pray that Your divine providence guide this Nation and all nations, and every believer, each in his or her way.

In Your spirit enable the Members of this people's House to accomplish Your will by the faithful performance of their responsibilities. Help them to do meaningful work that might give them satisfaction in their sense of purpose.

Strengthen them when it is difficult to accept what cannot be avoided, and to endure with love and resignation the things that could cause them to grow weary or be overcome by despair.

In truth, we do not see the entire picture, nor how we are already united in Your presence among us. Help us all to trust in You, which we claim we already do.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

VIOLATING THE CONSTITUTION IS NOT THE ANSWER

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because the Constitution is under attack by a President who has never respected the Second Amendment.

Gun ownership is a fundamental right of law-abiding Americans. The Supreme Court affirmed this right in 2010, and yet this week the President issued new executive actions that are unconstitutional and a clear abuse of power.

There is no question that we must stop senseless acts of violence, but violating the Constitution is not the answer. Criminals are criminals because they break the law. More laws won't keep guns out of criminals' hands.

Let's let law enforcement do their job and enforce the laws that we already have. Let's let law enforcement address the root cause of the violence. Let's look at what is causing it, like radicalism and mental illness.

I have no doubt that the President's latest actions will be challenged in court.

I will do everything in my power to protect Oklahoma's rights and the rights of all Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The Chair will remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

While Members may criticize the President's policies or official actions, they may not engage in personal attacks.

FAIRNESS IN CLASS ACTION LITIGATION ACT

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, last year, Volkswagen was caught defrauding its customers selling vehicles that emitted 40 times more pollution than is allowed by law in its so-called clean diesel models.

VW customers paid extra for vehicles they believed were both cleaner and better performing than other cars on the market, but that is not what they got. They have a right to join class action lawsuits to recoup their losses and hold VW accountable.

But the Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act, which we will consider

today, would weaken the ability of those customers to pursue class action claims. In the case of VW, the bill would limit classes to people with the same vehicle model, the same emissions-cheating device, and the same emissions system, even though all clean diesel customers were defrauded in the same way. It would shrink the class sizes and make it easier for VW to defeat or settle claims.

Why would we make it easier for VW to avoid responsibility by making it harder for Americans to pursue justice?

It is shameful that congressional Republicans are trying to do Volkswagen's bidding by weakening the rights their constituents currently have.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this bill.

HONORING DR. GREGORY EASTWOOD

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

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the distinguished career of Dr. Gregory Eastwood.

I am incredibly privileged to be joined here today by Dr. Eastwood and his wonderful family.

Celebrated throughout our entire region for his commitment to service, Dr. Eastwood first served as president of the State University of New York Upstate Medical University from 1993 until 2006—the longest in the history of the institution and of all sitting presidents on SUNY campuses. Dr. Eastwood returned to the president's seat in October 2013 when the campus was in dire need of his capable leadership.

Dr. Eastwood has served our community for years with distinction, holding leadership roles and partnering with many different organizations in the region.

He advanced an aggressive vision for the SUNY Upstate, which has grown under his leadership through the establishment of the University Health Care Center, the Joslin Diabetes Center, and the Golisano Children's Hospital.

A clinician, scholar, educator, community leader, and author, Dr. Eastwood has had a remarkable career.

Today, I want to thank Dr. Eastwood for his excellence, professionalism, caring presence, and commitment to the SUNY University and to central New York.

Our community is stronger now because of your work, Dr. Eastwood. We will sorely miss you.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, this House unfortunately passed a bill to basically repeal the Affordable Care Act and do away with funding for Planned Parenthood. I know the President will veto that bill, and I want to thank him in advance.

In Tennessee, 236,000 people signed up for the Affordable Care Act. That is 236,000 people who, if the bill becomes law, will not have health care or will have more expensive health care.

Nationally, 11 million people signed up. Those people will not have it or will have more expensive health care.

If you stop Planned Parenthood, you stop poor people, many of whom are in my district, from getting preventive health care: mammograms, HIV testing, and planned birth control programs.

This was a bad bill against the people of our country, taking away health care from people who need it, otherwise can't afford it, and otherwise wouldn't get it.

Thank you, Mr. President.

IMPROVING SECURITY IN OUR COMMUNITIES

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

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of talk this week about improving security in our communities. One way we can do that as a country is to stand shoulder to shoulder with our law enforcement officers. Just as they get our back each day, let us get theirs.

Tomorrow is Law Enforcement Appreciation Day. We can show our appreciation in this House by bringing up and passing legislation I have introduced called the Thin Blue Line Act, now with over 50 cosponsors on both sides of the Capitol. It simply gives prosecutors and judges greater flexibility to impose enhanced penalties on those who do harm to law enforcement officers.

Law enforcement officers each year are subject to over 50,000 assaults on them, 15,000 with injuries, and 150 unfortunately leading to law enforcement deaths.

The Thin Blue Line Act says very simply, if you take the life of a law enforcement officer, be prepared to lose your own.

Mr. Speaker, let's stand with law enforcement officers today and each day in this House.

GUN CONTROL EXECUTIVE ACTIONS

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

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the President's executive actions to curb gun violence and urge my colleagues to take the action needed to address this deadly plague.

I rise today in honor of more than 300 lives lost to gun violence in Detroit, a city I represent, just in 2015. That is nearly as many lives as we have days in the year.

We have failed to take meaningful action. We must pass legislation to support the President's executive actions.

We have heard a lot of dialogue this week. If you don't like the executive actions, then Congress must rise and let's take the action needed.

We can no longer sit on the sideline and allow this plague and this horrific violence in our country to continue. We must take action now before another day passes and another innocent life is destroyed.

GUN CONTROL EXECUTIVE ORDERS

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of every American's Second Amendment rights.

The recent announcement by President Obama to unilaterally enact gun control laws once again shows his complete lack of leadership and a complete disregard for Americans' fundamental rights. The President should be working with Congress to enact legislation, not creating executive orders because things don't work out his way.

The fact is that the President's executive actions would not have prevented a single mass shooting over the past several years. One of the main underlying causes of many of these shootings was mental illness, and I will be the first to agree that we should dedicate efforts to address mental illness in this country.

However, directing millions of dollars in new investment for mental health care is not the role of the President. That is the role for Congress.

If our Founding Fathers wanted to restrict the right to bear arms, they would have written it into our Constitution. If our Founding Fathers wanted an executive fiat government, they would have created one.

I call on my colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, to stand up for this institution and protect what our Founding Fathers fought and died for: a Republic elected by the people, for the people; a country that is not controlled by one man, but by many.

RECOGNIZING FARM FAMILIES OF THE YEAR

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

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the Second Congressional District's Farm Families of the Year.

Each year, the Florida Farm Bureau recognizes families across north Florida for their commitment to farming and our community. These families work hard every day to provide food for our tables and, just as importantly, they know farming is more than a job. It is a way of life and a part of our heritage.

Our farm families are the backbone of north Florida. Recognizing them with this award is just one thing we can do to show how much we appreciate their hard work and sacrifice.

I look forward to further recognizing them and highlighting their work as I begin the first official north Florida farm tour. I will be visiting all 14 counties in my district.

Again, congratulations to our Farm Families of the Year, and thank you to all of our State's farmers.

ARRESTING TERRORISTS, NOT RANCHERS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, while the Federal Government's focus to my constituents in the West appears to be reprosecuting ranchers for a small rangeland fire or to disarming Americans from protecting themselves, Federal agents focused on homeland security yesterday and bagged two Iraqi refugees in Sacramento and Houston with ties to recent travel to Syria to aid or seek to fight alongside Islamic State.

Mr. Speaker, as we will hear from the President here on this floor in the State of the Union next week, I hope his focus will be on a migrant or refugee program that secures our borders, not a gun agenda that makes Americans more defenseless.

With San Bernardino, California, being so fresh in our minds and that terrorism activity there, let's heed the words of Texas Governor Abbott and other States that are clamoring for a more effective vetting process before we bring more migrants into this country.

FAIRNESS IN CLASS ACTION LITIGATION ACT OF 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 1927.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 581 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1927.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 0915

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1927) to amend title 28, United States Code, to improve fairness in class action litigation, with Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of a bill that combines two important reforms, the Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act and the Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency Act, or the FACT Act. Let me first explain why my colleagues should vote in favor of the Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act.

Last year an independent research firm surveyed companies in 26 countries and found that 80 percent of those that were subject to a class action lawsuit were U.S. companies, putting those U.S. companies at a distinct economic disadvantage when competing with companies worldwide.

The problem of overbroad class actions doesn't just affect U.S. companies. It affects consumers in the United States who are forced into lawsuits they don't want to be in. How do we know that? We know that because the median rate at which consumer class action members take the compensation offered in a settlement is an incredibly low 0.023 percent. That is right.

Only the tiniest fraction of 1 percent of consumer class action members—less than 1 quarter of 1 percent—even bothers to claim the compensation awarded them. That is clear proof that vastly large numbers of class members are satisfied with the products they purchase, don't want compensation, and don't want to be lumped into a gigantic class action lawsuit.

Just recently a California judicial decision reported that, in a class action consisting of over 230,000 people, only two of those 230,000 wanted the coupons offered in the class action settlement. The judge in that case said that the case produced ''absolutely no benefit, really, to anybody.'' So where is all of the money going in these cases? To the lawyers who brought the lawsuits that hardly anyone wanted to be in.

In another case, the district court had refused to certify the class because most of the class members had not experienced any problems with the product. But then the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals reversed, holding that ''proof of the manifestation of a defect is not a prerequisite to class certification.''

In yet another case, when the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals allowed the certification of an overbroad class action, it had to subsequently throw out the resulting settlement, stating, ''The district court approved a class action settlement that is inequitable, even scandalous,'' because the relatively few class members who were actually injured ended up claiming less than 2 percent of what the trial lawyers got the district judge to say was warranted based on the overbroad size of the class.

Trial lawyers work the system today in the following way: They file lawsuits, for example, against a company that sells a washing machine. Some of those washing machines don't work the way they are supposed to, but most of them do. But the lawyers file a class action lawsuit that includes everyone who ever purchased a washing machine from the company, even the large number of people who are completely satisfied with their purchases.

When trial lawyers lump injured, non-comparably injured, and non-injured people into the same class action lawsuit, the limited resources of the parties are wastefully spent weeding through hundreds of thousands of class members in order to find those with actual or significant injuries. That is money that could have been spent compensating deserving victims.

Sometimes, because judges don't separate the injured from the non-injured in class actions early enough in the proceedings, they end up throwing out settlements because it turns out hardly any of the class members were harmed and didn't want compensation.

Other times, when judges realize they have created an overbroad class, they justify their actions by coming up with novel theories to provide some compensation to people who are entirely satisfied with the product and who don't want compensation.

Either way, the solution is to direct judges to determine as best they can early in the proceedings which proposed class members are significantly and comparably injured and which aren't and to treat them accordingly. That is fair to everyone.

The purpose of a class action is to provide a fair means of evaluating like claims, not to provide a way for lawyers to artificially inflate the size of a class to extort a larger settlement value for themselves and, in the process, increase the prices of goods and services for everyone.

Claims seeking monetary relief for personal injury or economic loss should be grouped in classes in which those who are the most injured receive the most compensation. No one should be forced into a class action with other uninjured or minimally injured members only to see their own compensation reduced.

The Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act would simply make clear what currently should be clear to the Federal courts, namely, that uninjured class members are incompatible with rule 23(b)(3)'s current requirement that common claims predominate a class action.

Here is the full text of the Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act, along with quotes from the Supreme Court that show how the bill's text codifies existing Supreme Court precedent:

The bill simply provides that ''no Federal court shall certify any proposed class seeking monetary relief for personal injury or economic loss unless the party seeking to maintain such a class action affirmatively demonstrates that each proposed class member suffered the same type and scope of injury as the named class representative or representatives'' and that ''an order issued under rule 23(c)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that certifies a class seeking monetary relief for personal injury or economic loss shall include a determination, based on a rigorous analysis of the evidence presented, that the requirement in subsection (a) of this section is satisfied.''

That is it. One page. Fair rules. Common sense and wholly consistent with Supreme Court precedent. Please join me in supporting this bill on behalf of consumers everywhere.

The FACT Act is also simple, fair reform we should all support.

This legislation helps asbestos victims who must look to the bankruptcy process to seek redress for their or their loved ones' injuries. Too often, by the time asbestos victims assert claims for compensation, the bankruptcy trust formed for their benefit has been diluted by fraudulent claims, leaving these victims without their entitled recovery.

Fraud is able to exist because of the excessive lack of transparency plaintiffs' firms have forced on the asbestos trust system. Under the current Bankruptcy Code, plaintiffs' firms essentially are granted a statutory veto right over debtors' chapter 11 plans that seek to restructure asbestos liabilities. Plaintiffs' firms have exploited this leverage to obtain trust rules that prevent information contained within the trust from seeing the light of day.

The predictable result has been a growing wave of claims and reports of fraud. The increase in fraudulent claims has caused many asbestos bankruptcy trusts to reduce recoveries paid to asbestos victims who emerge following the formation of trusts.

The FACT Act, introduced by Congressman FARENTHOLD, combats this fraud by introducing long-needed transparency into the system.

First, it requires asbestos trusts to file quarterly reports on their public bankruptcy dockets. These reports will contain basic information about demands to the trusts and the bases for payments made by the trusts to claimants.

Second, the FACT Act requires asbestos trusts to respond to information requests about claims asserted against and the bases for payments made by the asbestos trusts.

These measures are carefully designed to increase transparency while providing claimants with sufficient privacy protection. To accomplish these goals, the bill leverages privacy protections contained elsewhere in the Bankruptcy Code and includes additional safeguards to preserve claimants' privacy.

We cannot allow fraud to continue reducing recoveries for future asbestos victims.

I thank Mr. FARENTHOLD for introducing the FACT Act to combat fraud. I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this important legislation.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Members of the House, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1927, the so-called Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act and Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency Act.

I oppose the legislation because it cleverly shields corporate wrongdoers by making it more difficult for those who have been harmed by their actions from obtaining justice and it allows these wrongdoers to further victimize their victims.

Among H.R. 1927's many flaws is the fact that this legislation will have the effect of denying individuals access to justice and threatening victims of corporate wrongdoing, all in the name of protecting the powerful. Section 2 of H.R. 1927 will make it virtually impossible for victims of corporate wrongdoing to obtain relief through class actions in cases seeking monetary relief by requiring a party seeking class certification to show that every potential class member suffered the same type and scope of injury at the certification stage. Now, you know that is going to be difficult.

We come to the realization that, as it is, class actions are very difficult to pursue. Under current procedure, the courts strictly limit the grounds on which a large group of plaintiffs may be certified as a class, including the requirements that their claims raise common and factual legal questions and that the class representative's claims are typical of those of the other class members.

Rather than improving upon this class certification process, however, H.R. 1927 imposes requirements that are almost impossible to meet, effectively undermining the use of class actions.

Finally, section 3 of H.R. 1927 gives asbestos defendants—the very entities whose products injured millions of Americans—new weapons with which to harm their victims.

Section 3 requires a bankruptcy asbestos trust to report on the court's public case docket, which is then made available on the Internet, the name and exposure history of each asbestos victim who receives payment from such trust as well as the basis of any payment made to the victim.

As a result, the confidential personal information of asbestos claimants, including their names and exposure histories, would be irretrievably released into the public domain. Just imagine what identity thieves and others, such as insurers, potential employers, lenders, and data collectors, could do with this sensitive information.

Essentially, this bill revictimizes asbestos victims by exposing their private information to the public, information that has absolutely nothing to do with compensation for asbestos exposure. This explains why asbestos victims vigorously oppose this legislation, as it is an assault against their privacy interests.

□ 0930

So, in sum, H.R. 1927 is a seriously flawed bill that only benefits those who cause harm to others. Not surprisingly, the White House has appropriately issued a veto threat, stating that the administration ''strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 1927 because it would impair the enforcement of important Federal laws, constrain access to the courts, and needlessly threaten the privacy of asbestos victims.''

For all these reasons, I urge that this House oppose H.R. 1927.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the FACT Act. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law, I have examined this piece of legislation for over the past year. We held hearings on the bill and solicited views from experts and victims alike. I heard many of the same concerns that we are hearing this morning. However, my own conclusion is that the FACT Act is a sound and necessary bill.

By preventing fraudulent claims, the FACT Act protects asbestos victims and ensures the viability of the asbestos bankruptcy trust for the unknown victims yet to come. Claims that the bill hurts the victims are false. To the contrary, it would be a disservice to the victims themselves to permit certain bad actors to raid the trust funds and line their pockets in the process.

As companies that used asbestos filed bankruptcy, the trust funds were created in recognition that victims must be compensated. Any measure that preserves these funds is clearly pro-victim.

Some critics contend that the bill violates victim privacy by requiring the disclosure of certain information. We examined this specific issue during our hearings, and it could not be farther from the truth. This bill provides protections that are absent in State tort cases where court dockets and the personal information of plaintiffs are part of the public record. Section 2 of the FACT Act simply requires the claimant's name and a description of their exposure history. It then explicitly states that any disclosure does not

include any confidential medical records or the claimant's Social Security number. It is important to note what might be missed here.

The FACT Act amends the Bankruptcy Code. By doing this, it incorporates the existing privacy protections therein that permit the bankruptcy judge to issue protective orders when disclosure of information would create ''an undue risk of identity theft or other unlawful injury.'' This is a sound and pertinent piece of legislation.

I would like to thank Chairman GOODLATTE and my colleague from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) for bringing it to the floor. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, these bills are basically chamber of commerce week in the United States Congress. That is what we have come down to, is that the chambers of commerce who represent the large corporations who would be the defendants in these actions, by and large, and consist of the people that produce the asbestos, they are part of it too. It gives them an opportunity to not have to pay out damages to victims, victims where class actions are successful—but would make it more difficult to be successful—and people who have been victims of asbestos injuries, mesothelioma being the ultimate disease that kills people from exposure to asbestos.

Now, on the other side of the chamber of commerce and my friends on the other side are people on this side and certain groups. I want to tell you who the folks are who are against the bill. The NAACP. The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, often called the conscience of the Congress. The American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees. Consumers Union. The American Bar Association—and we have heard about how lawyers are doing this and lawyers are doing that, lawyers are on both sides of the cases—the American Bar Association. Americans for Financial Reform. Public Citizen. The Southern Poverty Law Center, Morris Dees and company. The National Disability Rights Network. The Asbestos Disease Awareness Organization.

The Asbestos Disease Awareness Organization is the voice of the victims, and they are against this. I have to be against it because I stand with the victims and for justice and what is fair for people who have been harmed by corporate wrongdoing.

I rise to tell a personal story. One of my best friends was a man named Warren Zevon. He was a singer and songwriter. Somewhere along the line, he was exposed to asbestos, and he died in September of 2003 of mesothelioma. But for asbestos and him being exposed to it in some manner, he would be with us today and would have been with us for the last 12 years, giving us entertainment and songs and maybe songs about some of the things that have been going down here.

One of his last songs was ''I Was in the House When the House Burned Down.'' Well, it wasn't this House, but it could have been this House. This House is the people's House, and it should be looking out for victims and people who should get compensation in courts.

When we travel internationally, one of the things we find is that people revere our justice system. They look to America for justice and an open court system that they don't have in their own nations. These bills would close the door on justice and close the door on the courts, and that is not what America is about and that is not why we are respected internationally.

I respectfully ask that we oppose these bills and vote ''no.'' Support the victims. Support justice.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chair, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), a distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1927, section 3, the so-called Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act of 2015, which is actually the text of H.R. 526, the Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency, or the FACT Act.

It is a fact that the Koch brothers are probably sitting back at home with their fingers crossed watching these debates, hoping and feeling quite confident that this will pass because they know when it passes, it is going to help them.

How does it help them? Well, they are the ones who manufactured or acquired the companies that manufactured the asbestos, this asbestos everybody knows now hurts people. So when people are hurt, they deserve to be able to go into a court of law and establish their claim and seek just compensation for their victimization by that company.

What this legislation does is to put its ugly hand on the scale of justice in favor of the manufacturers of this dangerous product and, also, their insurance companies. It puts its ugly hand on that scale, weighs it down in favor of those companies. So all of them are looking upon us now, hoping that we do what they would like for us to do.

Please know that not everybody is going to go along with this. There are some who stand with victims who deserve a day in court. They deserve, when they go to court, to not have to be subjected to the public release of their very private and sensitive information, their medical information. There should not be any kind of registry, like a gun registry, established.

This is a registry—we should actually call it an asbestos death database—which would allow these insurance companies and producers, manufacturers of death, to have access to people's personal information so that they could use it against them when they file claims. That is what this bill is all about.

I would ask that my colleagues understand the true purpose and vote ''no'' on this act.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), the chief sponsor of a portion of this legislation.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chair, it is my privilege to be here to speak on behalf of the FACT Act.

Just a quick, oversimplified history of how the asbestos trusts came into being. The manufacturers of asbestos, when it became known that it was such a deadly product, realized that there weren't enough assets within the company to pay all the claims. So they availed themselves of the bankruptcy laws of this country. What the bankruptcy courts said was: Look, put all of your assets into a trust to pay off the victims and you can reorganize your company. That is how these trusts were created.

So the companies are not going to be on the hook anymore. The ones that survived, reorganized, or were acquired have had their obligations, with respect to asbestos, discharged in bankruptcy. What they did to do this was they created these trusts to compensate future victims.

So what is happening now is there are people who are gaming the system, multiple claims in State or Federal courts. They are going to these trusts saying: I was injured by asbestos, pay me. Which is what is supposed to happen. But you are only supposed to get compensated once for your asbestos injury. If you do multiple claims, you are taking money out of the system that would be available for future victims. Diseases like mesothelioma take years to manifest themselves.

What the FACT Act does is require these trusts to publish a very small amount of information—the name of the person who is filing a claim, the basis of their claim—I was exposed to asbestos at XYZ location and developed mesothelioma—and it specifically protects their privacy by prohibiting the release of their Social Security number.

The information that is required here is actually less information than I would be required to give if, say, Mr. COHEN hit me with his car. If I were hit by his car, I would have to disclose my name, the nature of my injury, and a lot more information to file a suit in State court. We are not asking for any more information than is normally disclosed in any sort of litigation.

In fact, there are specific privacy protections in the Bankruptcy Code that are going to protect even further than you would in a State court. This bill was written to help those veterans who were exposed to asbestos and are not yet manifesting symptoms. It was designed to help all the victims who were exposed and are not yet manifesting symptons.

If we drain all the money out of these trusts, there is nothing that is going to be left to help the people who were injured later on in the process. So this is why I introduced the legislation, this is why I think it needs to pass, and this is why I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

I am also happy that this bill was combined with a great piece of legislation to get rid of some of the waste, fraud, and abuse that is happening within the system of class action lawsuits.

I don't know about you, Mr. Chairman, but my wife and I have probably got a half a dozen or so notices in the mail over the years for class actions. As a lawyer, I actually sit down and read them. It ends up most of the time that they are offering me a coupon or a gift certificate or something worth a couple of dollars while the plaintiff's attorney is getting millions of dollars.

We need to get this system down to where those who are actually injured as a result of whatever has happened in the class action get adequate compensation and those folks who weren't injured or are happy with the product don't get anything because they haven't asked for anything, they don't want anything, and they weren't injured.

□ 0945

This will simplify the system. It will lower the cost, and it will make sure there is more money available for those who were actually injured.

This is a great combination of bills, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD letters from 19 veterans organizations that are totally opposed to this bill.

JANUARY 7, 2015.

Re Veterans Service Organizations oppose H.R. 1927, the Fairness in Class Action Litigation and Furthering Asbestos Claims Transparency Act.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. STENY HOYER,
Minority Whip, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN, LEADER MCCARTHY, LEADER PELOSI, and WHIP HOYER: We, the undersigned Veterans Service Organizations, oppose H.R. 1927, the ''Fairness in Class Action Litigation and Furthering Asbestos Claims Transparency Act of 2015.'' We have continuously expressed our united opposition to this legislation via written testimony to the House Judiciary Committee, House Leadership, in-person meetings and phone calls with members of Congress, and most recently, an op-ed many of our legislative teams submitted to ''The Hill'', entitled ''Farenthold has his facts wrong: The FACT Act hurts Veterans''. It is extremely disappointing that even with our combined opposition H.R. 1927 stands poised to be voted on the House floor later this week.

Veterans across the country disproportionately make up those who are dying and afflicted with mesothelioma and other asbestos related illnesses and injuries. Although veterans represent only 8% of the nation's population, they comprise 30% of all known mesothelioma deaths.

When our veterans and their family members file claims with the asbestos bankruptcy trusts to receive compensation for harm caused by asbestos companies, they submit personal, highly sensitive information such as how and when they were exposed to the deadly product, sensitive health information, and more. H.R. 1927 would require asbestos trusts to publish their sensitive information on a public database, and also include how much money they received for their claim as well as other private information. Forcing our veterans to publicize their work histories, medical conditions, social security numbers, and information about their children and families is an offensive invasion of privacy to the men and women who have honorably served, and it does nothing to assure their adequate compensation or to prevent future asbestos exposures and deaths.

Additionally, H.R. 1927 helps asbestos companies add significant time and delay paying trust claims to our veterans and their families by putting burdensome and costly reporting requirements on trusts, including those that already exist. One must ask what is the real motivation for this legislation brought forward by Representative Farenthold? Rather than pursuing legislation to make it easier and less burdensome for our veterans and their families to get the compensation they so desperately need for medical bills and end of life care, trusts will have to spend time and resources complying with these additional and unnecessary requirements at the expense of our veterans.

H.R. 1927 is a bill that its supporters claim will help asbestos victims, but the reality is that this bill only helps companies and manufacturers who knowingly poisoned our honorable men and women who have made sacrifices for our country.

We urgently ask on behalf of our members across the nation that you oppose H.R. 1927.

Please contact Hershel Gober, National Legislative Director, Military Order of the Purple Heart with any questions.

Signed:

Air Force Sergeants Association, Air Force Women's Officers Associated (AFWOA), American Veterans (AMVETS), Association of the United States Navy (AUSN), Commissioned Officers Association of the US Public Health Services, Fleet Reserve Association (FRA), Jewish War Veterans of the USA (JWV), Marine Corps Reserve Association (MCRA) Military Officers Association of America (MOAA), Military Order of the Purple Heart (MOPH), National Association of Uniformed Services (NAUS), National Defense Council, Naval Enlisted Reserve Association, The Retired Enlisted Association (TREA), United States Coast Guard Chief Petty Officers Association, United States Army Warrant Officers Association, Vietnam Veterans Association (VVA).

Mr. CONYERS. I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chairman, the FACT Act, which is part of the underlying legislation, has been touted as an effort to promote transparency and address a supposedly systemic problem of fraud with asbestos trusts set up to pay settlements owed to victims of asbestos exposure, but this bill is a solution in search of a problem and places invasive demands on victims that violate their privacy and open them up to identity theft and other abuses while failing to require transparency from the companies that created this nationwide problem in the first place. The nonpartisan GAO found that 98 percent of trusts perform audits, and none of those audits uncovered fraud.

While the bill's proponents claim that this is a measure to protect asbestos trusts for victims, it speaks volumes that not a single victims group supports this bill.

For decades, asbestos companies knowingly put Americans at risk—servicemembers, children, teachers, first responders, construction workers, and even those who work here in the Capitol—with a toxic product that kills close to 15,000 people every year. Today old structures across the country still contain asbestos and can pose serious health risks. Experts have referred to workers who perform repair work as the current third wave of victims.

Given the nature of the asbestos threat, it is outrageous that the laws fail to require asbestos companies to disclose information when it comes to public health and safety and disappointing that this has become a partisan issue.

In 1988, President Reagan signed into law the Asbestos Information Act, which required manufacturers of asbestos-containing products to report information about these products to the Environmental Protection Agency, but the Asbestos Information Act was just a one-time reporting requirement, and it predated the Internet.

That is why, along with my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN), I have introduced the Reducing Exposure to Asbestos Database Act, or the READ Act, which amends the Asbestos Information Act to require those who manufacture, import, or handle products containing asbestos to annually report information to the EPA about their products and any public location where they have been present in the past year. This information would be made publicly available online, helping Americans avoid exposure to asbestos and incentivizing the continued reduction of asbestos use in our Nation until it is finally eliminated once and for all. Unfortunately, when the READ Act was offered as an amendment to this bill, it was not ruled in order.

Asbestos poses an ongoing threat to public health, and more transparency about this deadly product, not less, should be the norm.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. DELBENE. I urge my colleagues to oppose the FACT Act and join me in working to promote transparency that helps, rather than victimizes, those who have been facing heartbreaking consequences of asbestos exposure.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining on each side?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 14 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 16¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS).

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, veterans are disproportionately affected by diseases caused by asbestos, and although veterans represent only 8 percent of the Nation's population, they comprise almost one-third of all known mesothelioma deaths that have occurred in this country.

Mesothelioma has an uncommonly long period of latency of 20 to 30 years, which means that veterans exposed to asbestos who retired from Active Duty decades ago are getting sick today.

Hundreds of Navy ships and military installations dating back to World War II were constructed with asbestos flooring, flooring tiles, ceiling tiles, and wall insulation. That means that hundreds of thousands of workers and sailors were unknowingly exposed to dangerous asbestos levels, and as a result many of those men and women contracted asbestos-related diseases.

J. Patrick Little, the national commander of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, wrote to House leadership in direct opposition of this bill. He said: ''The FACT Act adds insult to injury for veterans and their families at a time when they are suffering from the devastating effects of asbestos exposure.''

The FACT Act must be amended to protect veterans who were exposed to those dangerous minerals while serving their country. I tried to amend this bill twice to exempt asbestos trusts from having to file onerous reports to the bankruptcy courts if the claimant is a member of the Armed Forces, a civilian employee of the Department of Defense, and their families to avoid any potential delay in these individuals receiving their desired benefits in a timely manner; but the majority did not make this commonsense amendment in order because they are not prepared to defend this bill against the serious concerns raised by veterans, including the Military Order of the Purple Heart, who say that the bill is unnecessary, unfair, and only benefits the asbestos industry rather than our veterans who proudly served their country and were unknowingly exposed to this deadly substance.

In the absence of this amendment, Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''no'' vote on the bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), a distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chair, I thank the distinguished ranking member from Michigan for yielding as well as for his steadfast leadership.

This is a new year with a new Speaker and new promises of bipartisan cooperation, yet we are here today on the House floor doing the same exact thing.

The asbestos industrial complex is responsible for unleashing mesothelioma, lung cancer, and other exotic diseases of mass destruction on thousands of unsuspecting Americans, many of whom have served this country in the military, and yet we are being asked today to support legislation that would shield the wrongdoers from liability.

At the end of the day, if you think about the bill that has been presented to us, the claim has been made that it is about disclosure, but the wrongdoers aren't really being asked to disclose anything further.

The claim has been made about this bill that it is about efficiency, yet there is not a scintilla of evidence of waste, fraud, or abuse.

The claim has been made that this is about fairness, yet at the end of the day the practical effect of this legislation would be to prevent the victims from being able to achieve just compensation.

At the end of the day, this is the same old approach: trying to find a solution in search of a problem that does not exist. This is a messaging bill that is dead on arrival in the Senate and will not be signed into law by the President.

Instead of wasting the time and the treasure of the American taxpayer through their elected Representatives here in the House, why don't we just get back to doing the business of the American people?

Vote ''no'' against this invidious legislation so we can do what the people have sent us to do here in the United States Congress.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 1927, as it will bring transparency to the asbestos claims process. This is an important goal, as the secrecy that currently surrounds the process has led to abuse and, in turn, compromised the benefits for future victims.

Those who oppose the bill have two arguments against passage. First, they suggest that there really is not a fraud problem. Well, when you leave the fox in charge of the henhouse, you typically end up with a problem.

The facts are pretty clear. A lack of transparency has allowed some law firms and individuals to manipulate the claims process. This should not surprise anyone. When you allow one of the ultimate beneficiaries to structure the trusts, administer the claims, with no accountability or oversight, of course there will be abuse.

Several policy studies, the GAO, and independent judges in at least 10 different States have found questionable claims, fraud, and abuse. So to those who vote against this solution, I say you are choosing to enrich unethical lawyers and claimants at the expense of victims who have legitimate injuries, injuries for which they deserve compensation.

The second argument against this bill is that it somehow compromises the privacy of claimants. Again, this is not true. The FACT Act has much stronger privacy protections than State court. Further, section 107 and rule 9037 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure offer additional safeguards. The reporting requirements do not require the disclosure of Social Security numbers or medical records. The act requires the disclosure of less information than would be required if the claimant were to start a lawsuit in State court.

A vote against this bill means you are okay with secrecy, you are not bothered by fraud or abuse, you don't mind allowing lawyers to use their positions as the architects of these trusts to line their own pockets, and you don't care about the victims who have legitimate claims of asbestos-related diseases.

It is, in fact, a problem that people have made this a political issue. To those who have argued against this bill, I ask: Who will be there and what resources will be available to our veterans when fraudulent claims and multiple claims have exhausted these trusts?

The rule contemplated in H.R. 1927 brings much-needed transparency to Bankruptcy Code section 524G.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a senior member of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Chairman GOODLATTE and Ranking Member CONYERS, thank you for managing this legislation; and thank you, Mr. CONYERS, for yielding the time.

Many of us in cases dealing with making sure our cities work, sometimes we have a one-way street, and we gravitate toward the one-way street because we might be able to move faster down that one-way street. That is traffic flow.

But when we talk about justice for people, a one-way street doesn't work because that means only one group of people can find justice at the courthouse—and that is what this legislation does. It is a one-way street. Only one group gets victory and justice because only one group is not required to be transparent. The other group has to be transparent. They can't get on the one-way street.

I oppose this legislation because it requires the Federal class action to have each class member suffer the same type and same scope of injury as the named class. I heard it on the floor by one of our distinguished Members

saying that it is the broken arm group. If you have got a broken arm, you are in the class; if you have a broken leg, you aren't, but it came about through the same incident. That is an unfair and impractical way of getting justice for the American people.

The second reason I oppose this legislation is because it would invade the privacy of asbestos victims by requiring the posting of personal exposure and medical information online and erect new barriers to victims receiving compensation for their asbestos illness.

Thousands of workers and family members have been exposed to, suffered, or died of asbestos-related cancers and lung disease. It is particularly outrageous that many of the major asbestos producers refuse to accept responsibility.

□ 1000

I would make the argument that many of us knew a very dear friend, Congressman Bruce Vento. I understand his wife may be in the gallery.

I think it is important that we think of the asbestos victims and their families who suffered from mesothelioma, as Congressman Vento did, and died.

His wife requested an opportunity to testify so that the voices of their family members could be heard on this bill, but she was turned down. I will include that letter in the RECORD.

In the last Congress, she and two other asbestos victims repeatedly requested to testify on the FACT Act, but they were turned down.

JANUARY 5, 2016.

Re Asbestos Patients and Their Families Say ''Listen to Us''—Oppose Section 3 of H.R. 1927, the So-Called ''FACT Act''

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We write to express our strong opposition to the misnamed ''Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency Act'' (the FACT Act), which has been incorporated as Section 3 of H.R. 1927, the ''Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act.'' Sponsors of the FACT Act claim that the legislation will ''increase relief for victims of asbestos.'' We are asbestos patients and family members of loved ones who have died or presently suffer from the wrongful and deceitful conduct of asbestos companies. We are from states and districts across the United States. We are Republicans and Democrats. We represent current and former workers, veterans, police officers, firefighters, homemakers and children. We have come together to express our unquestioned opposition to this legislation and our utter outrage that the House may pass it without even giving us—the ''Real People,'' not of Washington, but the actual victims of asbestos exposures a chance to testify on the record about the bill—even though supporters claim it is in our interest!

The fact is the so-called FACT Act is not in the interest of asbestos victims. The bill, as it is designed to do, will make it harder for victims to seek justice for their injuries and suffering. It is in the interest of the companies that are lobbying for it—the companies that used asbestos, knowing that it was a deadly toxin, exposed their workers and the public, and are now seeking to use Congress to shield them from legal liability for their behavior. We are horrified by this reality and we are going to do our best to let all Americans know what is going on here.

Many of us traveled to Washington, DC in February to watch the hearing on the FACT Act. Our group's spokesperson, Susan Vento, the widow of the late Congressman Bruce Vento who passed away from mesothelioma in 2000, had requested an opportunity to testify so that the voices of the people who are most affected by this bill would be heard. But she was turned down. In the last Congress, Sue and two other asbestos victims repeatedly requested to testify on the FACT Act, but they, too, were turned down each time. Tragically, one of those victims passed away from asbestos disease. To date, not one person who has been directly affected by the ravages of asbestos disease has been permitted to testify about this legislation. The bill's supporters claim to care about victims, yet we have been treated with disrespect and neglect every step of the way.

There is really no mystery why supporters of the legislation don't want to hear from us—it's because they know that this legislation was never intended to benefit victims. This legislation is being advanced at the request of the companies that used asbestos and concealed the dangers from their workers, employees and consumers, many of whom are paying with their very lives due to these deadly exposures. Now these companies are seeking to shield themselves from responsibility under the guise of imposing ''transparency'' on asbestos victims. Congress should not favor asbestos wrongdoers over the interests of patients and families.

The FACT Act would force victims seeking any compensation from a private asbestos trust fund to reveal on a public web site private information including the last four digits of our Social Security numbers, and personal information about our families and kids. This is offensive. The information on this public registry could be used to deny employment, credit, and health, life, and disability insurance. We are also extremely concerned that victims would be more vulnerable to cybercriminals, such as identity thieves, con artists, and other types of predators.

Glen Kopp, a partner with the law firm of Bracewell & Giuliani and a leading authority in the area of privacy law, recently reviewed the FACT Act and concluded that it presents significant privacy concerns. (See ''Analysis: Identity Theft Threatens Asbestos Victims Under Congressional Proposal,'' Asbestos Nation, EWG Action Fund, http://www.asbestosnation.org/analysis-identity-theft-for-asbestos-victims-looms-under-congressional-proposal/)

Mr. Kopp noted that the personal information of asbestos patients and families that the FACT Act would make public is precisely the type of information that is typically used by identity thieves. That is why federal and state law enforcement authorities recommend this type of information be kept away from any form of public disclosure. And yet, the FACT Act would require it to be placed on a public web site!

While the legislation invades the privacy of asbestos patients and families, it contains no requirements for transparency from the asbestos industry, which concealed the dangers of asbestos exposure for decades, causing one of the worst public health crises in U.S. history, affecting not just our families, but millions of American families, and that still continues to this day.

The FACT Act is completely one-sided. It requires so-called transparency from asbestos victims but it allows asbestos companies to continue to demand confidentiality of their settlements and hide information about how and when they exposed the public and their workers to asbestos. How can asbestos companies claim they want transparency, after they spent decades covering up the dangers of asbestos while we and our family members were unknowingly exposed?

We have heard that the FACT Act is needed because of an epidemic of fraud against the asbestos trusts. But the evidence doesn't support this claim. This bill treats us and other asbestos victims like criminals rather than innocent victims of corporate deceit.

The signatories on this letter represent thousands of people across the country who are suffering because of asbestos exposure. We would like to be in Washington in person to object to this mean-spirited and dangerous legislation. But most of us can't travel because of our illnesses. Others don't have the resources or the time to come all the way to Washington. But each and every one of us opposes any legislation that would make life more difficult for asbestos victims. Asbestos victims and our families don't have time on our side. Every day counts for us. Mesothelioma victims are typically racing against the clock to ensure their families aren't burdened with huge medical bills and that they are taken care of. It's astonishing to us that, of all the issues Congress could be addressing relating to asbestos, you have chosen one that does nothing for victims, but rather one that gives additional tools to the asbestos industry to drag out these cases and escape accountability.

We are the real people who matter in this debate, and yet the supporters of the FACT Act would not allow any of us to testify. We may have been shut out of the hearings, but we will not be silenced. We are determined to stop any legislation that places the interests of the asbestos industry above the rights of innocent victims. The U.S. Congress should honor all veterans and hard-working Americans. Please vote no.

Sincerely,

Susan Vento, Widow of Rep. Bruce Vento (D–MN), Mesothelioma Victim, Maplewood, Minnesota; Judy Van Ness, Widow of Richard Van Ness, Veteran and Mesothelioma Victim, Richmond, Virginia; Kim Beattie, Niece of Jerry Fisher, beloved Uncle and Mesothelioma Victim, West Branch, Iowa; Pam Wilson, Neice of Jerry Fisher, beloved Uncle and Mesothelioma Victim, Johnston, Iowa; Michael and Sharon Valach, Son and Daughter-in-law of George Valach, Mesothelioma Victim, Hiwassee, Virginia; Loring and Mary Jane Williams; Mary Jane Williams is a Mesothelioma Patient, Springfield, Ohio; Ginger and Jaffod Horton; Ginger Horton is a Mesothelioma Patient, Fairview, North Carolina; Jill Waite, Daughter of Bruce Waite, Deceased Mesothelioma Victim, Ontario, Ohio; Latonyta Manuel, Widow of Andrew Manuel Jr., Mesothelioma Victim, Canton, Michigan; Courtney Davis, Daughter of Larry Davis, deceased, because Congress never eliminated asbestos use, Durham, North Carolina; Rachel Alice Shaneyfelt, Rachel is a Mesothelioma Patient, Trussville, Alabama.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I want to listen to the families. I oppose this legislation, and I ask my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 982, the so-called ''Fairness in Class Action Litigation and Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency Act of 2015.''

I oppose this intrusive and burdensome legislation for two reasons.

First, I oppose H.R. 1927 because it would prohibit a federal court from certifying a federal class action unless each class member has suffered the same type and same scope of injury as the named class representative.

The practical effect of this requirement, if enacted, would be the effective immunization of corporate misconduct and fraud such as the

Volkswagen ''cheat device'' scandal on CleanDiesel vehicles.

For example, if H.R. 1927 were to become law, two families who were defrauded by Volkswagen would not be able to join together to bring a class action because they bought their cars at slightly different times or drove the cars in slightly different ways.

This makes no sense unless the objective is to discourage ordinary Americans from obtaining relief for the injuries caused by the misconduct of large national corporations.

The second reason I oppose this legislation is because it would invade the privacy of asbestos victims by requiring the posting of personal exposure and medical information online and erect new barriers to victims receiving compensation for their asbestos illnesses they contracted through no fault of their own and for which asbestos producers were legally responsible.

We have witnessed decades of uncontrolled use of asbestos, and, even after its hazards became widely known, the consequences of this dangerous product are visiting death, disease, and heartbreak on innocent victims and their families.

Hundreds of thousands of workers and family members have been exposed to, suffered from, or died of asbestos-related cancers and lung disease.

And sadly, the toll continues to the present day.

It is estimated that each year 10,000 people in the United States are expected to die from asbestos related diseases.

This is an outrage—and to add to their misery—they have to deal with the onerous provisions of H.R. 1927.

Time and time again, asbestos victims have faced huge obstacles, inconvenient barriers, and veiled but persistent resistance in receiving compensation for their injuries.

It is important to note that asbestos litigation is the longest-running mass tort litigation in the history of the United States.

It is particularly outrageous that many of the major asbestos producers refused to accept responsibility and most declared bankruptcy in an attempt to limit their future liability.

In 1994 Congress passed reasonably balanced legislation that allowed the asbestos companies to set up bankruptcy trusts to compensate asbestos victims and reorganize under the bankruptcy law.

But these trusts lack adequate funding to provide just compensation; according to a 2010 RAND study, the median payment across the trusts is sufficient to compensate only 25% of the damages suffered by the claimant.

With compensation from these trusts so limited, asbestos victims have sought redress from the manufacturers of other asbestos products to which they were exposed—the original tortfeasors.

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration, better known as OSHA, noted two decades ago that: ''It was aware of no instance in which exposure to a toxic substance has more clearly demonstrated detrimental health effects on human than has asbestos exposure.''

We see the harm that asbestos causes when it afflicts its victims—ordinary Americans who simply went to work every day to support their families.

And although the proponents of this legislation assert that it is intended to protect asbestos victims, it is interesting to note that not a single asbestos victim has come forth to express support for this legislation.

As the widow of one of our former colleagues, the beloved Congressman Bruce Vento of Minnesota, who passed away from mesothelioma, has stated, this legislation ''does not do a single thing'' to help asbestos victims and their families.

H.R. 1927 does not help and actually disturbs a reasonably well-functioning asbestos victim compensation process.

Entities facing overwhelming mass tort liability for causing asbestos injuries may, under certain circumstances, shed these liabilities and financially regain their stability in exchange for funding trusts established under Chapter II of the Bankruptcy Code to pay the claims of their victims, under certain circumstances.

H.R. 1927, however, interferes with this longstanding process in two ways.

First, the legislation would require these trusts to file a publicly available quarterly report with the bankruptcy court that includes personally identifiable information about claimants, including their names, exposure history, and basis for any payment made to them.

Second, the bill requires the trusts to provide any information related to payment and demands for payment to any party to any action in law or equity concerning liability for asbestos exposure.

It is particularly galling that many of the major asbestos producers refuse to accept responsibility and that most declared bankruptcy in an attempt to limit their future liability.

How much more can we put on these poor victims?

If you want information, go to their counsel, go to the courthouse.

With more than 10,000 Americans suffocating every year from horrific asbestos diseases like mesothelioma, this House should be focused on ensuring justice for the victims and protecting the public health and safety instead of debating legislation designed to delay compensation and deny justice for dying asbestos victims.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this utterly intrusive legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his ongoing championing of the pledge we take every day: liberty and justice for all.

Mr. Chairman, last year marked the 800th anniversary of the signing of the Magna Carta. Eight hundred years ago, this storied charter first laid out a basic right to justice as the foundation of a fair society.

It was interesting to see in the observance of the 800th anniversary of the Magna Carta that they brought out 12 chairs to represent where the barons sat to make their case to King John. Those 12 chairs represent a trial by jury, 12 peers. Even under the King, the Magna Carta declared the lawful judgment by his peers. This much was owed the people.

''To no one will we sell, to no one will we deny, or delay right or justice.'' We pledge each day not justice for only the powerful and the wealthy, but liberty and justice for all.

You can read what I said and much more about justice and the Magna Carta in the book ''1215: The Year of Magna Carta.'' It is pretty thrilling that 800 years ago, people knew that it was fundamental for the leverage to be with the people and that they had rights. The right to justice is part of the beating heart of America's democracy. It is the sword and shield against plutocracy and tyranny.

Yet, today, with their class action bill, Republicans are trying to weaken that right, taking the justice that belongs to every American and handing it to the privileged few. It is about who has the leverage.

Class actions are an indispensable tool for individuals to hold powerful interests and big corporations accountable for their misdeeds. Without the ability to band together, Americans who have endured grave injuries and egregious wrongs face a David and Goliath struggle for justice.

Without class actions, the wealthy and powerful can divide and conquer their victims, burying families' pleas for fair remedy with the sheer weight of their money and resources. With this bill, Republicans are yet again helping the special interests flatten hardworking Americans.

We see the same goal in play in the Republican provisions attacking asbestos victims that are folded into this bill. As was mentioned by our colleague, Congresswoman JACKSON LEE, in her letter, Sue Vento, widow of our esteemed colleague, Bruce Vento, made a plea for them not to include this in this bill, but they did.

These provisions claim to serve transparency. Indeed, the Republicans' effort to protect asbestos companies, intimidate asbestos victims, could not be clearer. They require absolutely no transparency on the part of the asbestos companies. Instead, they invade the privacy of thousands of Americans, many of them veterans and even children in schools.

This isn't about somebody taking a job that has risks. This is about children going to school and being exposed to asbestos and their privacy being invaded.

I am so pleased we will have a motion to recommit to address that later.

It also makes them vulnerable to harm by disclosing personal information in the public domain.

Over and over again, this Republican Congress works to stack the deck for the special interests against hardworking Americans. We see it in campaign finance, where Republicans will drown the voices of the American people in a tidal wave of unlimited special interest spending in our elections and completely resisting any opportunity to disclose. If you like transparency, you should love disclosure of where this money is coming from.

We see it in the assault on labor, where Republicans would dismantle collective bargaining and undermine workers seeking a bigger paycheck, which they have long deserved.

We see it in this bill on class actions, where Republicans would deny justice to millions of Americans. In the courts, in the workplace, in our environment, in our elections, the Republican Congress has strengthened powerful interests and weakened hardworking Americans.

Our Founders pledged their lives, their liberty, their sacred honor, to establish a government of the many, not a government of the money. This is the people's House. Let us stand with the American people in opposing this appalling Republican bill.

With that, I urge a ''no'' vote on the bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, as we have been going through this debate, we have entered in the RECORD and had some discussions about the groups that oppose this bill. I did want to point out that there are quite a few organizations—veterans organizations included—that are in support of this bill.

In fact, there is a pretty broad base of support: The 60 Plus Association; the Air Force Association, Department of Indiana; the American Military Society; the Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry; Arizona Manufacturers Council; the Civil Justice Association of California; Coalition for Common Sense; Cost of Freedom, Indiana Chapter; Florida Chamber of Commerce; Florida Justice Reform Institute; Georgia Chamber of Commerce; Hamilton County Veterans; Illinois Chamber of Commerce; Lawsuit Reform Alliance of New York; the Louisiana Association of Business and Industry; the Michigan Chamber of Commerce; the Military Officers Association, Indianapolis Chapter; Missing in America Project of Indiana; National Association of Manufacturers; the National Black Chamber of Commerce; the New Jersey Civil Justice Institute; the North Carolina Chamber of Commerce; the Pennsylvania Chamber of Commerce and Business and Industry; the Reserve Officers Association Department of Indiana; Save Our Veterans; the South Carolina Civil Justice Coalition; the Taxpayers Protection Alliance; the Texas Civil Justice League; the Cost of Freedom, Inc., of Indiana; Texans for Lawsuit Reform; the U.S. Chamber Institute for Legal Reform, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; the Veteran Resource List; the West Virginia Business and Industry Council; the West Virginia Chamber of Commerce; Wisconsin Manufacturers & Commerce; and, importantly, to me, as a Texan, the Texas Coalition of Veterans Organization, which is an umbrella group that represents more than 600,000 Texas veterans.

This bill is absolutely pro-veteran. As was pointed out on the other side of the aisle, a very large percentage of folks exposed to asbestos are veterans compared to the general population. Under sovereign immunity, they have no one to turn to but these trusts and the manufacturers that created these trusts.

So it is important that we have the FACT Act to preserve the resources in these trusts so that our veterans who are injured by asbestos and come down with mesothelioma or other asbestos-related diseases have resources to compensate them for their injury.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to ask my friend from Texas: Are there any asbestos victims organizations among that list that you recited?

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. I don't know if any of them particularly are asbestos victims associations. But, again——

Mr. CONYERS. Reclaiming my time, that is what I wanted to know, and the gentleman has told me.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise this morning to add my voice to those speaking against this anticonsumer bill and to remind my colleagues, if I can, of what it is to be an American.

One of the signal features of American citizenship is that we have rights. We have rights to property, to liberty, to our privacy. We have rights to be free of negligently inflicted injury and death. We have rights to be free of dangerous and defective products. We have rights that are enforced in court. These are rights that are respected.

To the point Representative COHEN made, people around the world envy us for our rights, our Bill of Rights, our full spectrum of rights. People envy us all over the world for our individual rights. But these individual rights are no good unless you can go to court and enforce them.

And make no mistake, Mr. Chair, the people who are bringing this bill and who are behind it are the ones who routinely get hauled into court to account for causing injuries and violations of American individual rights. They are the ones behind this bill.

The bill is wrong. Cutting back on American individual rights is wrong, too. So I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on H.R. 1927.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), our former leader of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1927, the so-called Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act.

In 2013, in Butler v. Sears, Judge Posner of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals spoke critically of the commonality in damages requirement found in this bill.

He said that ''the fact that damages are not identical across all class members should not preclude class certification. Otherwise defendants would be able to escape liability for tortious harms of enormous aggregate magnitude but so widely distributed as not to be remediable in individual suits.'' The court found that such a requirement ''would drive a stake through the heart of the class action device.''

Furthermore, Mr. Chair, the bill includes the so-called FACT Act, which would have a devastating impact on workers exposed to asbestos.

In the last few decades, thousands of workers in my district have developed asbestosis, lung cancer, and mesothelioma because of asbestos exposure that occurred between the 1940s and 1970s.

This exposure was inflicted upon many victims by corporations, such as one a New Jersey court found to have ''made a conscious, cold-blooded business decision, in utter flagrant disregard of the rights of others, to take no protective or remedial action.''

That is the kind of business that will benefit from the bill. The victims don't want it.

In the letter the ranking member will be introducing, they point out that veterans represent 8 percent of the population, but 30 percent of the victims.

That letter points out that the FACT Act would mandate unnecessary public disclosure of sensitive personal information and would increase the cost of litigation, thereby limiting the available pool of money to compensate the victims of those cold-blooded business decisions.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we would recognize that the asbestos victims have suffered too much already. Therefore, we should defeat this legislation.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

□ 1015

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank our ranking member of the Judiciary Committee for yielding to me.

I rise in strong opposition to this legislation. The so-called Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act is an attempt by the House majority to take away America's access to the courthouse and punish asbestos victims by requiring personal information be made public on the Internet.

I am proud to represent the hardworking people in the 29th District of Texas. Our district is home to the Port of Houston and the largest petrochemical complex in the country. The people in Eastside Houston and Harris County are proud of the work they do in producing the oil and gas and chemicals that drive our Nation's economy.

We also produce a lot of seafarers because we are the largest international port in the country.

This inherently hazardous work needs to be done as safely as possible. Workers in Harris County and throughout our great country should not be exposed to known human carcinogens like asbestos. This is why I introduced, with my colleague, Representative SUZAN DELBENE, the Reducing Exposure to Asbestos Database, or READ Act, last year.

This legislation would expand existing protections enacted under the Reagan administration that would create a public database with the location of asbestos and asbestos-containing products in the country.

The READ Act would bring muchneeded transparency to the known location of asbestos in our country, potentially saving thousands of Americans from asbestos-related illnesses, like lung cancer and mesothelioma, while helping industry reduce workers' exposure to this known carcinogen.

I urge my colleagues to stand with America's working families and join me in voting against today's bill that unfairly punishes asbestos victims and denies the American people access to the justice they deserve.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Members of the House, this legislation is just the latest attempt to take power away from ordinary citizens and place it in the hands of the most powerful corporations and industries in this country.

Whether it is by making it almost impossible for ordinary people to pursue their day in court through the important class action mechanism or threatening the privacy of asbestos victims, it is clear that H.R. 1927 does not have the interest of ordinary people in mind.

And it raises a broader question of who, rightfully, should hold power in a representative democracy like ours, politically unaccountable corporations, who seek only to maximize their own profit, or the people who are supposed to be sovereign. We say it is the people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

There have been a lot of arguments we have heard today for and against this bill, but I think the biggest argument for it is that it preserves precious and limited resources for those who were injured by asbestos and shuts down an avenue of waste, fraud, and abuse that is being exploited right now in the current system.

There has also been a lot of talk about veterans. Folks have said the FACT Act hurts veterans. I say it helps veterans. As I pointed out earlier, veterans cannot pursue litigation against the United States Government because of sovereign immunity, so they have to rely solely on the bankruptcy claims process to get recovery. That is why a significant number of veterans groups, many of whom I list earlier, have written to the committee in support of the FACT Act.

In fact, let me read you the words of John Brieden, a former national commander of the American Legion, in a letter he wrote to The Hill.

> The FACT Act, and its sunshine provision, is strongly supported by veterans like myself who are dedicated to preserving the rapidly diminishing congressionally established asbestos trust fund for all servicemembers who have been injured by a substance we now know to be dangerous and even deadly.

The best way to protect veterans and other asbestos victims from attorneys' double dipping is the FACT Act's requirement to disclose information about the trust fund claims. We have got to protect the privacy in here. That is why the FACT Act was specifically drafted to protect the privacy of those who claim.

The text of the section of the bill that deals with asbestos trusts is only 1½ pages long, but a big part of that is dedicated to privacy. The disclosures are minimal. It is the name of the person, the type of their injury. It particularly prohibits the disclosure of the claimant's Social Security number. So protection is done.

The settlement amounts, work history, and information about the veteran's children and family is simply not in the bill. Furthermore, confidential medical records and Social Security numbers disclosing that information is expressly prohibited under the bill.

So, in summary, this legislation enacts two important reforms that will increase fairness in class action lawsuits and will introduce transparency into the asbestos trust system.

Given that class action lawsuits involve more money and touch more Americans than any other litigation pending in our legal system, it is important we have a Federal class action system that benefits those that have been truly injured, and injured in comparable ways, and is fair to both plaintiffs and defendants.

The Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act would require that a class be composed of members with comparable injuries. The bill would, thereby, achieve a very important reform, clustering actually injured individuals or similarly injured class members in their own class.

People who were injured deserve their own class action in which they present their uniquely powerful cases and get the large recoveries that they deserve.

Under this legislation, uninjured or noncomparably injured people can still join class actions, but they must do so separately, without taking away from the potential recovery of those who are actually injured or more significantly injured.

This legislation also seeks to introduce a modest amount of transparency into a very opaque asbestos bankruptcy system.

The opponents to the FACT Act have offered creative and far-ranging allegations against the measure, but we know these allegations are unfounded. What we do know is the that there is widespread fraud and abuse in the asbestos bankruptcy trust system because it has been documented in news reports, State bankruptcy cases, and before the Judiciary Committee in numerous hearings on this issue.

We also know that the FACT Act will introduce transparency to help curb this fraud, and it will help asbestos victims by protecting these trust funds for those future claimants who have not yet started to show symptoms.

I urge my colleagues to reject the unfounded allegations offered against today's bill and vote in support of these simple, meaningful, commonsense reforms.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114–38. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1927

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 ''Fairness in Class Action Litigation and Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency Act of 2015''

SEC. 2. FAIRNESS IN CLASS ACTION LITIGATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No Federal court shall certify any proposed class seeking monetary relief for personal injury or economic loss unless the party seeking to maintain such a class action affirmatively demonstrates that each proposed class member suffered the same type and scope of injury as the named class representative or representatives.

(b) CERTIFICATION ORDER.—An order issued under Rule 23(c)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that certifies a class seeking monetary relief for personal injury or economic loss shall include a determination, based on a rigorous analysis of the evidence presented, that the requirement in subsection (a) of this section is satisfied.

SEC. 3. FURTHERING ASBESTOS CLAIM TRANSPARENCY.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 11, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 524(g) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(8) A trust described in paragraph (2) shall, subject to section 107—

''(A) file with the bankruptcy court, not later than 60 days after the end of every quarter, a report that shall be made available on the

court's public docket and with respect to such quarter—

''(i) describes each demand the trust received from, including the name and exposure history of, a claimant and the basis for any payment from the trust made to such claimant; and

''(ii) does not include any confidential medical record or the claimant's full social security number; and

''(B) upon written request, and subject to payment (demanded at the option of the trust) for any reasonable cost incurred by the trust to comply with such request, provide in a timely manner any information related to payment from, and demands for payment from, such trust, subject to appropriate protective orders, to any party to any action in law or equity if the subject of such action concerns liability for asbestos exposure.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section and the amendments made by this section take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) APPLICATION OF AMENDMENTS.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to cases commenced under title 11 of the United States Code before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 114–389. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 114–389.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Line 6 on the first page, strike ''No'' and insert ''Except as provided in subsection (c), no''.

After line 18 on the first page, insert the following:

(c) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) does not apply with respect to a claim for monetary relief brought against a perpetrator of a terrorist attack by a victim of the attack.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 581, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment, which was made in order, and which would make an exception to H.R. 1927's required showing for class certification for any claims brought by the victims of a terrorist attack against the attack's perpetrators.

We all agree that victims of terrorist attacks deserve justice, and they should have the fullest opportunity to obtain compensation for any injuries they have suffered because of such attacks.

Sadly, our history over the last generation has no shortage of examples of the kind of victims this amendment would help. From the 1983 bombing of the Marine barracks in Beirut and the 1996 Khobar Towers bombing in Saudi Arabia, to the downing of Pan Am 103 by Qadhafi's Libya, recourse to our courts has been one of the few ways that victims of terrorism have been given at least some opportunity to seek justice for the acts committed against their family members and them.

I know Chairman GOODLATTE shares my concerns for these victims, and I applaud him for his successful efforts to create a compensation fund for those victims of state sponsors of terrorism who receive final court judgements against those state sponsors.

The program also compensates those held hostage in the U.S. Embassy in Iran in 1979.

In some of these cases, the victims, or their survivors, pursued class actions against the state sponsors of the terrorist act. Yet, under section 2 of H.R. 1927, these victims may not have had the opportunity to pursue a class action in the first place.

As noted during the general debate, section 2 adds the new requirement that a named plaintiff prove, as a condition of class certification, that every putative class member suffered the same ''scope'' of injury; not comparable, but the same scope.

This requirement can be read to preclude a class action where, for instance, one terrorism victim loses his legs, while another loses his arms as a result of some terrorist attack. Or maybe somebody isn't a direct victim of the terrorist attack, but hurt in the aftermath of the attack. In short, they did not suffer the same scope of injury.

I note that ''scope'' can mean the same thing as ''extent,'' as the bill introduced originally stated. Current rules, while requiring commonality of facts and law, does not require a showing of commonality in damages as a prerequisite for certifying a class action, as this ''scope of injury'' standard requires.

It is rare that two class members suffer the exact same scope of injury, and almost impossible to prove this at the certification stage.

Think about Boston. Some people lost a leg, some people lost a life, some people lost both legs. They couldn't be part of a class. The relevant inquiry is whether they allegedly both suffered injury as a result of the same alleged wrongful act by the defendant.

It is hard enough as it is to pursue class actions because of years of efforts by industry to make it more and more difficult. Sometimes, in these terrorist situations, it is a different type of defendant.

It is wrong to place the heightened burdens of H.R. 1927 on terrorism victims who seek justice for the acts committed against them. I would ask that this amendment be accepted by the other side because all it does is make exception for victims of terrorism, and we all share in our hope that victims of terror get justice and that we don't put any more hurdles in the way of them successfully completing the track of seeking justice for them and their heirs, ancestors who might have been killed in those attacks.

My amendment would offer them relief of these burdens, and I would hope the other side would accept it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, I agree with Mr. COHEN 100 percent that the victims of terrorism deserve compensation from those who perpetrated the acts of terror.

However, I oppose this amendment because it denies the victims of terrorism the protections that the bill would otherwise afford them. If this amendment is adopted, it would result in less compensation for the most deserving victims in class action lawsuits.

Under the base bill, the most severely injured victims of terrorism would have their own day in court, and they would be compensated to the maximum extent because their entire class would consist of significantly injured members.

Under the base bill, the most significantly injured will not have their compensation reduced by the cost of weeding out from the class the significantly less injured or uninjured.

But if this amendment were adopted, huge numbers of uninjured or less significantly injured victims of terrorism would be allowed into the class and be able to siphon off for themselves the limited resources that may be available to compensate those most injured. That is not right and it is not fair, but that is what this amendment would allow.

□ 1030

To recap, thed purpose of a class action is to provide a fair means of evaluating similar claims, not to provide a means of artificially inflating the size of a class to extort a larger settlement value. Exempting a subset of money damage cases from the bill, as this amendment would do, would only serve to incentivize the creation of artificially large classes to extort larger or unfair settlements from innocent parties for the purpose of disproportionately awarding uninjured parties.

Any claims seeking monetary relief for personal injuries or economic loss should be grouped into classes that are similar with the most injured receiving the most compensation. It is a fair principle that should be applied equally for the benefit of all, including terrorism victims. Why should victims of terrorism be subjected to a particularly unfair treatment by being allowed to be forced into a class action

with other uninjured or marginally injured members, only to see their own compensation reduced? That does a disservice to those claimants, yet that is exactly what the amendment attempts to do.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114–389.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask that the amendment be considered.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Line 6 on the first page, strike ''No'' and insert ''Except as provided in subsection (c), no''.

After line 18 on the first page, insert the following:

(c) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) does not apply with respect to a claim for monetary relief arising from a foreign-made product.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 581, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chairman, having seen the outcome of the last vote where there was one Member of the other side and four Members of this side, and the vote was given to the other side, I just think that it would be best for the process if I withdrew this amendment because I can see the writing on the wall. And I am going to withdraw the amendment and hope that maybe on the floor we will pass something that takes care of the victims of terror and see that they aren't deterred by this.

I would like to just mention my friend, Warren Zevon, again. He had a song called ''Lawyers, Guns and Money'' and the other side is certainly for two-thirds of that.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee.

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 114–389.

Mr. CONYERS. I have an amendment at the desk, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Line 6 on the first page, strike ''No'' and insert ''Except as provided in subsection (c), no''.

After line 18 on the first page, insert the following:

(c) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) does not apply with respect to a claim for monetary relief under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 581, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which would exempt from section 2(a) of the bill any claim for monetary relief under title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Title VII prohibits discrimination in employment on the basis of race, color, sex, religion, or national origin.

During the subcommittee hearing on H.R. 1927 in the Judiciary Committee, I expressed concern about the effect the bill's original language would have on civil rights claims. In particular, I was concerned that the bill applied to all class actions and that it restrictively defined ''injury'' to mean the alleged impact of a defendant's action on a plaintiff's body or property. Although the bill was revised in committee to delete this narrow definition of ''injury'' from H.R. 1927 and to limit the bill's scope to class actions seeking monetary relief for personal injury or economic loss, I remain concerned that significant categories of civil rights cases could still be effectively precluded by this bill.

Plaintiffs in employment discrimination cases, cases that seek backpay and other monetary relief for economic loss resulting from an adverse employment decision, frequently pursue class actions because such employment cases tend to be the kind that are well-suited for class treatment. These cases often involve multiple victims who were subjected to the same discriminatory employment practice or policy. While damages awarded pursuant to a single plaintiff may not be large enough to deter the employer's alleged wrongdoing, aggregate damages awarded to plaintiffs as a result of a class action would have a deterrent effect.

Unfortunately, the bill still requires class action plaintiffs to prove at the certification stage that every potential class member suffered the same type and same scope of injury, a requirement that is virtually impossible and cost prohibitive to meet. This onerous requirement would effectively deter employment discrimination plaintiffs from proceeding with any class actions.

Moreover, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 already imposes significant constraints on the ability of plaintiffs to pursue class actions. Indeed, it was an employment discrimination case in Walmart v. Dukes that the Supreme Court gave what, in my view, was a cramped interpretation of rule 23's commonality requirement making it harder for employees claiming discrimination to proceed as a class.

Because of my continuing concerns with the legislation's potential effects on this important category of civil rights cases, I urge the House to adopt my amendment.

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment.

First, the base bill only applies to proposed classes ''seeking monetary relief for personal injury or economic loss.'' Insofar as civil rights cases do not seek money damages, they are completely unaffected by the substitute and would proceed just as they do today. Indeed, Rule 23(b)(2) expressly provides for civil rights cases in which a class action can be certified when the defendant—and I am quoting the rule—''has acted or refused to act on grounds that apply generally to the class, so that final injunctive relief or corresponding declaratory relief is appropriate respecting the class as a whole.'' Injunctive relief and declaratory relief, of course, are not claims for monetary relief.

Now, if money damages are sought by a proposed class, then of course they should be subject to the procedures in this bill. The purpose of a class action is to provide a fair means of evaluating like claims, not to provide a means for artificially inflating the size of a class to extort a larger settlement value. Exempting a subset of money damage cases from the bill, as this amendment would do, would serve only to incentivize the creation of artificially large classes to extort larger and unfair settlements for the purpose of disproportionately awarding uninjured plaintiffs.

Any claims seeking monetary damages for personal injury or economic loss should be grouped in classes in which those who are most injured receive the most compensation. Why should certain civil rights claimants seeking money damages under one specific statute be subjected to a particularly unfair treatment by being allowed to be forced into a class action with other uninjured or minimally injured members, only to see their own compensation reduced? That does a disservice to those claimants. That is exactly what this amendment would do.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. DEUTCH

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 114–389.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Line 6 on the first page, strike ''No'' and insert ''Except as provided in subsection (c), no''.

After line 18 on the first page, insert the following:

(c) EXCEPTION.—This section does not apply with respect to a claim brought by a gun owner seeking monetary relief involving the defective design or manufacturing of a firearm.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 581, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chairman, we know the intentions behind the bill before us today, H.R. 1927, the so-called Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act. The goal of this bill isn't to protect consumers. The goal of this bill is to wipe out class action lawsuits and to deprive consumers of their ability to band their resources together to take large corporations to court for defective and, many times, dangerous products.

We have heard from many of my colleagues already today about the problems this bill creates, and I agree that this is a bad bill. But it is a uniquely bad bill for one group in particular: gun owners. That is right, gun owners—law-abiding Americans exercising their Second Amendment rights who suffer injury or even death when gun manufacturers sell defective and ultrahazardous weapons.

Every year, many gun owners and innocent bystanders are killed when a firearm discharges just at being set down on the ground, when a faulty safety leaves a child dead, when an experienced and safety-conscious gun owner is the victim of a deadly malfunction. Unique to consumer products, no Federal safety agency has the authority to issue a recall of a defectively manufactured firearm. Indeed, the Consumer Product Safety Commission has jurisdiction and oversight to ensure that more than 15,000 household and recreation products are safe for consumers.

Thanks to years of hard work by the gun lobby, the Consumer Product Safety Commission is specifically prohibited from protecting consumers from defectively manufactured firearms. Moreover, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives has the authority to license gun manufacturers but does not have the authority to recall defectively manufactured firearms.

Today, this bill's rigorous requirement for certifying a class would render gun owners even more powerless. Currently, gun owners' only recourse in these unfortunate events is our court system, and most people don't have the resources to go up against the massive titans of the gun industry.

Let me give you an example of the kind of class action suit that would not exist under this legislation. In 2013, a class action was filed against Taurus in a U.S. District Court in my State of Florida. The claim involved a design defect in the semiautomatic pistol's trigger safety blade.

Let me read you a news story from Alabama. You will hear about Judy Price, an experienced gun owner. She says she knows them all, how to handle them safely, and she speaks to people taking concealed-carry classes. Price said that no amount of gun knowledge could have saved her from what happened in 2009. Her concealed-carry holster fell to the floor as she was undressing. Then her Taurus pistol went off with a bullet going through her groin, through her stomach, and into her liver.

''I laid down on the floor. I looked up into his eyes, and I said, 'Paul, I am going to die tonight. But I love you.' ''

Incredibly, she didn't die that night, although for about 9 days it was ''touch and go,'' she said.

The lead plaintiff in this country was actually a sheriff from Iowa. Chris Carter, a sheriff's deputy in Scott County, was serving on narcotics detail and was pursuing a fleeing suspect. As he ran, his pistol fell from his holster, hitting the ground and discharging a bullet that struck a nearby vehicle. Luckily, it was unoccupied.

Thanks to the ability to pursue a class action, this case was settled, and Taurus voluntarily recalled the pistols. Under this legislation, it is unlikely that gun owners wronged by bad actors in the gun manufacturing industry would have any recourse at all.

I will give you one more example. The gun owner who took his 22 Colt single-action revolver with him fishing. When his gun fell out of his holster, it fired and lodged a bullet in his bladder. He lost the ability to have children.

Under this bill, Federal courts would only be able to hear class action suits involving a group of people if they can prove that they have all ''suffered the same type and scope of injury'' as the named representatives. The family who lost a loved one to a bullet wound in the head due to a defective gun living in Florida would not be able to join with a gun owner shot in the knee in Oregon, would not be able to join together and seek justice even if the injuries were caused by the same defect in the same make and model of gun.

□ 1045

This overly specific language would prevent gun owners from satisfying the bill's requirement that each member demonstrate the ''same type'' and ''scope of injury.''

It would remove the courts as the last remaining venue to ensure that gun manufacturers are held liable for selling defectively manufactured firearms.

My amendment can fix this problem at least—at least—with respect to gun owners bringing claims for a defective design or manufacturing of a firearm.

This bill's rigorous requirements for certifying a class would have prevented the lawsuits I mentioned and would keep any future class actions brought by gun owners against manufacturers for defectively manufactured items from moving forward. The manufacturers, in many cases, were well aware of the defects for many years, but it took a class action for them to finally do something about it.

Today, you have the opportunity to choose to stand with sportsmen, with law-abiding citizens purchasing guns to protect their homes and families, and with law enforcement who are protecting our communities, or you can stand with the gun manufacturers when they put out defective products that put responsible gun owners at risk.

I strongly urge support for my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, I feel like I am caught in Groundhog Day. I am making the same argument again and again.

The purpose of this bill is to make sure the most injured are the most compensated and not result in a dilution of those by bringing in massive amounts of people not similarly injured.

I disagree with the gentleman's argument that it isn't a similar injury if you are shot in the leg or you are shot in the arm by a defective gun.

Why should guns be treated differently than toasters? If your defective product injures somebody, you are responsible for it; but if your defective product doesn't injure somebody, you shouldn't be.

Mr. DEUTCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARENTHOLD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DEUTCH. I would agree with the gentleman that guns should be treated exactly the same way as toasters. I hope that the gentleman would consider working with me to ensure that the Consumer Product Safety Commission could recall defective guns just like they can recall defective toasters.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Reclaiming my time, we are dealing with the tort system right now and class action. I would be happy to have a conversation sometime in the future about consumer protection legislation.

At this point, under the bill we are discussing, if you exempt guns, people injured by guns—truly injured by guns—will actually receive less compensation because they will be exempted, and the plaintiffs' attorneys will be able to build a big class where even if, in a worst-case scenario, you could exhaust all of the resources of the gun company, you end up maybe with people getting a coupon for 20 percent off their next firearm as opposed to actual monetary damages, with the plaintiffs' attorney taking home millions.

This bill is designed to make sure the most injured get the most money and those not injured do not. That is what we are trying to do here. Regardless of whatever exception you want to put for whatever industry, the bill generally works for all industries. That is the way it was designed.

I urge everyone to oppose this amendment

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 114–389.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Line 6 on the first page, strike ''No'' and insert ''Except as provided in subsection (c), no''.

After line 18 on the first page, insert the following:

(c) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) does not apply with respect to causes of action arising under the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.) or the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (15 U.S.C. 1691 et seq.).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 581, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would exempt suits arising out of the Fair Housing Act or the Equal Credit Opportunity Act.

I offer my amendment today, Mr. Chairman, out of a real concern about the consequences the bill will have on social justice issues. One of these issues that is very dear to me is the disparate access to financial products for African Americans. That is the reason that I, before I became a Member of Congress, created a credit union for my area in Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

We are still seeing discrimination in housing and auto financing and insurance products in my home district of Milwaukee. This is not something, Mr. Chairman, that happened in the good old days. We have witnessed discrimination in mortgage loans as recently as 2012.

As a member of the Financial Services Committee, we have learned about the CFPB's role in cracking down on auto lenders who discriminate against minorities. Folks who have the same credit score, if your name is Rodriguez or Barack Obama Jones, suddenly your auto loan would be at a higher rate.

Class actions are an important tool to fight back. For example, in Adkins v. Stanley, a class action suit was filed against Morgan Stanley for practices through a mortgage lender that had a significant impact against an entire African American community. In Detroit, Michigan, from where our distinguished ranking member hails, the practices led to filling these communities with high-risk subprime loans, leading up to the 2008 housing crisis. I would commend any of you to go to Detroit and see the result of that discrimination where entire communities have been eviscerated.

Actions helped to uncover and fight back against auto finance lender practices that used these subjective criteria, whether your name was Rodriguez or Barack Obama Jones, to determine creditworthiness. This practice was found to have a disproportionate impact, charging these higher interest rates for minorities compared to White borrowers with the exact, similar credit ratings.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, I once again make the same argument. Once we take out one specific claim or the other, we do away with the benefits to that group that this bill confers.

This bill is pro-consumer by making sure the most injured receive the most compensation and that you don't artificially build up a class and dilute the award. It is the exact same argument I made on almost all of the previous amendments.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, that argument is not a good argument because when you think of the example of just, say, Morgan Stanley, if there was someone who, in Detroit, Michigan, lost their house through the subprime lending, that has as much impact on that person as the person next door who was underwater and couldn't sell their home and couldn't repair it because of the impact on their next-door neighbor.

This notion that they have to be injured in exactly the same way really flies in the face of logic and, of course, flies in the face of justice.

I would ask Members to adopt my amendment. It is common sense. It is just. There are so many cases against minorities, in particular, that would be adversely impacted through this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 114–389.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Line 6 on the first page, strike ''No'' and insert ''Except as provided in subsection (c), no''.

After line 18 on the first page, insert the following:

(c) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) does not apply with respect to any cause of action arising from a pay equity claim under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C 2000e et seq.) or that portion of the Fair Labor Standards Act (29 U.S.C. 206(d)) known as the Equal Pay Act of 1963.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 581, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would exempt pay equity lawsuits arising from title VII of the Civil Rights Act or the Equal Pay Act.

Today, the wage gap for women is a very real experience, not only for those women, but for families in the United States workforce. According to the National Women's Law Center, the gender wage gap amounts to over $10,000 a year in median income.

But this bill, H.R. 1927, takes away one of the only effective tools that women in the workplace have to narrow the wage gap. That is through class action suits filed under title VII of the Civil Rights Act or the Equal Pay Act. This bill would, to borrow Judge Posner's term, really drive a stake through the heart of the Equal Pay Act or the Civil Rights Act.

This bill will make it harder to certify members of a class in pay equity

cases because each detail relating to the type and scope of the damage is often unique to the woman who was injured. For example, a woman involved in a class could have a different type of job, different number of years working for a company, different wages, different benefits, and if the company is discriminating against all women, across all the job categories, they would not be certified as a class unless they made exactly the same pay, worked there exactly the same number of years, which, Mr. Chairman, is ludicrous.

This bill would also make it harder for women in pay equity cases because, at the certification stage, women wouldn't have the same information about each other to know whether or not they could be in the same class.

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, again, we get back to the argument, as you start to exempt certain groups or certain types of lawsuits, it creates the same situation we have now that we are trying to fix in that class where those mostly injured get the most compensation and those only marginally injured are compensated accordingly.

I think part of where the other side has a little misunderstanding of the bill is I keep hearing the word ''exact.'' It is not the exact same injury. The bill requires that class members share the same scope of injury, which is intended to prevent certification of grossly overbroad class action lawsuits that include members with wildly varying injury.

The dictionary and ordinary meaning of ''scope'' is the range of a relevant subject. Judges are certainly capable of determining relevant range of injuries that would make class members suitably typical of one another. I think this could happen in all cases and actually probably more so in these equal pay type of cases if the scope of the injury is being paid less.

Again, I think common sense is going to dictate. As we have seen historically, the vast majority of the times our Federal Court systems get it right. There are few notable exceptions, but that is beyond the scope of this argument.

I would urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, this exception, to a great piece of legislation that is designed to make our class action system fair and make sure those who are the most injured are the most compensated.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague for that exhaustive explanation and definition of scope.

Common sense just ain't common, so we cannot rely on common sense.

I just want to say that the courts already require a plaintiff seeking class action certification to make substantial showings that they have, in fact, been injured. That is our argument, that they have to have the same scope and that we need to reserve the benefits for those at the top so that women who are discriminated against in a firm—we are only concerned with those women who are going to lose the most money because they didn't get a management position. We are not going to be concerned with the women who worked in the janitorial services and were discriminated against.

I think that there is a smoking gun here when you hear our opponents make these furious arguments and regale us with definitions of scope, where the courts have already done that. If it ain't broke, don't fix it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, I stand by the plain language of the statute, and the intent is to help victims and make the class action system fair. Exceptions will only weaken that.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin will be postponed.

□ 1100

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. MAXINE WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 114–389.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

On the first page, line 6, strike ''No'' and insert ''Except as provided in subsection (c), no''.

On the first page, after line 18 insert the following:

(c) EXCEPTION.—The requirements for a demonstration under subsection (a) and the inclusion of a determination relating to that requirement under subsection (b) do not apply with respect to a claim against—

(1) any institution or third party servicer that receives or services funds under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.);

(2) any institution that originates, services, or otherwise administers qualified education loans (as defined in section 221 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986); or

(3) any institution providing a course of education approved for purposes of chapter 33 of title 38, United States Code.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 581, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 1927, the Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act.

My amendment would protect students, servicemembers, and veterans who are seeking monetary relief from fraudulent institutions of higher education by exempting them from the onerous requirements for class certification outlined in the bill.

H.R. 1927 requires Federal courts to certify a class only when all class members demonstrate they have suffered the same type and scope of injury. This additional requirement would be unduly burdensome to students, servicemembers, and veterans who have been fraudulently misled by the for-profit college industry.

For example, recently the Department of Education conducted a joint investigation with California Attorney General Kamala Harris. They concluded that for-profit college Corinthian Colleges misrepresented its job placement rates to prospective and enrolled students.

Specifically, the investigation found that, among other abuses, a Corinthian accounting program reported a job placement rate of 92 percent of its graduates in accounting-related fields, but that, in reality, only 12 percent of the graduates of this program had secured jobs in accounting.

For a separate business associate program, Corinthian reported a 95 percent job placement rate, but the Department of Education determined that, in reality, only 14 percent of the program's graduates had jobs in the relevant field.

It is clear that, with job placement rate errors of 80 and 81 percent respectively, students enrolled in both programs were intentionally and fraudulently misled by Corinthian Colleges.

Yet, under H.R. 1927, these defrauded students arguably would not be able to form a class to seek relief because they have been injured by a mere 1 percent degree of difference or because they were lied to about job placement rates in different careers. This is totally illogical and unfair, and it defeats the purpose of the class action.

As the example demonstrates, particularly in the context of higher education, H.R. 1927 essentially makes class certification impossible to achieve and, thus, impractical to pursue. The inability to bring forth class actions will selectively shield for-profit colleges from accountability and will significantly reduce access to our court system for deserving students and veterans.

We only need to look further at Corinthian Colleges to understand the harm that ensues when these schools are left unaccountable. For decades, Corinthian Colleges defrauded its students by inflating job placement rates,

by engaging in unfair marketing practices and illegal debt collection tactics, and by requiring students to take out private loans at high interest rates.

According to the California attorney general, it likewise unlawfully used military seals in its advertising materials to lure an increasing number of our active servicemen and veterans. Worse yet, by including bans on class actions as a prerequisite to enrollment, Corinthian Colleges protected itself from liability while engaging in these awful predatory tactics.

As a result of its decades of predatory conduct, Corinthian Colleges was finally forced to close its doors in April 2015, leaving thousands of students with tens of thousands of dollars in debt, with worthless degrees, and with no job opportunities to show for their time and hard work.

Hundreds of veterans forfeited their GI benefits, which were earned on the battlefield in service to our country. One veteran of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan told Politico that the months he had spent studying auto mechanics at a Corinthian school was wasted time because of the poor equipment and the training he received.

In October, a Federal judge ruled that Corinthian Colleges was operating a predatory lending scheme and ordered the school to pay back $531 million in damages to all students who attended the network of colleges before it closed its doors.

Yet, in reality, because the school has filed for bankruptcy, executives will walk away with millions while students and veterans will never see any of the money owed to them. Meanwhile, taxpayers will be expected to pick up the tab for this and any other future Corinthian judgments.

The law already favors schools like Corinthian and other big corporations over classes of harmed consumers—as evidenced by the fact that students were unable to join together and prevail in a class action during Corinthian's prior decades of misconduct, and prior to its bankruptcy and collapse. Corinthian should have been forced to repay these students out of their own profits, and our service members and veterans should have had their G.I. benefits returned so those funds could be used at a competitive, high-achieving institution.

Yet, today, we are considering advancing H.R. 1927, which will serve as an additional barrier to ensuring justice for these students, service members and veterans. My amendment would eliminate the hurdle that H.R. 1927 imposes on defrauded students, which would help ensure that the institutions of higher education would be on the hook for their fraud and unfair practices, and ensure that other for-profit institutions would be held accountable in the future.

I would ask for support for my amendment. I am sure that my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle would not want to go down in history as preventing these kinds of acts from being dealt with.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. FOXX). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Chair, I oppose this amendment for the same reason that I have opposed almost every amendment so far in that it exempts a certain class from the bill that is designed to help those who are most injured.

First, the base bill only applies to classes that are seeking monetary relief for personal injury or economic loss. Insofar as education-related cases do not seek monetary damages, they are completely unaffected by the bill and would proceed just as they do today. If money damages are being sought, then, of course, they should be subject to the procedures in this bill.

The purpose of a class action is to provide a fair means of evaluating like claims, not to provide a means of artificially inflating the size of a class to extort a larger settlement. The other side is continually saying that these groups or classes must be exactly the same. The language is of the same scope. The bill is designed to keep from grossly inflating the size of a class.

The students of the college that the gentlewoman is citing were all in the same class and would appear to be similarly injured. I cannot predict what a court would do. I believe, under this bill, even without the gentlewoman's amendment, they would continue to be certified as a class because the scope of their injuries would be the same.

It is not designed to make it exact. It is the same scope. And that is where we are trying to go. Claimants who are seeking monetary relief need to be grouped in classes in which the most injured receive the most compensation, but it doesn't have to be the exact same injury.

I don't see any need for this amendment. I think it actually would unfairly hurt those folks from the college because they would not be subject to the protections of this bill in that an attorney could inflate the class to include folks, let's say, who didn't have as many damages and who were from other colleges. I can think of a wide variety of hypotheticals here.

The idea behind this bill is, regardless of the class, if you are the most injured, you should be the most compensated, and there is a lot of area in which the judges can determine what the scope of those injuries is.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 114–389.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Line 10 on the first page, strike ''and scope''.

Line 8 on the first page, strike ''or economic loss''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 581, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Chair, my amendment would remove the scope and economic loss language from the bill.

Think of yourself as driving down a two-lane road, doing 55 miles an hour. It is nighttime or it could be daytime. Suddenly, you lose control of your car because your ignition switch cuts off the car and you lose control of your power steering and your brakes. There is an 18-wheeler coming at you and you have no time to react. There is a crash and you, as the driver, are killed in the unfortunate accident.

Let's assume that that has happened in numerous other cases. Perhaps the injuries were not as bad as a death. Perhaps someone just suffered a closed-head injury, a concussion, or perhaps a broken arm in the accident. Let's assume that both of those cars were made by the same manufacturer, had the same ignition switch, and a defect in that ignition switch caused the crashes.

Now there are numbers of claimants who are wanting to get together and file a class action lawsuit because they know that the large company has an army of lawyers, all of whom will go to court against a single plaintiff to defeat the claim. These briefcase-toting, loafer-wearing, silk-stocking lawyers, who are getting paid $900 an hour go to court, have helped the corporation hide the existence of the defect for many years, and there have been so many accidents that have occurred that singular plaintiffs who aggregate their claims and come together against that corporation have a better shot at winning the case than has just a single plaintiff who is going against an army of corporate lawyers.

This legislation changes the rules. It tilts the scales in favor of the company by making the plaintiffs prove that

they have suffered the same type and scope of injury as has the named class representative, and that is despite there being one common question of law in fact that permeates all of the cases. Why shouldn't they be allowed to bring that case together?

This amendment would remove the scope and economic loss language of the bill so that it would not impede the ability of claimants to bring a class action lawsuit against a corporate wrongdoer. I would ask my colleagues to support my amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Chair, this amendment should be defeated because it essentially guts the bill.

The bill requires that class action members share the same scope of injury, which is intended to prevent the certification of grossly overbroad class action lawsuits that include members with wildly varying injuries.

The ordinary meaning of scope in the dictionary is the range of a relevant subject. Judges are certainly capable of determining the relevant range of injuries that would make class members suitably typical of one another.

□ 1115

The base bill uses the word ''scope'' to make clear that all class members do not need to have suffered the same type of injury to the exact same extent, but they still must demonstrate they have suffered the same range of injuries as determined by the court.

This amendment also strikes the term ''economic loss'' from the bill. The base bill defines the scope of class actions covered by the bill as those involving claims for monetary relief for personal injury or economic loss. Economic loss is defined by Black's Law Dictionary as ''a monetary loss, such as lost wages or lost profits.'' In a products liability suit, the economic loss includes the cost of repair or replacement of defective property as well as commercial loss for the property's inadequate value and consequential loss of profits or use.

These sorts of claims should also be covered under the bill because they are claims for monetary relief. Those with significantly greater claims for such relief should have their own day in court and the chance to obtain the most compensation for their economic loss.

I am urging my colleagues to reject this gutting amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Chair, that is exactly what I want to do, is to gut this legislation, because it guts the ability of asbestos victims to press class actions against the wrongdoing Koch brothers and other companies that manufacture that product.

I want it to be known that there are veterans organizations that oppose this legislation: the Air Force Sergeants Association; Air Force Women Officers Associated; American Veterans, AMVETS; the Association of the United States Navy; the Commissioned Officers Association of the U.S. Public Health Services; Fleet Reserve Association; the Jewish War Veterans of the USA; the Marine Corps Reserve Association; the Military Officers Association of America; the Military Order of the Purple Heart; the National Association of Uniformed Services; the National Defense Council; the Naval Enlisted Reserve Association; the Retired Enlisted Association; the United States Coast Guard Chief Petty Officers Association; the United States Army Warrant Officers Association; the Vietnam Veterans Association; and on and on.

I don't know what those veteran organizations that my friend named actually do. I don't know who they are. They certainly have names that appear to misrepresent whether or not they are in favor of the rights of servicemen and -women, but these organizations that I just named are.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Chair, again, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill. The gentleman on the other side of the aisle, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, of course, indicated that it is his intent to gut the bill here.

We need to defeat this amendment. Of course, Mr. JOHNSON is free to vote against the bill, although I belive that would be a mistake.

I would urge my colleagues to not only oppose this amendment, but to support the underlying bill when we get to it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 114–389.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Beginning on page 2, strike line 5 and all that follows through line 2 on page 3, and insert the following:

''(8)(A) A trust described in paragraph (2) shall, subject to subparagraph (B) and section 107, provide upon written request and subject to payment (demanded at the option of the trust) for any reasonable cost incurred by the trust to comply with such request, to any party that is a defendant in a pending court action relating to asbestos exposure, information that is directly related to the plaintiff's claim in that pending action.

''(B) A defendant requesting information under subparagraph (A) shall first disclose to such plaintiff and such trust, subject to an appropriate protective order the median settlement amount paid by that defendant for claims settled or paid within 5 years of the date of the request, by disease category, for the State in which the plaintiff's action was filed. No personally identifiable information shall be included in any exchange of information under this paragraph.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 581, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I think most of all that we have had a vigorous discussion on behalf of the American people. I hope they are listening.

I hope my colleagues are listening because, as I listened to the debate myself, I heard a continuing theme: Let's bash the plaintiffs and those seeking justice and make sure we make our friends who want to eliminate costs, eliminate the road to justice, provide them with an opportunity to reconfigure the road that has the Lady Justice balanced scales as a symbol of this system.

When I heard my colleague from Texas, a good friend, talk about costs and making sure that the individuals in the class are spread out so that they are limited in the ability to press their case, I got the answer. Again, I say that a one-way street to justice is unacceptable. There are too many people who died that I cannot stand on this floor and deny those who are sick and ailing or those who had in the 1950s thalidomide where babies were born with malformations because women took medicine that had not been tested.

The Jackson Lee amendment would provide a balanced approach to the bill's disclosure requirements by applying transparency rules in the bill equally to the asbestos industry defendants. Specifically, this amendment will require that an asbestos defendant seeking information from the trusts about a plaintiff to first make available to the plaintiff and trust information about the median settlement amount paid by that defendant for claims settled or paid within 5 years of the date of the request for the State in which the plaintiff's actions were filed.

The American Bar Association understands my point. Frankly, in their comments, they made the following statement that I think is important: ''We oppose legislation such as H.R. 1927, because it would unnecessarily circumvent the Rules Enabling Act, make it more difficult for large numbers of injured parties to efficiently seek redress in court''—again, a one-way street—''and could place added burdens on the already overloaded court system.'' The ABA goes on to relate how this bill is a poor bill.

I include their letter for the RECORD.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, January 6, 2016.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of the American Bar Association and its over 400,000 members, I write to offer our views as the House considers class action reform. I understand that you intend to bring up H.R. 1927, the ''Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act of 2015,'' as early as this week. The ABA has long recognized that we must continue to improve our judicial system; however, we oppose legislation such as H.R. 1927, because it would unnecessarily circumvent the Rules Enabling Act, make it more difficult for large numbers of injured parties to efficiently seek redress in court, and could place added burdens on an already overloaded court system.

This legislation would circumvent the time-proven process for amending the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure established by Congress in the Rules Enabling Act. Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure governs determinations whether class certification is appropriate. This rule was adopted in 1966 and has been amended several times utilizing the procedure established by Congress. The Judicial Conference, the policy-making body for the courts, is currently considering changes to Rule 23, and we recommend allowing this process to continue. In addition, the Supreme Court is poised to rule on cases where there are questions surrounding class certification. For example, the Court recently heard arguments in Tyson Foods v. Bouaphakeo where it will determine whether a class can be certified when it contains some members who have not been injured. We respectfully urge you to allow these processes for examining and reshaping procedural and evidentiary rules to work as Congress intended.

Currently, to proceed with a class action case, plaintiffs must meet rigorous threshold standards. A 2008 study by the Federal Judicial Center found that only 25 percent of diversity actions filed as class actions resulted in class certification motions, nine percent settled, and none went to trial. These data show that current screening practices are working. However, if the proponents of this legislation are concerned about frivolous class action cases and believe that screening can be even more effective through rule changes, those changes should be proposed and considered utilizing the current process set forth by Congress in the Rules Enabling Act.

In addition to circumventing the traditional judicial rulemaking process, the legislation would severely limit the ability of victims who have suffered a legitimate harm to seek justice collectively in a class action lawsuit. The legislation mandates that no Federal court shall certify any proposed class seeking monetary relief for personal injury or economic loss unless the party affirmatively demonstrates that each proposed class member suffered the same type and scope of injury as the named class representative(s). This requirement leaves a severe burden for people who have suffered personal injury or economic loss at the hands of large institutions with vast resources, effectively barring them from forming class actions. For example, in a class action against the Veterans Administration, several veterans sued for a variety of grievances centered on delayed claims. The requirement in this legislation that plaintiffs suffer the same type of injuries might have barred these litigants from forming a class because each plaintiff suffered harms that were not the same.

We were pleased that a manager's amendment offered in Committee removed the requirement that the alleged harm to the plaintiff involved bodily injury or property damage. This improved the bill, but the remaining requirement leaves too high a burden. Class actions have been an efficient means of resolving disputes. Many of the legitimate complaints about lawsuit abuses through class-action litigation have been addressed through the evolution of class-action standards by the courts themselves; others are currently being considered by the Judicial Conference as part of the Rules Enabling Act process. Making it harder for victims to utilize class actions could add to the burden of our court system by forcing aggrieved parties to file suit in smaller groups, or individually.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide our input and urge you to keep these concerns in mind as you continue to debate class-action reform legislation. If the ABA can provide you or your staff with any additional information regarding the ABA's views, or if we can be of further assistance, please contact me or ABA Governmental Affairs Legislative Counsel, David Eppstein.

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. SUSMAN.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Again, my friends, this speaks to the idea that we are not focusing on the plaintiff. So the injured party is at a disadvantage.

Let me say to my colleagues that this bill is unnecessary because, in a class action, you do not get the same amount of money. It just allows you to put together your resources to press forward your case. So if you are a poor farmer or if you are a poor waitress or you are someone driving a 1989 car and you are in a circumstance that puts you in a category where that car, even as old as it is, had some defect and you have no ability to press your case, you have the ability to press your case along with others. I am outraged to think that they would deny that.

So my amendment says to the defendant: You need to put forward all the information that you are demanding of those individuals who are singularly unable to provide the kind of legal representation that they need.

If transparency was the true goal of this bill, then, why doesn't the bill require settling defendants to reveal information important to public safety? The asbestos health crisis is the result of a massive corporate coverup. Trust information is already public. So let's make it a two-way street.

Let me also include for the RECORD a letter and these words: ''Far from being even-handed, this bill allows defendants—and only defendants—to do an end-run around state rules of discovery that place limits on information-gathering. The bill would tip the scales of justice in favor of asbestos defendants.''

JANUARY 6, 2016.

Re Opposition to Section 3 of H.R. 1927, the Fairness in Class Action Litigation and Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency Act of 2015

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI: The undersigned groups strongly oppose Section 3 of H.R. 1927, the ''Fairness in Class Action Litigation and Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency Act of 2015,'' formerly H.R. 526, the ''Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency Act'' (FACT Act). This bill will interfere with state legal systems without justification, severely invade the privacy of asbestos victims and their families, and delay and deny justice to people suffering from lethal asbestos-related diseases. While it may seem like an opportune time to legislate in the area of asbestos litigation, this bill is extremely misguided. It will do little more than harm dying victims (including many former Navy shipyard workers), while advantaging the big corporations responsible for compensating them.

For decades, secrecy and deceit have been a way of business for the asbestos industry, and this bill does absolutely nothing to change that. This wholly unnecessary and one-sided legislation is an affront to states' rights and unfair to victims.

Section 3 of H.R. 1927 has two primary provisions: 1) requires asbestos trusts to disclose on public websites the private, confidential information about every asbestos claimant and their families, including past, current and future claimants. The legislation does nothing to stop asbestos defendants from continuing to demand secrecy when they settle cases (as they routinely do), or force companies to disclose any information to help a claimant with his or her case. To this day, these companies refuse to make public information about where asbestos is present, where it was used, and where it is imported. This bill is an unfair and unwarranted imposition on people who are likely to die because the asbestos industry covered up the dangers of asbestos for over 50 years and still insists on confidentiality today. Moreover, the information that will go on these public sites includes victims' names, addresses, medical information, how much they received in compensation, and the last four digits of their social security numbers. This extreme invasion of privacy will make victims and their families vulnerable to predators, con artists, and unscrupulous businesses who will scour these sites for information.

2) It gives any defendant in any asbestos lawsuit the right to demand any information about any asbestos victim from any asbestos trust at any time for any reason. The trusts themselves have already told the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law that such a provision would place substantial burdens on them, requiring them to spend tens of thousands of additional hours per year trying to comply with this requirement. And because the provision is unlimited, the costs of compliance for trusts would be very high as well. Trusts are already underfunded. A RAND study found that the median payment from asbestos trusts to victims is 25 percent of the value of the claim, and some payments are as low as 1.1 percent of the claim's value.

In addition to cost burdens, severe delays will result. As explained by Caplin & Drysdale attorney Elihu Inselbuch in his

''Responses to Questions for the Record'' following his 2013 subcommittee testimony: because trusts will be buried in otherwise unnecessary paperwork seeking claimant information, ''The bill would slow down or stop the process by which the trusts review and pay claims, such that many victims would die before receiving compensation, since victims of mesothelioma typically only live for 4 to 18 months after their diagnosis.'' In many cases, ''the delays in trust payment will force dying plaintiffs, who are in desperate need of funds, to settle for lower amounts with solvent defendants . . . Delay is a weapon for asbestos defendants.''

Finally, Mr. Inselbuch explained that, because this bill does not require that the information demanded by defendants be relevant to, or admissible in, any lawsuit, it is an unwarranted and ''heavy-handed piece of federal interference with the states' legal systems.''

Far from being even-handed, this bill allows defendants—and only defendants—to do an end-run around state rules of discovery that place limits on information-gathering. The bill would tip the scales of justice in favor of asbestos defendants by giving defendants access to information about victims' settlements with asbestos trusts while allowing defendants to continue hiding information about their settlements with other victims. To level the playing field, victims should be entitled to information from defendants regarding previous settlement amounts and true transparency about where the defendants' asbestos was used, manufactured, and stored.

As to the claim that this bill will ''prevent fraud,'' this bill places new, burdensome requirements on regularly-audited trusts. No one can find evidence of significant fraud in the trust process. The U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) studied the problem and did not identify one fraudulent claim. As Mr. Inselbuch noted, ''[b]ecause the injured victim was typically exposed to multiple asbestos products at multiple job sites over a period of many years, he or she must file different claims, with different trusts, with different forms that request different information. The fact that the exposure information submitted to one trust differs from the exposure information submitted to another does not mean it is 'inconsistent'—and certainly not specious or fraudulent.'' Similarly, with regard to charges that victims ''double-dip,'' he explains, ''when an asbestos victim recovers from each defendant whose product contributed to their disease, that victim is in no way 'double-dipping'; rather they are recovering a portion of their damages from each of the corporations who harmed them. In fact, each trust is responsible for and pays for only its own share of the damages.'' And as noted above, each trust usually can pay only pennies on the dollar.

Since at least the 1930s, asbestos companies and their insurers have been denying responsibility for the millions of deaths and illnesses caused by this deadly product. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention report that roughly 3,000 people continue to die from mesothelioma and asbestosis every year. Other experts estimate the death toll is as high as 15,000 people per year when other types of asbestos-linked diseases and cancers are included. The companies hid the dangers posed by asbestos exposure, lied about what they knew, fought against liability for the harms caused, tried to change the laws that held them responsible and, to this day, fight against banning asbestos in the U.S. The asbestos industry is not interested in transparency. This legislation is nothing but another industry attempt to avoid responsibility for the grave harms they have caused. We are asking you to stand with veterans and other cancer victims of the asbestos industry's wrongdoing and oppose H.R. 1927.

Thank you for your consideration of our views.

Sincerely,

Alliance for Justice, Asbestos Disease Awareness Organization, Center for Effective Government, Center for Justice & Democracy, Connecticut Center for Patient Safety, Constitutional Alliance, Consumer Action, Consumer Watchdog, EWG Action Fund, National Employment Lawyers Association, National Association of Consumer Advocates, National Consumers League, OpenTheGovernment.org, Protect All Children's Environment, Public Citizen, U.S. PIRG.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I ask my colleagues to support my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Chair, one of the issues the FACT Act addresses is State court litigants' inability to obtain information from bankruptcy asbestos trusts. The FACT Act eliminates this problem by requiring minimal disclosures from asbestos trusts and allowing for access to additional information at the cost of the requesting party. It doesn't put a burden on the trusts.

The amendment not only removes the minimal disclosure requirements, but it would replace additional disclosure requirements on parties who request information from the asbestos trust.

Over the course of four separate hearings before the Judiciary Committee the issue highlighted was the lack of disclosure by the asbestos bankruptcy trust, not private party litigants. There has been no record of plaintiffs encountering difficulties in obtaining information necessary to sue these businesses. In fact, the evidence is to the contrary. Go look at a plaintiff's attorney who specializes in asbestos litigation Web site and you see how they tout their access to information necessary to sue these companies.

It is the parties, other than the plaintiffs, including other asbestos bankruptcy trusts, as well as State court judges, who have difficulty obtaining information from the asbestos bankruptcy trust system which has created an environment that is conducive to fraud and takes money out of those trusts that is needed for future victims. The FACT Act merely levels the playing field so all parties have access to the same information.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. How much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I vigorously disagree with my good friend from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) because it is very clear that the bill would tip the scales of justice in favor of asbestos defendants by giving defendants access to information about victim settlements with asbestos trusts while allowing the defendants to continue hiding information about their settlements.

My amendment asks for the defendants to give the same information. No matter how much my good friend tries to redirect and suggest that this bill does not do that, it does.

Might I also suggest that the other side offered the suggestion that there were groups like Save Our Veterans, The Cost of Freedom, Veterans Resource, that were representing the veterans community. Again, I would take issue with that representation. I insert into the RECORD a whole list that has been recounted by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), my colleague.

JANUARY 7, 2015.

Re Veterans Service Organization oppose H.R. 1927 the ''Fairness in Class Action Litigation and Furthering Asbestos Claims Transparency Act''

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington DC.
Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Majority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington DC.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives, Washington DC.
Hon. STENY HOYER,
Minority Whip, House of Representatives, Washington DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN, LEADER MCCARTHY, LEADER PELOSI, AND WHIP HOYER: We, the undersigned Veterans Service Organizations oppose H.R. 1927 the ''Fairness in Class Action Litigation and Furthering Asbestos Claims Transparency Act of 2015.'' We have continuously expressed our united opposition to this legislation via written testimony to the House Judiciary Committee, House Leadership, in-person meetings and phone calls with members of Congress, and most recently, an op-ed many of our legislative teams submitted to ''The Hill'', entitled ''Farenthold has his facts wrong: The FACT Act hurts Veterans''. It is extremely disappointing that even with our combined opposition H.R. 1927 stands poised to be voted on the House floor later this week.

Veterans across the country disproportionately make up those who are dying and afflicted with mesothelioma and other asbestos related illnesses and injuries. Although veterans represent only 8% of the nation's population, they comprise 30% of all known mesothelioma deaths.

When our veterans and their family members file claims with the asbestos bankruptcy trusts to receive compensation for harm caused by asbestos companies, they submit personal, highly sensitive information such as how and when they were exposed to the deadly product, sensitive health information, and more. H.R.1927 would require asbestos trusts to publish their sensitive information on a public database, and also include how much money they received for their claim as well as other private information. Forcing our veterans to publicize their work histories, medical conditions, social security numbers, and information about their children and families is an offensive invasion of privacy to the men and women who have honorably served, and it does nothing to assure their adequate compensation or to prevent future asbestos exposures and deaths.

Additionally, H.R. 1927 helps asbestos companies add significant time and delay paying

trust claims to our veterans and their families by putting burdensome and costly reporting requirements on trusts, including those that already exist. One must to ask what is the real motivation for this legislation brought forward by Representative Farenthold? Rather than pursuing legislation to make it easier and less burdensome for our veterans and their families to get the compensation they so desperately need for medical bills and end of life care, trusts will have to spend time and resources complying with these additional and unnecessary requirements at the expense of our veterans.

H.R. 1927 is a bill that its supporters claim will help asbestos victims, but the reality is that this bill only helps companies and manufacturers who knowingly poisoned our honorable men and women who have made sacrifices for our country.

We urgently ask on behalf of our members across the nation that you oppose H.R. 1927.

Please contact Hershel Gober, National Legislative Director, Military Order of the Purple Heart at goberh@aol.com with any questions.

Signed:

Air Force Sergeants Association, Air Force Women's Officers Associated (AFWOA), American Veterans (AM VETS), Association of the United States Navy (AUSN), Commissioned Officers Association of the US Public Health Services, Fleet Reserve Association (FRA), Jewish War Veterans of the USA (JWV), Marine Corns Reserve Association (MCRA), Military Officers Association of America (MOAA), Military Order of the Purple Heart (MOPH), National Association of Uniformed Services (NAUS), National Defense Council, Naval Enlisted Reserve Association, The Retired Enlisted Association (TREA), United States Coast Guard Chief Petty Officers Association, United States Army Warrant Officers Association, Vietnam Veterans Association (VVA).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. The Air Force Sergeants Association, Vietnam Veterans Association, Jewish War Veterans of the USA, and others, these are the groups that are saying they are against this bill. The reason is because they are for the little guy. That is why they go to the battlefield and fight.

I am standing here for the little guy. My amendment says let the big guys give you the same information and the little guys shouldn't even have to pay, if I might say. Let the big guys do it because they are the individuals who come and try to thwart the individuals.

Madam Chair, let me express my appreciation to Chairman SESSIONS and Ranking Member SLAUGHTER for their leadership and for making the Jackson Lee Amendment in order.

Thank you for this opportunity to explain my amendment to H.R. 1927, the "Fairness in Class Litigation and Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency Act of 2015".

The Jackson Lee Amendment #9 would provide a balanced approach to the bill's disclosure requirements by applying the transparency rules in the bill equally to asbestos industry defendants.

Specifically, this Amendment would require that an asbestos defendant seeking information from the trust about a plaintiff to first make available to the plaintiff and trust information about the median settlement amount paid by that defendant for claims settled or paid within 5 years of the date of the request, for the State in which the plaintiffs action was filed.

Thus, in order for defendants to obtain the privileges of victim information disclosure as required in H.R. 1927, asbestos companies would also be required to report information about their asbestos-containing products.

Without the Jackson Lee Amendment, H.R. 1927 is one-sided.

If passed without this balance approach, H.R. 1927 maintains the rights of asbestos defendants to demand confidentiality of settlements and protects an asbestos defendant's right to continue to hide the dangers of their asbestos products from asbestos victims and the American public.

A typical asbestos defendant who settles a case in the tort system demands confidentiality as a condition of settlement in order to ensure that other victims cannot learn how much they paid or for which asbestos products the defendant is paying compensation.

These same defendants now want the victims to disclose specific settlement amounts with the trusts, along with product exposure information and work history, that they do not themselves provide nor would have provided before the trusts were created.

If transparency were the true goal of this bill, then why doesn't the bill require settling defendants to reveal information important to public safety and health?

The asbestos health crisis is the result of a massive corporate cover-up.

For decades, asbestos companies knew about the dangers of asbestos and failed to warn or adequately protect workers and their families.

Now, the same industry responsible for causing this crisis is asking Congress to protect them from liability.

At the very least, this bill should require asbestos defendants to reveal information about their asbestos products, where they are in use, and how many Americans continue to be exposed to those products.

Trust information is already public.

Trusts already disclose far more information than solvent defendants do about their settlement practices and amounts—the settlement criteria used by a trust and the offer the trust will make if the criteria are met are publicly available in the Trust Distribution Procedures ("TDP") for that trust.

Trusts also file annual reports with the Bankruptcy courts and publish lists of the products for which they have assumed responsibility.

If asbestos victims are going to be forced to reveal private medical and work history information in a public forum, to the very industry that caused their harm, asbestos defendants should at least be required to reveal which of their products contain asbestos and how many people are being exposed.

H.R. 1927 seeks to override state law regarding discovery and disclosure of information.

State discovery rules currently govern disclosure of a trust claimant's work and exposure history.

The bill's proponents offer no explanation as to why the bill's potentially costly and burdensome information request provision is necessary or why Federal law should subvert state discovery processes.

If such information is relevant to a state law claim, a defendant can seek and get that information according to the rules of a state court.

What a defendant cannot do, and what this bill would allow, is for a defendant to engage in fishing expeditions for irrelevant information which has no use other than to delay a claim for as long as possible.

Thus, H.R. 1927 must be amended to apply to defendants who should be required to reveal important information about their asbestos-containing products.

Lastly, let me add that the asbestos defendants would not be required to disclose trade secrets under this amendment.

The asbestos defendants would only be required to disclose information about which of their products contain asbestos, where they are in use, and how many people are being exposed.

The Jackson Lee Amendment would not force asbestos defendants to reveal industry trade secrets or place them at a competitive disadvantage in the marketplace.

Instead, this amendment ensures transparency from both the asbestos victims and asbestos defendants since transparency is the stated goal of the bill.

I urge my colleagues to Support the Jackson Lee Amendment.

I ask for my amendment to be supported.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Chairman, with all due respect to the gentlewoman from Houston, who is my friend, the requirement of the FACT Act does not require that the settlement amount be disclosed. What it does require to be disclosed is the minimal amount of information that we believe is necessary to help prevent fraud, that is, the name of the claimant and the basis of exposure and the nature of the claim. It specifically protects all sorts of private information, in addition to the protections already built into the Bankruptcy Clause.

I guess the veterans groups are divided on that. Ms. JACKSON LEE listed out a group, and we have entered into the RECORD a list of veterans groups and other groups that support it.

Of most interest to the gentlewoman from Texas should be the Texas Coalition of Veterans Organization, which represents more than 600,000 Texas veterans, supports this because they know that our young servicemen and -women that were exposed to asbestos and have not yet manifested the symptoms of mesothelioma or other asbestos-related diseases need to have these trusts in place so that there will be money to compensate them because they can't sue the Federal Government over sovereign immunity. This protects the veterans and makes sure there is money for future claimants.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

□ 1130

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KLINE) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

FAIRNESS IN CLASS ACTION LITIGATION ACT OF 2015

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 114–389.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Beginning on page 2, strike line 5 and all that follows through line 2 on page 3, and insert the following:

''(8) A trust described in paragraph (2) shall file with the bankruptcy court, not later than 60 days after the end of every quarter, a report that shall be made available on the court's public docket and with respect to each such reporting period contains an aggregate list of demands received and an aggregate list of payments made.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 581, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, my amendment would address the bill's serious violation of the privacy of asbestos victims. Instead of requiring asbestos trusts to disclose detailed personal information about asbestos victims, as the bill would do, my amendment would require aggregate reporting of the demands received and payments made by those trusts. This would ensure transparency of the trusts without jeopardizing the privacy of the victims.

Let's remember why these asbestos trusts are established in the first place. Corporations that knowingly produced a toxic substance that killed or seriously injured unsuspecting American consumers and workers have since been held accountable for their practices through litigation. Asbestos companies that enter bankruptcy have the option of establishing a trust to satisfy the obligations to their victims while shielding themselves from future claims when they emerge from bankruptcy.

As if contracting a painful and life-threatening disease like lung cancer or mesothelioma from exposure to asbestos is not bad enough, this bill would further victimize claimants by putting their personal information on the Internet, available to anyone who may seek to take advantage of them. The bill would require each asbestos trust to list the payment demands it has received, the amounts demanded, as well as the names and exposure histories of each claimant, along with the basis for any payment from the trust of such claimant. This information would be posted on the public docket of the court that established the trust, a docket that is easily accessible on the Internet through paying a nominal fee.

Now, it is true that the reports required under this bill would not include any ''confidential medical record''—a term that is undefined—or a claimant's full Social Security number, but with just the information that the bill requires to be provided, one can still learn a tremendous amount of sensitive health information about a victim. Releasing such information is an invitation to scam artists, to identity thieves, as well as to data brokers who may use the information collected to deny employment or credit or insurance to the victims.

To prevent this totally unnecessary and wrong invasion of privacy, my amendment would say, okay, we will release aggregate data from the trust sufficient to ensure transparency and to combat the imagined fraud claimed by supporters of the bill, but we won't expose the personal information of asbestos victims and make them vulnerable to further victimization.

Rather than standing with the corporations supporting this legislation, which spent decades poisoning Americans with asbestos, I urge my colleagues to stand with Susan Vento, a fierce opponent of this bill and the widow of our former colleague Bruce Vento, who lost his life due to asbestos exposure.

Stand with the many organizations opposing this bill that do not wish to see asbestos victims' personal information compromised. Stand with the victims who have suffered enough.

If you believe there is fraud, fine. The amendment would say present the aggregate information which would prevent or reveal the fraud, but don't further victimize the victims by putting their personal information on the Internet so that they can be further victimized in their privacy, and in reality they can be victimized by scam artists or employers or others.

I urge adoption of the Nadler amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Chair, the FACT Act requires increased transparency to combat fraud committed against the asbestos trusts. This amendment strikes the requirement that the asbestos trusts publish the very data that would be necessary to detect the fraud between the trusts and State court tort proceedings.

In its place, the amendment calls for quarterly reports under the bill to publish only aggregate lists of demands received and aggregate lists of payments made by the trusts. Simple aggregation of information is not enough to allow defendants and State court parties and sister asbestos trusts to make meaningful inquiry into whether or not they are being defrauded.

The amendment also removes the requirement that the asbestos trusts respond to information requests from parties subject to asbestos-related suits and imposes the cost of such requests on the inquiring parties. The cost-shifting element of this provision is significant. In fact, a GAO report found that one asbestos trust had to pay over $1 million to respond to a discovery request. Rather than have asbestos trust money used to comply with discovery requests, they should be preserved for the payment to the victims of asbestos-related illnesses.

This amendment not only guts the transparency requirements and elements of the bill, it also removes meaningful cost-saving measures. In fact, the bill is carefully crafted to protect folks' privacy. Here is what happens: The legislation ensures that claimants' confidential medical records and full Social Security numbers will not be made public.

Trust reports are also subject to the Bankruptcy Code's existing privacy protections. Section 107 of the code, for example, allows courts to protect any information that would present an undue risk of identity theft or injure a claimant if disclosed. Rule 9037 of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, Privacy Protection for Filings Made with the Court, would also apply to these public reports. The rule would allow the courts to require redactions of personal and private information. Finally, rule 9037 will allow the courts to limit or prohibit electronic access to the trust reports.

Courts throughout the country already use these rules to protect the personal information of individuals who file claims during asbestos bankruptcies. For example, the court, in overseeing a Garlock bankruptcy, redacted trust claims information that was introduced into a hearing record and later released to the public. Other courts have required anyone reviewing bankruptcy claims to agree to strict protective ordinances.

Witnesses at the House Committee on the Judiciary on the FACT Act have explained that the bill does not threaten asbestos victims' privacy and that asbestos claimants routinely disclose more information than the trust would be required to report in the course of tort litigation and bankruptcy proceedings.

For these and other reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Nadler amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, we should realize that the Bankruptcy Code sections cited by the distinguished gentleman from Texas are permissive, not mandatory. Bankruptcy Code section 107(c), for example, permits, but does not require, the bankruptcy court to issue an order prohibiting the disclosure of certain information pertaining to an individual's for cause if the court finds that disclosure of such information would create undue risk of identity theft or other unlawful injury to the individual or the individual's property.

In other words, the victim here, who has been victimized by the people who produced the asbestos, would now have to go into court and request the protective order. The burden would be on the victim.

Why are we putting the burden on the victim instead of on the tortfeasor? The bill would do that. The Bankruptcy Code's section 107 so-called privacy protection is not automatic. As a result, the asbestos victim would have to retain counsel and go to court to prove cause to obtain relief. Again, you are shifting the burden further to the victim from the tortfeasor. That is not a very good idea, and there is no great necessity for it.

If the court finds or if a trust believes that it is being defrauded, it can request the court to get this information. It can ask for discovery. Yes, discovery is expensive, but you want to shift the expense to the victim. That is highly unfair.

This bill shifts tremendous burden to the victim. If he doesn't pick up that burden and go in for protective orders, it puts personal information that can be used to further victimize him open to anyone who wants to get it on the Internet.

My amendment would say no, to publish aggregate data that will help prevent fraud—I am not sure that there is much fraud—but publish aggregate data that would help prevent fraud; and if you have a reason, then you can go and ask the court for more, instead of the other way around.

The question is: Should the burden be on the tortfeasor or on the victim? I side with the victim.

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Chair, I think we are going down a rabbit trail here. I agree with Mr. NADLER. This bill is designed to protect victims. It is not intended to increase the burdens or the cost on the victim. It does require the trusts to publish the name and the basis of the claim of folks who claim trust so that they are not double-dipped and pay more than one claim for the same person. That is what we are trying to do here.

As we start to get into the additional information, that is further down the road. That is not part of the disclosure requirements of the FACT Act. But once the litigation proceeds and we have determined that somebody has filed a claim and they are in another court, the further information requested would normally be part of that proceeding and then would fall under the Bankruptcy Code rules.

The disclosures of the FACT Act requirements from the asbestos trust are very limited: name and the nature of the claim and where they were exposed. That is less information than you have to release when you file any sort of tort case in a State court. It is basically what we consider to be the bare minimum in order to allow defendants to sniff out the possibility of double-dipping and fraudulent claims.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114–389 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. COHEN of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. CONYERS of Michigan.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. DEUTCH of Florida.

Amendment No. 5 by Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

Amendment No. 6 by Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

Amendment No. 7 by Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

Amendment No. 9 by Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas.

Amendment No. 10 by Mr. NADLER of New York.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 158, noes 211, not voting 64, as follows:

[Roll No. 23]

AYES—158

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Eshoo
Esty
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meehan
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schiff
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Stefanik
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—211

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)

Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Salmon
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—64

Beyer
Black
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Buck
Capuano
Cárdenas
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cleaver
Costa
Culberson
DeLauro
DeSaulnier
Doggett
Ellison
Engel
Farr
Fincher
Gohmert
Grayson
Harper
Huffman
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Larson (CT)
McCarthy
McCaul
Meeks
Messer
Miller (MI)
Nugent
Pingree
Pocan
Price, Tom
Reed
Ros-Lehtinen
Ruiz
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Sewell (AL)
Smith (WA)
Stivers
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Wagner
Walker
Wasserman Schultz
Webster (FL)
Welch
Westerman
Young (AK)

□ 1203

Messrs. PETERSON, BRIDENSTINE, HENSARLING, and STEWART changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. MEEHAN changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Chair, during rollcall vote number 23 on January 8, 2016, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

Stated against:

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Madam Chair, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 23 on the Cohen of Tennessee Amendment No. 1 on H.R. 1927. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 221, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 24]

AYES—163

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Carney
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—221

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (MS)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—49

Black
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Clark (MA)
Cleaver
DeLauro
Engel
Farr
Fincher
Grothman
Harper
Issa
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Maloney, Carolyn
McCarthy
Miller (MI)
Moulton
Nolan
Nugent
Pingree
Pocan
Price, Tom
Ribble
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rush
Sewell (AL)
Shuster
Smith (WA)
Stivers
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Wagner
Walker
Webster (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1207

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Chair, during rollcall vote number 24 on January 8, 2016, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. DEUTCH

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 232, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 25]

AYES—163

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Esty
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—232

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—38

Bass
Black
Brown (FL)
Capuano
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Clark (MA)
Cleaver
DeLauro
DeSaulnier
Eshoo
Farr
Fincher
Grayson
Grothman
Harper
Issa
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Larson (CT)
McCarthy
Miller (MI)
Nolan
Nugent
Pocan
Price, Tom
Ros-Lehtinen
Rush
Smith (WA)
Stivers
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Wagner
Walker
Webster (FL)
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1210

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Chair, I was not present during rollcall vote number 25 on January 8, 2016. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Chair, I was unavoidably detained during rollcall votes 24 and 25. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on Conyers Amendment to H.R. 1927, and "yea" on the Deutch Amendment to H.R. 1927.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 229, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]

AYES—172

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—229

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)

Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—32

Black
Brown (FL)
Capuano
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cleaver
DeLauro
Farr
Fincher
Grayson
Harper
Issa
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Larson (CT)
McCarthy
Miller (MI)
Nugent
Pocan
Price, Tom
Ros-Lehtinen
Rush
Smith (WA)
Stivers
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Wagner
Walker
Webster (FL)
Young (AK)

□ 1214

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 224, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 27]

AYES—177

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—224

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—32

Black
Brown (FL)
Capuano
Cárdenas
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cleaver
DeLauro
Farr
Fincher
Harper
Issa
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Larson (CT)
McCarthy
Miller (MI)
Nugent
Pocan
Price, Tom
Ros-Lehtinen
Rush
Smith (WA)
Stivers
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Wagner
Walker
Webster (FL)
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1218

Mr. DOLD changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. MAXINE WATERS OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 223, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 28]

AYES—177

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—223

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Joyce
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—33

Black
Brown (FL)
Capuano
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cleaver
Davis, Rodney
DeLauro
Farr
Fincher
Harper
Issa
Johnson, E. B.
Jordan
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Larson (CT)
McCarthy
Miller (MI)
Nugent
Pocan
Price, Tom
Ros-Lehtinen
Rush
Smith (WA)
Stivers
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Wagner
Walker
Webster (FL)
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1222

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 223, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 29]

AYES—177

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—223

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold

Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Griffith

NOT VOTING—32

Black
Brown (FL)
Capuano
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cleaver
DeLauro
Farr
Fincher
Harper
Issa
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Larson (CT)
McCarthy
Miller (MI)
Nugent
Pocan
Price, Tom
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rush
Smith (WA)
Stivers
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Wagner
Walker
Webster (FL)
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1225

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 228, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

AYES—174

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—228

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—31

Black
Brown (FL)
Capuano
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cleaver
DeLauro
Farr
Fincher
Harper
Issa
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Larson (CT)
McCarthy
Miller (MI)
Nugent
Pocan
Price, Tom
Ros-Lehtinen
Rush
Smith (WA)
Stivers
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Wagner
Walker
Webster (FL)
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1228

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 179, noes 222, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 31]

AYES—179

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Zinke

NOES—222

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—32

Black
Brown (FL)
Capuano
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cleaver
DeLauro
Farr
Fincher
Harper
Issa
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Larson (CT)
McCarthy
Miller (MI)
Nugent
Pocan
Price, Tom
Ros-Lehtinen
Rush
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Stivers
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Wagner
Walker
Webster (FL)
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1232

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Ms. FOXX, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1927) to amend title 28, United States Code, to improve fairness in class action litigation, and, pursuant to House Resolution 581, she reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Very much so, I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. McCollum moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 1927) to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of section 3 of the bill, add the following:

(c) PROTECTING THE PRIVACY OF CHILDREN INJURED BY ASBESTOS IN A SCHOOL.—Paragraph (8) of section 524(g) of title 11 of the United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall not apply with respect to a claimant whose claim is filed by or on behalf of an individual exposed to asbestos as a child in a school environment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

Mr. Speaker, asbestos is a known carcinogen. Asbestos wreaks havoc on the health and livelihoods of the people exposed to it, killing approximately 10,000 Americans each year.

This deadly poison can cause lung cancer and mesothelioma, an aggressive cancer that an estimated 3,000 Americans are diagnosed with each year.

Once detected, mesothelioma victims may only survive 8 to 14 months. This was true for my predecessor, the late Congressman Bruce Vento. Bruce proudly served Minnesota's Fourth District for more than 20 years in this House, and many of you served with him in this Chamber.

Bruce died from mesothelioma in 2000, only months—only months—after he was diagnosed. I lost a friend and a mentor. His family lost a husband, a father, a son, and a brother. Since then, I have worked with mesothelioma patients and their families to fight this awful disease, and to hold those responsible for asbestos exposure accountable.

I can tell you, this legislation does not support the victims of asbestos. Asbestos trusts would be forced—forced—to release the private information of

patients and their families on a public Web site. Listing a patient's name, their address, health and financial information, and the last four digits of their Social Security number exposes these patients to identity theft.

H.R. 1927 would also delay any compensation victims could receive with new, cumbersome, and unnecessary procedural hurdles, meaning many victims will not live long enough to get the justice they deserve or know that their families will not be burdened with medical costs.

This legislation is unacceptable for those seeking justice from asbestos exposure. It is especially outrageous when we know this legislation does not provide basic protection for children.

This amendment would protect children. This amendment will ensure that children exposed to asbestos will not have their personal information disclosed—children exposed to asbestos from the walls, the ceilings, and the floors of their classrooms, or even the possible exposure from crayons that they used that were manufactured in China.

Our children deserve protection. Their parents should have the peace of mind that their child's privacy is secure.

As a mother, I cannot imagine the anguish of worrying about my child's health as they suffer from asbestos exposure, and then add the burden of worrying that my child's private information was exposed on a Web site.

Without this amendment to the current bill, you will be voting to deliver sensitive information about children to criminals who could exploit them. Let me be clear: This information will be available to identity thieves and to sexual predators.

Congressman Vento was a dedicated public servant and an asbestos victim. I know Bruce would be horrified that this House would allow a child's personal information to be exposed in this incredibly irresponsible manner, and we should stop it from happening. We can stop it from happening.

Congress has a responsibility to find real solutions to help and support victims, especially children of asbestos exposure and their families. This bill falls far short of it.

The least we can do here today is to protect the privacy of innocent children who have already suffered enough. I urge my colleagues to pass this amendment and to protect the privacy of vulnerable children.

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I am stunned by how many people apparently have not read this 3-page bill. Nowhere in the bill does it say we are going to release addresses. Nowhere does it say we are going to release medical records. It is simply the name, the basis of the claim, and exposure.

Furthermore, this is designed to protect victims, especially children. There needs to be money in these trusts for future claims. We want to help the children, not the plaintiffs' attorneys.

This amendment is wholly unnecessary. If you look at rule 9037 of the Bankruptcy Code, by default, unless the court orders otherwise, information about a minor is restricted to only releasing, in any case, the last 4 digits of the Social Security number, the year of the individual's birth, the minor's initials, not the minor's name, and the last four digits of the financial account number.

This motion to recommit is just a waste of time and it is unnecessary. It is already covered by the Bankruptcy Code.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 227, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 32]

AYES—173

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—227

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall

Yoder	Young (IA)	Zeldin
Yoho	Young (IN)	Zinke

NOT VOTING—33

Black	Issa	Price, Tom
Brown (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Ros-Lehtinen
Capuano	Kennedy	Rush
Chaffetz	Kind	Smith (WA)
Chu, Judy	King (IA)	Stivers
Cleaver	Larson (CT)	Thompson (MS)
Collins (NY)	McCarthy	Titus
DeLauro	McDermott	Wagner
Farr	Miller (MI)	Walker
Fincher	Nugent	Webster (FL)
Harper	Pocan	Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1247

Mr. HURT of Virginia changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 32 (On Motion to Recommit with Instructions related to H.R. 1927), had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

(By unanimous consent, Ms. MCSALLY was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE COMMEMORATING FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF SHOOTING IN TUCSON, ARIZONA

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues from Arizona and around the country to commemorate the fifth anniversary of the shooting that took place on January 8, 2011, in Tucson, Arizona.

On that sunny, chilly Saturday morning, six people were killed and 13 were wounded at a Congress on Your Corner event, hosted by Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords. The Congresswoman was among the injured, along with the member of her staff who would succeed her, Congressman Ron Barber.

For many, the pain of that day will always be with us, but Tucson has not languished in grief. As we remember the victims, we also remember how our community rose up with courage and unity to support those grieving and to honor their loved ones.

Signs of that courage are all around us. The January 8th Memorial Foundation is working to build a permanent tribute to the victims as well as to our community's response. Just feet below us in this building is the Gabriel Zimmerman Meeting Room, a lasting tribute to the congressional staffer who died while serving the men and women of southern Arizona.

Today and this weekend people around southern Arizona will be coming together to celebrate the lives of our friends and loved ones who were taken too soon and to celebrate the difference they made and continue to make. There are hikes, bike rides, runs, storytelling, discussions, gatherings, and much more.

While we know some wounds may never fully heal, by carrying on the legacy of those who died, we ensure their memories are never forgotten: Christina-Taylor Green, Dorothy Morris, Judge John Roll, Phyllis Schneck, Dorwan Stoddard, and Gabe Zimmerman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House observe a moment of silence in remembrance of those we lost.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 211, noes 188, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

AYES—211

Abraham	Gibbs	McMorris Rodgers
Aderholt	Gohmert	McSally
Allen	Goodlatte	Meadows
Amodei	Gosar	Messer
Babin	Gowdy	Mica
Barletta	Granger	Miller (FL)
Barr	Graves (GA)	Moolenaar
Barton	Graves (LA)	Mooney (WV)
Benishek	Graves (MO)	Mullin
Bilirakis	Grothman	Mulvaney
Bishop (MI)	Guinta	Murphy (PA)
Bishop (UT)	Guthrie	Neugebauer
Blackburn	Hanna	Newhouse
Blum	Hardy	Noem
Bost	Harris	Nunes
Boustany	Hartzler	Olson
Brady (TX)	Heck (NV)	Palazzo
Brat	Hensarling	Palmer
Bridenstine	Herrera Beutler	Paulsen
Brooks (AL)	Hice, Jody B.	Pearce
Brooks (IN)	Hill	Perry
Buchanan	Holding	Pittenger
Buck	Hudson	Pitts
Bucshon	Huelskamp	Poe (TX)
Byrne	Huizenga (MI)	Poliquin
Calvert	Hultgren	Pompeo
Carter (GA)	Hunter	Posey
Carter (TX)	Hurd (TX)	Ratcliffe
Chabot	Hurt (VA)	Reed
Clawson (FL)	Jenkins (KS)	Reichert
Coffman	Jenkins (WV)	Renacci
Cole	Johnson (OH)	Ribble
Collins (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Rice (SC)
Comstock	Jolly	Rigell
Conaway	Jordan	Roby
Cook	Joyce	Roe (TN)
Cramer	Katko	Rogers (KY)
Crawford	Kelly (MS)	Rohrabacher
Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Rokita
Culberson	King (NY)	Rooney (FL)
Davis, Rodney	Kinzinger (IL)	Roskam
Denham	Kline	Ross
Dent	Knight	Rothfus
DeSantis	Labrador	Rouzer
DesJarlais	LaHood	Royce
Dold	LaMalfa	Salmon
Donovan	Lamborn	Sanford
Duffy	Lance	Scalise
Duncan (SC)	Latta	Schweikert
Ellmers (NC)	Long	Scott, Austin
Emmer (MN)	Loudermilk	Sensenbrenner
Farenthold	Love	Sessions
Fleischmann	Lucas	Shimkus
Fleming	Luetkemeyer	Shuster
Flores	Lummis	Simpson
Forbes	MacArthur	Smith (MO)
Fortenberry	Marchant	Smith (NE)
Foxx	Marino	Smith (NJ)
Franks (AZ)	McCaul	Smith (TX)
Frelinghuysen	McClintock	Stefanik
Garrett	McHenry	Stewart
Stutzman	Walberg	Wilson (SC)
Thompson (PA)	Walden	Wittman
Thornberry	Walorski	Womack
Tiberi	Walters, Mimi	Woodall
Tipton	Weber (TX)	Yoder
Trott	Wenstrup	Yoho
Turner	Westerman	Young (IA)
Upton	Westmoreland	Young (IN)
Valadao	Whitfield	Zeldin
	Williams	

NOES—188

Adams	Frankel (FL)	Murphy (FL)
Aguilar	Fudge	Nadler
Amash	Gabbard	Napolitano
Ashford	Gallego	Neal
Bass	Garamendi	Nolan
Beatty	Gibson	Norcross
Becerra	Graham	O'Rourke
Bera	Grayson	Pallone
Beyer	Green, Al	Pascrell
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Payne
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Pelosi
Bonamici	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hahn	Peters
	Hastings	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Pingree
Brownley (CA)	Higgins	Polis
Burgess	Himes	Price (NC)
Bustos	Hinojosa	Quigley
Butterfield	Honda	Rangel
Capps	Hoyer	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Huffman	Richmond
Carney	Israel	Rogers (AL)
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Jeffries	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Jones	Russell
Cicilline	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Clark (MA)	Keating	Sánchez, Linda T.
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	
Clay	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Clyburn	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Connolly	Kuster	Schiff
Conyers	Langevin	Schrader
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Costa	Lawrence	Scott, David
Costello (PA)	Lee	Serrano
Courtney	Levin	Sewell (AL)
Crowley	Lewis	Sherman
Cuellar	Lieu, Ted	Sinema
Cummings	Lipinski	Sires
Curbelo (FL)	LoBiondo	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Loebsack	Speier
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Swalwell (CA)
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Takai
DeGette	Lowey	Takano
Delaney	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Thompson (CA)
DelBene		Tonko
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Torres
Deutch		Tsongas
Diaz-Balart	Lynch	Van Hollen
Dingell	Maloney, Carolyn	Vargas
Doggett		Veasey
Doyle, Michael F.	Maloney, Sean	Vela
	Massie	Velázquez
Duckworth	Matsui	Visclosky
Duncan (TN)	McCollum	Walz
Edwards	McGovern	Wasserman Schultz
Ellison	McKinley	
Engel	McNerney	Waters, Maxine
Eshoo	Meehan	Watson Coleman
Esty	Meeks	Welch
Fattah	Meng	Wilson (FL)
Fitzpatrick	Moore	Yarmuth
Foster	Moulton	Zinke

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Griffith

NOT VOTING—33

Black	Issa	Price, Tom
Brown (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Ros-Lehtinen
Capuano	Kennedy	Rush
Chaffetz	Kind	Smith (WA)
Chu, Judy	King (IA)	Stivers
Cleaver	Larson (CT)	Thompson (MS)
Collins (NY)	McCarthy	Titus
DeLauro	McDermott	Wagner
Farr	Miller (MI)	Walker
Fincher	Nugent	Webster (FL)
Harper	Pocan	Young (AK)

□ 1256

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 33 (On Passage related to H.R. 1927), had I been present, I would have voted ''nay.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on January 8, 2016, I was not present for rollcall votes 23 through 33. If I had been present for these votes, I would have voted: ''aye'' on rollcall vote 23, ''aye'' on rollcall vote 24, ''aye'' on rollcall vote 25, ''aye'' on rollcall vote 26, ''aye'' on rollcall vote 27, ''aye'' on rollcall vote 28, ''aye'' on rollcall vote 29, ''aye'' on rollcall vote 30, ''aye'' on rollcall vote 31, ''aye'' on rollcall vote 32, and ''nay'' on rollcall vote 33.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on Friday, January 8, 2016. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: ''no'' on rollcall No. 23 (Cohen Amendment); ''no'' on rollcall No. 24 (Conyers Amendment); ''no'' on rollcall No. 25 (Deutch Amendment); ''no'' on rollcall No. 26 (Moore Amendment); ''no'' on rollcall No. 27 (Moore Amendment); ''no'' on rollcall No. 28 (Waters Amendment); ''no'' on rollcall No. 29 (Johnson Amendment); ''no'' on rollcall No. 30 (Jackson Lee Amendment); ''no'' on rollcall No. 31 (Nadler Amendment); ''no'' on rollcall No. 32 (Democrat Motion to Recommit); ''yes'' on rollcall No. 33 (Passage of H.R. 1927).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on the following rollcall votes.

Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: on rollcall vote 2, Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of the Senate Amendment to H.R. 3762, I would have voted ''no.''

On rollcall vote 3, H. Res. 579—Rule providing for consideration of the Senate Amendment to H.R. 3762, Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015, I would have voted ''no.''

On rollcall vote 4, Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of both H.R. 1155 and H.R. 712, I would have voted ''no.''

On rollcall vote 5, H. Res. 580—Rule providing for consideration of both H.R. 1155—SCRUB Act of 2015 and H.R. 712—Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall vote 6, Motion to Concur in the Senate Amendment to H.R. 3762—Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015, I would have voted ''no.''

On rollcall vote 7, Rep. Johnson (GA) Amendment 2 to H.R. 712, Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall vote 8, Reps. Cummings/Connolly Amendment to H.R. 712, Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall vote 9, Rep. Lynch Amendment to H.R. 712, Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall vote 10, Reps. Johnson (GA)/Jackson-Lee Amendment 6 to H.R. 712, Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall vote 11, Democratic Motion to Recommit, H.R. 712, Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall vote 12, Final Passage of H.R. 712, Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015, I would have voted ''no.''

On rollcall vote 13, Rep. Johnson (GA) Amendment to H.R. 1155, Searching for and Cutting Regulations that are Unnecessarily Burdensome Act of 2015, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall vote 14, Reps. Cummings/Connolly Amendment to H.R. 1155, Searching for and Cutting Regulations that are Unnecessarily Burdensome Act of 2015, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall vote 15, Rep. Cicilline Amendment, Searching for and Cutting Regulations that are Unnecessarily Burdensome Act of 2015, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall vote 16, Rep. DelBene Amendment, Searching for and Cutting Regulations that are Unnecessarily Burdensome Act of 2015, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall vote 17, Rep. Cicilline Amendment, Searching for and Cutting Regulations that are Unnecessarily Burdensome Act of 2015, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall vote 18, Rep. Pocan Amendment, Searching for and Cutting Regulations that are Unnecessarily Burdensome Act of 2015, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall vote 19, Democratic Motion to Recommit, Searching for and Cutting Regulations that are Unnecessarily Burdensome Act of 2015, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall vote 20, Final Passage of H.R. 1155, Searching for and Cutting Regulations that are Unnecessarily Burdensome Act of 2015, I would have voted ''no.''

On rollcall vote 21, Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1927, Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act of 2015, I would have voted ''no.''

On rollcall vote 22, H. Res. 581, Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1927, Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act of 2015, I would have voted ''no.''

On rollcall vote 23, Rep. Cohen Amendment, H.R. 1927, Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act of 2015, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall vote 24, Rep. Conyers Amendment, H.R. 1927, Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act of 2015, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall vote 25, Rep. Deutch Amendment, H.R. 1927, Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act of 2015, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall vote 26, Rep. Moore Amendment 5, H.R. 1927, Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act of 2015, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall vote 27, Rep. Moore Amendment 6, H.R. 1927, Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act of 2015, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall vote 28, Rep. Waters Amendment, H.R. 1927, Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act of 2015, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall vote 29, Rep. Johnson (GA) Amendment, H.R. 1927, Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act of 2015, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall vote 30, Rep. Jackson-Lee Amendment, H.R. 1927, Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act of 2015, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall vote 31, Rep. Nadler, H.R. 1927, Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act of 2015, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall vote 32, Democratic Motion to Recommit, H.R. 1927, Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act of 2015, I would have voted ''yes.''

On rollcall vote 33, Final Passage of H.R. 1927, Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act of 2015, I would have voted ''no.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I regrettably missed votes on January 6, 2016, January 7, 2016, and January 8, 2016. Had I been present I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall vote 2, ''no'' on vote 3, ''no'' on vote 4, ''no'' on vote 5, ''no'' on vote 6, ''yes'' on vote 7, ''yes'' on vote 8, ''yes'' on vote 9, ''yes'' on vote 10, ''yes'' on vote 11, ''no'' on vote 12, ''yes'' on vote 13, ''yes'' on vote 14, ''yes'' on vote 15, ''yes'' on vote 16, ''yes'' on vote 17, ''yes'' on vote 18, ''yes'' on vote 19, ''no'' on vote 20, ''no'' on vote 21, ''no'' on vote 22, ''yes'' on vote 23, ''yes'' on vote 24, ''yes'' on vote 25, ''yes'' on vote 26, ''yes'' on vote 27, ''yes'' on vote 28, ''yes'' on vote 29, ''yes'' on vote 30, ''yes'' on vote 31, ''yes'' on vote 32, ''no'' on vote 33.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained so I missed rollcall vote No. 23 regarding ''On Agreeing to the Cohen Amendment''. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

I missed rollcall vote No. 24 regarding ''On Agreeing to the Conyers Amendment''. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

I missed rollcall vote No. 25 regarding ''On Agreeing to the Deutch Amendment''. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

I missed rollcall vote No. 26 regarding ''On Agreeing to the Moore Amendment''. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

I missed rollcall vote No. 27 regarding ''On Agreeing to the Moore Amendment''. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

I missed rollcall vote No. 28 regarding ''On Agreeing to the Waters, Maxine Amendment''. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

I missed rollcall vote No. 29 regarding ''On Agreeing to the Johnson (GA) Amendment''. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

I missed rollcall vote No. 30 regarding ''On Agreeing to the Jackson Lee Amendment''. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

I missed rollcall vote No. 31 regarding ''On Agreeing to the Nadler Amendment''. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

I missed rollcall vote No. 32 regarding ''On Motion to Recommit with Instructions''. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

I missed rollcall vote No. 33 regarding ''To amend title 28, United States Code, to improve fairness in class action litigation'' (H.R. 1927). Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

RECONCILIATION ACT—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114–91)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOLLY) laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 3762, which provides for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, herein referred to as the Reconciliation Act. This legislation would not only repeal parts of the Affordable Care Act, but would reverse the significant progress we have made in improving health care in America. The Affordable Care Act includes a set of fairer rules and stronger consumer protections that have made health care coverage more affordable, more attainable, and more patient centered. And it is working. About 17.6 million Americans have gained health care coverage as the law's coverage provisions have taken effect. The Nation's uninsured rate now stands at its lowest level ever, and demand for Marketplace coverage during December 2015 was at an all-time high. Health care costs are lower than expected when the law was passed, and health care quality is higher—with improvements in patient safety saving an estimated 87,000 lives. Health care has changed for the better, setting this country on a smarter, stronger course.

The Reconciliation Act would reverse that course. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the legislation would increase the number of uninsured Americans by 22 million after 2017. The Council of Economic Advisers estimates that this reduction in health care coverage could mean, each year, more than 900,000 fewer people getting all their needed care, more than 1.2 million additional people having trouble paying other bills due to higher medical costs, and potentially more than 10,000 additional deaths. This legislation would cost millions of hard-working middle-class families the security of affordable health coverage they deserve. Reliable health care coverage would no longer be a right for everyone: it would return to being a privilege for a few.

The legislation's implications extend far beyond those who would become uninsured. For example, about 150 million Americans with employer-based insurance would be at risk of higher premiums and lower wages. And it would cause the cost of health coverage for people buying it on their own to skyrocket.

The Reconciliation Act would also effectively defund Planned Parenthood. Planned Parenthood uses both Federal and non-federal funds to provide a range of important preventive care and health services, including health screenings, vaccinations, and check-ups to millions of men and women who visit their health centers annually. Longstanding Federal policy already prohibits the use of Federal funds for abortions, except in cases of rape or incest or when the life of the woman would be endangered. By eliminating Federal Medicaid funding for a major provider of health care, H.R. 3762 would limit access to health care for men, women, and families across the Nation, and would disproportionately impact low-income individuals.

Republicans in the Congress have attempted to repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act over 50 times. Rather than refighting old political battles by once again voting to repeal basic protections that provide security for the middle class, Members of Congress should be working together to grow the economy, strengthen middle-class families, and create new jobs. Because of the harm this bill would cause to the health and financial security of millions of Americans, it has earned my veto.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 8, 2016*.

□ 1300

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the veto message and the bill will be printed as a House document.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SCALISE

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I move to postpone consideration of the veto message to January 26, 2016.

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, this is a simple motion which will postpone further consideration of the President's veto of the bill gutting ObamaCare and defunding Planned Parenthood. This short delay will ensure that the Members of the House and the American people will have the time to fully consider the President's veto and its implications.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the majority whip, for the purpose of giving us the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Members are advised that first votes of the week are expected at 6:30 p.m. on Monday.

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Wednesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. No votes are expected in the House on Thursday or Friday.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list which will be announced at the close of business today.

I want to take a moment to highlight one of those bills. The North Korea Sanctions Enforcement Act by Chairman ED ROYCE is a critical bill, given current events, which would prohibit North Korea's access to the hard currency and other prohibited goods that allow this oppressive regime to continue its destabilizing behavior.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a bill, H.R. 3662, the Iran Terror Finance Transparency Act, sponsored by Representative STEVE RUSSELL. This bill, Mr. Speaker, would block the President from offering sanctions relief to an individual or bank until certifying that the entity has not conducted any transactions with a terrorist organization.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider two bills aimed at burdensome rules and regulations by this Obama administration. The first of those, Mr. Speaker, is a bill by Representative ALEX MOONEY, H.R. 1644, the STREAM Act, which is a critical piece of legislation to address the administration's stream protection rule. This is a rule which is designed to shut down all surface mining and a significant portion of underground mining, particularly in the Appalachian region. H.R. 1644 would save taxpayer dollars and protect American jobs.

The second is a joint resolution, S.J. Res. 22, calling for the disapproval of the Obama administration's regulatory overreach on the Waters of the United States. This resolution would express congressional disapproval of an unprecedented power grab that harms the traditional Federal-State partnership in implementing the Clean Water Act and would expand the scope of the EPA to puddles in the backyards of millions of Americans.

Those are the bills that I wanted to highlight and feature.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for the information. I know the majority leader is not here, but I observed, with some irony, how much argument for legislation was included in the scheduling announcement. I think that is not necessarily inappropriate—I will make that point—but I am sure the majority leader will remember that in the future.

I thank the gentleman for the information.

I want to say to him at the outset, we note and we took action on his motion to which we neither asked for a vote nor objected, but that we have delayed the consideration of the veto of the President of the United States, ensuring that the 22 million people that would be removed from health insurance, if the President had not vetoed that bill, will not go into effect.

I want to assure the majority whip, as the minority whip, that that bill will not go into effect whether we vote on it today or we vote for it on the 25th. There are more than sufficient votes on this side of the aisle to support and confirm the President's veto and to ensure that those 22 million people, as well as those who are benefiting

from other portions of the bill, will continue to do so.

I thank the gentleman for that information. I regret that we have delayed that vote, but I am absolutely assured that on the 25th or the 26th, that veto will be sustained by this House. Of course, it will initiate in this House.

I also wanted to say to the gentleman, the Speaker has pointed out that this year, he wants to see real substance considered during the debate on the bill that I just discussed, the Affordable Care Act. There was some discussion by Mr. UPTON that there was an alternative that the Republican side of the aisle had or his committee had. We, of course, never considered—notwithstanding the 62 votes to repeal—an alternative.

I would ask the gentleman if he believes that there will be, during the coming weeks or months, an alternative to the Affordable Care Act considered on this floor.

I yield to my friend from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

I know that the gentleman from Maryland is aware that Speaker RYAN has laid out a vision that we want to have a bold agenda that we are going to bring forward for 2016. In fact, one of the things that the Speaker laid out is not an agenda that is going to be driven from the top down; it is not agenda that is going to be driven by leadership. In fact, it will be driven by the Members.

One of the things that both the House Republican and House Democrat conferences do in the upcoming weeks is have Member retreats, where our Members can come together and discuss those items. That is what we are going to be doing next: our Members are going to be coming together. We want to build a consensus amongst our membership, again, not from the top down, but one that includes the interests of the Members of our conference to fix the problems that have been created by the President's healthcare law and actually bring forward a patient-centered approach that puts patients back in charge of their healthcare decisions.

Mr. HOYER. I understand that, and I appreciate the gentleman's observations.

I am wondering whether or not our Members would expect, at some time in the future, to have such a bill presented for a vote on the floor so that the American people could see, as I understand the Speaker's premise being that he wants to lay out an agenda so that in this Presidential election, there will be alternatives.

My question to the whip is: Will this House be expecting to vote on an alternative, to consider an alternative with amendments perhaps made in order as well?

I yield to my friend from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Again, Speaker RYAN's commitment has been that we are going to restore regular order in the House. What regular order means is that there is not going to be some predisposed outcome by leadership to determine what is going to happen and when it is going to happen, regardless of what the membership feels, regardless of what the committee process produces.

Again, I think what is exciting to our membership about this year is that the Members are going to be able to participate in that process and the committees will be involved in this. I can't tell you what the committees will ultimately do or produce. This is going to be a process that is going to be very open and transparent. People can watch on C–SPAN as hearings are held. It is not going to be some predisposed outcome from the top down. Again, this will be something that will be membership-driven, using the regular order of the House.

Mr. HOYER. Well, I appreciate the gentleman's presentation.

Of course, presumably, if it is transparent, if it is open, then presumably, the Democratic members of the committee of jurisdiction on whatever issue there may be, we think we can work together with you on supporting job creation, reaching a long-term fiscal agreement on permanently replacing the sequester, which your chairman believes is not a reasonable alternative.

We believe we can reach agreement with you hopefully on comprehensive tax reform, although my personal opinion was that the passage of the tax bill a few weeks ago, which I voted against, undermines that possibility.

We also believe we can work together with you on something that this week has been made dramatically clear, that is needed very, very badly, and that is comprehensive immigration reform.

As I said on Ex-Im Bank, I thought there was a majority of votes in both parties for the Ex-Im Bank. Unfortunately, it took a discharge petition to get it to the floor. When it got to the floor, I was correct. It had a majority of the Republicans and all but one Democrat for it.

I think comprehensive immigration reform would pass. In a system that is transparent and open to the American people, what one would do would have a vote here on this floor so the American people can see where each Member is on that issue.

We also believe we can work with you, Mr. Whip, and with the majority leader, the Speaker, and your Members, on restoring voting rights.

Mr. Cantor, when he was here, and Mr. MCCARTHY, the majority leader, he and I were honorary cochairs—JOHN LEWIS is, of course, the chair—when we went to the Edmund Pettus Bridge in recognition of that march, which ultimately led to the adoption of the Voting Rights Act. We think we can work together with you on that.

I know there are strong feelings on the efforts that the President has taken to make sure that those who purchase guns in America are not dangerous to their neighbors or to others. We think we can work together with you on that.

Does the gentleman expect a vote on that issue on this floor in the near future?

I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman, again, for yielding.

Of course, as the gentleman knows, many of these issues that he discussed are at various stages of the legislative process. Some are in current hearings in committees. Some legislation is being developed or being voted on. Some of those issues that were discussed by the gentleman have already come to the House floor and passed. In fact, many of the bills to get the economy back on track passed this Senate with good, strong bipartisan votes that had been stuck in the Senate.

I encourage the gentleman from Maryland, the minority whip, to work with us in the majority to get our colleagues in the Senate to move forward on some of that important legislation that we have passed out of the House in a bipartisan fashion.

I know the gentleman from Maryland was at the same ceremony as I was earlier this week, where the Navy did, I think, a very important, significant action in naming a class of Naval vessels after our colleague and civil rights hero, JOHN LEWIS. It was an honor to participate in that ceremony, as I know you were there as well, in a very touching, warm moment where you saw House Members come together to pay tribute to our colleague, JOHN LEWIS.

Also, you saw the Navy making such a significant step in saying they are going to develop and build a class of Naval ships that honor civil rights legends, starting with and, in fact, naming the entire class of ships after JOHN LEWIS.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for bringing up that issue. We are all privileged and honored to serve in this House with JOHN LEWIS. There is probably no Member of this House who has been recognized for greater contributions to what America stands for than our colleague, JOHN LEWIS.

It was so appropriate for Secretary Mabus, who is the Secretary of the Navy from Mississippi and former Governor of Mississippi, to not only name this ship, as the gentleman observed, but because it is the first ship. And this ship is all about serving others, about supplying others with that which they need—not only fuel, but also food and supplies—and is so appropriate because JOHN LEWIS lived his life serving others and supplying.

This is not a warship, per se. It is a Naval ship that is going to be critically important to our Navy. The gentleman is absolutely correct that honoring JOHN LEWIS was an appropriate act to take. I think he and I both extend our thanks to Secretary Ray Mabus for taking this action.

□ 1315

Lastly, I have had a long association with Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico, of course, is an integral part of the United States of America. Its citizens are citizens of the United States of America. Like other jurisdictions—whether they be in California or in New York or in the Midwest or the South or the North—who have from time to time found themselves in deep fiscal trouble, Puerto Rico now finds itself in that position.

I had the opportunity to talk a little earlier today with Chairman ROB BISHOP about the hearings that are going on in the Committee on Natural Resources this month with reference to Puerto Rico. I know that Speaker RYAN has indicated that we need to address this issue in an effective way by March 31. I very much appreciate his setting a goal and a timeframe for that.

Can the gentleman give me any additional information as to the status of consideration of Puerto Rico and extending it bankruptcy authority so that it might restructure its debt so that it doesn't undermine its school system, its public safety, its transportation, and other needs of its people?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Of course, as the gentleman from Maryland knows, Puerto Rico is facing a serious debt crisis and is in need of structural reform. That is critical. That is why our committee is starting the process of examining solutions. In fact, as the gentleman mentioned, next week, on January 12 at 10 a.m., the committee of primary jurisdiction, the House Committee on Natural Resources, led by Chairman BISHOP, as the gentleman mentioned, has the first hearing scheduled on this matter.

In keeping with Speaker RYAN's commitment to regular order, it is important that we allow the committees of jurisdiction to work through these issues to put forward the best solutions to a bad situation.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

I would reiterate to my friend, we really do look forward to working with your side of the aisle on addressing some of the critical problems that I mentioned, that you have mentioned, that Speaker RYAN has mentioned. We hope that those will be open, transparent, and inclusive so that all views can be heard. Ultimately, we hope that proposals and policies do come to this floor for a vote.

It is my understanding that the Speaker also wants to do the 12 appropriations bills, do them discretely, that is, one at a time, and bring them to this floor. We look forward to that process occurring as well.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. SCALISE. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I would just say, in the spirit of bipartisanship, at some point I would like to bring up some great blue crabs from the Gulf of Mexico, and the gentleman can bring up some of those great Maryland blue crabs, and we can do a good taste test and enjoy some of our great cuisines and enjoy some good company.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that offer. I hope his feelings are not hurt when his crabs are left on the table.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JANUARY 8, 2016 TO MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 2016

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, January 11, 2016, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING CHEROKEE TRAIL'S STATE CHAMPION VOLLEYBALL TEAM

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

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the girls varsity volleyball team at Cherokee Trail High School in Aurora, Colorado, for winning the 2015 Colorado 5A State championship game on November 14, 2015.

The students and staff who were part of the title-winning Cougar team deserve to be recognized for winning in what has been a season full of challenges. Following the tragic death of one of their players, Celeste James, and a serious injury to another, Amazing Ashby, the Cherokee Trail Cougars showed courage in the face of true adversity to complete their title-winning season which honored their teammates.

In their dominant performances at the State championship, the girls of Cherokee Trail High School's volleyball team proved that hard work, dedication, and perseverance is the perfect recipe for champions. These volleyball players were led to the championship title through the tireless leadership of their head coach, Terry Miller, and his outstanding staff.

It is with great pride that I join all of the residents of Aurora, Colorado, in congratulating the Cherokee Trail Cougars for their State championship.

CONGRATULATIONS TO BRIGADIER GENERAL DIANA HOLLAND

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Brigadier General Diana Holland for becoming the first female commandant at West Point.

I believe Brigadier General Holland's appointment comes at a very pivotal time in U.S. history, when the military pursues to fully integrate women into the military.

Last month, Secretary of Defense Ash Carter announced his and the services' decision to open all units to women. This decision would not only open 220,000 jobs for women that were previously closed to them, but it would also open the doors for more women to rise in the chain of command. I believe that we need that to happen in our military.

Servicewomen have bravely served our country in and out of combat. Finally, we will be giving them the recognition that they deserve. No longer will archaic policies limit the potential of capable and qualified servicewomen.

The talent and determination of our servicewomen will continue to strengthen our Nation's military, and I am proud to stand behind them.

RETIREMENT OF JOHN GUERRIERO

(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, this week marked the retirement of John Guerriero, who has covered politics for the Erie Times-News for more than three decades.

John joined the Times-News in 1981 after graduating from college. John's stories have focused on just about anything you can imagine, from local, State, and Federal politics, education issues, to stories involving court cases in Erie and those involving gambling.

With background on so many issues, it is common for John to follow up on action here in Washington with questions on how it might impact the Erie region.

Mr. Speaker, I have long followed his work in the newspaper, but I had the chance to truly interact with John in 2013 when he spent several days with Congressman MIKE KELLY and myself here on Capitol Hill. I was glad to talk with him about representing Pennsylvania's largest congressional district, and about how priorities and concerns across the district often lead to policies discussed here on the House floor.

I wish John the best of luck in retirement and congratulate him on a wonderful career.

I CANNOT BE SILENT

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

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to call attention to the issue of gun violence that has seized our Nation. A little over a month ago, my hometown of San Bernardino fell victim to gun violence and was added to a

list that no community wants to join: Aurora, Newtown, Chattanooga, Charleston, and the list goes on. And that is the problem, the list goes on.

The only action Congress has taken to address the epidemic of gun violence has been to hold moments of silence in honor of their memory. As a father of two young boys and as San Bernardino's voice in Congress, I cannot be silent.

We owe it to our communities, from San Bernardino to Newtown, to do something. As one of the family members mentioned earlier in the week: ''Congress has offered their thoughts and prayers, but thoughts and prayers are cheap when you have the power they have.''

While one single law could not have prevented the horrific events in San Bernardino, that doesn't justify a refusal to take action to make our communities safer.

ISIS TROLL IN HOUSTON, TEXAS

(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, terror has come to my hometown of Houston, Texas.

Yesterday, the FBI arrested 24-year-old Omar Saeed Al Hardan, a Palestinian born in Iraq who came to the U.S. as a refugee. He has been indicted for providing support to ISIS, a terrorist organization.

Al Hardan applied for full citizenship, and when he did, he lied on his application, saying he wasn't associated with terrorist organizations. The evidence shows that he is a troll for ISIS. Prior to coming to America, he had been trained to operate machine guns.

The administration says that the 31 State Governors who want to turn away unvetted refugees have no right to refuse them. That is why Senator CRUZ and I have introduced the State Refugee Security Act of 2015. This legislation will give State Governors the right, under the 10th Amendment, to deny the entrance of unvetted refugees to their State.

Congress must take immediate action to support those States that have refused to participate in the refugee resettlement program because of serious security concerns.

This case shows that the FBI Director was right. America cannot properly vet refugees. The interest of foreign refugees should not be more important than the safety of citizens in the United States.

And that is just the way it is.

DECEMBER JOBS REPORT

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the jobs numbers released this morning are excellent. This is a very strong way to end 2015. The numbers are a reminder of just how far we have come since the long, dark days of the Bush-era recession.

The economy added 292,000 private sector jobs last month. Businesses now have added jobs for a record 70 straight months. The unemployment rate stands at 5 percent, half of what it was at the peak of the recession, and the gains are becoming more broadly shared. The unemployment rate for African Americans fell 1.1 percentage points last month. It now stands at the lowest level since 2007.

Of course, there is much more that needs to be done. We must make sure that every American family benefits from this recovery. Some of my colleagues across the aisle will continue their efforts to cast doubt on the Obama recovery. I urge them to look at the numbers.

COMMEMORATING THE RETIREMENT OF STU WITT

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

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to commemorate the retirement of Stu Witt.

Stu is retiring from the commercial Mojave Air and Space Port in Mojave, California. He started his career at CSUN and went on to a naval career where he flew F–14s off the *John F. Kennedy* and F/A–18s. He then followed it up by flying B–1s, F–16s, and the YF–23. But I knew Stu as a person who took the Air and Space Port in Mojave and put it on the map.

He talked to me early in my legislative career in California and said: I have got a bill. This bill has never gone anywhere. It has never even gotten a committee hearing, but I want you to run it.

So we did.

That bill turned into the indemnification law in California, which allowed private spaceflight to happen in California. Without that leadership, California would not be on the map for private spaceflight. I believe that today, without Stu Witt, California would probably have lost out to other States in the Union.

I would like to say as to Stu Witt's retirement: We know we are going to have great things in the future; we know what you have done in the past; and we look forward to your exploits for the advancement of aerospace in America.

□ 1330

ABSURD COMMENTS ABOUT ABORTION

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, over the years, I have heard some rather absurd comments from my Republican colleagues about abortion. Some have compared Planned Parenthood to drug dealers, abortion factories, and the Ku Klux Klan. I have even heard grown men debate ''legitimate rape'' on live TV. I have even heard a Republican lawmaker put forth the claim that, if women are allowed to have abortions, men should be allowed to rape.

After nearly 30 years of public office, nothing really surprises me anymore, Mr. Speaker. So you can imagine my lack of astonishment when my dear friend and colleague from Wisconsin, SEAN DUFFY, rolled out abortion statistics among African American women to lecture Black legislators like myself about defending the welfare of our constituents.

Since the United States Supreme Court ruled in 1963 that women are guaranteed the privacy and power and right to make medical decisions concerning their own bodies, anti-choice legislators have been trying to end safe and legal abortion. A tactic that has been part of their strategy is to use inflammatory, racial arguments, and deceptive claims to stigmatize abortion in communities of color.

I don't expect Representative DUFFY to understand why his comments are offensive, but what he and so many of his Republican colleagues fail to acknowledge is the underlying context behind high abortion rates in African American communities.

High rates of abortion are related to poverty and lack of access to quality care. The war on women's health centers has resulted in multiple barriers to accessing quality, affordable health care, which could lead to higher rates of both unintended pregnancy and abortion.

Representative DUFFY's hypocrisy on this issue is as predictable as it is offensive. If he truly, truly wants to fight for the hopeless and voiceless, he should join us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Wisconsin has expired.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. What is the rule on attacking personalities in the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. House rule XVII prohibits Members from engaging in personalities in debate.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Did the prior speech violate that rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot give an advisory opinion on that.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

PUTTING THE SAFETY OF AMERICANS FIRST

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

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, for months Americans have been demanding stronger FBI background checks on Syrian and Middle Eastern refugees entering the United States, and just yesterday an ISIS-affiliated Syrian refugee was arrested in Houston, Texas.

Rather than taking action to address these national security vulnerabilities, President Obama shockingly believes that it is more important to increase FBI background checks on law-abiding American citizens.

This additional round of unconstitutional executive action is a new low for this administration. Their overreach on guns and law-abiding Americans shows how truly misplaced their priorities are. Sadly, it only confirms what we have already come to learn, that this is a failed President with a very distorted sense of the real world.

Mr. Speaker, putting the safety and security of the American people first means ending this administration's refusal to secure our borders, refusal to respect the right of law-abiding Americans to exercise their First and Second Amendment rights, and refusal to enhance background checks on immigrants and refugees from the safe havens of terrorism.

LAW ENFORCEMENT APPRECIATION DAY

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

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is National Law Enforcement Appreciation Day. I would like to take this time to thank all of the men and women who put their lives on the line each and every day to keep our communities safe.

As a former cop of 33 years, I know firsthand what it means to leave your home and not know if you are coming back. My family knows that feeling of: Is Deputy Dave going to come home tonight to his family?

Well, early in my career, that was a big question mark. I found myself in a fight for my life at 23 years old, being attacked by a man with a butcher knife. I came home that night with 45 stitches in my neck.

Years later, I lost a good friend and a partner who was ambushed, shot, and killed in 1982. Two years later, I lost a good friend—an academy colleague—who was stabbed to death in 1984. Sadly, deaths of police officers are occurring across this country each and every day.

I want to take this time to especially mention the last two in Washington State who have sacrificed their lives for the protection of our community: Officer Rick Silva of Chehalis Police Department and Detective Brent Hanger of the Washington State Patrol.

Mr. Speaker, we should take this time, especially tomorrow and in the coming weeks, to stop and say thank you to our law enforcement officials across this country for putting their lives on the line each and every day to keep our families safe.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CHARLES FRANCIS CLIFFORD, JR.

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

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, today I want to say goodbye to a good friend who died this week: Charles Francis Clifford, Jr.

Mr. Chuck was a World War II veteran who served in the Navy for 35 years, where he attained the rank of captain. He spent his professional career with State Farm. Along with his loving wife, Ann, they raised four children together.

Chuck lived an honorable and dutiful life. He served his country faithfully. He was devoted to his family and to his faith, and he saw his business career as an extension of the call to service. He was a kind man, always with a smile.

After Ann died 7 years ago, Chuck continued to be an ongoing presence in our community, volunteering at our church. He received frequent requests from the children at St. Joseph's School to tell his story about living through the Depression and his service during World War II.

Chuck Clifford was an example of manly steadiness and goodness. He was my friend, and I will miss him. Well done, good and faithful servant.

REQUEST FOR JOINT MEETING OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, one of the great honors this body can bestow upon a foreign leader is an invitation to address a joint meeting of Congress.

As co-chairman of the Friends of Egypt Caucus, TULSI GABBARD and I have delivered a letter today to the Speaker of the House, PAUL D. RYAN, urging him to invite Egyptian President el-Sisi to give such an address.

General el-Sisi came to power amidst chaos and restored order to his country. He was then democratically elected as President of Egypt. He is a pivotal figure in the Middle East during this time of great danger. He is a champion of the Egyptian people and a friend to the people of the United States.

Most importantly, he is a voice for respect and reconciliation between people of all faiths. Thus, he is a force for peace and stability in a region plagued with terrorism and religious persecution. He and the people of Egypt have earned our moral and strategic support.

I will include in the RECORD the official request that the Friends of Egypt Caucus have made to Speaker RYAN to invite President el-Sisi to be invited to address a joint meeting of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, January 8, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As co-chairs of the Friends for Egypt Caucus we request that Egyptian President Abdel Fattah elSisi be invited to address a Joint Meeting of Congress during the second session of the 114th Congress.

Egypt under President el-Sisi's leadership is playing a pivotal role in North Africa and the Middle East. Egypt is a bulwark against a barbaric and fanatic Islamic state and its ilk. El Sisi's courage and commitment to peace and stability is a dramatic and positive force that deserves to be recognized. His call for tolerance and respect of people of all religions has been a dramatic step towards reconciliation and stability in the Middle East. His visits to Christian gatherings have been historic and worthy of praise by all people of good will.

The United States and Egypt have had a long and mutually beneficial relationship. We need to bolster relations between our people now in this time of crisis and radical terrorist attacks in the region and throughout the world.

Having President el Sisi address the United States Congress would be a message to the world of our solidarity with moderate Muslim leaders who share our goal of a more peaceful and stable world. His appearance before a Joint Meeting of Congress will underscore our gratitude for his leadership in this time of turmoil.

We appreciate your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

DANA ROHRABACHER,
Member of Congress.
TULSI GABBARD,
Member of Congress.

REGULATORY GRIDLOCK

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HARDY).

Mr. HARDY. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is our first week back in session after spending the holidays in our districts. While we were meeting with our constituents and enjoying the company of loved ones, the Federal bureaucracy was firing on all cylinders, cranking out thousands of pages of regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand what our regulators were doing on Christmas Eve. In my other hand I am holding 298 pages of what our Federal regulators were doing on New Year's Eve.

This breakneck pace of activity, deep within the bowels of our executive branch, capped off a record year for the Federal Register, the official record of the government's regulatory and other actions.

The grand total for 2015 was 82,035 pages of regulations. This leaves the current administration with an annual

page count of nearly 80,000 per year and puts it on pace to contribute more pages of regulations to the Federal Register than any other administration in American history.

Mr. Speaker, this is a perversion of our Founding Fathers' intent and a disservice to the American people.

Article I, section 1, of the Constitution vests all legislative power in a Congress of the United States, not with regulatory agencies.

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution vests all the power to make all laws in Congress to the United States, not with regulatory agencies.

Article II, section 3, of the Constitution clearly states that the President shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed. That means executive agencies execute the laws as Congress intended, not that they make their own.

Mr. Speaker, there is no ambiguity. Federal laws get made right here on this floor and in the other Chamber across the rotunda and nowhere else. But over the past 228 years, the founding principles have been manipulated.

With this massive expansion of the Federal Government's role during the New Deal, agencies were awarded rulemaking authority through acts of Congress. This statutory authority was granted to allow our Federal agencies to better implement the law in a growing, complex Nation. But it was not a blank check.

Unfortunately, far too many here in Congress have been complicit in delegating our sacred lawmaking authority to legions of unelected bureaucrats. How can this be?

We are the first branch of government, the branch that is closest to the people. We are directly accountable to our constituents. It is because of that accountability that we must reclaim that constitutional duty to make all laws.

That is why I am a proud original cosponsor of the REINS Act of 2015 and why I voted to pass that important bill last year. The REINS Act takes the important step of requiring congressional approval of all major rules. This is a huge improvement over the current status quo under the Congressional Review Act.

The default standard for all major rules should be rejection unless they are congressionally approved, not acceptance until rejection.

The Congressional Review Act is a failed attempt to reclaim our exclusive legislating authority. Rejecting one single rule on ergonomic chairs in 20 years is simply unacceptable. We need laws with more teeth.

The bills we passed this week, including the SCRUB Act of 2015, will help in this effort.

Mr. Speaker, something needs to change. Churning out thousands of final rules on tens of thousands of Federal Register pages each and every year is hamstringing our economy and crushing our businesses.

□ 1345

According to a study done by the National Association of Manufacturers, complying with the Federal regulations costs Americans $2.028 trillion in lost economic growth each and every year. That is 12 percent of our GDP down the drain.

As a former small-business owner, I can tell you that mom-and-pop shops aren't poring over each and every issue of the Federal Register, and they sure aren't doing it on Christmas Eve. Unlike large corporations that can afford armies of attorneys to navigate the complex Federal bureaucracy, small businesses are left hanging out to dry.

As the people's House, we are advocates for the people we represent. We serve them. We are accountable to them. We owe it to the people to go on record and vote on major rules that impact their daily lives.

I challenge any President or elected official to say that the American people don't deserve the right to hold their government accountable.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, news surfaced today. Here is a story from Ed Morrissey: ''Has the State Department released a smoking gun in the Hillary Clinton email scandal? In a thread from June 2011, Hillary Clinton exchanges emails with Jake Sullivan, then her deputy chief of staff and now her campaign foreign-policy adviser, in which she impatiently waits for a set of talking points. When Sullivan tells her that the source is having trouble with the secure fax, Hillary then orders Sullivan to have the data stripped of its markings and sent through a nonsecure channel.''

Then it is quoting from the email: ''If they can't, turn into nonpaper with no identifying heading and send nonsecure.''

The article goes on to say: ''That's an order to violate the laws handling classified material. There is no other way to read that demand. Regardless of whether or not Sullivan complied, this demolishes Hillary claim to be ignorant of marking issues, as well as strongly suggests that the other thousand-plus instances where this did occur likely came under her direction.''

Fox News also noticed the email this morning, although they don't have a copy of it linked. And it is quoting: ''However, one email thread from June 2011 appears to include Clinton telling her top adviser Jake Sullivan to send security information through insecure means.

''In response to Clinton's request for a set of since-redacted talking points, Sullivan writes, 'They say they've had issues sending secure fax. They are working on it.' Clinton responds, 'If they can't, turn it into nonpaper with no identifying heading and send nonsecure.'

''Ironically, an email thread from 4 months earlier shows Clinton saying she was 'surprised' that a diplomatic officer named John Godfrey used a personal email account to send a memo on Libya policy after the fall of Muammar Qaddafi.''

The article goes on later: ''Did those talking points get illegally transmitted on Hillary Clinton's order? If so, then Sullivan may find himself in legal trouble, too. Paragraph (g)''—quoting from the law—''makes it clear that 'each of the parties to such conspiracy shall be subject to the punishment provided for the offense which is the object of such conspiracy.'

''This explains why more than a thousand pieces of classified information have found their way into Hillary unauthorized and unsecured email system—and why the markings have been stripped from them. Hillary herself apparently ordered the Code Red, so to speak.

In an update, the author says: ''There are a few people wondering whether the 'TPs' ''—or talking points—''in question in this thread were classified in the first place.

''There are a couple of points to remember in that context: Unclassified material doesn't need to be transmitted by secure fax; if the material wasn't classified, Sullivan would have just faxed them normally.

''Ordering aides to remove headers to facilitate the transmission over unsecured means strongly suggests the information was not unclassified. On top of that, removing headers to avoid transmission security would be a violation of 18 USC 793 anyway, which does not require material to be classified—only sensitive to national security.''

Also: ''State did leave this document unclassified, but that's because there isn't any discussion of what the talking points cover. They redacted the subject headers with B5 and B6 exemptions, invoked to note that the FOIA''—Freedom of Information Act—''demand doesn't cover the material.

''Ordering the headings stripped, and Sullivan's apparent reluctance to work around the secure fax system, makes it all but certain that the material was classified at some level—and Hillary knew it.''

Just breaking news of interest.

ACTIVITIES OF ABDURAHMAN ALAMOUDI

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, a matter of grave concern continues to arise stemming back from a man who was born in Eritrea named Abdurahman Alamoudi. And this is from DiscoverTheNetworks.org.

He, Mr. Alamoudi, immigrated to the United States in 1979. That would be the same year, Mr. Speaker, you will recall, that radical Islam declared war on the United States, attacked our embassy in Tehran, took over 50 Americans hostage, and held them for over a year.

That same year, that year, 1979, is the year Mr. Alamoudi came to the United States, and then he became a naturalized U.S. citizen in 1996.

In 1981, he founded the Islamic Society of Boston. It is not in this article, but I have also seen the documentation

of his founding. And it is, I think, worth noting that the Islamic Society of Boston that Mr. Alamoudi founded, the two mosques in the Boston area, one of which produced the Tsarnaev brothers, where they worshipped and learned more about Islam.

This article says, from 1985 to 1990 Mr. Alamoudi served as executive assistant to the president of the SAAR Foundation in Northern Virginia.

In 1990, Alamoudi founded the American Muslim Council. The following year, he established the American Muslim Armed Forces and Veterans Affairs Council, whose purpose was to ''certify Muslim chaplains hired by the military.''

During the 1992 Presidential election cycle, Alamoudi courted both the Democratic and the Republican Parties. When Bill Clinton emerged victorious, Alamoudi increased his donations to Democrats. He went on to serve the Clinton administration as an Islamic affairs adviser and a State Department ''goodwill ambassador'' to Muslim nations.

In 1993, the Defense Department certified Alamoudi's American Muslim Armed Forces and Veterans Affairs Council as one of two organizations, along with the Graduate School of Islamic and Social Sciences, authorized to approve and endorse Muslim chaplains.

Among the chaplains endorsed by Alamoudi's group was James Yee, who eventually would be arrested in 2003 on suspicion of espionage.

Mr. Speaker, it is very reassuring that this man arrested on suspicion of espionage here in the United States was certified by Mr. Alamoudi's group.

In March 1993, Alamoudi disparaged the Federal Government for the ''flimsy'' evidence it had used as a basis for arresting Mohammed Salameh, a suspect in the World Trade Center bombing of February 26 of 1993. Salameh was later convicted and sentenced to life in prison on what, apparently, Mr. Alamoudi thought was flimsy evidence.

It goes on: ''In 1995, Alamoudi helped President Clinton''—interesting verb that, helped—''Alamoudi helped President Clinton and the American Civil Liberties Union develop a Presidential guideline entitled 'Religious Expression in Public School,' which established a legal justification upon which the ACLU would file lawsuits restricting Christmas celebrations and removing Nativity scenes from public schools.

''Alamoudi made numerous controversial statements during the 1990s and early 2000s, including these:

''In 1994 he said: 'Hamas is not a terrorist group . . . I have followed the good work of Hamas.

''In March 1996, Alamoudi said he was 'honored to be a member of the committee that is defending' Islamic Association of Palestine''—or IAP—''founder Musa Abu Marzuk, who in 1997 would be deported from the United States because of his Hamas-related activities. 'I really consider him to be from among the best people in the Islamic movement.' ''—that is a quote from Alamoudi—''Alamoudi added. 'Hamas . . . and I work together with him.' ''

In December of 1996, as Alamoudi continued to work with the Clinton administration to find good Muslims to work in the government, Alamoudi told a meeting of the IAP: ''I think if we were outside this country we can say, 'Oh, Allah, destroy America,' but once we are here, our mission in this country is to change it . . . You can be violent anywhere else but in America.''

''In October 2000, Alamoudi attended an anti-Israel protest outside the White House, where he proudly declared himself 'a supporter of Hamas' and 'a supporter of Hezbollah.' '' And apparently there is video of that.

In 2000, Alamoudi literally ''began making regular trips to Libya, where he met with government officials to discuss strategies by which they could create 'headaches' for Saudi Arabia.

''In January 2001, Alamoudi attended a conference in Beirut with leaders of numerous terrorist organizations, including al Qaeda, Hamas, Hezbollah, and Islamic Jihad.

''In June 2001, Alamoudi was a guest speaker at a Northern Virginia conference where senior Islamic militants from throughout the Middle East were gathered. Many of the speakers denounced the 'Zionist entity that aims to destroy the Muslim ummah,'' or community.

□ 1400

''That same month, Alamoudi attended a briefing on President Bush's faith-based initiative, and the White House invited him to the post-9/11 prayer service on September 14th at the National Cathedral in Washington.

In September 2003, British customs officials arrested Alamoudi at Heathrow Airport as he was returning from Libya with 340,000 in cash given to him by President Muammar Qadhafi to finance a plot involving two U.K.-based al Qaeda operatives intending to assassinate Saudi Crown Prince, later King Abdullah.

Alamoudi was subsequently extradited to the United States. In October 2003, he was arrested at Dulles Airport on charges of having illegally accepted $10,700 from the Libyan mission to the United Nations.

''With Alamoudi in custody, federal authorities released a transcript of a telephone conversation in which he had: lamented that no Americans had died during al Qaeda's 1998 bombing of the U.S. Embassy in Kenya; recommended that more operations be conducted like the 1994 Hezbollah bombing of a Jewish cultural center in Buenos Aires, in which 85 people died; and clearly articulated his objective of turning America into a Muslim nation.

''Alamoudi was indicted not only for his illegal dealings with Libya, but also for tax evasion and immigration fraud. He ultimately pled guilty to, and was convicted of, being a senior al Qaeda financier who had funneled at least $1 million into the coffers of that terrorist organization. He also acknowledged that he had pocketed almost $1 million for himself in the process. In October 2004, Alamoudi was sentenced to 23 years in federal prison.

''During the Holy Land Foundation for Relief and Development trial of 2007, which examined evidence of the HLF's fundraising on behalf of Hamas, the U.S. government released a list of approximately 300 of HLF's 'unindicted co-conspirators' and 'joint venturers.' Alamoudi was named in that list . . . In addition to the affiliations listed above, Alamoudi has also been, at various times, a board member of American Muslims for Jerusalem; the head of the American Task Force for Bosnia; a board member of the Council for the National Interest Foundation; a director of the Council on American-Islamic Relations, CAIR''—which, by the way, Mr. Speaker, has very open access to the highest officials, including the President.

They are the ones that got Langley to call off a 2-day seminar for law enforcement on radical Islam and got the rules changed so people that were American experts on Islam could not talk to any U.S. Government group about radical Islam unless they got approval from people like those that CAIR approved of.

CAIR—we are talking also about a named co-conspirator in the Holy Land Foundation trial in which convictions were obtained for principals in the Holy Land Foundation for supporting terrorism. I would humbly submit that had Eric Holder not become Attorney General and Barack Obama not become President of the United States, many, if not all, of those co-conspirators would have been then indicted and tried as supporters of terrorism.

Instead, a new President and a new Attorney General came in, and instead of being indicted and tried for supporting terrorism as they were named in the Federal District Court in Dallas and the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals said in opinions—there was plenty of evidence to support that they were co-conspirators—well, the new administration dropped the matter, and these people became helpful to the administration in advising on Islam.

It also notes that Mr. Alamoudi was a founding trustee of the Fiqh Council of North America, a board member of the Interfaith Impact for Justice and Peace, a regional representative for the Islamic Society of North America—which was also a named co-conspirator for supporting terrorism—a board member of Mercy International, president of the Muslim Student Association of the U.S. and Canada, a board member of the Somali Relief Fund, secretary of the Muslim Brotherhood Affiliated, Success Foundation, and director of the Talibah International Aid Association.

In fact, in an article back in 2004, Andrew C. McCarthy noted that:

''Abdurahman Alamoudi was sentenced today to 23 years' imprisonment for terrorism financing, false statements on his naturalization petition, and tax violations. The sentence was imposed by Judge Claude Hilton of the U.S. District Court in Alexandria, Virginia.

''Alamoudi was influential in the American Muslim circles, and thus in Washington. He participated in several political and charitable organizations, founding the American Muslim Council—an enthusiastic supporter of Hamas and Hezbollah. The federal government permitted him a key role in selecting the Islamic clerics who minister in the military and in the prison system. Over the years, moreover, he occasionally traveled the globe as an emissary of the State Department.

''As we now know, he also traveled to Libya, engaged in financial transactions with Qadhafi's government, and collected hefty sums, including the $340,000 seized from him when he was arrested last year, which were designed to be routed back to his causes in the U.S. without the knowledge of American authorities. All of those activities violate the International Emergency Economic Powers Act imposes terrorism-related sanctions prohibiting unlicensed travel to and commerce with Libya.''

I will parenthetically insert here that it had to be very convenient for Mr. Alamoudi, this convicted supporter of terrorism, to be working for the State Department as he went to different countries and apparently continued to conspire to support terrorism as the State Department funded his travel on its behalf.

But also found was this article. The author was Brian Blomquist and the date is June 27, 2003. It is an article about the esteemed U.S. Senator CHARLES, or CHUCK, SCHUMER entitled, ''SCHUMER wants fanatical imams rooted out of jails, armed forces.''

The article says: ''Militant Muslim imams are preaching a distorted, hateful form of Islam to U.S. soldiers and federal prisoners, creating a 'dangerous situation,' Senator CHARLES SCHUMER charged yesterday.

''SCHUMER said the problem is that the Pentagon and the federal Bureau of Prisons select Muslim imams on the advice of Islamic groups in the grip of the fanatical Wahhabism strain of the religion.

'' 'While the potential Wahhabi influence in the U.S. Armed Forces is not well documented, these organizations have succeeded in ensuring that militant Wahhabism is the only form of Islam that is preached to the 12,000 Muslims in federal prison,' SCHUMER said at a Senate hearing on extremist Wahhabi Islam, which has been linked to terrorism.

''In February, the New York prison system barred its top Muslim chaplain from its prison facilities after the imam, Warith Dean Umar, said the 9/11 hijackers should be treated as martyrs.

'' 'The imams flood the prisons with anti-American, pro-bin Laden videos, literature and sermon tapes . . . The point of prison should be to rehabilitate violent prisoners.' ''

Mr. SCHUMER is so right.

The article goes on: ''The Bureau of Prisons uses the Graduate School of Islamic and Social Sciences, which is under investigation for possible funneling of money to terrorists, and the Islamic Society of North America, which has board members with terror links, SCHUMER charged.

''American Muslim Foundation President Abdurahman Alamoudi said his organization had no role advising the Pentagon. Alamoudi said he formerly gave the Pentagon advice on selecting imams, but 'they pushed me out.' ''

Well, we know that that was not until right before the British Government arrested Alamoudi and then provided apparently the U.S. Government plenty of evidence to show that Alamoudi was supporting terrorism.

That is why I was so shocked, since the FBI got information from Britain, gathered their own information that they had been gathering at least since 1991 on radical Islamic beginnings here in the United States, that during the Bush administration the FBI would have a partnership outreach program with the Council of American-Islamic relations, of which Mr. Alamoudi was a board member. CAIR was a named co-conspirator for supporting terrorists, which the courts have said there is plenty of evidence to support that they are. While the FBI had gathered such evidence, they were outreach partners with this organization, CAIR, named as a co-conspirator with the Holy Land Foundation.

This article from WND, ''Pentagon admits chaplains from Muslim Brotherhood group,'' published on March 6, 2014, by Aaron Klein said: ''The U.S. Army and Air Force has selected two Muslim chaplains from a program run by an Islamic group closely tied to the Muslim Brotherhood that was named by the Justice Department as an unindicted co-conspirator in a scheme to raise money for Hamas.

''WND broke the story in 2011 that the controversial Islamic Society of North America, or ISNA, is the official endorsing agency for the U.S. Armed Forces Muslim chaplain program.

''WND further reported that year that the Muslim chaplain program was founded by a terror-supporting convict, while the Army's first Islamic chaplain, who is still serving, has been associated with a charity widely accused of serving as an al-Qaida front.

''Now, ISNA has announced that two of its former applicants for chaplaincy were selected to serve on active duty in the United States Army and Air Force.

'' 'The significance of this news is that the Department of Defense . . . has not selected an ISNA-endorsed chaplain for active duty in over 15 years,' said the ISNA press release.

''ISNA Chaplain Services Director and Islamic Endorsing Agent Abdul-Rasheed Muhammad said in a statement that the two chaplains selected for active duty are ready to serve Allah and the country—making the statement in that order.

'' 'After speaking by phone with both soldiers, it was more than clear both were eager and ready to serve Allah and country'. . . 'May Allah bless our new chaplain candidates and their families as they prepare for new challenges and opportunities in the Army and Air Force Chaplain Corps,' said Muhammad.

''While the new chaplains' ties to ISNA has received some attention in the conservative blogosphere in recent days, missing from the conversation is the larger partnership between the U.S. military and not just the ISNA but also other terror-tied groups.

''In fact, Muhammad himself, the ISNA's endorsing agent, has been tied to a group accused of serving as an al-Qaida front.''

By the way, parenthetically, 1993 was the year in which we had another terrorist attack, that being the first attempted bombing, or the first bombing, of the Word Trade Center in an attempt to bring it down and kill tens of thousands of Americans.

□ 1415

''Since the Muslim chaplain program's inception in 1993, ISNA has been the official endorsing agency of the new chaplains.

''In 2005, ISNA initiated a yearly Muslim chaplain conference that includes leadership talks for chaplains in both the military and the U.S. prison system.

''Discover the Networks notes that ISNA—through its Saudi-government-backed affiliate, the North American Islamic Trust—reportedly holds the mortgages on 50 percent to 80 percent of all mosques in the U.S. and Canada.

'' 'Thus the organization can freely exercise ultimate authority over these houses of worship and their teachings,' states Discover the Networks.

''ISNA was founded in 1981 by the Saudi-funded Muslim Students' Association, which was founded partially by the Muslim Brotherhood. The two groups are still partners.

''WND previously attended an MSA event at which violence against the U.S. was urged by speakers.

'' 'We are not Americans,' shouted one speaker, Muhammad Faheed, at Queensborough Community College in 2003. 'We are Muslims. The U.S. is going to deport and attack us! It is us versus them! Truth against falsehood! The colonizers and masters against the oppressed, and we will burn down the master's house!' ''

Well, Mr. Speaker, with those kind of comments coming at their meetings, it is so wonderful that principles from these organizations have such close ties with the current leadership in the country, in the White House, in the State Department, and in the Justice Department.

This article goes on:

''ISNA was named in a May 1991 Muslim Brotherhood document, 'An Explanatory Memorandum on the General Strategic Goal for the Group in North America,' as one of the Brotherhood's likeminded 'organizations of our friends' who shared the common goal of destroying America and turning it into a Muslim nation, according to Discover the Networks.

''Islam scholar Stephen Schwartz describes ISNA as 'one of the chief conduits through which the radical Saudi form of Islam passes into the United States.'

''According to terrorism expert Steven Emerson, ISNA 'is a radical group hiding under a false veneer of moderation' that publishes a bimonthly magazine, Islamic Horizons, that 'often champions militant Islamist doctrine.' The group also 'convenes annual conferences where Islamist militants have been given a platform to incite violence and promote hatred,' states Emerson. Emerson cites an ISNA conference in which al-Qaida supporter and PLO official Yusuf Al Qaradhawi was invited to speak.

''Emerson further reports that in September of 2002, a full year after 9/11, speakers at ISNA's annual conference still refused to acknowledge Osama bin Laden's role in the terrorist attacks.

''Also, ISNA has held fundraisers for terrorists, notes Discover the Networks. After Hamas leader Mousa Marzook was arrested and eventually deported in 1997, ISNA raised money for his defense. The group also has condemned the U.S. government's post-9/11 seizure of the financial assets of Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihad.

''ISNA, meanwhile, has an extensive relationship with the Obama administration, which recently announced it is open to diplomacy with the Muslim Brotherhood.''

Mr. Speaker, this is where I have to say, having visited with leaders in the Middle East, Muslim leaders who are actually friends of the United States, not in official open meetings, but when we get in private, they ask the question: Why does your U.S. administration continue to support the Muslim Brotherhood? Do you not understand the Muslim Brotherhood has been at war with the United States since 1979, and you have got friendly Muslims that want to help you—I would submit that the current President of Egypt is one of those—and yet you are insistent on helping the Muslim Brotherhood that is at war with the United States? Oh, not with violence yet, but they claim they are getting so much accomplished in taking over the United States without violence, that they don't want to use that yet. That will come later if necessary. But right now they are doing such a good job as advisers and in important positions in the administration that they should not be using violence.

Well, back to the article:

''The relationship began even before Obama took office.

''One week before last year's presidential inauguration''—again, keeping in mind this article is from 2014.

''One week before last year's presidential inauguration, Sayyid Syeed, national director of ISNA's Office for Interfaith and Community Alliances, was part of a delegation that met with the directors of Obama's transition team. The delegation discussed a request for an executive order ending 'torture.'

''ISNA President Mattson represented American Muslims at Obama's inauguration, where she offered a prayer during the televised event. Mattson also represented ISNA at Obama's Ramadan dinner at the White House.

''In June 2009, Obama senior aide Valerie Jarrett invited Mattson to work on the White House Council on Women and Girls, which Jarrett leads.''

Yeah, that is what you want. You want someone who supports the Muslim Brotherhood's idea that women don't have rights. They have no business showing their face in public or driving or having property. Yeah, that is what you want advising the White House on women's issues, for heaven's sake.

The article goes on:

''One month later, the Justice Department sponsored an information booth at an ISNA bazaar in Washington, D.C.

''Also that month, Jarrett addressed ISNA's 46th annual convention. According to the White House, Jarrett attended as part of Obama's outreach to Muslims.

''In February, Obama's top adviser on counter-terrorism, John Brennan, came under fire for controversial remarks he made in a speech to Muslim law students at an event sponsored by ISNA at New York University.

''In his speech, Brennan, who later became CIA director, stated that having a percentage of terrorists released by the U.S. return to terrorist attacks 'isn't that bad,' since the recidivism rate for inmates in the U.S. prison system is higher.

''He also criticized parts of the Bush administration's response to 9/11 as a 'reaction some people might say was over the top in some areas' that 'in an overabundance of caution we implemented a number of security measures and activities that upon reflection now we look back after the heat of the battle has died down a bit we say they were excessive, OK.'

''WND reported Brennan stated at the ISNA-organized event that the Obama administration is working to calibrate policies in the fight against terrorism that ensure Americans are 'never' profiled.

''Speaking at the question-and-answer session, Brennan declared himself a 'citizen of the world.'

'' 'We need to be looking at ourselves as individuals. Not the way we look or the creed we have or our ethnic background. I consider myself a citizen of the world,' he said.

''Brennan told the audience the Obama administration is trying to 'make sure that we as Americans can interact in a safe way, balance policies in a way that optimizes national security but also optimizes the opportunity in this country never to be profiled, never to be discriminated against.' ''

Yes, that is right. Sure. If you hate America and you want America's Western lifestyle and freedoms destroyed, you want women subjugated, we shouldn't profile people just because they want America destroyed as part of their religious beliefs. That kind of thinking gets a nation in trouble. And, thus, we are in trouble.

This article was published this week, January 5, 2016, from Jennifer Hickey, ''Ripe for Radicalization: Federal Prisons 'Breeding Ground' for Terrorists, Say Experts.'' Here we are in 2016 substantiating the statements that Senator CHUCK SCHUMER made back in 2003 that our prisons have been, for years now, a breeding ground for radical Islamism.

Under both Republican and Democratic administrations, we have allowed people who have been named—and for which the Federal courts have said there is plenty of evidence to support that they are co-conspirators in financing terrorism and supporting terrorism—we have allowed them to pick imams, approve imams, put imams in our military and in our prisons. Is it any surprise that 13 years after CHUCK SCHUMER raised that issue, that since nothing has been done about it, that the Federal prisons are a breeding ground for radical Islamists?

This quote from Representative STEPHEN FINCHER, my friend from Tennessee, says: ''Over the years, our Federal prisons have become a breeding ground for radicalization.''

That is supportive of what CHUCK SCHUMER said years ago.

In fact, this article by Carol Brown, December 5, 2014, american thinker.com, ''Prisons are Breeding Grounds for Jihadist'':

''Muslims comprise 15% of the prison population. This number far exceeds the percentage of Muslims in the general population. It is eighteen times greater, to be exact.''

So there are 18 times more Muslims in Federal prison than the percentage of Muslims in the general population. That raises issues, questions, and problems.

''Put another way, there are about 2.4 million Muslims in the United States and 350,000 of them are in jail. That means more than 12% of Muslims in America are incarcerated.

''Reports on the number of prisoners who convert to Islam vary and are framed in different ways. Some sources estimate 40,000 prisoners per year convert. Others put the numbers closer to 135,000 per year. Some posit that 80% of inmates who 'find faith while in prison convert to Islam.'

''One thing is for sure: The majority of those who convert to Islam in prison

are black, with as many as one in three black prisoners converting. The number of Hispanic prisoners converting to Islam is also on the rise.

''These numbers are staggering. And the implications are serious, as will be addressed further on in this article.

''There are numerous reasons why conversions to Islam are skyrocketing in our jails.

''Many prisoners feel angry, disenfranchised, and yes, even victimized and wronged by society. Many harbor a deep disdain for America. They are, therefore, prime targets for recruitment to a religious ideology that shares many of these attitudes.

''In addition, Islamic teachings are often framed as a noble code of ethics to live by. Case in point: The Nation of Islam is the largest prison ministry.''

I am sure they are meaning the largest prison ministry in the United States.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, this is going on as I speak. It has been going on for the 13 years since CHUCK SCHUMER brought it up in the Senate, and we don't appear to have learned any lessons from this.

My friend DANA ROHRABACHER is pushing that we invite the President of Egypt, President el-Sisi, to come speak to a joint session of Congress. I was talking to Chairman ROYCE about it. He believes it would be a good idea.

Our majority whip, STEVE SCALISE, just met with President el-Sisi in Egypt. I am thrilled he did. He is a Muslim leader who understands the Muslim Brotherhood is a threat to freedom in Egypt and in America and in Europe. It is time we did something about it to protect ourselves.

You don't have to profile Muslims, but you should be profiling those who are studying radical Islam, like Qutb, like in his booklet ''Milestones,'' which Osama bin Laden said radicalized him—or helped.

Yet, this administration will not allow our Justice Department, our intelligence departments and agencies, and our State Department to be educated on radical Islam. So, of course, you are going to be admitting a woman who takes a man's name that denotes a terrorist Islamic Jihadist from hundreds of years ago, Tashfeen Malik.

Our Homeland Security has run off people who are real patriots, like Phil Haney, and who are brilliant on the issue of radical Islam. We have run them out.

The message is clear that you had better not study radical Islam and you had better not know anything about radical Islam in Homeland Security because, if you do, we will run you off if we don't do something worse. Thank God Phil Haney had such a clean record. They were looking for anything.

Our country is in trouble, and there are people who want to destroy it. It is ridiculous that anybody still has to say: We know all Muslims are not terrorists. Of course, they are not. But it is ridiculous to continue to allow and to even encourage radical Islamist imams in our prisons to transform prisoners into additional radical Jihadists, who are going to go off like bombs, figuratively and literally, at some point down the road.

We also have to look at our immigration policy when it comes to continuing to allow people like al-Amoudi—who hates America, who considers himself to be a person who could help bring about the global caliphate, a person who is financing terrorism—have his wife come and have a child in America.

Before he started trying to radicalize that country and take power unto himself as if he were a dictator, Morsi's wife—Morsi, the former President of Egypt—had a child here.

Do you think that child was being brought up to love America? Do you think al-Amoudi's child was being raised to love America while his parents were scheming to terrorize it?

Anwar al-Awlaki is one about whom my friends on both sides of the aisle have discussed the proprieties or improprieties of having a President just issue an order to kill an American citizen, Anwar al-Awlaki, a man who led staffers in Muslim prayers right here on Capitol Hill.

Capitol Hill staffers were led in prayer by a man who, ultimately, the Obama administration—the President himself—considered to be so dangerous he had to take him out with a drone strike in Yemen. He was so dangerous to the United States that we couldn't even risk arresting him later. He had to take him out with a bomb strike.

How was he an American citizen? His parents, who raised him to hate America, came to America on student visas. They studied here and had Anwar al-Awlaki. They took him back to Yemen and taught him to hate America. He became so dangerous that even President Obama felt he had to order a strike on an American citizen, without his having had a trial, without due process. He felt he had to take him out with a drone because that American citizen—an American citizen only because his parents came here on visas—was too dangerous for them to do anything else. It is time we started protecting our homeland, and we need an administration that will do it.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me just add that the reports have been that the Obama administration used the NSA to spy on Members of Congress to help it keep the Iran treaty in play. Mr. Speaker, we have got to get to the bottom of that.

If it turns out that our President was unconstitutionally spying on Members of Congress, I do not care if they were all Democrats or Republicans. I do not care. They may have been Democrats. It doesn't matter.

If he were spying on Members of Congress—using the NSA or any other government agency to spy on Members of Congress—we need to find out if it happened. If he were, he needs to be removed from office, period. Otherwise, we can't save the Nation.

I hope and pray those allegations are not true. I hope and pray that the President of the United States did not have the NSA spying on Members of Congress to help him with the Iran deal, to help him as he was supporting the biggest supporters of terrorism in the world. I hope and pray that is not true. I hope and pray it is not, but we need to find out.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to engage in personalities relating to the President.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. STIVERS (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of his duties with the Ohio National Guard.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on January 7, 2016, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 3762. To provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 11, 2016, at noon 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:

3916. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-087, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)(C); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(c) (as added by Public Law 94-329, Sec. 211(a)); (82 Stat. 1326); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3917. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-114, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)(C); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(c) (as added by Public Law 94-329, Sec. 211(a)); (82 Stat. 1326); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3918. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, Transmittal

No.: DDTC 15-115, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)(C); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(c) (as added by Public Law 94-329, Sec. 211(a)); (82 Stat. 1326); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3919. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, Transmittal No.: DDTC 14-154, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)(C); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(c) (as added by Public Law 94-329, Sec. 211(a)); (82 Stat. 1326); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3920. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-104, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)(C); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(c) (as added by Public Law 94-329, Sec. 211(a)); (82 Stat. 1326); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3921. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-084, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)(C); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(c) (as added by Public Law 94-329, Sec. 211(a)); (82 Stat. 1326); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3922. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-112, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d)(1); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(d) (as added by Public Law 94-32 9, Sec. 211(a)); (90 Stat. 740); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3923. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-252, ''Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Support Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2015'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3924. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-248, ''Domestic Partnership Termination Recognition Amendment Act of 2015'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(2); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3925. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-247, ''Health-Care Decisions Amendment Act of 2015'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3926. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-250, ''Higher Education Licensure Commission Amendment Act of 2015'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3927. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-249, ''Uniform Interstate Family Support Act of 2015'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3928. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-251, ''Interim Eligibility and Minimum Shelter Standards Amendment Act of 2015'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3929. A letter from the Chair, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Commission's Inspector General's Semiannual Report to Congress and the Semiannual Management Report for the period ending September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); Public Law 95-452, Sec. 5(b); (92 Stat. 1103); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3930. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Office of Congressional and Legislative Affairs, Small Business Administration, transmitting a letter with information on accessing the Administration's annual Agency Financial Report electronically, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a); (104 Stat. 2849); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3931. A letter from the Executive Secretary, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting notification of three federal vacancies, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3932. A letter from the Chair, Federal Election Commission, transmitting legislative recommendations approved unanimously by the Commission on December 16, 2015, pursuant to 52 U.S.C. 30111(a)(9); Public Law 92-225, Sec. 308 (as amended by Public Law 96-187, Sec. 109); (93 Stat. 1363); to the Committee on House Administration.

3933. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Missouri Regulatory Program [SATS No.: MO-041-FOR; Docket ID: OSM-2013-0008; S1D1S SS08011000 SX064A000 167S180110; S2D2S SS08011000 SX064A000 16XS501520] received December 22, 2015, 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.

3934. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Kaskaskia River MM 28 to 29; New Athens, IL [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0777] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 22, 2015, 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.

3935. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zones; Shell Arctic Drilling/Exploration Vessels, Puget Sound, WA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0295] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 22, 2015, 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.

3936. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Grounded Vessel, Atlantic Ocean, Port St. Lucie, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0992] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 22, 2015, 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.

3937. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Pago Pago Harbor, American Samoa [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0906] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 22, 2015, 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.

3938. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Mississippi River between mile 488.0 and 480.5; Lake Providence, LA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0894] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 22, 2015, 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.

3939. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Mississippi River between mile 467.0 and 472.0; Transylvania, LA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0893] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 22, 2015, 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.

3940. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area; Herbert C. Bonner Bridge, Oregon Inlet, NC [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0987] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received December 22, 2015, 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.

3941. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary interim rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Snake Creek, Islamorada, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0046] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received December 22, 2015, 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.

3942. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Mavericks Surf Competition, Half Moon Bay, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0949] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received December 22, 2015, 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.

3943. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation for Battle of Hampton; Hampton River, Hampton, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0820] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received December 22, 2015, 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.

3944. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone, Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway; Oak Island, NC [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0809] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 22, 2015, 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.

3945. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; 520 Bridge Construction, Lake Washington, Seattle, WA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0570] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 22, 2015, 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.

3946. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; West Larose Vertical Lift Bridge; Houma, LA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0886] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 22, 2015, 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.

3947. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace, Neah Bay, WA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3321; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ANM-17] received December 21, 2015, 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.

3948. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3783; Directorate Identifier 2015-SW-027-AD; Amendment 39-18342; AD 2015-25-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 21, 2015, 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.

3949. 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-2014-1043; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-079-AD; Amendment 39-18321; AD 2015-23-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 21, 2015, 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.

3950. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0933; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-098-AD; Amendment 39-18297; AD 2015-21-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 28, 2015, 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.

3951. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Passenger Train Exterior Side Door Safety [Docket No.: FRA-2011-0063, Notice No.: 2] (RIN: 2130-AC34) received December 21, 2015, 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.

3952. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Tekamah, Nebraska [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1394; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ACE-4] received December 28, 2015, 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.

3953. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Wakeeney, KS [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1832; Airspace Docket No.: 14-ACE-10] received December 28, 2015, 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.

3954. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Disclosure of Seat Dimensions To Facilitate Use of Child Safety Seats on Airplanes During Passenger-Carrying Operations [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0205; Amdt. Nos.: 11-57 and 121-373] (RIN:2120-AK17) received December 28, 2015, 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.

3955. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Registration and Marking Requirements for Small Unmanned Aircraft [Docket No.: FAA-2015-7396; Amdt. Nos.: 1-68, 45-30, 47-30, 48-1, 91-338] (RIN: 2120-AK82) received December 21, 2015, 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.

3956. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; New Designated Countries-Montenegro and New Zealand [FAC 2005-86; FAR Case 2015-034; Item III; Docket No.: 2015-0034; Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AN15) received December 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform and Armed Services.

3957. A letter from the General Counsel, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Rules of Practice in Transportation: Investigative Hearings, Meetings, Repots, and Petitions for Reconsideration [Docket No.: NTSB-GC-2012-0002] received January 5, 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.

3958. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Definition of ''Multiple-Award Contract'' [FAC 2005-86; FAR Case 2015-019; Item I; Docket 2015-0019, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM96) received December 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Oversight and Government Reform.

3959. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's interim rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Sole Source Contracts for Women-Owned Small Businesses [FAC 2005-86; FAR Case 2015-032; Item II; Docket No.: 2015-0032; Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AN13) received December 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform and Armed Services.

3960. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Trade Agreements Thresholds [FAC 2005-86; FAR Case 2016-001; Item No.: IV; Docket No.: 2016-0001, Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AN16) received December 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, Armed Services, and Oversight and Government Reform.

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. AMASH (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 4350. A bill to repeal the Cybersecurity Act of 2015; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Homeland Security, Intelligence (Permanent Select), Armed Services, the Judiciary, Foreign Affairs, Science, Space, and Technology, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 4351. A bill to protect individuals who are eligible for increased pension under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs on the basis of need of regular aid and attendance from dishonest, predatory, or otherwise unlawful practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOULTON (for himself and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS):

H.R. 4352. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program establishing a patient self-scheduling appointment system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EMMER of Minnesota:

H.R. 4353. A bill to extend the exemption of small banks and savings associations from classification as a financial entity for purposes of the swaps clearing requirements of the Commodity Exchange Act, to their holding companies,; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. BABIN, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. JONES, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. RIGELL, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. TROTT, Mr. SALMON, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PALAZZO, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 4354. A bill to affirm the power of the President to revoke the Presidential Medal of Freedom awarded to Bill Cosby and to provide for criminal penalties for anyone who wears or publicly displays a Presidential Medal of Freedom that has been revoked; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. HASTINGS (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 4355. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to impose certain additional requirements on applicants for COPS grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 4356. A bill to ensure greater accountability by licensed firearms dealers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 4357. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the waiver of required minimum distribution rules for certain retirement plans and accounts for 2016; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 4358. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to enhance accountability within the Senior Executive Service, and for other purposes; 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. AMASH:

H.R. 4350.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the implied power to repeal laws that exceed its constitutional authority as well as laws within its constitutional authority.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 4351.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states that Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; Article I, Section 8, Clause 12: To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years. Article I, Section 8, Clause 13: To provide and maintain a Navy.

By Mr. MOULTON:

H.R. 4352.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. EMMER of Minnesota:

H.R. 4353.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress is empowered to regulate interstate commerce under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 4354.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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 Office thereof (Necessary and Proper Clause)

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 4355.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 4356.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 4357.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 4358.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 187: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 379: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 706: Mr. LABRADOR.
H.R. 775: Mr. CLAY and Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 793: Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 911: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 953: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 973: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 1087: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 1188: Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 1288: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 1391: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. FUDGE, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 1397: Mr. HANNA, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 1427: Mr. GRAYSON and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 1552: Mr. KEATING.
H.R. 1611: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 1671: Mr. MASSIE.
H.R. 1751: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 1769: Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 1854: Mr. KEATING and Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 2016: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2083: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2090: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 2114: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2124: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2170: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 2264: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 2300: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 2411: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 2646: Mr. RIGELL.
H.R. 2713: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 2715: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2752: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 2799: Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 2800: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 2911: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 2994: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 3238: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 3326: Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 3406: Ms. LOFGREN and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 3480: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 3520: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 3523: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 3526: Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 3603: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 3722: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 3779: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.
H.R. 3852: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 3886: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 3952: Mr. WALBERG and Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 3953: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. YOHO, Mr. MICA, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 4063: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 4083: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 4084: Mr. LUCAS and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 4132: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 4219: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 4223: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 4224: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 4229: Mr. GOWDY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 4247: Mr. DESANTIS and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 4262: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. PALMER.
H.R. 4277: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 4295: Ms. NORTON and Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 4319: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 4321: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 4328: Mr. MASSIE.
H.R. 4336: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 4348: Mr. BURGESS.
H. Con. Res. 77: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H. Con. Res. 105: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. BURGESS.
H. Res. 14: Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TROTT, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Ms. TITUS.
H. Res. 28: Mr. DONOVAN.
H. Res. 343: Mr. COOK, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. REICHERT.
H. Res. 374: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. BASS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. CHABOT, and Ms. MENG.
H. Res. 432: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.
H. Res. 569: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. BONAMICI.
H. Res. 575: Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. EDWARDS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 582: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ROSS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BABIN, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

41. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Municipal Council of the city of Newark, NJ, relative to Resolution No. 7R9-E, calling upon President Barack Obama to grant clemency to Oscar Lopez Rivera; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CELEBRATING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CITY OF STANTON

HON. ALAN S. LOWENTHAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 2016

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following:

Whereas, in 1911, the City of Stanton, previously known as the ''Benedict'' community, was incorporated and named after Philip A. Stanton an honorable legislator; and

Whereas, Stanton remained an incorporated community until 1924. At an election held on July 22, 1924, the voters decided to disincorporate to allow the State to construct roads in the territory; and

Whereas, on May 15, 1956 a successful election was held on incorporation. On June 4, 1956, the City of Stanton was officially incorporated again under the general law form of government as specified by the State of California; and

Whereas, upon recommendation of the Stanton Women's Civic Club in October 1959, the Jacaranda was selected as the City Tree, and the Bird of Paradise was selected as the City Flower; and

Whereas, at the City Council meeting of January 24, 1989 the City was presented with a flag that incorporated the official city logo and colors. The City Council unanimously adopted the City flag on February 14, 1989; and

Whereas, on March 24, 1987 the City Council unanimously adopted ''Community Pride and Forward Vision'' as the official City motto; and

Whereas, Stanton is home to more than 39,000 residents within its three square miles in the heart of northwestern Orange County. Recent years have seen the City of Stanton experience rapid growth in the commercial, industrial and residential sectors, creating a balanced community with a deep sense of pride in its accomplishments; and

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that January 12, 2016, is the beginning of celebrations for the 60th anniversary of the City of Stanton and encourage all residents of the City of Stanton to celebrate the 60th anniversary of the City of Stanton by exploring and honoring its rich history and embracing the City's future.

IN HONOR OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF CARMEL-BY-THE-SEA, CA

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 2016

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a native Californian to mark the 100th anniversary of my hometown, Carmel-by-the-Sea, California's most charming coastal community. Carmel was founded as a unique and special city by artists and writers. It is now known around the world for its charm and scenic coastal beauty. It is also where my parents Fred and Janet Farr raised me and my sisters, and where my wife Shary and I raised our daughter Jessica. So I am especially pleased to speak on the occasion of this special remembrance.

Carmel may be celebrating 100 years as an incorporated city, but its history stretches back much further. In many ways, Carmel and the greater Monterey Peninsula is where California began. The Esselen natives called Carmel's estuaries, canyons, hills, beaches, and forests home for thousands of years. The first Europeans passed Carmel in 1547 when the explorer Juan Cabrillo sailed up the California coast on behalf of the Spanish Empire. In 1770, the recently canonized Father Junipero Serra accompanied the Portola expedition north from Mexico to establish a settlement in Monterey. In 1771, Serra established the now famous mission in Carmel as one of the eventual 21 such missions established along the California coast. Serra, himself, is interred at the Mission.

By the end of the nineteenth century various investors made sporadic attempts to develop a township in the area adjacent to the old mission. Finally in 1902, the Carmel Development Company under James Frank Devendorf and Frank Powers filed a subdivision map and took other steps to found a town at Carmel's current site. By 1905, the Carmel Arts and Crafts Club formed to support Carmel's small community of artists. That arts community grew dramatically following the 1906 San Francisco quake as artists fleeing the destruction of their city were drawn to the beautiful community by the sea with the burgeoning reputation as an arts colony. The new residents were offered home lots for ten dollars down and whatever they could pay on a monthly basis. Many prominent artists became associated with Carmel, including Robinson Jeffers, Sinclair Lewis, and Jack London, to name just a few. All this growth built Carmel to the point in 1916 that it could incorporate as a full-fledged city.

This background gave Carmel a vibrant energy as it continued to develop in the 20th Century. By the 1940s when my parents moved us to Carmel, it had grown into a thriving small town. As I grew up during the 1950s, every street was filled with families and children. My father was a local lawyer who got elected to the California State Senate in 1955 and represented the area in Sacramento until 1966. He returned to save the Robinson Jeffers home and the Odello artichoke fields at the mouth of the valley. Now in the 21st Century, the same beauty and culture that built Carmel has made it a global tourism destination. What will the next 100 years bring?

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for the whole House as well as my fellow Carmelites, in celebrating this first 100 years of our wonderful little city.

CELEBRATING BISHOP GUILFOYLE CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL FOR ITS SECOND CONSECUTIVE PIAA CLASS A STATE FOOTBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 2016

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the 2015 Bishop Guilfoyle Catholic High School football team for earning its second consecutive PIAA Class A state football championship.

Adding to its inspiring accomplishments from last season, this dedicated Marauder team, led by Coach Justin Wheeler, finished this season with a perfect 16–0 record. Even more impressive, that brings their winning streak to 32 straight games over two seasons.

By handily winning another PIAA Class A football championship this year, the team has even made regional football history by not only making it to the big game in back-to-back years but also winning it. What's more, winning more than one state football championship is something that no other team in the region can claim.

While these many notable achievements are worth highlighting, I also believe it's worth pointing out the humility and work ethic that accompanied them. Through their efforts, the Bishop Guilfoyle football team's players and coaches have displayed character and commitment worth recognizing. This team's continued success is surely another reason to be proud of where we're from.

Today I am honored to recognize the 2015 Bishop Guilfoyle football team for another state championship victory and its continuously growing list of accomplishments. I am proud of how this team has represented Central Pennsylvania and I speak for many when I say I look forward to seeing what the future holds for this program.

TRUDY ROGERS EARNS GIRL SCOUT GOLD

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 2016

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Trudy Rogers for earning the prestigious Girl Scouts of the USA Gold Award, their highest honor.

Trudy is a junior at Travis High School and lives in my hometown of Sugar Land, Texas. She is a member of New Territory-Brazos Valley Community Troop 28103 and serves as an Ambassador Girl Scout for her troop. She earned the Gold Award for her extraordinary project, ''Underdog Yelp!,'' that helps Sugar Land Animal Services. Trudy constructed a staircase, exercise ramp and platform to help

keep the shelter animals healthy and entertained. She also sponsored a community adoption event for animals at the shelter and Pet Harbor and the importance of proper animal healthcare. What an accomplished and caring young woman. The leadership skills Trudy has learned through Girl Scouts are already benefiting our community.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Trudy Rogers for receiving the Girl Scouts of the USA Gold Award.

RECOGNIZING PAM BRIER

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 2016

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a leader who has worked tirelessly to improve healthcare for residents of Brooklyn and all of New York City.

At the beginning of this month, Pam Brier retired as President and Chief Executive Officer of Maimonides Medical Center. Throughout her illustrious career, Pam has shepherded Maimonides from a community hospital to a state-of-the-art medical hub, a pioneer of integrating technology into medical care.

Pam's achievements are too many to recount. She helped introduce information technology to better care for the chronically ill. She launched a cancer center in Brooklyn, making treatments more accessible in our borough. She worked on securing clothing for homeless patients, and made countless other contributions to New York's health system.

Pam founded the Brooklyn Health Information Exchange, bringing together healthcare providers and social service providers. With support from the state and from a Federal Innovation Award, she encouraged the development of a collaborative model program to coordinate the care of individuals living with serious mental illness and other chronic diseases.

Pam accomplished all of this because of her outstanding personal abilities. I've known her for decades and can tell you she has that rare combination of traits that make for an exceptional leader. She has the perseverance to stay the course during trying times, to evolve her thinking as new challenges arise and a special quality that inspires others to succeed.

During her tenure, Pam made sure every staff member was working together to build Maimonides into the premier healthcare institution it is today. She did all of this, while never losing sight of the fact that healthcare is not just about medicine—it is about caring for people.

Pam has an unwavering commitment to helping cure the sick and provide for those of meager means. I can tell you there was never a moment when Pam did not take the opportunity to advocate for better healthcare. Whether it was a meeting at the hospital in New York or any other occasion—like my birthday—or even hers—she always found a way to work healthcare issues into the conversation.

That tireless advocacy comes from a good place. It is because Pam Brier knows that when it comes to healthcare we are talking about people's lives and she never stopped fighting to improve our healthcare system.

Pam Brier has done much for our community and City. We all owe her a debt of gratitude. Later this month the Maimonides community will come together to salute Pam and wish her well. For now, Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating Pam Brier on her many achievements and her well-deserved retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 2016

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr Speaker, I was unable to vote on Wednesday, January 6, 2016. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: ''yes'' on rollcall Number 2 (Previous Question); ''yes'' on rollcall Number 3 (Adoption of the Rule for Reconciliation); ''yes'' on rollcall Number 4 (Previous Question); ''yes'' on rollcall Number 5 (Adoption of the Combined Rule for H.R. 712 & H.R. 1155); and ''yes'' on rollcall Number 6 (Concur in the Senate Amendment to H.R. 3762).

IN HONOR OF ROBERT WALTER ''BOBBY'' DEWS

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 2016

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and solemn remembrance that I rise today to pay tribute to a respected athlete, coach, author, and family man, Robert Walter ''Bobby'' Dews. Sadly, Bobby Dews passed away on Saturday, December 26, 2015. A private funeral service was attended by close family and friends.

Mr. Dews was a longtime resident of Georgia and graduated from Edison High School in Calhoun County before attending the Georgia Institute of Technology, where he played baseball and basketball.

As a young man, Bobby Dews was drafted by the St. Louis Cardinals. He was an infielder on the team for eight years before beginning his managerial career. Mr. Dews eventually returned to Georgia and served as manager, scout, and coach for the Atlanta Braves for over 30 years. In recognition of his successful career in baseball, Mr. Dews was inducted into Georgia Tech's Hall of Fame.

Bobby Dews was not only a natural athlete and baseball enthusiast but also a masterful storyteller, publishing several novels and books of short poetry and prose. After retiring from the Braves, Mr. Dews remained involved in the community and served as the writer-in-residence for Andrew College in Cuthbert, Georgia, where he had previously received his Associate's degree.

Mr. Dews was truly an asset to the Atlanta and Edison communities and the state of Georgia. A prominent sports figure in the state, Bobby Dews will be remembered by all who had the pleasure of knowing this inspiring mentor and humble friend.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. once said, ''Life's most urgent question is: What are you doing for others?'' Bobby Dews committed a prodigious amount of time and love to service others and shared his own enthusiasm and wisdom in order to better those around him. In life and in death, Mr. Dews has left a lasting impact on all those who he mentored over the years.

Bobby Dews leaves behind his loving wife of 39 years, Glenda; his daughter, Dana; and his grandson and namesake, Robert Dawson Gates. Additionally, Mr. Dews is survived by his sister, stepsister, and two stepbrothers as well as several nieces and nephews who will miss him dearly. He was a longtime member of the First United Methodist Church of Edison, Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me and my wife, Vivian, in extending our deepest sympathies to Bobby Dews' family and friends during this difficult time. May they be consoled and comforted by their abiding faith in the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF PATRICIA ''PATTY'' SIEGEL

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 2016

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, on December 25th, a beautiful Christmas day in San Francisco, a beloved community leader and esteemed childcare advocate passed away. Patricia 'Patty' Siegel was a courageous, passionate and relentless champion for children, who dedicated her life and career to making childcare accessible and affordable for all families. Patty helped lay the groundwork for America's contemporary childcare network.

In 1972, drawing on her experience as a mother, teacher and parent-organizer, Patty founded one of the nation's first childcare resource and referral agencies, the Childcare Switchboard, now known as the Children's Council of San Francisco. For 30 years, Patty served as Executive Director of the California Child Care Resource & Referral Network, the first such network in the nation, which empowered her to play an influential role in shaping state and federal childcare policy. Among her biggest achievements was the passage of federal legislation in 1990 creating the Child Care and Development Block Grant, which provides subsidies to low-income families seeking childcare.

Patty served on the Governor's Advisory Committee on Child Care Development and was one of the original state commissioners for the First 5 California Commission that oversees and supports the funding of education, health, and childcare programs for California children under age 5 and their families. With her customary energy and vision, Patty also inspired and guided the development of Parent Voices, a grassroots parent-led effort to engage and empower parents to participate in the policy process.

An early champion of the idea that early education creates long-term cognitive and emotional benefits, Patty Siegel's name is synonymous with the best initiatives giving all children the opportunity to succeed. As we mourn Patty's passing, we know she lives on—in the

children she helped, in the working families she empowered, and in the activists she inspired.

Sadly, in 2014, Patty lost her beloved husband, Sandy, who proudly supported her efforts over the years. I hope it is a comfort to their children Toby, Tara and Kelsey, and their four grandchildren, that so many are thinking of them during this difficult time. We are grateful to them for sharing such a magnificent and dearly beloved woman with us. Her beautiful spirit lives on in the battles she won, the policies she changed, and the countless lives she continues to impact.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 2016

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and so I missed Roll Call vote number 2 regarding ''On Ordering the Previous Question'' (H. Res. 579). Had I been present, I would have voted ''No''.

I missed Roll Call vote number 3 regarding ''Providing for consideration of H.R. 3762'' (H. Res. 579). Had I been present, I would have voted ''No''.

I missed Roll Call vote number 4 regarding ''On Ordering the Previous Question'' (H. Res. 580). Had I been present, I would have voted ''No''.

I missed Roll Call vote number 5 regarding ''Providing for consideration of H.R. 712'' (H. Res. 580). Had I been present, I would have voted ''No''.

I missed Roll Call vote number 6 regarding ''Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015'' (H.R. 3762). Had I been present, I would have voted ''No''.

KASEY HODGE EARNS EAGLE SCOUT RANK

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 2016

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Kasey Hodge from Katy, Texas for earning the rank of Eagle Scout. The Eagle Scout Award is the highest honor in Boy Scouts.

Only a small percentage of Boy Scouts reach the rank of Eagle Scout, which takes years of dedicated effort. Community service and leadership—the most important aspects of scouting—are values every Scout brings wherever life leads them. Kasey's project involved building a community bench in a local dog park. Kasey's dedication to our community has prepared him to be a leader in college and his future career. The leadership skills Kasey has learned through Boy Scouts are already benefiting our community.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again on becoming an Eagle Scout. I have no doubt Kasey has a bright future ahead.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN LEWIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 2016

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast roll call votes on a few days in the First Session of the 114th Congress. Had I been present, I would have cast the following votes: I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 116; I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 179; I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 180; I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 181; I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 182; I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 183; I would have voted Aye on roll call vote 184; I would have voted Aye on roll call vote 185; I would have voted Aye on roll call vote 186; I would have voted Aye on roll call vote 187; I would have voted Aye on roll call vote 188; I would have voted Aye on roll call vote 189; I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 190; I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 191; I would have voted Aye on roll call vote 192; I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 193; I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 194; I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 195; I would have voted Aye on roll call vote 196; I would have voted Aye on roll call vote 197; I would have voted Aye on roll call vote 198; I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 199; I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 200; I would have voted Aye on roll call vote 201; I would have voted Aye on roll call vote 202; I would have voted Aye on roll call vote 203; I would have voted Aye on roll call vote 204; I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 205; I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 206; I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 207; I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 208; I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 209; I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 210; I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 211; I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 212; I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 213; I would have voted Aye on roll call vote 214; I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 215; I would have voted Aye on roll call vote 261; I would have voted Aye on roll call vote 264; I would have voted Aye on roll call vote 265; I would have voted Aye on roll call vote 266; I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 267; I would have voted Aye on roll call vote 500; I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 674; I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 675; I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 677; I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 678; I would have voted Nay on roll call vote 679 and I would have voted Aye on roll call vote 680.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 2016

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was $10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is $18,918,380,217,573.17. We've added $8,291,503,168,660.09 to our debt in 7 years. This is over $8 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 2016

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on Thursday, January 7, 2016. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: No on Roll Call Number 47 (Johnson Amendment); No on Roll Call Number 98 (Cummings Amendment); No on Roll Call Number 9 (Lynch Amendment); No on on Roll Call Number 10 (Johnson Amendment); No on Roll Call Number 11 (Democrat Motion to Recommit); Yes on Roll Call Number 12 (Passage of H.R. 712); No on Roll Call Number 13 (Johnson Amendment); No on Roll Call Number 14 (Cummings Amendment); No on Roll Call Number 15 (Cicilline Amendment); No on Roll Call Number 16 (DelBene Amendment); No on Roll Call Number 17 (Cicilline Amendment); No on Roll Call Number 18 (Pocan Amendment); No on Roll Call Number 19 (Democrat Motion to Recommit); Yes on Roll Call Number 20 (Passage of H.R. 1155); Yes on Roll Call Number 21 (Previous Question); and Yes on Roll Call Number 22 (Adoption of H. Res. 581).

RECOGNIZING COACH FRANK BEAMER

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 2016

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Coach Frank Beamer on the occasion of his retirement as the head football coach of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Virginia Tech), located in Blacksburg, Virginia, as he concludes his highly successful career. For almost three decades, Coach Beamer has been a tremendous leader in Virginia, and a mentor to hundreds of student athletes.

In twenty nine seasons under Coach Beamer's leadership, Virginia Tech Football has enjoyed unprecedented success, notching 237 wins, three Big East championships, four Atlantic Coast Conference championships, and the opportunity to play for a national championship. His ''Beamer Ball'' style of play has led Virginia Tech to become one of the nation's most respected college football programs. In 1999, Coach Beamer was named the consensus Associated Press College Football Coach of the Year.

Coach Beamer's first postseason berth as head coach at Virginia Tech was a trip to the 1993 Independence Bowl game which resulted in a victory for the Hokies. It was only fitting that Coach Beamer ended his coaching career with a 55–52 victory over the University of Tulsa in the 2015 Independence Bowl, capping off a school record 23 straight postseason bowl games.

Raised in Hillsville, Virginia, Coach Beamer graduated from Hillsville High School where

he earned eleven varsity letters as a three-sport athlete in football, basketball, and baseball. He went on to attend Virginia Tech as an undergraduate and started three years as a cornerback, playing on the Hokie's 1966 and 1968 Liberty Bowl teams. While attending Radford University to receive his master's degree in guidance, he began his coaching career in 1969 as an assistant at Radford High School. From there he went on to work as a graduate assistant at Maryland for one year, followed by the Citadel for five seasons, where he was defensive coordinator for two of them. In 1979, Coach Beamer joined Murray State University as defensive coordinator and was named head coach in 1981. In 1987, Coach Beamer made his way back to his native Southwest Virginia to take the reins at Virginia Tech. He has brought honor to Southwest Virginia and Virginia Tech by always being the consummate Virginia gentlemen and a darn good coach to boot. He has devoted his time and passion to the teams he has coached as well as the greater Southwest Virginia community. In 2004, he was presented with a Humanitarian Award by the National Conference for Community and Justice for his contributions to fostering justice, equity, and community in the Roanoke Valley.

As evidenced by his incredible success, Coach Beamer has much to be proud of, and can look back on an honest and accomplished career. His passion for coaching led him to achieve what many coaches dream of. He has shaped futures and touched lives in Virginia and the nation that extend generations. This is the true measure of a great coach.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to help commemorate the career of a remarkable man. After twenty nine years of dedicated leadership to Virginia Tech and the greater community, I would like to thank Coach Beamer for his service. I wish him and his family all of the best in retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RUBÉN HINOJOSA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 2016

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present in the House chamber for certain roll call votes this week. Had I been present on January 5th and 6th, 2016, I would have voted 'Present' for roll call 1 and 'nay' on roll calls 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 2016

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, on roll call nos. 21 & 22, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

HONORING THE SCOTTSVILLE METHODIST 150TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 2016

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 150th anniversary of Scottsville Methodist Church.

Begun around the close of the Civil War in an area known as Scotts Corners, Scottsville Methodist has served as a community of faith for the people of Lower Bucks County for a century and a half. Over the years, the church has changed names and locations, but what has remained consistent is its commitment to strengthening the faith and sense of community for those who worship there.

On this, the celebration of their 150th anniversary, I join with the congregation of Scottsville Methodist Church and congratulate them on this great accomplishment. I wish you many more years of success and peaceful worship.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN C. CARNEY, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 2016

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to clarify my position on Roll Call Vote Number 12, cast on January 7, 2016. The vote was on passage of H.R. 712, the Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015, which would require an agency seeking to enter a covered consent decree or settlement agreement to publish such decree or agreement in the Federal Register and online not later than 60 days before it is filed with the court. On passage of H.R. 712, I voted "Aye." It was my intention to vote "No."

While I firmly believe in judicial transparency, I could not support this legislation in its entirety. H.R. 712 included provisions that place unreasonable burdens on our regulatory process and give undue influence to certain groups. This legislation addressed pressing issues with the efficacy and efficiency of our regulatory process; however, it did not strike the right balance. That is why I ultimately decided to oppose this legislation, and I would like to reflect this intent.

HONORING HARRISON LIM ON THE OCCASION OF HIS 80TH BIRTHDAY

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 2016

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to pay tribute to a great community leader and dear friend, Harrison Lim, on the occasion of his 80th birthday and 50th wedding anniversary. I join his family and friends, City officials, Chinese family associations and service organizations to honor and thank him for 45 years of extraordinary leadership, vision, and enormous generosity to the Chinese American community of the San Francisco Bay Area.

Through the numerous organizations he has founded and guided, he has represented and served the political, economic and charitable needs of Chinese Americans living in the Bay Area. Today's Chinese American community is bright, vibrant, hopeful and prosperous, thanks to champions such as Harrison Lim.

Harrison Lim immigrated to the United States in 1970, and since that time has devoted himself to helping newcomer families transition to their new homeland and pursue the American Dream.

Harrison founded two essential nonprofit social service agencies in California, one in San Francisco and one in San Jose, to help new immigrants adjust to a new culture and achieve success.

The first agency, Charity Cultural Services Center, was established in 1983 in San Francisco to help Chinese immigrants learn English and gain skills to become independent and thrive in their new community. It has provided immigration and naturalization services, cooking and carpentry job training and placement, tutoring programs with San Francisco high schools and much more. Before retiring in 1998, Harrison purchased a building in the heart of Chinatown as a permanent home for this nonprofit agency.

The second nonprofit agency, Cross-Cultural Community Services Center, was established in 1991 in San Jose. Staff worked with the City of San Jose and 14 elementary schools to provide tutoring and afterschool activities for African American, Southeast Asian, Hispanic and Chinese American students to help them achieve academic success.

Mr. Lim has won numerous awards during his career, including: Unsung Hero Award by KQED Channel 9 and the Examiner Newspaper—1995; Community Hero Award by the San Francisco Foundation—2001; Community Hero Award by the World Journal—2004; Most distinguished alumni for Chinese University of Hong Kong's 50th Anniversary—2013; Outstanding Volunteer Award from President Barack Obama—2015.

Harrison remains active on the board of the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association. For the past 30 years, he has helped the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association and the United Way fundraise for 12 agencies in Chinatown, such as the YMCA, YWCA, Chinese Hospital and Self Help for the Elderly. He has also been recognized for his leadership in establishing the Chinatown Campus of San Francisco City College.

I have been honored by our longstanding friendship and wish to thank his wife, Margaret, his daughters, Artina and Rosana, and his sons, Jackson and Samson, for sharing their extraordinary husband and father with us.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 8, 2016

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and so I missed rollcall vote number 7 regarding "On Agreeing to the Johnson (GA) Amendment". Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

I missed rollcall vote number 8 regarding "On Agreeing to the Cummings Amendment". Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

I missed rollcall vote number 9 regarding ''On Agreeing to the Lynch Amendment''. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

I missed rollcall vote number 10 regarding ''On Agreeing to the Johnson (GA) Amendment''. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

I missed rollcall vote number 11 regarding ''On Motion to Recommit with Instructions''. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

I missed rollcall vote number 12 regarding ''Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015'' (H.R. 712). Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

I missed rollcall vote number 13 regarding ''On Agreeing to the Johnson (GA) Amendment''. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

I missed rollcall vote number 14 regarding ''On Agreeing to the Cummings Amendment''. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

I missed rollcall vote number 15 regarding ''On Agreeing to the Cicilline Amendment''. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

I missed rollcall vote number 16 regarding ''On Agreeing to the DelBene Amendment''. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

I missed rollcall vote number 17 regarding ''On Agreeing to the Cicilline Amendment''. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

I missed rollcall vote number 18 regarding ''On Agreeing to the Pocan Amendment''. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

I missed rollcall vote number 19 regarding ''On Motion to Recommit with Instructions''. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

I missed rollcall vote number 20 regarding ''Searching for and Cutting Regulations that are Unnecessarily Burdensome Act of 2015'' (H.R. 1155). Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

I missed rollcall vote number 21 regarding ''On Ordering the Previous Question'' (H. Res. 581). Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

I missed rollcall vote number 22 regarding ''On agreeing to the Resolution'' (H. Res. 581). Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session and stands adjourned until 2 p.m., on Monday, January 11, 2016.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 9 public bills, H.R. 4350–4358 were introduced. **Page H222**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page H223**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act of 2015: The House passed H.R. 1927, to amend title 28, United States Code, to improve fairness in class action litigation, by a recorded vote of 211 ayes to 188 noes with one answering ''present'', Roll No. 33.

Pages H181–H200, H200–10

Rejected the McCollum motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 173 ayes to 227 noes, Roll No. 32. **Pages H207–09**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114–38 shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill.

Page H189

Rejected:

Cohen amendment (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 114–389) that sought to make an exception from the bill's required showings for class certification for claims for monetary relief against the perpetrator of a terrorist attack by victims of such attack (by a recorded vote of 158 ayes to 211 noes, Roll No. 23); **Pages H190–91, H201–02**

Conyers amendment (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 114–389) that sought to make an exception from the bill's required showings for class certification for claims for monetary relief pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (by a recorded vote of 163 ayes to 221 noes, Roll No. 24); **Pages H191–92, H202**

Deutch amendment (No. 4 printed in H. Rept. 114–389) that sought to create an exception for claims brought by a gun owner seeking monetary relief involving the defective design or manufacturing of a firearm (by a recorded vote of 163 ayes to 232 noes, Roll No. 25); **Pages H192–93, H202–03**

Moore amendment (No. 5 printed in H. Rept. 114–389) that sought to exempt causes of action arising under the Fair Housing Act or the Equal Credit Opportunity Act from the bill's requirements (by a recorded vote of 172 ayes to 229 noes, Roll No. 26); **Pages H193, H203–04**

Moore amendment (No. 6 printed in H. Rept. 114–389) that sought to exempt causes of action arising from a pay equity claim under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act or the Equal Pay Act from the requirements of the bill (by a recorded vote of 177 ayes to 224 noes, Roll No. 27); **Pages H193–94, H204**

Maxine Waters (CA) amendment (No. 7 printed in H. Rept. 114–389) that sought to create an exception for claims brought by students, service members and veterans seeking relief from institutions of higher education that have engaged in fraudulent activities and unfair practices (by a recorded vote of 177 ayes to 223 noes, Roll No. 28); **Pages H194–95, H204–05**

Johnson (GA) amendment (No. 8 printed in H. Rept. 114–389) that sought to strike the ''scope''

and ''economic loss'' language from the bill (by a recorded vote of 177 ayes to 223 noes with one answering ''present'', Roll No. 29);

Pages H195–96, H205–06

Jackson Lee amendment (No. 9 printed in H. Rept. 114–389) that sought to provide litigants in a pending class action access to information held in a trust that is directly related to a plaintiff's claim for asbestos exposure (by a recorded vote of 174 ayes to 228 noes, Roll No. 30); and **Pages H196–99, H206**

Nadler amendment (No. 10 printed in H. Rept. 114–389) that sought to replace the bill's requirement for asbestos trusts to disclose detailed personal information with aggregate reporting of demands received and payments made by the trusts (by a recorded vote of 179 ayes to 222 noes, Roll No. 31).

Pages H200–01, 206–07

Withdrawn:

Cohen amendment (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 114–389) that was offered and subsequently withdrawn that would have made an exception from the bill's required showings for class certification for claims for monetary relief arising from a foreign-made product. **Page H191**

H. Res. 581, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1927), was agreed to yesterday, January 7th.

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 noon on Monday, January 11th for Morning Hour debate. **Page H213**

Presidential Veto Message—Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015: Read a message from the President wherein he transmitted his Memorandum of Disapproval of H.R. 3762, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, and explained his reasons therefore—ordered printed (H. Doc. 114–91).

Pages H210–11

The House agreed by voice vote to the Scalise motion to postpone further consideration of the veto message and the bill until the legislative day of January 26, 2016. **Page H211**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Eleven recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H201–02, H202, H203, H203–04, H204, H205, H205–06, H206, H207, H208–09 and H209. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 2:37 p.m.

Committee Meetings

EFFECTS OF REDUCED INFRASTRUCTURE AND BASE OPERATING SUPPORT INVESTMENTS ON NAVY READINESS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness held a hearing entitled ''Effects of Reduced Infrastructure and Base Operating Support Investments on Navy Readiness''. Testimony was heard from Vice Admiral Dixon Smith, USN, Commander, Navy Installations Command; Rear Admiral Mary Jackson, USN, Commander, Navy Region Southeast; and Captain Louis Schager, USN, Commanding Officer, Naval Air Station Oceana.

CYBER SECURITY: WHAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT CAN LEARN FROM THE PRIVATE SECTOR

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Research and Technology; and Subcommittee on Oversight, held a joint hearing entitled ''Cyber Security: What the Federal Government Can Learn from the Private Sector''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 2016

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on H.R. 1644, the ''STREAM Act''; H.R. 3662, the ''Iran Terror Finance Transparency Act''; and S.J. Res. 22, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency relating to the definition of ''waters of the United States'' under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 5 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Energy and Trade, hearing entitled ''SBA's Office of International Trade: Good for Business?'', 4 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

2 p.m., Monday, January 11

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 5 p.m.), Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of Luis Felipe Restrepo, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, with a vote on confirmation of the nomination, at approximately 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

12 p.m., Monday, January 11

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.