United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2014 No. 141

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 18, 2014.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GLENN THOMPSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2014, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

THOUGHTS ON AL SHARPTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, the recent rumors circulating around Capitol Hill suggest that President Obama may seek advice and counsel from Al Sharpton regarding the identity of our next Attorney General. I hope this is only a rumor.

Al Sharpton seeks out matters that involve conflict, turmoil, and violence. I do not recall Al Sharpton appearing at an event where racial harmony was promoted and encouraged. Permit me to compare Al Sharpton with Loretta Lynch, President Obama's recent nominee to become our next Attorney General.

Mr. Speaker, I was born in Greensboro, North Carolina, and decades later, Loretta Lynch was born in Greensboro. I am about to insert oars into unknown waters to me, that is, Senatorial waters involving judicial nominees. What I know about Loretta Lynch, Mr. Speaker, is limited, but what I do know about her is favorable, and she has been twice confirmed by the United States Senate.

Some have compared Al Sharpton with Dr. Martin Luther King, not a good comparison.

Dr. King was a unifier, a promoter of racial harmony. The good news is Al Sharpton does not measure up to Dr. Martin Luther King. More good news: Loretta Lynch is no Al Sharpton.

LEGALIZING MEDICAL MARIJUANA FOR VETERANS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the front page of last Sunday's Washington Post had a poignant story about Army veteran Amy Rising, who uses medical marijuana to help her deal with her posttraumatic stress disorder. Now, we weren't told exactly where she lives, just that medical marijuana is legal where she uses it, so she could be in any one of 23 States and the District of Columbia.

Fifty-seven percent of Floridians voted to legalize medical marijuana earlier this month, more votes for medical marijuana in Florida than any statewide politician on the ballot. This is part of a growing trend across the country.

But Amy's predicament is that the Federal Government does not allow physicians in the Department of Veterans Affairs to be able to help their patients with medical marijuana, whether it is right for them; instead, people are forced away from their primary care physician and the veterans' benefits that they have earned.

Why do they have to seek out someone else who doesn't know them as well, doesn't have the same relationship, and then bear that extra cost? This actually should be a terrible embarrassment.

I had a proposal during the appropriations deliberations that would have clarified this policy, which actually isn't based on any law or regulation. It is simply what is termed ''guidance.'' My proposal would have enabled doctors to be able to work with their patients in the VA.

Now, I am not suggesting by any stretch of the imagination the nature of those conversations and what the conclusion should be. Some physicians are strongly supportive of medical marijuana. Others have reservations. Others simply don't know. But it is outrageous that the people who know our veterans best are forbidden to work with them on this therapy.

I will be introducing legislation that would put in law what we had for that budget amendment. This is one of several things that I hope this Congress does something about before we adjourn.

While we are at it, shouldn't we want to stop the lunacy of making marijuana an all-cash business by denying them bank accounts? What about giving people tax justice by repealing an outmoded and unfair provision known as 280E, so that it will allow perfectly legal businesses, hundreds of them across the country, to deduct their legitimate business expenses? Otherwise, these hundreds of small legal businesses will continue to pay punitively high tax rates.

Now, the Obama administration is slowly lurching in the right direction.

Printed on recycled paper.

The President famously said that he had bigger fish to fry than trying to prevent Washington and Colorado from implementing what their voters have approved. Just this last week, we had more approvals from the State of Alaska, the District of Columbia, and in my home State of Oregon. Marijuana got more votes in Oregon than anybody on the Oregon ballot.

While States are still influencing the reform, we need to bring Federal policies out of the Dark Ages. We need to be able to harness the therapeutic power of marijuana. We shouldn't force, for example, families to have to move to another State to be able to get relief for their children who suffer from torturous, violent epileptic seizures, simply because they live in a nonmedical marijuana State when medical marijuana has proven to be one of the few areas of relief for these children.

While the States are moving in this direction, the public is moving in this direction, it is not too late for Congress to move with these small steps that will make a difference.

We should start with our veterans, to give them access to their doctors, to understand what this tool is, to see if it can provide relief for them as it has done for hundreds of thousands of other people, especially veterans with chronic pain and PTSD.

Make no mistake, this is not a Republican issue or a Democratic issue; it is a veterans' issue. It is allowing the public to be able to take advantage of the proven therapeutic value, as over a million Americans are able to do today.

It is past time the Federal Government makes its policies consistent in the States in which our veterans reside. Give them this right, allow them access to the therapy, give them access to their own doctors.

Here is an opportunity for Congress to catch up with the voters, to catch up with the developments in therapy, catch up with veterans' advocates, and do something far less risky and more beneficial than what is too often inflicted upon them.

States have been showing leadership on marijuana reform and hemp legislation. Now is the chance for Congress to make progress, especially for our veterans.

INTRODUCING THE PATIENT FREEDOM ACT

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

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, once again, the President's health care plan, known to the Nation as ObamaCare, is in the news, both because it is open season for individuals to choose their level of health care coverage, but also because of the now-made-public suggestion by a senior architect of ObamaCare that the administration would have to rely on, in his words, the ''stupidity'' of the American people to get the President's plan enacted.

Those are shameful words that disrespect every American and have rightfully been condemned by Members on both sides of the aisle. I think the American people know exactly what is in the bill.

We are reminded of it every day that we now live in a country where our government will fine you—fine you—for not having the health care coverage that it deems adequate. It is called the individual mandate, and it is a classic government-knows-best ruse, but this time with the threat of fines and penalties on individuals who don't comply or, in the interpretation of the Supreme Court, with new taxes just for you.

These fines will steadily increase each year. By 2016, it is estimated that 6 million Americans will be subjected to individual fines from their government.

I take a very different view than many in the current administration. First, I think the American people are smart enough to make health care coverage choices for themselves. Second, I don't believe our government should be mandating on individuals the health care coverage that is right for them and their family, particularly under the threat of penalties and fines and additional taxes.

That is why this week I have introduced legislation to rescind the individual mandate in ObamaCare as though it never happened. Unlike the 906-page bill that was ObamaCare, this bill, the Patient Freedom Act, is merely two pages. Every Member of this body can know what is in this bill before we pass it.

Many of us believe that a full repeal of ObamaCare is appropriate and right for the country, but it is foolish for us to think that the President will sign a repeal of his signature legislative achievement. That is why my bill covers only one provision, the individual mandate.

Let's have a government that, again, trusts the people to make their own discussions, that does not suggest, in the terms of this now-famous adviser to the administration, that the American people are too ''stupid'' to make their own health care coverage choices. Let's empower people with true patient freedom, true health care coverage choice.

This modest compromise is very simple. It says to the American people, ''If you like your ObamaCare, you can keep it, but if you believe that you should have different coverage, you are empowered, you are entrusted, you have complete control over the health care coverage discussions for you and your family.''

We are entering a period in January when compromise will be required for this Congress and this President to work together. This is a simple two-page bill that says the American people are indeed smart enough to make their own health care decisions for themselves.

I urge my colleagues to consider this commonsense bill. Let's put it on the President's desk and ask him to do what is right for the American people.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN USED EXECUTIVE ACTION

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, last week, we celebrated Veterans Day, so naturally, there was a lot of talk about the military, but there was also a lot of talk about President Obama taking executive action on immigration. It got me thinking about Harry Truman.

Like me, Harry Truman was from the Midwest and a plain talker who didn't mince words and sometimes made his fellow Democrats uncomfortable. Like every Republican and Democratic President in modern history, including this current one, Harry Truman was not afraid to use his executive power to fight for justice in the United States, even when Congress failed to act.

In 1946, we had just defeated fascism. We were already locked in a cold war. Black, Asian, Hispanic, and Native American troops had helped deliver that victory against fascism, but when the war was over, they faced the same segregation, discrimination, Jim Crow, and violence that they had before they were deployed, markers of an era from which we continue to feel the lasting effects to this very day.

In response, Truman established a Committee on Civil Rights. One concrete step the President wanted to take was to desegregate the military, but President Truman knew that legislation mandating desegregation would not pass through the U.S. Congress, which was dominated by Southern segregationists who, it is worth remembering, were mostly just like Truman, Democrats.

But he pushed forward, and Harry Truman signed Executive Order 9981 on July 26, 1948. The last all-Black unit in the United States military was finally abolished years later. Congress caught up with reality and with the President, but it took many years.

I am fairly confident that Democrats from North Carolina, Arkansas, Georgia, and Louisiana asked Harry Truman not to do a thing, but he did it anyway. I would venture to guess that there aren't too many Members of Congress today who wish that Truman did not desegregate the military or had waited however long it took for Congress to evolve on the issue of segregation. He used his pen, and we celebrate his courage today.

Here is one big difference between what Truman did and what President Obama is considering: President Truman never, ever asked Congress for legislation to desegregate the military, but President Obama, as he contemplates taking executive actions to keep families together and spare certain immigrants from deportation,

knows that he did ask Congress repeatedly to act.

□ 1015

He has been judicious in his use of executive actions throughout his Presidency, despite facing a Congress deeply entrenched, well, in being deeply entrenched.

But he did ask this Congress to act. He worked with both parties in the Senate to help shepherd an immigration bill through in June of 2013, and for a year and a half, he has waited, patiently deferring the use of executive action as a last resort. He has held off again and again so that he could give the Republicans in the House of Representatives time to pass a bill, but they never did, never even considered one.

When Republicans in the Senate said gay people can't be included under any circumstances, the Democrats didn't like it. It offended us. But we said, let's keep trying to find a compromise.

When Republicans said they needed 30,000 more Border Patrol agents, the Democrats found a way to include that, too, in the Senate.

When the House said it would not even consider a Senate bill, we Democrats, myself included, said, okay, let's work on a House bill.

And when Republicans said immigrants could not get a special pathway to citizenship and that we would have to pass many separate bills piecemeal, Democrats and the President never left the negotiating table.

When the Speaker of the House called the President last June to say that, despite all of the Speaker's efforts and all of the President's efforts, the House was not even going to allow a vote, the President said he would do what he said he was going to do all along: use his pen under current law to help this Nation.

Now the Speaker says that the President is picking a fight with Republicans over immigration and that he is vowing to fight back, which is the Speaker's right. But I would advise the Speaker that his fight is not with the President or with Democrats; it is with the American people. It is a fight he will have to deport millions of U.S. citizens' parents; the spouses, husbands, and wives of U.S. citizens; the parents of DREAMers who know no other country but this one. And that is who the Republican Party intends to fight.

But let's be clear: nothing the President does will keep the House from working with the Senate to pass an immigration bill.

Sitting at his desk in the White House, Harry Truman said, ''The buck stops here.'' And he was right then, and he is just as right today about the current occupant of the White House. The President has a responsibility to act, even when Congress refuses to do so.

And just like the 1950s and the 1960s, after Harry Truman desegregated the military, it will be time for this Congress to catch up to the executive branch and to catch up to reality.

THE IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, we are just 6 days away from the November 24 Iran nuclear negotiations deadline, and as each day passes and we get closer to the impending deadline, we are presented with more and more evidence that Iran is not serious about abandoning its nuclear ambitions.

Here are the reasons why Iran remains the greatest threat to U.S. national security interests:

Iran has been a U.S.-designated State Sponsor of Terrorism since 1984 and has been the foremost supporter for terrorist groups across the world since the Islamic Revolution in 1979.

Through its proxies likes Hezbollah and Hamas, Iran has targeted America and our ally, the democratic Jewish State of Israel, with violent acts of terror for over three decades, including the 1979 Iranian hostage crisis, the 1983 Beirut bombing and Marine barracks bombing, and the 1992 Israeli Embassy bombing and the 1994 AMIA Jewish community center bombing, both in Buenos Aires, Argentina.

Iran has been the chief supporter of Hamas' and Hezbollah's terrorist and rocket attacks in Israel like we saw in the year 2006 and 2012 and again just this past summer. In fact, since the Iranian hostage crisis in 1979, the United States has been officially in a continued state of national emergency with respect to Iran, a state of emergency that President Obama just renewed last week.

Tehran continues to demand that it has a right to enrich its own uranium. After operating a covert nuclear program for decades, Iran forfeited any so-called right to enrichment. Yet the centrifuges continue to spin and President Obama has seemingly acquiesced to Iran's illegitimate claim to enrichment.

The regime in Tehran also maintains an advanced ballistic missile program, a program that just this week it used to threaten Israel and U.S. military bases in the Middle East. And it is a program that continues to expand in violation of several U.N. Security Council resolutions.

Iran also remains one of the world's worst human rights violators. It is currently designated a Tier 1 Country of Particular Concern, a designation reserved for the world's worst, most egregious violators of religious freedom as stated by our own State Department and the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom. Despite the selection, not a real election, of a so-called moderate last year, Iran's human rights record has only gotten worse as Iran has executed a record number of people under so-called President Rouhani.

And despite all of this clear and indisputable evidence that Iran is led by a dangerous regime that cannot be trusted, these misguided negotiations taking place right now focus solely on Tehran's illicit nuclear program, and none of it is based on its other illicit activities.

So while the President continues to try to reach a deal on Iran's nuclear program at, seemingly, any cost, he has turned a blind eye to the multitude of other threats that Iran poses to us and to global security.

Mr. Speaker, the President and the P5+1 countries are operating as if Iran's nuclear program exists in a vacuum, and, in doing so, it jeopardizes the stability of the Middle East and the security of many of us in the West. There is every reason to believe that these negotiations are just one big ploy by the Iranian regime, and the Obama administration has fallen for it. That is why it is up to us in Congress to be the counterbalance.

Tomorrow, the subcommittee which I chair will be convening a hearing on the Iranian deal with former CIA Director General Hayden as one of our witnesses. The general has said that right now we are not getting the proper monitoring and verification provisions that we need, and he said were he still advising the President, General Hayden would tell him that this deal could not be adequately verified.

That is why we must take action to ensure that the administration does not agree to a weak and bad nuclear deal, and we must not waver in our resolve. Unless the negotiations result in agreement that ends Iran's other illicit activities and ensures that Iran will stop all enrichment and will dismantle its nuclear infrastructure, then we must act to impose and strengthen and expand sanctions against the regime, and the administration must walk away and abandon these foolish and dangerous talks.

THE CONGRESS OF ABANDONED AUTHORITY

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, as it stands today, the 113th Congress will go down in history as the Congress of abandoned authority.

With little exception, this Congress has failed to address the issues the American people sent us here to take on: tax reform, immigration, transportation infrastructure, climate change. This Congress has shown little progress, and in so doing, we have ceded more and more of our power as a legislature to the executive. Nowhere has our abandoned authority inflicted greater harm on Congress as an institution than our abdication of leadership in the fight against ISIS.

The Constitution gives Congress, and Congress alone, the power to declare war. But while unilateral Executive action on every other issue has been met

with partisan attacks, this Congress seems content with allowing the President to call the shots on military engagement with ISIS.

Mr. Speaker, this abandoned authority must end. Before the end of the 113th Congress, we must restore our constitutional authority over the Nation's war powers. We must commit to a full, open, and honest debate on an authorization for use of military force in the fight against ISIS.

Our brave men and women are risking their lives, and we are afraid to even risk a vote. It is time for Congress to put some skin in the game. It is time for Congress to outline in clear terms the legal authority under which the U.S. will wage this war and, in so doing, future conflicts.

The fact of the matter is that right now the U.S. is at war. From August 8 to November 12, we have spent an average of $8 million a day and $776 million in total on military operations to combat ISIS. As of October 23, the U.S. has conducted 632 airstrikes involving 6,600 sorties dropping more than 1,700 bombs. We are at war with ISIS, and we are waging that war without congressional authorization.

No one should doubt the inhumanity of ISIS. They pose a unique threat to the region, our allies, and the innocent civilians of Iraq and Syria. Left unchecked, the threat and reach of ISIS will grow. ISIS has made no secret of its plans to broaden its reach in the region and to attack Western nations, even threatening the homeland of the United States.

The President was right to target and attack ISIS with our military assets and to begin to train local, on-the-ground forces, but this is just the start. As our Commander in Chief, I do believe the President has the legal authority to begin these military operations, but the authority to begin a military operation is not a substitute for the full legal authority required to continue military operations that must be debated here in the United States Congress.

The President has said he welcomes a new AUMF, and we have debated repealing the Affordable Care Act more than five dozen times in this Congress. On ISIS though? On our wartime operations? On sending our brave men and women into harm's way? We continue to sit idly.

We had a debate on the last-minute amendment to a temporary spending bill that authorized only one small piece of a larger overall strategy. That is not a true debate. That is certainly not a substitute for war authorization.

Americans did not send us here for piecemeal amendments to last-minute spending bills. You disagree with the President and think we shouldn't be arming Syrian rebels? Let's write an AUMF.

You think we should be working towards a contingency plan in which American ground forces get involved? Let's write an AUMF.

You think, as I do, that our fight against ISIS should have clear, defined goals and a timeline before we consider further authorization? Then let's write an AUMF.

Mr. Speaker, I call on congressional leadership to take up this task. Your Members are ready for debate. The American people are ready for a debate. We simply have no excuse to let this opportunity pass us by.

Let's step up to the plate. We should not end the 113th Congress without debating and passing an Authorization for Use of Military Force.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF MAYOR LEROY GOODMAN

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

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to retiring Mayor of Fernley, Nevada, LeRoy Goodman.

A native of the Silver State, born in Virginia City, Nevada, resident of Fernley for the last 44 years, former educator and high school coach, also a key member of the private sector after that working for Sentex from the Silver State in Nevada, for Nevada Cement, Mayor Goodman had and has a statewide network of friends which helped him serve his native city, his city that he is the mayor of, in an extraordinary manner.

Member of the Association of Counties, Lyon County commissioner for 12 years, he is one of those few folks that the phrase ''politician'' does not apply to; it is ''public servant.''

What also applies to him is a word that we see used less and less these days when we talk about people who are elected by those, and that is a ''leader.'' The father of the effort to create Nevada's newest incorporated city, being Fernley, in the legislature during his term on the Lyon County Commission, his leadership was effective and resulted in the creation of that city. The people of Fernley were very well served.

I want to read to you what he said when he was elected to be the mayor after serving a short term as the appointed one:

> I am both privileged and proud to be voted in as mayor of Fernley. I shall endeavor to fulfill the role with dignity and purpose. My priorities and mandate will be centered on improving the overall functioning of the council, city operations, and focusing on doing the people's business. Fernley is my home. I am committed to giving the residents of Fernley my absolute best.

Mr. Mayor, your absolute best does us all proud.

I want to add a few more praises to this tribute, and that is ''class act'' and ''true leader.''

I want to also thank the first lady of Fernley, your wife, Diana, for her support of you and your endeavors, and say thank you very much on behalf of those folks not only at the home of the Vaqueros in Fernley, but also throughout Nevada.

You are truly, truly a part of the fabric of not only your community, but our State.

□ 1030

GIANTS OF THE SOUTH

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

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, ladies and gentlemen of America, and President Barack Obama, I rise this morning with a heavy, heavy heart at the passing of two great, magnificent Americans from my home State of Georgia, Herman Russell and Governor Carl Sanders—two men, two giants whose lives intertwined at a most important time in the history of this Nation and especially in the history of the South, for these two men, Herman Russell and Governor Carl Sanders, ushered in and gave birth to the New South, the South away from segregation. It was Herman Russell and Governor Carl Sanders who broke down the barriers of segregation and paved a new way and a new day for this Nation. That is why we are so proud of these two gentlemen.

Every school should look at their autobiographies, because they made it the hard way, against the odds. Herman Russell, born into poverty in south Atlanta, came up and didn't let the ravages of segregation stop him, didn't let his speech impediment stop him, and emerged with the world's largest, most profitable construction and real estate financial firm owned by an African American. But, oh, it wouldn't have happened if he hadn't had a Governor at that time named Carl Sanders, who broke down those racial barriers. I will tell you about him.

As a quarterback at the University of Georgia, he left the University of Georgia and went and volunteered at 19 years old to fight in the military for his country. He came back and ran for the State House of Representatives, against the segregationist party. And this man, because of him being in the right place at the right time, and because of Herman Russell being in the right place at the right time, Major League Baseball came knocking, and there we built Atlanta Stadium. Ivan Allen said: Build it, and they will come. It was Carl Sanders who passed the legislation setting up the Atlanta Fulton County Recreation Authority that made it happen—all of this happening while all around us in the South was racial turmoil, and Herman Russell building his great company and becoming the first African American to sit on the board and a member of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce.

Oh, my friends, the world, these are two great trees who were planted by the rivers of waters, and they brought forth their fruit and their season, and none of their leaves withered, and let

me tell you that every single thing they touched prospered. They touched me. I wouldn't be in Congress this day if it weren't for Herman Russell, an African American who dared to fight segregation and reach across, and Carl Sanders, a White Governor, who, himself, fought and integrated the schools in Georgia when it was not popular.

When I got ready to run for the State House, it was Herman Russell who I asked, Could you help me?

He said, Yes, I will. Who have you got with you?

I said, I have got Andy Young. I have got Maynard Jackson. I have got ''home run king'' Hank Aaron.

Then Herman said, Well, where are your White folks?

I went, and the first door I knocked on was that of Governor Carl Sanders, who took me in and gave me a contribution. He didn't stop there. He even assigned two of his lawyers, Norman Underwood and Dale Schwartz, to get out into the community and help me. That is what Carl Sanders and Herman Russell mean. They built Atlanta the right way.

When Pete Rozelle wanted the NFL—all of this while the civil rights movement was churning, but in Atlanta, the NFL was coming—he picked up the phone and called Carl Sanders. Can you get me somebody there, Governor, who has got $5 million or $6 million? We will bring an NFL team to Atlanta. Carl Sanders got on the phone and called his old buddy at the University of Georgia.

We thank God for Herman Russell and Carl Sanders. God bless Herman Russell and Carl Sanders, and God bless the United States of America.

IN NOBLE TRIBUTE TO SHERIFF'S DEPUTY DANNY OLIVER AND DETECTIVE MICHAEL DAVID DAVIS

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, on October 24, Sacramento County Sheriff's Deputy Danny Oliver and Placer County Detective Michael David Davis were wantonly gunned down in one of the most cold-blooded rampages in the history of either county. By all accounts these were exemplary law enforcement officers, fathers, husbands, sons, and neighbors.

Deputy Oliver spoke his last words as he approached a car in a parking lot for the simple purpose of asking if he could help a couple who appeared to be lost.

How is it going? he said.

The gunman and his accomplice next gunned down a bystander who was too slow in turning over his car keys as the couple hijacked his car. Miraculously, the bystander survived a gunshot wound to the head but vividly remembers the smile on the gunman's face as he pulled the trigger.

The next victim was Detective Michael Davis. You may have heard of him. On the very same date 26 years earlier, Michael Davis' father was killed in the line of duty as a Riverside County Sheriff's Deputy. Michael was 16 years old at the time.

Mr. Speaker, I wish there were some words of consolation to offer the grieving families of Danny Oliver and Michael Davis, but there are limits to our language, and words fail us when they are the most needed, but I know this: that the esteem and gratitude that our communities hold for these two officers and the sympathy we feel for the terrible losses their families have sustained could be seen most vividly and eloquently in the solemn faces of literally thousands of ordinary citizens who lined the funeral route for these officers or who stood silent vigil outside the church where they were mourned.

As I looked at the law enforcement officers from throughout the country who had come to honor these fallen peace officers at their funerals, it occurred to me that Deputy Oliver and Detective Davis and their many brothers and sisters in law enforcement are the business end of all of the highest principles of this amazing Republic of ours—a society that proudly proclaims itself a nation of laws.

We often speak of the rule of law, but who among us is willing to lay down our lives for it? Michael Davis was. Danny Oliver was. Because of their sacrifices, this rampage ended without a single civilian death. They protected us, but did we do everything we could to protect them? Their assailant had repeatedly entered this country illegally. While here, he had been apprehended for committing other crimes and had been repeatedly deported, only to easily recross the border without even being challenged. That is a subject for another day.

On this day, we should reflect on the agony of the Oliver and Davis families, who have lost devoted husbands and fathers. We should reflect on the extraordinary courage of our peace officers who bear growing and mortal risks every day to protect the peace that we too often take for granted.

Michael Davis' brother Jason eulogized his older brother. Jason is also a Placer County Deputy and was on the scene only minutes after his brother had been shot. Their third brother, Christopher, had died in 1998 in an accident as he, too, had been preparing for a career in law enforcement. And Jason, who had been present 26 years before when his mother was told of his father's death, who 16 years ago had informed their mother of Chris' death, and who days before had told her of Michael's death, looked at his grieving mother and asked the question if all of their pain justified their family's commitment to law enforcement. Without hesitation, he answered, ''Yes.''

I don't know where we get men like Danny Oliver and Michael Davis, but I know what we owe them. Of course, we owe them our gratitude and every honor that we can bestow upon them, but most of all, we owe it to them, to their families, and to their fellow officers to be just as devoted to the rule of law as they were. If we, the people, would do that, then we will have proven Jason Davis right—that their extraordinary devotion to these principles is as justified as it is noble.

ON THE EVE OF A NUCLEAR DEAL WITH IRAN

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning on what could be the eve of a nuclear deal with the Islamic Republic of Iran as U.S. and European and Iranian negotiators are going back to Vienna for a final round of talks.

With so much of the region in turmoil right now, it seems hard to imagine that we could be on the verge of, arguably, the most important diplomatic achievement in the Middle East in recent U.S. history. The leadership of President Obama, the tenacity of the U.S. negotiators, and the determination of President Rouhani and his team have set the stage for a landmark agreement that would turn the page on decades of distrust, dissension, and cynicism.

Here is what the nuclear deal would mean: a profound reduction in the decades-long tension between Iran, the U.S., and our allies that has set us on a path to war; a contained Iranian nuclear program with verifiable, internationally accepted limits; meaningful sanctions relief that bolsters Iran's flagging economy and allows U.S. businesses access to a potentially vibrant market; finally, an opening for a broader understanding between the U.S. and Iran, as well as an opportunity to work with Iran as an ally in the fight against ISIS.

Like all compromises, there may be parts of this deal that Americans won't like, and there may be parts of this deal that Iranians won't like, but such is the definition of cooperation—working together for something meaningful and building momentum toward a solution even when the easiest option is to get up and walk away.

President Obama deserves enormous credit for his steely resolve in pursuit of a nuclear deal, especially in the face of those hoping he will fail. If we do not reach a nuclear accord next week, if a deal is delayed, or if, heaven forbid, the talks collapse, I believe President Obama is still owed our thanks.

It has become fashionable around these halls and certainly in the media these days to deride the 44th President, to call him ''aloof'' when he acts methodically or to threaten impeachment when he acts decisively to promote the best interests of the American people. The fact that he has the audacity to try with persistence and openness, in the face of withering doubt from

friends and allies, is a mark of a true statesman. Many in this Chamber have already raised their strong objections, as we have recently heard, to a potential deal, and they make no secret of their thinking of President Obama as being on a fool's errand, but I am reminded of what Teddy Roosevelt said of leadership.

He said:

> Credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood . . . who, at the best, knows, in the end, the triumph of high achievement and who, at the worst, if he fails, at least fails while daring greatly so that his place shall never be with those cold and timid souls who seek neither victory nor defeat.

President Obama deserves credit for what he is doing, and we wish him Godspeed in the negotiations as they come to their near end.

□ 1045

CONDEMNING ISIS ATTACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my deepest condolences to the parents of Peter Kassig, a former Army Ranger, Iraq veteran, and humanitarian aid worker who was murdered in cold blood by mass cowards, representing the so-called Islamic State of Iraq and Syria.

These barbaric acts are those of cowards who have unleashed terror throughout the desert in western Syria and northern Iraq. They have massacred entire villages, beheaded families, and sold women and children into slavery. ISIS blows up history it does not agree with and sells artifacts to fund its rampage.

Now, I condemn this attack and all attacks against the innocent and call for neighboring countries to become more actively engaged in defeating this threat. Not only is ISIS a threat to stability in the region, acts like these have shown that they are a threat to peace-loving people across the globe.

They have brainwashed thousands of young individuals and have set their eyes on preparing a new generation of terrorists. Last week, ISIS even announced a partnership with al Qaeda.

To quote Ed and Paula Kassig, Peter's parents, ''Good will prevail.'' Fortunately, some have stepped up to fight the spread of ISIS. Our brave men and women in the U.S. Air Force and Navy have led an incredible and efficient bombing campaign against ISIS targets, halting their advance.

Kurdish Peshmerga forces have gained ground and have been an effective fighting force. Iraqi forces have organized and began an offensive to retake lost territory. There has been progress, but more needs to be done to secure the region.

Despite clearly evil acts by ISIS, there are good people pushing back who have risked everything to help those most affected. Aid workers and volunteers have gone into the war-torn portions of Syria and Iraq to help provide assistance and hope to those most affected. These workers have provided food, water, first aid, and support.

Peter Kassig did the right things. He helped the helpless. He aided the deprived. He treated the wounded. Because he did these things, Peter and others became targeted by ISIS.

We should look at the examples set by Peter Kassig and not forget the selflessness he embodied.

CONNECTICUT VETERANS HALL OF FAME

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

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow night in Hartford, Connecticut, at the State capital, there will be a solemn annual event, where 10 veterans are inducted into the Connecticut Veterans Hall of Fame.

This is a ceremony which dates back to 2005 in which 10 veterans are honored by the State of Connecticut. One of the 92 veterans that are on the rolls is President George Herbert Walker Bush who hails, of course, from the State of Connecticut.

Again, it honors not only their service, where they wore the uniform of our Nation, but also for their work after they left the service, to help the over 200,000 veterans that reside in the State of Connecticut.

For the Second Congressional District of eastern Connecticut, it is a particularly proud night because six of the 10 hail from the Second District. I would argue that this is no coincidence.

This is the home of the largest operating military installation in New England with the Groton Submarine Base and, as was recently described by the Hartford Courant, had the highest concentration of Iraq and Afghanistan war veterans, again, because of the great patriotism and sense of duty that I think is a part of the fabric of that great part of our State.

I would like to briefly describe these six gentlemen and have their names entered into the RECORD. Edward Francis Atkins, known as Bud, from Oakdale, Connecticut, served 40 years in the Navy. A former submariner, he mentors students at the Naval Submarine School. Bud is a respected leader within the submarine force and a command master chief petty officer, retired, and for the last 4 years has been on the selection panel to identify outstanding sailors who are the best of the best in the submarine force.

He is now heading up the Groton Subvets chapter which, again, helps the 8,000 sailors that live in that community. He will be hard at work at Thanksgiving, serving meals to make sure that those sailors have some of the comforts of home while they are serving their Nation.

Samuel Baez of Waterford, Connecticut, served as a Navy chaplain during Vietnam, conducting the memorial service in Da Nang for the first Marine casualties of the war. Those seven names are still memorialized on the first panel of the Vietnam Memorial here in Washington. Since he retired, he has continued to counsel veterans around the world and serves as a counselor and parental sponsor to Coast Guard cadets who are attending the Coast Guard Academy in New London, Connecticut.

Edmond Clark of Madison, Connecticut, served our Nation in Vietnam as a marine, and after earning his law degree, he has provided legal assistance free of charge to help veterans receive the benefits they receive through their service.

It is not well-known that the VA caps legal fees at $10 for any veteran who challenges a disability ruling. Mr. Clark has brushed aside that restriction and, again, represented veterans free of charge to make sure that they get the benefits they deserved.

Maurice Collin of Coventry, Connecticut, a Marine Corps Vietnam veteran, served as a veteran service officer in the Office of Advocacy and Assistance in the Connecticut Department of Veterans Affairs. He was selected to serve as acting commissioner for a period of time.

Since his retirement from State government, he has continued to contribute his time to veterans. He provides volunteer driving assistance to disabled veterans in eastern Connecticut to their medical appointments and supervises the clothing donation program at the Newington VA hospital.

Robert Getman of Old Lyme, Connecticut, will be inducted posthumously today. He served 30 years in the Coast Guard. After his retirement in 1984, he went on to serve as the director of the Veterans Home in Rocky Hill, and for 10 years, he worked vigorously to rehabilitate, educate, and place veterans into careers.

Finally, Gerry Wright of Bolton, Connecticut, my neighbor, served two tours in Vietnam in the Army and later, as a member of the Army National Guard, served in Operation Desert Storm. Since retiring in 1999, Gerry has been everywhere, helping veterans all across Connecticut.

He devotes his time to various veterans service organizations helping veterans in many ways, collecting care packages for Connecticut servicemen overseas, and he has faithfully attended every sendoff and welcome home ceremony for the Connecticut National Guard at the Hartford State Armory over the last few years.

The hard work of these men, combined with their unfailing dedication to service, even after leaving the military, exemplifies the greatest attributes of the American spirit. Because of their continued service, the

few that stand out in particular are well-deserving of being honored tomorrow at the Connecticut Veterans Hall of Fame.

I want to thank them for their commitment to improving their communities and the lives of their fellow veterans. At a time of an all-volunteer service, it is critical that we have folks like these out there making sure that this Nation respects and honors and provides all the assistance to the 1 percent of the people who stand up to defend our Nation.

RECOGNIZING ARCHBISHOP BLASE JOSEPH CUPICH AND CARDINAL FRANCIS GEORGE OF CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome Blase Joseph Cupich as the ninth archbishop of the archdiocese of Chicago and to thank Cardinal Francis George for all of his years of service to the archdiocese. Archbishop Cupich is being installed today at a mass at Holy Name Cathedral in Chicago.

After many years of study in the U.S. and in Rome, including a doctorate at Catholic University, in August of 1975, Blase Cupich was ordained to the priesthood. In his first assignment, he served as associate pastor at St. Margaret Mary Church and as an instructor at Paul VI High School in Omaha.

From 1981 to 1987, he served as secretary of the Apostolic Nunciature of the Holy See to the United States here in Washington, D.C.

Cupich was appointed bishop of Rapid City, South Dakota, by St. Pope John Paul II on July 6, 1998. Pope Benedict XVI appointed Cupich bishop of Spokane on June 30, 2010, and he was installed as the sixth bishop on September 3, 2010.

Cupich has served as chair of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops Committee on the Protection for Children and Young People since 2008. He has remained a strong advocate for children, saying that the Catholic Church needs to put children first and foremost. In March 2013, he began a 3-year term as chairman of the National Catholic Education Association.

In addition to his dedication to Catholic education, Archbishop Cupich is committed to Catholic social teaching of reaching out to help the poor and others at the margins of society. Yesterday, at the Rite of Reception, he spoke of the challenges that await him, including immigration reform, violence in the streets, drug problems, and staying connected to the real lives of people.

I look forward to working together with our new archbishop as he addresses these issues and other challenges that we face.

Archbishop Cupich is succeeding Cardinal Francis George, who has been archbishop of Chicago for 17 years. Cardinal George was ordained to the priesthood in 1963 at his home parish of St. Pascal Church in Chicago, Illinois. His older sister, Margaret, remembers a young Cardinal George holding pretend masses in his bedroom as a child.

After earning several degrees, including his masters in theology from the University of Ottawa in 1971, Cardinal George embarked on a journey across the globe as a student missionary. From 1974 to 1986, he served as vicar general of the oblates in Rome.

In this position, he led numerous priests and brothers as they journeyed across the world. Cardinal George then went on to earn two doctorates. In 1997, he was appointed by St. Pope John Paul II as archbishop of Chicago, and in 1998, he was elevated to cardinal.

Despite being diagnosed with polio at age 13 and battling cancer currently, Cardinal George has never slowed down. ''Even illness can be a gift in some way,'' Cardinal George has said.

His spirited demeanor is well-known to Catholics. Bishop Francis Kane has said, ''He's involved on so many levels. He's involved nationally. He's involved in our whole archdiocese, and then he loves to go out to individual parishes.''

Cardinal George's outreach goes beyond the Catholic community. He is known to convene interreligious discussions and shows deep respect for other faith communities, and he is deeply committed to social justice that reaches to all corners of our society.

On a personal level, the more that I had the opportunity to get to know Cardinal George, the more I have admired him. He is an intellectual powerhouse who has a special ability to communicate great truths in a simple manner.

Every time I hear him speak, I learn something that enriches both my mind and my faith, but his intellect is not a distant intellect of a philosopher in an abstract world, but it is well-grounded in an understanding of the everyday life of his people, and as someone who appreciates straightforwardness, I have always liked his directness. Maybe that is because Cardinal George and I both come from Chicago.

I will never forget the time he took my wife, Judy, and me 2 years ago in Rome on the eve of the installation of Pope Francis. He truly is a remarkable man and a great shepherd.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in welcoming Archbishop Cupich and honoring Cardinal Francis George. I offer both men my prayers as they enter into a new phase of their new calling by God and the Catholic Church to the service of others.

VETERANS' ISSUES

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I believe, in the inner sanctum of my soul, that we are the home of the free because we are the land of the brave.

I salute those who are willing to serve their country, who are willing to go to distant places, and who don't always return home the way they left. I highly commend them, and I believe that those who serve us in our military, the men and women who serve us, should always be appreciated for their willingness to make the ultimate sacrifice.

I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that we spend a huge amount of money—about $1 trillion in one circumstance—to put them in harm's way. I believe that if we can spend $1 trillion to put them in harm's way, we can spend whatever it takes when they return home to make sure they have got the best health care, they get the best housing, and that they get good jobs.

I also believe that we have a responsibility and an obligation in the Congress of the United States of America to make sure that their needs are met. This is why I have introduced certain pieces of legislation to deal with the issues that are confronted by our veterans.

□ 1100

I would like to mention a few pieces of this legislation today. And I rarely use the personal pronoun ''I,'' but in my business, if you don't use the personal pronoun, somebody else will.

I would like to talk about H.R. 384, Homes for Heroes. This piece of legislation would place a person in HUD, who would have the responsibility of filing a report with Congress annually on the status of veterans and who would be there to look out for veterans. There is currently a person there, but the person is not there in a legal capacity such that it would continue beyond this President or ad infinitum.

I also have sponsored H.R. 2362, Transportation for Heroes. We have veterans who need to get to jobs and who need to get to the VA who cannot afford public transportation. I believe that we need to make sure that they get the same opportunity to take a public transportation system, to utilize it, that persons who are senior citizens have and persons who are disabled have. We have to provide a means by which veterans can get to those places that can be a benefit to them.

This is why we have also sponsored H.R. 3876, Burial with Dignity for Heroes. This piece of legislation would allow those veterans who die in poverty, who have family members who are in poverty, who cannot afford to send them to a tribal cemetery once they die in some place that is distant from a tribal cemetery or a State facility—if you can't send them currently, you have to try to scrape the money up as best you can—I think this country ought to be grateful enough to make sure these veterans cannot only get to these places where they may be buried, but also they should get there and have

a casket or an urn. They should have the opportunity to be buried with dignity. No veteran should die in poverty and then find that they can't get a burial with dignity.

I also believe that we should have our veterans who are hurt after they leave the military be accorded the opportunity to have places to live such that they can access them easily and use them efficaciously. This is why we have filed the HAVEN Act, H.R. 3743. The HAVEN Act would accord $20 million—by the way, that we don't have; I believe that if we can spend money we don't have to put them in harm's way, we can spend money we don't have to take care of them when they get home—$20 million, $5 million a year, a pilot program to allow NGOs to match the $20 million and provide the type of facility that a veteran would need to move efficaciously, to move and have a great degree of functionality within his or her home. This is the kind of thing that a grateful nation ought to do. This piece of legislation is currently in the Senate defense authorization bill, and in that bill this legislation lies. But there is some question as to whether or not it will survive a conference committee. I pray and I hope for this piece of legislation, $20 million over 5 years to modify homes for disabled veterans, those who are hurt after they have left the military, to help them. There is already a program for those who are hurt while they are in the military. This is not duplicative. This does help veterans who need help.

I believe we are the land of the free because we are the home of the brave. I believe that if we are going to continue to be the land of the free, we must make sure we must protect those who are the brave.

God bless you.

VIOLENCE IN THE STATE OF TAMAULIPAS, MEXICO

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

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring attention to the violence in the state of Tamaulipas, Mexico.

Last month, three of my constituents were murdered in northern Mexico. Erica Alvarado Salinas, Alex Alvarado, and Jose Angel Alvarado were visiting their father near Matamoros, Mexico, on the other side of my hometown of Brownsville, Texas. The siblings were abducted on October 13 by armed men. Their burned bodies were found on October 29 in a field in northern Mexico.

Today I call on the United States State Department to ensure that the Mexican Government thoroughly investigates these heinous crimes and that those responsible be brought to justice and prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. These cold-blooded murders demonstrate the brutal violence in northern Mexico.

In a travel warning dated October of 2014, the State Department warns:

Matamoros, Reynosa, Nuevo Laredo, and Ciudad Victoria have experienced numerous gun battles and attacks with explosive devices in the past year. Violent conflicts between rival criminal elements and/or the Mexican military can occur in all parts of the region and at all times of the day. The number of reported kidnappings for Tamaulipas is among the highest in Mexico, and the number of U.S. citizens reported to the consulates in Matamoros and Nuevo Laredo as being kidnapped, abducted, or disappearing involuntarily in the first half of 2014 has also increased.

For the last century and a half, residents of northern Mexico and south Texas enjoyed a bicultural experience where crossing to work, eat, shop, or visit family and friends was a part of everyday life. This way of life has been ripped apart. We should demand that those whose criminal acts have destabilized Mexico be held responsible.

Martin Luther King said, ''Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.'' Our country must ensure that those who murdered Erica, Alex, and Jose be brought to justice.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 5 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Arne Panula, Catholic Information Center, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, Lord of life and death, in this season, as days grow dark and cold, as leaves fall in the sad autumn twilight, so we recall that souls fall each day into eternity, and that one day the falling leaf will be ours.

''For here we have no lasting city, but . . . seek the one which is to come.'' The true measure of the present is life's end: what excites or exasperates in the moment diminishes in eternity.

And, conversely, these things that seem minute in the present—an act of kindness, a smile, a heartfelt prayer, a small sacrifice—are the grains of sand that accumulate and toward eternity become a mountain, a monument of grace.

Help us, Heavenly Father, never to lose sight of life's end, never to overlook those grains of sand but, rather, collect them for eternity's hour.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

CONGRATULATING KEVIN HARVICK

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

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the entire Kern County community, I would like to congratulate Kevin Harvick on winning the NASCAR Sprint Cup championship at Homestead this weekend.

Sunday's win capped off an incredible season, exemplifying the determination, resilience, and fortitude needed to excel, especially in such a long and competitive racing season.

These attributes that embody Kevin's success are ingrained in our community. Our families get up early, work hard, and put in long hours to get the job done. Kevin's racing is a reminder to the world that the Bakersfield way drives champions.

Your hometown is proud of your achievement, Kevin. For all the kids across Kern County who watched races, like myself, at Mesa Marin and now at the Kern County Raceway Park and dreamed of becoming a NASCAR champion, they now have someone to emulate.

Congratulations again to you, to DeLana and Keelan and your entire family, and to your crew chief, Rodney Childers, and the entire 4 team for an incredible season and championship. Kevin, as you said, not bad for an '08er.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON IMMIGRATION

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, it has been more than 500 days since the Senate overwhelmingly passed bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform. But

House Republicans have done nothing. They refused to act. If the Republicans are unwilling to use their power to act, then the President must act. In fact, recently, 117 of my colleagues and I sent a letter to President Obama urging him to act now.

Since 1952, every single President, regardless of political party, has used their broad executive authority to shape our Nation's immigration policy. So the President's decision to use executive action is not unprecedented. Neither is it ideal. But, unfortunately, it is necessary.

We can no longer stand by while we separate mothers from their children, throw young people out of this country. The only strategy that the Republicans in this House have had has been deport, deport, deport.

ISRAEL TERROR ATTACKS

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deepest condolences to the families of the four Israelis, three of whom are also American citizens, who were murdered by Palestinian terrorists in Jerusalem during morning prayers in a synagogue.

My thoughts and prayers are with the people of Israel who again have to endure another tragedy at the hands of Palestinian terrorists.

It is no coincidence that this latest string of attacks on innocent Israelis comes after the Supreme Leader of Iran urged Palestinians to use violence against Israel and called for Israel's destruction, as did the terrorist group Hamas.

This is another example of Iran's dangerous meddling in an effort to attack our U.S. interests and Israel, and Hamas's continued incitement of violence and terror.

There is now a clear link to terrorism in both the West Bank and Gaza, and there can be no U.S. taxpayer dollars going to support a unity government that is backed by Hamas and the Palestinian Authority.

INCREASE FUNDING FOR MEDICAL RESEARCH

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support increased funding for medical research. In the last decade, funding to the National Institutes of Health has been cut by nearly 25 percent, and America's health, position as global leader, and economy are paying the price.

In 2013, NIH funded 640 fewer competitive research projects than the year before. Fewer opportunities sent a signal to young people to avoid careers in medical research. Meanwhile, as America is falling behind, Japan, Germany, China, and India are dramatically boosting medical research funding.

Underinvestment in medical research is financially shortsighted. Every dollar of NIH funding generates $2.21 in local economic activity.

We should be investing in ways to alleviate the burden of chronic diseases, such as Alzheimer's, which costs the Nation $200 billion a year, and cancer, which costs the Nation another $216 billion.

We cannot afford to wait. I encourage my colleagues to join Congresswoman DELAURO and me in supporting H.R. 5580, the Accelerating Biomedical Research Act. The time to reverse these cuts is now.

NEW GERMAN-AMERICAN CAUCUS LEADERSHIP

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the efforts and hard work of the German-American Caucus over the past several years and the great leadership of caucus Cochairman JIM GERLACH.

I have had the pleasure of knowing Mr. GERLACH since before I was elected to Congress, and I am honored to take his place as the next cochairman of the German-American Caucus alongside Congressman BILL KEATING.

Under Mr. GERLACH's leadership, the caucus has grown to nearly 100 members and helped foster a great appreciation for the many ties and connections shared between our two countries.

From meeting with very important government, business, and industry leaders to hosting networking events on the Hill, the German-American Caucus has served as an important medium for the exchange of information.

Pennsylvania is proud of its German heritage. The Commonwealth hosts one of the largest German populations in the country. Accordingly, I look forward to working with Ambassador Peter Wittig and Congressman KEATING and the leaders of the German American Business Council as we move towards the 114th Congress.

I promise to do my best to live up to the leadership that has been provided by my good friend Congressman JIM GERLACH.

AMERICAN EDUCATION WEEK

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as we observe American Education Week, I would like to pay tribute to America's public schoolteachers and administrators for their leadership and service to our communities.

Teachers are proof that you really can change the world if you care enough. That is why so many, even when faced with diminishing resources and budget cuts, work tirelessly to ensure our students receive the education they deserve.

Our promise as a nation depends on our teachers. We all must do our part to support America's educators. That is why I oppose sequestration cuts that threaten school districts and teachers. That is why I worked to pass bipartisan legislation to provide food nutrition programs to schoolchildren during the summer months.

I have donated nearly 1,500 books to schools in my district and was proud to have launched the Robin's Readers program in my district, which is a literacy partnership between my office and Second District schools.

This week, I encourage you all to reach out and get to know your local schools. Offer to volunteer your time and energy to their efforts. But, most importantly, thank an educator.

REAGAN DEFENSE FORUM AND SEQUESTRATION

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

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, from day one as a Member of Congress, I have always known that our number one constitutional responsibility is to the common defense of this Nation at home and abroad.

We should make the smart financial investments in our men and women in uniform—their readiness, their training, and their weapons—as if our lives depend on it. Because their lives do.

This weekend, I gathered with some of the greatest defense minds in our Nation to discuss the safety and security of our country at the annual Reagan Defense Forum. A common narrative from this forum was that the defense cuts under sequestration are dangerous and undermining our national security.

If so, then why are these dangerous cuts allowed to stand?

The American people, the military, Members of Congress, and even the President recognize the world is not becoming a safer place but much more dangerous. Ronald Reagan's policy of peace through strength worked, and it worked well. The time has come to remove these cuts and restore our Nation's strength so we can live up to our constitutional responsibility.

ACT ON IMMIGRATION REFORM NOW

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

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, we all agree that it is up to Congress to overhaul the broken immigration system. However, despite all the talk and promises, there is one thing that is clear: this Republican Congress has done

nothing to address immigration reform and has only been an obstacle to this process.

Now is the time for the President to act. His legal standing is solid. It is time for us to act. Now is the time to do what is right, what is fair, what is just, not only for the immigrant community, but for this great country.

NATIONAL ADOPTION DAY

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

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because this coming Saturday, November 22, is designated as National Adoption Day.

Each year, thousands of families navigate a complicated and expensive adoption process and welcome a much-wanted child into their families and into their lives. This Saturday, we will recognize, honor, and say ''thank you'' to these families.

We will also raise awareness of the over 100,000 children who are currently in the foster care system who have not found permanent homes or a permanent family to belong to. Sadly, 32 percent of these children will wait over 3 years in foster care before being adopted.

Globally, estimates are that there are 153 million orphans. U.S. families have adopted more than 7,000 of these children in 2013, but that is just the start. It may feel and appear to be overwhelming, but we can make a difference one child at a time.

I am proud to report that adoption rates in west Michigan, my hometown area, are among the highest in the country. Since the beginning of 2014, just one west Michigan adoption agency alone has processed 38 domestic infant adoptions, 26 intercountry adoptions, and helped many others.

We want to say thank you to them for their work.

□ 1215

NEW YORK STATE HUNGER ACTION NETWORK

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to families across this country going without or simply scraping by as we enter the holiday season.

Food pantries and organizations like the Hunger Action Network of New York State do a great deal to care for our neighbors who are cold, hungry, or homeless—but they cannot do it alone. These organizations need Washington's help, and the people these organizations care for need it even more.

A uniquely American tradition is helping those in need. In my congressional district, one in 10 households lives below the poverty line. These families live each day with struggles that are reflected across our great Nation. These struggles can be fixed by a Congress that pursues policies that ensure a livable wage, that supports programs that help the less fortunate, and that invests in job creation instead of in cuts to critical programs like SNAP.

It is my hope that this House will work together more than it has in recent years to make progress for all Americans, especially for those whom this Chamber seems to have forgotten about. We do not need to wait for the next Congress to take action. I can think of no better time than this holiday season to make progress on these critical issues.

REMEMBERING GROVE HILL MAYOR LEVON HICKS

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember a loyal community servant, Grove Hill Mayor Levon Hicks. Sadly, Mayor Hicks passed away on November 14 after an extended illness.

He devoted his life to serving his family, his church, and his community. He was a dedicated member of Jackson Church of Christ for more than 50 years, serving as an elder and attending several mission trips over the years. He served two terms on the Grove Hill Town Council before becoming mayor. He also served around 40 years as a volunteer fireman and was an active member of the Lions Club. He worked tirelessly for the betterment of the Grove Hill community and enjoyed fishing, traveling, and the University of Alabama football.

Mr. Speaker, to Mayor Hicks' wife, Helen, and his children and grandchildren, we say thank you for sharing Levon with us. We will miss him greatly.

THE PRESIDENT'S EXECUTIVE AMNESTY

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

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues against the President's unilateral amnesty plan.

Unlike the President's amnesty, I support an immigration system that is accountable to the American people and the democratic process. Like most Americans, I believe immigrants who work hard, play by the rules, and contribute to our communities are good for our country.

Immigration laws should be properly controlled and strictly enforced, but under President Obama, this is not the case. Just look at the numbers: In 2012 alone, 11.7 million foreign nationals resided in the United States without authorization. Visa overstays are estimated to be up to 57 percent of that unauthorized population.

Unilateral amnesty ignores the will of the American people, it is unfair to legal immigrants, and it hurts U.S. citizens who are seeking jobs. Put simply, those who follow the rules should be rewarded, and lawbreakers should be punished. The President's executive amnesty does the exact opposite.

HUMANITARIAN GENEROSITY

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I love living in a country, Mr. Speaker, that is known around the world for its humanitarian generosity.

In the State of Texas, there are almost 1.3 million undocumented individuals. They are undocumented, but they are working. They are undocumented, but they are paying taxes. They are undocumented, but they love their children, many of them citizen children who everyday go to school or work or college to try and make a difference.

Mr. President, you do the right thing, and that is to use your executive power vested in article II of the Constitution that allows you to give humanitarian relief as indicated by the Arizona decision in 2012.

This is a time for courage, not politics. It is a time for truth, not misrepresentation. This is not amnesty—this is prioritization; this is saving money; this is keeping families together; this is allowing children to not come home to places where their parents have been thrown from their places of work and taken away from them.

I am excited about the courage of this President. I look forward to America finally understanding the gifts that you are given. Let us not be a selfish nation. Let us be a generous nation, and let us help those who are in this country who are working every day, including many of our soldiers.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 18, 2014.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on November 18, 2014 at 9:45 a.m.:

That the Senate adopted a resolution relative to the death of Howard O. Greene, Jr., Former Senate Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate S. Res. 579.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1422, EPA SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD REFORM ACT OF 2013; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4012, SECRET SCIENCE REFORM ACT OF 2014; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4795, PROMOTING NEW MANUFACTURING ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM NOVEMBER 21, 2014, THROUGH NOVEMBER 28, 2014

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 756 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 756

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1422) to amend the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 to provide for Scientific Advisory Board member qualifications, public participation, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology; (2) the further amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Stewart of Utah or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4012) to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from proposing, finalizing, or disseminating regulations or assessments based upon science that is not transparent or reproducible. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113-57. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as 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 in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4795) to promote new manufacturing in the United States by providing for greater transparency and timeliness in obtaining necessary permits, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as 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 in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 4. On any legislative day during the period from November 21, 2014, through November 28, 2014—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 5. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 4 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 756 provides for the consideration of three important pieces of legislation to create a more transparent and accountable Environmental Protection Agency, one that works in an open manner for all of America. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate for each of the three bills contained within the rule. Further, amendments were made in order for each of the three bills for a total of five amendments from Members of both parties.

Mr. Speaker, the first bill contained in this rule, H.R. 1422, the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2013, brings greater accountability and greater oversight to the board of appointed advisors which the EPA uses to review the scientific bases for its official actions. Created in the late 1970s, the Science Advisory Board was intended to be a check on the EPA in order to ensure that the Agency's math and the Agency's statistics were all in order before it promulgated rules or regulations.

In fact, the original authorization for the board made clear that the Science Advisory Board was to report both to the EPA and to Congress on its findings. However, over the course of the past several decades since its inception, the Science Advisory Board has become little more than a rubberstamp for whatever the EPA Administrator wishes to accomplish, with the board members being handpicked by the Administrator, likely being chosen primarily on the basis that they hold the same environmental worldview as whoever the head of the EPA happens to be at any given point in time.

The bill before us would provide for a more balanced representation on the Science Advisory Board, setting out parameters regarding whom the Administrator can choose and ensuring that State and local governments have representation on the board so that they are not simply relegated to environmental activists, which, unfortunately, has been the case for some time now.

□ 1230

Indeed, current regulations exclude industry experts from serving on the

Science Advisory Board, but not officials from environmental advocacy groups. The new regulations are necessary to ensure against any appearance of impropriety on the board.

This legislation becomes even more critical when one considers the numerous regulations that the Environmental Protection Agency is currently contemplating, which could have significant impacts upon the Nation's economy.

From proposed carbon regulations to ratcheting down ozone regulations, the Science Advisory Board has been tasked with reviewing the science that will back up some of the most expensive rules in the Environmental Protection Agency's history.

It is critical the American people have confidence in what their Federal Government is doing and confidence that it is justified. I fear that, absent any significant reform to the EPA's process, that is currently not the case.

The second bill contained in this rule, H.R. 4012, the Secret Science Reform Act, is also intended to make the Environmental Protection Agency's rulemaking process more transparent, a goal that at one time was supposedly shared by the President.

The legislation states that the Environmental Protection Agency may take official action on an environmental regulation only if it has identified all scientific and technical information upon which the Agency has relied for that particular action, and further, it must use only publicly available studies and can thus be independently peer reviewed. This would bring the EPA's process in line with how many scientific journals operate when they publish peer-reviewed studies.

Further, the bill is prospective and will not interfere with any previously-enacted rules or regulations by the EPA. To address concerns expressed during the Science Committee's consideration of the bill, the legislation spells out that nothing in these requirements would jeopardize any privacy concerns with scientific studies.

The CDC has successfully made its studies available without exposing any of its test subjects' personal information, and the EPA should have no problem similarly complying with these requirements.

Finally, H.R. 4795, the Promoting New Manufacturing Act, the third bill included in the rule before us today, provides for greater transparency and would cut much of the red tape surrounding the permitting process for manufacturers attempting to comply with the Clean Air Act's requirements.

It would require the EPA to publish guidance on how companies may more efficiently obtain construction permits and navigate what is often a lengthy and arduous process.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are waking up to how much of the United States economy is subject to the EPA and its regulations, from carbon dioxide to ozone, and people are rightly anxious over how these new and, in some cases, unprecedented rules will affect consumers' wallets.

It is reasonable and expeditious to ensure that the science upon which the EPA is relying to craft its regulations will be transparent and available to all and not just a select few who the EPA deems worthy to see its work products.

Even the congressional committees who are charged with legitimate oversight over EPA's actions have had difficulty in obtaining basic scientific justifications for its actions over the past few years. The bills before us today will begin the process of making the EPA accountable to the very constituency the Agency claims to be protecting, the American people.

I encourage all of my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the rule and ''yes'' on the underlying bills, and I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thought one of the lessons of this last election was that the American people wanted Washington to work, that they wanted us to work toward passing legislation, sensible legislation, that could be passed in both Chambers, that could go to the White House and be signed into law, and we could move this country forward, but I guess that lesson somehow escaped my Republican colleagues because what we are doing here today is another colossal waste of time.

Now, I rise in opposition to this rule, and I rise in opposition to the underlying legislation. The points of the bills that we are considering today seek to prevent the EPA from protecting public health and the environment. It is that simple.

The White House has already issued three veto threats against these bills. The other body is not going to take these bills up, so here we are in this lameduck session with a lot of work that we should be doing, and instead, we are doing this.

On December 11, this government will run out of money. Maybe we should be spending some time trying to figure out how to avoid another government shutdown or to do the appropriations process in a more thoughtful way, but instead, my colleagues are going to wait until the last minute and bring a bill to the floor that most Members will not have time to read, and then that will be that.

Maybe we should be talking about passing an increase in the minimum wage. We are reading story after story about how income inequality in this country is getting bigger and bigger and bigger. Maybe we ought to make sure that work actually pays a livable wage in this country, or maybe we could pass a pay equity bill so that women can earn equal pay for equal work—we are not doing any of that—and that surely would be signed by the White House.

What about an immigration bill? The United States Senate passed in a bipartisan way a comprehensive immigration bill, dealing with a very important problem in this country. It is supported by labor unions, and it is supported by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and again, it had a bipartisan vote in the United States Senate.

Are we doing that here today? No. We can't even bring that to the floor to have a debate because the leadership in this House runs such a closed process.

We have wasted time in this Chamber debating Republican messaging bills to repeal the Affordable Care Act, to undermine the Dodd-Frank financial reform law, and weaken public health and environmental regulations while failing to consider legislation to help people, to create jobs, to boost the economy and help vulnerable Americans rise out of poverty, so instead of kind of doing the people's business, we are back into Republican messaging bills again.

The three bills that we are talking about here today—H.R. 4795, H.R. 4012, and H.R. 1422—will allow industry to have a greater influence over the policies developed at the EPA, will weaken our air quality, and prevent the EPA from using critical high-quality and peer-reviewed data in their policy development.

Why in the world would we want to do this? Well, because the Republicans' corporate constituency demand it, so this may be a nice way to thank big Republican donors for their support in the last election, but quite frankly, it is lousy policy.

H.R. 4795, the cleverly named Promoting New Manufacturing Act, does nothing to boost manufacturing and does nothing to help improve the permitting process or create jobs. The bill requires the EPA to issue both regulations and guidance concurrently when issuing national ambient air quality standards. If this requirement is not met, a new or expanding facility must only show it complies with the old insufficient standard.

Not only will this legislation create several new avenues for litigation, but it will also weaken air quality protections and threaten public health. Why in the world would we even contemplate doing that? H.R. 4012, the Secret Science Reform Act, will prevent the EPA from using the best available scientific data, harm future research, and delay the implementation of public health protections.

Far from protecting transparency and accountability, this bill will limit the body of high-quality scientific research that can be used and will undermine the EPA's ability to function.

The EPA relies on peer-reviewed scientific research that often contains information scientists are legally required to keep confidential, like an individual's health records. How is the EPA supposed to determine the effects of a pollutant on our health if they are not allowed to look at health data?

Individual health records should be highly protected, and I would like to point out that the peer-reviewed studies that form the basis of EPA's actions are already available.

The purpose of this bill is not to create transparency but to create bureaucracy, to make it impossible for the EPA to develop policies to protect our health and our environment. There is no secret science, just science that my Republican colleagues do not like.

I am pleased to see that the amendment to H.R. 4012, submitted by my good friend from Massachusetts, JOE KENNEDY, was made in order. I strongly support this amendment, which would allow the EPA to continue to rely upon peer-reviewed scientific data, even if that data is legally required to be kept private. The EPA must be allowed to continue to use this critical data in their policy development.

Lastly, H.R. 1422, the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act, will slow down the EPA's ability to develop regulations and effectively force the EPA to include individuals with financial conflicts on the Science Advisory Board, so long as the conflicts are disclosed.

It isn't logical to include an individual on a decisionmaking board if that individual would be financially affected by its decision.

I should note that the legislation limits the participation of academic scientists with relevant subject matter expertise from providing their advice to EPA, which will lead to panels with disproportionately high amounts of industry representation.

This bill would allow the Republicans' corporate constituency a direct route to disrupting the EPA's ability to create regulations designed to protect our health.

I would say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, ''I get it. You don't like science, and you don't like science that interferes with some of the interests of your corporate clients.''

But we need to rely on science so we can protect the public health and we can protect our environment. One of the main jobs that we are tasked with is to protect our constituencies. So why we would be trying to move ourselves back in a direction that would endanger public health is beyond me.

Mr. Speaker, today, we are considering three bills to undermine public health, hurt the environment, and tie up the EPA in red tape. I would, again, say to my colleagues, ''We are going to have this debate here today. These bills aren't going anywhere. We are wasting our time by doing this today.''

I am just going to close with one other issue that we ought to be talking about. In July, a majority in this House supported an amendment that I had offered, saying that if in fact we had sustained combat operations in Iraq, that Congress would vote to authorize, or not, such action.

Well, clearly, we have sustained combat operations going on in Iraq. We are getting sucked deeper and deeper and deeper into war while this Congress sits and twiddles its thumbs and does everything possible to avoid a debate on whether or not we should be involved in another war.

You know what, there are thousands of Americans that have been put in harm's way, and we are not living up to our constitutional responsibility. Surely, we should be spending some time talking about that, whether or not the United States ought to get sucked into another war halfway around the world, a war that will cost American lives and that will continue to cost a great deal in terms of our national treasure, but instead of debating that and other things that really matter to people, we are doing it on a messaging bill.

I regret the fact that here we are in these few days that we have left in this lameduck session, doing this kind of stuff, when we ought to be doing the people's business.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this restrictive rule, vote against all of the underlying legislation, and I plead to the Republican leadership: let's bring something to the floor that will help the American people.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this point, I am delighted to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), and I really appreciated his statement on this rule today.

Mr. Speaker, once again, you would think that we would almost expect that nothing good would happen here, and I am rising with a very heavy heart today because nothing good is happening in my office as well because, today, we are seeing the last rule worked on by my friend Don Sisson, who has been with us here for over 10 years, works extraordinarily well in the Rules Committee, has provided us with outstanding service, and really has an integral part that he is going to be playing over at the White House. This means a significant loss for us.

□ 1245

He has accepted a new job as the Special Assistant to the President for Legislative Affairs. And while I really want to wish him well, to be perfectly honest with you, it is breaking my heart to see him go.

Don is not only an expert on the rules and a computer genius, and when anything electrical goes awry, Don can fix it in a moment, but Don is a caretaker. He not only takes great care about the rules, his work, and everyone on the committee whom he really loved and enjoyed working with, he takes care of people individually, and he has certainly done that for me.

I had a pretty bad year this past year losing my husband, and Don was always there. If electricity didn't work or something else didn't happen, Don knew who could fix that for me. So as I speak about it, my personal feelings overwhelm the wonderful opportunity for him as a young man to work in the White House of the United States Government with the President.

I would like to go over his credentials here, but I am not going to. I am simply going to tell you that Don is one of the best people that ever worked in the United States House of Representatives and one of the finest persons on the Rules Committee who understands not only rules, but is a friend to every single person who works in this House and beyond. He could always be counted on as a friend, as someone with extraordinarily gifted intelligence, and as being able to work his way through the most dangerous Gordian Knot. Don Sisson is a ''man for all seasons.''

Mr. Speaker, I wish him the very best of everything, but say to you that, without a doubt, the loss for our side, for our office, and for our friends is profound. Nonetheless, he is going to go. I just want the White House to understand what a jewel they are getting.

Thank you very much, Mr. MCGOVERN, for yielding me the time.

Thank you, Don, for your service, and you will always have a place here in this House. Thank you very much.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to join the gentlewoman from New York in congratulating Don Sisson for his new position at the White House Office of Legislative Affairs and certainly look forward to working with him. I actually am somewhat comforted to know that there is an Office of Legislative Affairs in the White House and look forward to his occupying that position.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to also join with the ranking member in honoring Don Sisson. As she mentions, this will be his last day on the floor. I think his last day is this week.

Mr. Speaker, Don has been working for the Rules Committee for 10 years under both Republicans and Democrats. He is a native of upstate New York, and he has been around for historic debates in Congress and has been an integral part of the Rules Committee staff for many, many, many years. As Ms. SLAUGHTER pointed out, he will be moving on to the White House, and we are going to miss him dearly.

I think it is important for all of us to take a moment just to recognize that Don represents the best, I think, of the staff that work here. He is up here for all the right reasons. He wants to make the world a better place, and he has shown this great ability to work across party lines and to build things and make things happen. I know he will use those skills in his new position at the White House.

Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee meets an awful lot, and we are together an awful lot, and so we are all family. So when somebody leaves, it is painful because it is like a family member moving on and going someplace else. So we are going to miss Don, but he won't be that far away. We will work with him in a new capacity.

On behalf of everybody on that committee, members and staff included, I think we all owe you a debt of gratitude, and we are grateful for your service. You have served this institution with great honor and dignity, and we wish you all the best in your new job. So thank you very much for a job well done.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to announce to my colleagues that I am going to urge that we defeat the previous question, and if we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to continue the ATTIRE Act. This bill would support textile research and innovation in the United States and will continue to strengthen the Made in America Movement as a conduit for creating American jobs and bolstering our economy. It is the right way to help create American jobs.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the ATTIRE Act, which we will offer as an amendment to the rule if the previous question is defeated.

The most notable aspect of the majority's so-called manufacturing bills before us is their lack of ambition and vision. They are simply messaging bills.

So we have an alternative to put forward, a bill that already has broad support in this body. The bill would support textile research and innovation in the United States, strengthening the Make It In America movement as an instrument for creating American jobs, bolstering our economy, and improving our international competitiveness.

The ATTIRE Act would establish a Department of Commerce grant program to fund textile research, supporting innovation in the U.S. textile and fiber products industry. The bill is fully paid for. Although our Nation's manufacturing base has suffered major losses over the last 20 years, the American textile industry continues to employ over 500,000 workers across the country and contributes nearly $60 billion to our gross domestic product annually.

Even in the face of an economic downturn, the industry continues to thrive and adapt to the competitive global marketplace by remaining at the cutting edge of innovations in textile and fiber technologies. Despite all this, there is currently no dedicated source of Federal funding for research into new textile applications and market opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, some of our colleagues may need to be disabused of the notion that the textile industry is old or inflexible or in decline. That is an undeserved reputation. The fact is our Nation's leading textile research universities, research institutes, and textile firms that have been quick to follow up on research findings have made remarkable progress, particularly in the areas of nonwoven fabrics. They have developed innovative technologies and materials with applications in industries as varied as aerospace, biomedical, and alternative energy.

The applications for advanced textiles in the areas of defense and homeland security, notably for first responders, are especially promising. I am referring to major advances in heat-resistant clothing, bacteria-resistant microfibers, and nanofibers able to conduct electricity and capture solar energy.

Additional advances are promised by new manufacturing, processing, and fitting technologies currently under development. Such advances in processing hold the promise of ''reshoring'' many of those textile jobs lost over the past 20 years to low-wage countries.

Mr. Speaker, Federal support for textile research isn't a new idea. Between 1986 and 2010, the Department of Commerce provided consistent and ongoing annual support for textile research conducted by entities such as the National Textile Center, a research partnership of eight universities, and TC-Squared, a leading industry consortium.

Since 2010, however, the Department has not provided any comparable source of funding for advanced technical research, largely because Congress has not provided that funding. Industry stakeholders as varied as high-end athletic and outdoor apparel companies, aerospace manufacturers, defense contractors, and defense textile manufacturers all recognize the importance of Federal support for advanced textile research.

So instead of spending time on short-sighted legislation undermining the EPA's ability to do its job, we should instead be focusing on forward-thinking manufacturing and economic policy to improve our Nation's international competitiveness. With our support, U.S. manufacturers and workers will dominate the 21st century global economy as they did in the 20th century.

Mr. Speaker, if colleagues want to do something serious to help American manufacturers and workers, then we should support this bill. It is as simple as that.

I urge defeat of the previous question.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire from the gentleman if he has additional speakers besides himself?

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, we had one other speaker who is not here, but in light of that, I will close.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I am going to ask my colleagues to vote against the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, we will make in order the ATTIRE Act that Mr. PRICE so carefully described to all of us here today.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just say in closing that it is frustrating to be back after the election and to kind of engage in the same old-same old Republican partisan messaging bills that are going nowhere that just waste time. We ought to do the people's business in the next campaign which is about to start in a little while.

The fact that we are back here not debating this conflict that is now going on in the Middle East, the fact that we are not debating an immigration bill, the fact that we are not debating a pay equity bill or a minimum wage bill and we are doing this is very discouraging.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to send a strong statement today and vote ''no'' on this rule and certainly vote ''no'' on the previous question. I would also urge, if the rule passes, that we vote ''no'' on the underlying legislation. We have a lot of work to do. What we are doing here today does not constitute that work, and I regret it very much.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for the consideration of three important bills to provide for open and transparent rulemaking at the Environmental Protection Agency. I certainly want to thank the authors for their thoughtful legislation. I want to urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bills.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 756 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

SEC. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 937) to support innovation and research in the United States textile and fiber products industry. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 937.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

The Republican majority may say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.'' But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: ''Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.''

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were 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 adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 190, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 521]

YEAS—225

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—190

Adams
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel

Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

Bachmann
Buchanan
Campbell
Davis, Danny
Duckworth
Engel
Fattah
Hall
Hastings (FL)
Hurt
Jackson Lee
Miller, Gary
Moore
Mullin
Negrete McLeod
Roskam
Sherman
Smith (WA)
Titus

□ 1322

Messrs. HINOJOSA and DOGGETT changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HURT. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 521, a recorded vote on H. Res. 756. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 521, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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 227, noes 192, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 522]

AYES—227

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOES—192

Adams
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moran
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Bachmann
Buchanan
Campbell
Davis, Danny
Duckworth
Engel
Fattah
Hall
Hastings (FL)
Jackson Lee
Miller, Gary
Moore
Mullin
Negrete McLeod
Smith (WA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1330

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained by a meeting on constituency matters on rollcall vote No. 521 and 522. If I had been present, I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall vote No. 521 and ''no'' on rollcall vote No. 522.

EPA SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD REFORM ACT OF 2013

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 756, I call up the bill (H.R. 1422) to amend the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 to provide for Scientific Advisory Board member qualifications, public participation, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 756, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology printed in the bill, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1422

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 ''EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2013''.

SEC. 2. SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD.

(a) MEMBERSHIP.—Section 8(b) of the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 4365(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b)(1) The Board shall be composed of at least nine members, one of whom shall be designated Chairman, and shall meet at such times and places as may be designated by the Chairman in consultation with the Administrator.

''(2) Each member of the Board shall be qualified by education, training, and experience to evaluate scientific and technical information on matters referred to the Board under this section. The Administrator shall select Board members from nominations received as described in paragraph (3) and shall ensure that—

''(A) the scientific and technical points of view represented on and the functions to be performed by the Board are fairly balanced among the members of the Board;

''(B) at least ten percent of the membership of the Board are from State, local, or tribal governments;

''(C) persons with substantial and relevant expertise are not excluded from the Board due to affiliation with or representation of entities that may have a potential interest in the Board's advisory activities, so long as that interest is fully disclosed to the Administrator and the public and appointment to the Board complies with section 208 of title 18, United States Code;

''(D) in the case of a Board advisory activity on a particular matter involving a specific party, no Board member having an interest in the specific party shall participate in that activity;

''(E) Board members may not participate in advisory activities that directly or indirectly involve review and evaluation of their own work;

''(F) Board members shall be designated as special Government employees; and

''(G) no federally registered lobbyist is appointed to the Board.

''(3) The Administrator shall—

''(A) solicit public nominations for the Board by publishing a notification in the Federal Register;

''(B) solicit nominations from relevant Federal agencies, including the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Energy, and Health and Human Services;

''(C) make public the list of nominees, including the identity of the entities that nominated them, and shall accept public comment on the nominees;

''(D) require that, upon their provisional nomination, nominees shall file a written report disclosing financial relationships and interests, including Environmental Protection Agency grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, or other financial assistance, that are relevant to the Board's advisory activities for the three-year period prior to the date of their nomination, and relevant professional activities and public statements for the five-year period prior to the date of their nomination; and

''(E) make such reports public, with the exception of specific dollar amounts, for each member of the Board upon such member's selection.

''(4) Disclosure of relevant professional activities under paragraph (3)(D) shall include all representational work, expert testimony, and contract work as well as identifying the party for which the work was done.

''(5) Except when specifically prohibited by law, the Agency shall make all conflict of interest waivers granted to members of the Board, member committees, or investigative panels publicly available.

''(6) Any recusal agreement made by a member of the Board, a member committee, or an investigative panel, or any recusal known to the Agency that occurs during the course of a meeting or other work of the Board, member committee, or investigative panel shall promptly be made public by the Administrator.

''(7) The terms of the members of the Board shall be three years and shall be staggered so that the terms of no more than one-third of the total membership of the Board shall expire within a single fiscal year. No member shall serve more than two terms over a ten-year period.''.

(b) RECORD.—Section 8(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 4365(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting ''risk or hazard assessment,'' after ''at the time any proposed''; and

(B) by inserting ''risk or hazard assessment,'' after ''to the Board such proposed''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting ''risk or hazard assessment,'' after ''the scientific and technical basis of the proposed''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following: ''The Board's advice and comments, including dissenting views of Board members, and the response of the Administrator shall be included in the record with respect to any proposed risk or hazard assessment, criteria document, standard, limitation, or regulation and published in the Federal Register.''.

(c) MEMBER COMMITTEES AND INVESTIGATIVE PANELS.—Section 8(e) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 4365(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''These member committees and investigative panels—

''(1) shall be constituted and operate in accordance with the provisions set forth in paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (b), in subsection (h), and in subsection (i);

''(2) do not have authority to make decisions on behalf of the Board; and

''(3) may not report directly to the Environmental Protection Agency.''.

(d) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—Section 8 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 4365) is amended by adding after subsection (g) the following:

''(h)(1) To facilitate public participation in the advisory activities of the Board, the Administrator and the Board shall make public all reports and relevant scientific information and shall provide materials to the public at the same time as received by members of the Board.

''(2) Prior to conducting major advisory activities, the Board shall hold a public information-gathering session to discuss the state of the science related to the advisory activity.

''(3) Prior to convening a member committee or investigative panel under subsection (e) or requesting scientific advice from the Board, the Administrator shall accept, consider, and address public comments on questions to be asked of the Board. The Board, member committees, and investigative panels shall accept, consider, and address public comments on such questions and shall not accept a question that unduly narrows the scope of an advisory activity.

''(4) The Administrator and the Board shall encourage public comments, including oral comments and discussion during the proceedings, that shall not be limited by an insufficient or arbitrary time restriction. Public comments shall be provided to the Board when received. The Board's reports shall include written responses to significant comments offered by members of the public to the Board.

''(5) Following Board meetings, the public shall be given 15 calendar days to provide additional comments for consideration by the Board.''.

(e) OPERATIONS.—Section 8 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 4365) is further amended by adding after subsection (h), as added by subsection (d) of this section, the following:

''(i)(1) In carrying out its advisory activities, the Board shall strive to avoid making policy determinations or recommendations, and, in the event the Board feels compelled to offer policy advice, shall explicitly distinguish between scientific determinations and policy advice.

''(2) The Board shall clearly communicate uncertainties associated with the scientific advice provided to the Administrator.

''(3) The Board shall ensure that advice and comments reflect the views of the members and shall encourage dissenting members to make their views known to the public and the Administrator.

''(4) The Board shall conduct periodic reviews to ensure that its advisory activities are addressing the most important scientific issues affecting the Environmental Protection Agency.''.

SEC. 3. RELATION TO THE FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed as supplanting the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

SEC. 4. RELATION TO THE ETHICS IN GOVERNMENT ACT OF 1978.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed as supplanting the requirements of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in part A of House Report 113–626, if offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART), or his designee, which shall be considered read and shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill, H.R. 1422.

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

There was no objection.

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

Members of Congress have been asking for greater transparency from the EPA's Science Advisory Board for years, and the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act, we believe, addresses those concerns.

Currently, the board is made up of 52 members appointed by the Administrator of the EPA to serve 3-year terms. The large majority of these members are affiliated with academic institutions, while private industry and other interested parties are unrepresented.

The only State governments represented are California and Vermont, while tribal and local governments have no representation on the board. Under H.R. 1422, at least 10 percent of the board members will be from States, local governments, or tribal entities.

The bill reinforces peer-review requirements and reduces conflicts of interest while providing opportunity for disinterested panelists to make their views known.

The EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act promises fairness, transparency, and independence to ensure unbiased advice is given to the EPA.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART), and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control the time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1422, the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act. I thank my colleagues, Mr. SMITH and Mr. SCHWEIKERT, for their intention to improve the EPA's Science Advisory Board, and I thank them for working with me on other legislation that passed the Science Committee in the House on a bipartisan basis. It is unfortunate that we could not be repeating that bipartisan collaboration today.

My colleagues who support H.R. 1422 may describe this bill as an attempt to strengthen public participation in EPA's scientific review process, improve the process for selecting expert advisers, expand transparency requirements, and limit nonscientific policy advice within EPA's Science Advisory Board. All of these are good government principles that I agree with.

If this bill achieved those goals, I would be here today supporting it. However, on close examination of its provisions, H.R. 1422 would not achieve these good government goals. Instead of improving the Science Advisory Board structure or operation, the bill before us today will likely limit the quality of scientific advice the EPA receives and further delay EPA's regulatory process.

H.R. 1422 would make it easier for industry representatives to serve on a board, even if they have a financial conflict of interest. To be clear, and this is something with which I trust my Republican colleagues would agree, I am not opposed to industry experts participating on the Science Advisory Board or in the peer-review process at the EPA. In fact, their insight into processes and industry can provide valuable guidance to an advisory body.

That being said, Congress should not be endorsing legislation that undermines longstanding ethics requirements and practices with the end result being an overrepresentation of industry voices on EPA's Science Advisory Board, and that is likely to be the result of this bill today.

At the same time this bill eases the way for more industry members, the act also makes it difficult, if not impossible, for the best and brightest from academia to serve because it would exclude from the board anyone who has participated in activities that were even indirectly reviewed by the EPA.

This provision would disqualify some of the most qualified scientists because academic researchers frequently need to compete for research funds from the Federal Government, and that includes the EPA.

Additionally, it appears H.R. 1422 would also significantly delay the work of the Science Advisory Board with new provisions that would require written responses to significant public comments following new public information-gathering sessions, a requirement that is duplicative because the board meetings are already open to the public and have time set aside for public comment. These provisions would simply result in more work without more resources and unlimited time to halt, derail, or slow EPA actions.

Finally, this bill sets a quota for membership on the Scientific Advisory Board from State, local, or tribal governments, which could very well mean that more qualified experts would not be able to serve.

EPA's science is tied to its mission, to protect public health and the environment through rational regulation. Scientific research, knowledge, and technical expertise are fundamental to EPA's mission and inform its regulatory functions.

The need for that expertise is why Congress created advisory bodies such as the Science Advisory Board in the first place, to provide independent advice on the science underpinning regulation, which in turn allows the EPA Administrator to make sound regulatory decisions.

Instead of undermining the scientific advice EPA receives, we should be giving the Agency the tools they need to strengthen and improve the regulatory process with sound science.

In closing, I want to again thank my colleagues, Mr. STEWART and Mr. SCHWEIKERT, for their efforts.

This bill does not do what it needs to do. I want to quote from a letter I received from a coalition of organizations, including Physicians for Social Responsibility, Clean Water Action, and more. The letter states:

> The bill shifts the current presumption against including people with financial conflicts on SAB panels . . . The bill's provisions are inconsistent with a set of nearly universally accepted scientific principles to eliminate or limit financial conflicts.

I agree with this assessment of H.R. 1422, and I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to also thank the ranking member, my friend from Oregon. We disagree on this bill, as it will become evident through this debate today, but she has always been respectful and professional, and I appreciate that.

The issues we are debating today are important, and the decisions we will make today are significant. There is a process that is broken, and it is through this bill that we cannot only improve that process, but also restore trust between the American people and the Federal Government.

□ 1345

If I could reemphasize what I just said, the process is broken. This is an opportunity for us to restore trust between the American people and the Federal Government that has fostered so much distrust of late.

Established by Congress in 1978, the EPA's Science Advisory Board, or what we refer to as SAB, is intended to provide meaningful, balanced, and independent reviews of the science conducted and used by the Agency. Its members are selected by the EPA Administrator, and it plays an important role in reviewing everything from the EPA's research budget to individual chemical assessments.

This panel is indispensable in critically reviewing the underlying science of virtually all major EPA regulatory activities. That is a tall order in recent years, especially given the fact that the Agency has pursued an overreaching, economically threatening agenda, creating an environment where politics and policies have taken the wheel from unbiased science.

This bill contains basic, good government changes and draws upon noncontroversial provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee handbook, the EPA's own Peer Review Handbook, the National Academies' committee composition and conflict of interest policy, and even recommendations from the Science Committee testimony and other outside groups.

It has widespread support from groups such as the National Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Farm Bureau, the American Road & Transportation Builders Association, the American Chemistry Council, the American Gas Association, Small Business and Entrepreneurship Council, Portland Cement Association, the American Forest and Paper Association, and I could go on and on with a long list of councils and associations that support this legislation.

It makes important clarifying changes to the scope of SAB's purview and institutes commonsense reforms. I would like to emphasize this. You are going to hear this again and again today: commonsense reforms to improve transparency. How can you argue against that? It specifically builds upon the bipartisan agreement made to the SAB in the farm bill.

H.R. 1422 would also facilitate meaningful public participation across all of the standing committees. Once again, let me emphasize that: it facilitates meaningful public participation. And let's be clear. The transparency and the public participation concerns addressed in this bill are not without merit.

For example, in my own experience, during a hearing in the Science Committee last year, I was alarmed to hear from both SAB members and the chair of the EPA's Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee and a State official testify that EPA's science advisers virtually never respond to public comments and, in many cases, they don't even read these public comments. Imagine the arrogance of a government committee that pretends to seek public

comment and promises to consider those comments, and then to learn that they don't even read them, let alone consider what has been said. This bill would change that.

This bill also provides clarity to the SAB member selection and disclosure process. Despite an existing requirement that these panels be ''fairly balanced in terms of point of view represented,'' EPA has systematically excluded State, local, and tribal entities and private sector scientists from serving as advisers.

For example, last year EPA announced a new Hydraulic Fracturing Research Advisory Panel. Even though dozens of people with recent and direct experience with oil and gas technical developments were nominated, the EPA excluded nearly every one of them from serving on the panel.

There are also a number of other unsettling Agency trends about how the EPA selects its supposedly independent advisers. For instance, according to the Congressional Research Service, almost 60 percent of the members of EPA's chartered SAB and Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee have directly received grants from the Agency, and that is only since the year 2000. These advisers served as principal or co-investigators for EPA grants, totaling approximately $140 million. The EPA also frequently chooses panelists whose research is directly or indirectly under review.

And finally, in addition, many of the SAB panelists have clearly taken sides or made public pronouncements on issues they are advising about. For example, roughly 40 percent of the current panel members reviewing the science behind upcoming EPA ozone standards have already made statements that the regulations should be more stringent.

The issues identified in this bill seem to many as too specific and diving into the weeds, but credible peer review is critical to everything the EPA does. We may not be able to control all the EPA's regulatory overreach, but guaranteeing that there is an independent check whose sole focus is to provide unbiased, independent science is essential to the process.

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

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

Before I yield, I will place into the RECORD letters from various groups opposed to this bill, including the Union of Concerned Scientists, Natural Resources Defense Council, and Physicians for Social Responsibility, among many others.

In addition, I will place into the RECORD the Administration's Statement of Administration Policy on the bill threatening a veto if the bill were to pass.

UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTISTS,
Cambridge, MA, November 17, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Union of Concerned Scientists strongly opposes the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2013, H.R. 1422, set to be voted on by the House as early as November 18. This bill will cripple the Environmental Protection Agency's ability to protect public health informed by the best available science.

When he discussed his proposal last year, Rep. Chris Stewart (UT) revealed the real purpose of his bill. He attacked the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for ''promulgating air quality regulations that could shut down large swaths of the West, undertaking thinly veiled attacks on the safety of hydraulic fracturing, or pursuing job-killing climate regulations. . . .''

This proposal will make it nearly impossible for the Board to do the crucial independent evaluations of EPA scientific analyses that enable the agency to protect public health. This bill opens the door for more corporate influence on the Board, because the bill directly stipulates that experts with financial ties to corporations affected by SAB assessments are ''not excluded.'' This signal likely will increase the number of conflicted SAB panelists empowering companies to delay the SAB's work for years, if not decades. It strikes at the heart of the whole concept of independent reviews, and at a time when the ability of corporations to influence policy is already high.

At the same time this bill encourages corporate experts to join the SAB, it creates roadblocks for academic experts to meaningfully participate by banning experts' participation in ''advisory activities that directly or indirectly involve review and evaluation of their own work.'' This effectively turns the idea of conflict of interest on its head, with the bizarre presumption that corporate experts with direct financial interests are not conflicted while academics who work on these issues are.

The notion that a member of the SAB cannot participate in a discussion that cites the member's own work is counterproductive and goes far beyond the common-sense limits imposed by the National Academies. Of course, a scientist with expertise on topics the Science Advisory Board addresses likely will have done peer-reviewed studies on that topic. That makes the scientist's evaluation more valuable, not less.

The bill offers almost limitless opportunities for public comment, opportunities that only benefit moneyed special interests. For example, for each major advisory activity, the Board must convene a public information-gathering session ''to discuss the state of the science'' related to that activity.

It is possible, under this requirement, that the Board may find itself repeatedly reexamining ''the state of the science'' on climate change or the harmful effects of certain toxins—each time it made an assessment that touched on either climate change impacts or reducing air pollution.

In addition, both the EPA, before it asks for the Board's advice, and the Board itself, would be required to ''accept, consider, and address'' public comments on the agency's questions to the Board. As the SAB deliberates, it must also encourage public comments ''that shall not be limited by an insufficient or arbitrary time restriction.'' In effect, these provisions turn a scientific evaluation into a public hearing, even though EPA must already accept public input on all its regulations.

The Board is required to respond in writing to each ''significant'' comment. In practice, it is difficult to see how the Board could impose any deadlines on accepting comment. Nor is it a reasonable expectation on the Board's membership of pro bono experts.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that implementing the law's mandates will cost the EPA about $2 million over a four-year period. These are funds that could be put to much better use by a cash-strapped agency.

This bill would not improve the work of the Board, and would make it more difficult for the EPA to receive the independent science advice it needs to do its work. We strongly urge your opposition.

Sincerely,

ANDREW A. ROSENBERG, PH.D.,
Director, Center for Science and Democracy, Union of Concerned Scientists.

BLUEGREEN ALLIANCE; CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY; CENTER FOR EFFECTIVE GOVERNMENT; CLEAN WATER ACTION; COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA; DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE; EARTHJUSTICE; ENVIRONMENT AMERICA; ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND; INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE & AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA (UAW); LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS; NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL; PUBLIC CITIZEN; SIERRA CLUB; SOUTHERN ENVIRONMENTAL LAW CENTER (SELC); SOUTHERN OREGON CLIMATE ACTION NOW; UTILITY WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA (UWUA); WE ACT FOR ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our millions of members and supporters we strongly urge you to oppose the trio of anti-EPA bills hitting the floor this week: the ''Secret Science Reform Act of 2014'' (H.R. 4012), the ''EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2013'' (H.R. 1422), and the ''Promoting New Manufacturing Act'' (H.R. 4795). Collectively, these misleadingly named bills would radically diminish EPA's ability to protect public health. Under these bills, EPA would be required to ignore significant science; the Scientific Advisory Board would be required to ignore conflicts of interest; and enforcement officials would be required to ignore pollution emitted in violation of the law. These bills are broadly written and would have damaging impacts far in excess of what their sponsors will admit.

The ''Secret Science Reform Act,'' H.R. 4012, is based on a faulty premise. Its notion of ''secret science,'' based on claims about studies of fine soot pollution conducted almost two decades ago, is unfounded despite lengthy congressional inquiries. The bill would deny EPA the ability to rely upon peer-reviewed medical studies that involve commitments to patient confidentiality, when the agency carries out its statutory responsibilities to safeguard public health and the environment. Further, this bill would effectively amend numerous environmental statutes by forbidding EPA to use certain kinds of studies in setting health standards. It would also make it impossible for EPA to use many kinds of economic models it routinely relies on because those models are proprietary. This marks a radical departure from longstanding practices. Its end result would be to make it much more difficult to protect the public by forcing EPA to ignore key scientific studies.

H.R. 1422 would attack EPA's scientific process in a different way. This bill would significantly weaken the content and credibility of the Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) reviews—a textbook example of making a government program function poorly to the benefit of polluting industries and at the expense of public health and independent science. The bill will add unnecessary new

burdens on the SAB, distorting its mission and altering its process with no benefit to EPA or the public. The worst provision would mandate allowing the participation of scientists with financial conflicts of interest, as long as those conflicts are disclosed. This is inconsistent with a set of nearly universally accepted scientific principles to eliminate or limit financial conflicts. The bill also significantly broadens the scope of the SAB and creates a comment process that will add needless delay to the Board's work. The result would be further stalling and undermining of important public health, safety, and environmental protections.

Lastly, H.R. 4795 is a substantive attack on our nation's right to clean air protections. It would grant amnesty from national clean air health standards, create red tape and cause unintended burdens to local businesses. The bill would exacerbate air pollution nationwide, causing harm to public health and making the jobs of state and local officials harder to perform. Newly permitted industrial facilities would be allowed to operate in violation of national health standards, while other local businesses and local communities would have to ''pick up the slack'' and be penalized for the new facility's amnesty and pollution. In so doing, the bill repeals a health safeguard in place for nearly 40 years under the Clean Air Act, making it more difficult for states to permit new facilities while also keeping their air clean.

This legislation will obstruct the implementation and enforcement of critical environmental statutes, undermine the EPA's ability to consider and use science, and jeopardize public health. For these reasons, we urge you to oppose these bills.

Sincerely,

BlueGreen Alliance; Center for Biological Diversity; Center for Effective Government; Clean Water Action; Communications Workers of America; Defenders of Wildlife; Earthjustice; Environment America; Environmental Defense Fund; International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW); League of Conservation Voters; Natural Resources Defense Council; Public Citizen; Sierra Club; Southern Environmental Law Center (SELC); Southern Oregon Climate Action Now; Utility Workers Union of America (UWUA); WE ACT for Environmental Justice.

NOVEMBER 17, 2014.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned individuals and organizations working on public health and science-informed regulation strongly oppose H.R. 4012, the Secret Science Reform Act, and H.R. 1422, the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act, up for a House vote as early as November 18.

Both bills would severely undermine the ability of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to use the best available scientific evidence when making decisions regarding the protection of public health and safety and the environment.

H.R. 4012, the erroneously named Secret Science Reform Act, would tie the EPA's hands by restricting the information it can use to develop protective regulations. The EPA could only regulate based on publicly available scientific data. This restriction would block the agency's use of many different types of public health data, such as those for which public release would violate privacy protections, or data from corporations that are designated as confidential business information.

It also would restrict the use of scientific data that is not ''reproducible.'' This provision seems to adopt a very narrow view of scientific information solely based on laboratory experiments. As major scientific societies including the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) have noted, such a restriction would eliminate the use of most epidemiological and public health data, such as those regarding the public health impacts of air pollution, because these data are collected in long-term studies following individuals longitudinally.

Not only do privacy concerns arise, but such studies are not inherently reproduced in the way a laboratory experiment or a clinical trial may be. It would be unethical to deliberately expose adults or children to air pollution merely to determine whether the increased rates of asthma and heart attacks caused by such exposures can be duplicated, or to encourage teenagers to smoke to re-assess the toxic effects of tobacco.

H.R. 1422, the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act would greatly weaken the EPA's advisory process, ensuring that recommendations from its independent Science Advisory Board (SAB) will be dominated by corporate special interests. While the bill has been improved by several amendments offered by minority members of the House Science Committee, it still remains unacceptable.

This bill opens the door to increased corporate influence on the Board, both by encouraging the EPA to accept more SAB panelists with corporate ties, and disqualifying some of the nation's leading experts.

The bill's overly broad restriction that a member of the SAB cannot participate in a discussion that cites the member's own work is counterproductive, and goes far beyond the common-sense limits imposed by the National Academies. Of course, a scientist with expertise on topics the SAB addresses likely will have done peer-reviewed studies and other work on that topic. That makes the scientist's evaluation more valuable, not less.

Even worse, the bill requires the SAB to remain in an endless loop soliciting public comment about the ''state of the science'' touching on every major advisory activity it undertakes and responding to nearly every comment before moving forward, without being limited by any time constraints. At best, the SAB will be reduced to busy work. At worst, the SAB's assessments will address the concerns of corporations, not the desires of citizens for science-informed regulation that protects public health.

These bills together will greatly impede the ability of EPA, and potentially other agencies, to utilize the best available science, independently reviewed, to inform regulations crucial to public health and the environment.

We strongly urge you to vote No on H.R. 4012 and H.R. 1422.

Sincerely,

Center for Science and Democracy at the Union of Concerned Scientists; Annie Appleseed Project; Breast Cancer Action; Center for Medical Consumers; Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies; National Center for Health Research; National Physicians Alliance; Our Bodies, Ourselves; Physicians for Social Responsibility; Public Citizen; The TMJ Association; Woodymatters; Susan F. Wood, PhD, Associate Professor, Director, Jacobs Institute of Women's Health, The George Washington University, Milken Institute School of Public Health; John H. Powers, MD, Associate Clinical Professor of Medicine, The George Washington University School of Medicine.

LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS,
Washington, DC, November 17, 2014.

Re Oppose H.R. 1422, H.R. 4012, and H.R. 4795: An Attack on Scientific Integrity and Public Health.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The League of Conservation Voters (LCV) works to turn environmental values into national priorities. Each year, LCV publishes the National Environmental Scorecard, which details the voting records of members of Congress on environmental legislation. The Scorecard is distributed to LCV members, concerned voters nationwide, and the media.

LCV urges you to vote NO on H.R. 1422. H.R. 4012, and H.R. 4795.

H.R. 1422, the so-called EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act would undermine the ability of the Science Advisory Board to provide independent scientific advice to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). This bill would allow industry participation on the Scientific Advisory Board, while preventing subject experts from being included. Additionally, new burdens imposed on the Board would needlessly delay necessary public health and environmental protections.

H.R. 4012, the so-called Secret Science Reform Act of 2014 would endanger public health by preventing the EPA from using the best available science. The bill contains favorable exemptions for industry and would severely restrict the health studies that the EPA is able to use by prohibiting the use of peer-reviewed studies with confidential health information. These types of studies are the basis for the best research on pollution's effects on people. This legislation cripples the EPA's ability to develop effective public health safeguards.

H.R. 4795, the so-called Promoting New Manufacturing Act is an attack on clean air protections. This bill would create unclear procedural requirements and loopholes that could allow newly permitted industrial facilities to be exempted from the most recent national air quality standards set by the EPA. This legislation effectively creates amnesty for new facilities while delaying the permitting process and threatening public health.

We urge you to REJECT H.R. 1422, H.R. 4012, and H.R. 4795, a collective attack on scientific integrity and public health. We will strongly consider including votes on these bills in the 2014 Scorecard.

Sincerely,

GENE KARPINSKI,
President.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 1422—EPA SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD REFORM ACT OF 2013

(Rep. Stewart, R–UT, and 21 cosponsor, Nov. 17, 2014)

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 1422, which would affect the ability of EPA's Science Advisory Board (SAB) to form panels and perform its essential functions. The SAB, along with other functions, reviews the quality and adequacy of certain scientific and technical information used by EPA or proposed as the basis for EPA regulations. Therefore, it is imperative that the SAB be composed of the most knowledgeable scientific and technical experts available. The Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), which governs Federal advisory committees such as the SAB, provides for balanced panels and subcommittees that include experts with diverse backgrounds who represent wide-ranging perspectives.

H.R. 1422 would negatively affect the appointment of experts and would weaken the scientific independence and integrity of the

SAB. For example, the bill would impose a hiring quota for SAB members based on employment by a State, local, or tribal government as opposed to scientific expertise. Further, it would prohibit a SAB member from participating in ''advisory activities that directly or indirectly involve review and evaluation of their own work.'' Determining the practical meaning of ''indirect'' involvement will be difficult and consequently problematic to implement. The provisions on appointment of experts to the SAB and various other requirements could preclude the nomination of scientists with significant expertise in their fields.

H.R. 1422 also would add burdensome requirements on the SAB with respect to solicitation of and response to public comments, above and beyond those imposed by FACA. These new requirements would saddle the SAB with workload that would impair its ability to carry out its mandate. Further, H.R. 1422 would add an unnecessary, burdensome, and costly layer of requirements for hazard and risk assessments without defining the scope of these requirements and absent recognition that many high profile assessments already are reviewed by the SAB.

If the President were presented with H.R. 1422, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the ranking member of the Science Committee.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the ranking member.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1422, the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act. H.R. 1422 is a continuation of the majority's anti-science agenda. It benefits no one but the industry, and it harms public health.

The bill before us today ''reforms'' EPA's Science Advisory Board not for the better, but for the worse. The supposed intent of H.R. 1422 is to improve the process of selecting advisers to serve on the Agency's advisory board, but, in reality, H.R. 1422 will allow the board to be stacked with industry-affiliated representatives while making it more difficult for the experts from academia to serve on the board.

The role of the board is to provide independent scientific analysis and advice to the EPA, which includes reviewing the quality and relevance of scientific information used as the basis for regulations.

My Republican colleagues seem to have a fundamental distrust of scientists from our Nation's universities because these researchers, the ones with the most relevant expertise to EPA's mission of protecting public health, are denied the opportunity to provide EPA with their advice under H.R. 1422. It is difficult to understand how anyone could object to the most expert academics in the country being called on to offer their expertise to EPA. Who would know better whether EPA had mischaracterized the science on an issue than the people who are leaders in their respective fields?

The board is supposed to be composed of experts, including those who may have, literally, ''written the book'' on a matter. What is the alternative? Should we find people to serve who are less expert?

Equally troubling, H.R. 1422 goes out of its way to guarantee that industry-affiliated experts are the dominant voice on the board of experts. An expert with an industry association is far more likely to find that the science they are asked to review will have a financial impact on the employer. Academic scientists do not have such financial conflicts of interest with the board's advice or EPA's actions.

To be clear, I am not arguing that industry should have no representation on EPA's Science Advisory Board. Their insight is valuable. But I do not support stacking the board with industry representatives, as would be the outcome if this bill passes.

Another goal of H.R. 1422, as stated by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, is to ''improve the science that goes into EPA regulations.'' H.R. 1422 falls shorts of that goal as well and, instead, weakens and delays the scientific review process, putting the health of every American at risk.

As a former nurse, I cannot support legislation that endangers public health, and I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 1422.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this bill came out of committee without a single Democratic vote.

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

Before I recognize the gentleman from Texas, I would like to respond briefly, if I could, to the minority Member, some of her comments regarding this bill.

The bill very clearly does not allow for the SAB to be stacked, to use her phrase, with the industry experts. I have the bill before me. It is only a couple of pages long. It is very simple. I would ask anyone to show me the language where it allows for the SAB to be stacked with industry experts.

All we are asking is that there be some balance to those experts who are asked and that there, further, be transparency, and that we understand who is selected, why they were selected, and why others were excluded from this, just like, by the way, we are not asking that those scientists who have EPA-funded backgrounds be excluded. We are not saying that they are conflicted to the point where they couldn't participate. We recognize that they have expertise that could help in this process.

But we also are asking, on the other hand, that we recognize that there are industry experts who are currently being excluded from this because of their background. Of the 51 members of the current SAB, only three—only three—have any industry expertise, and we are losing valuable insight and valuable guidance because we don't include them in the process.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that some of the things that we are hearing from the opponents of the bill are that the committee is going to be stacked with people from industry, from the States. It is as if the people from industry can't be trusted, people from States can't be trusted.

Then we hear the theme that there was not a single Democratic vote to get this bill out. It almost sounds like the Affordable Care Act to me where people—recent revelations are one of the proponents has said that Americans were too stupid to understand, so that's why the Affordable Care Act had to be passed, and it couldn't have transparency because it would never have passed Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1422. The Science Advisory Board, called the SAB—I guess we would say this is a ''sad SAB story''—was established by Congress to review the science behind the EPA's decisions and to advise Congress and the EPA on science and technical matters. Unfortunately, the SAB is no longer functioning as designed, without the impartiality and expertise needed to be an effective arbiter of EPA's use of science in its regulations.

Why no transparency, Mr. Speaker? That is what we have got to ask. The American public deserves transparency. These are taxpayer dollars we are talking about.

The membership of the SAB has excluded individuals from the State agencies and private sector. Again, I would remind us that these are the people who build communities and industries in neighborhoods, in cities, in towns, and in States.

Can you say 10th Amendment?

States have all the rights reserved. They are the building block. Communities, citizens, industry is the building block of this country. This is a country that has a government, not a government that has a country.

So, as the EPA continues its regulatory assault on America's economy, it is critically important that Congress act to improve the quality of EPA's use of science in its decisions. This bill, this legislation, will do just that. It will improve the quality of SAB's membership. It will increase public participation in its scientific reviews. It will allow for dissenting opinions among its members and limit the SAB's activities to questions of science, not policy.

□ 1400

And I want to say thank you to Congressman STEWART and Chairman SMITH for bringing this important legislation to the floor today. It is very important that we get on top of this. The American people deserve transparency, they deserve a seat at the table, and they deserve nothing less.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from California, I just want to respond that, certainly, we on this side of the aisle agree with

the goal of transparency. However, transparency does not mean letting industry, people with a financial interest, serve by disclosing it. That is not what transparency means.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA), who is not only a physician but a great member of the Science Committee.

Mr. BERA of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Oregon for her leadership on the Science Committee as well as our ranking member from Texas for her leadership.

But I have to rise in opposition of H.R. 1442, the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act, and here is why: it is absolutely accurate that the best science and the best advice comes from multiple perspectives. You certainly need the perspective of industry, but you have to independently have that perspective of science as well.

You need a board that is unbiased, that is unfettered, that is transparent, that is looking at it from the perspective of advising Congress and giving us the best possible advice because our sole job is to protect our citizens, to provide that best advice to our citizens. That is what the advisory board is designed to do and should do.

But it requires a delicate balance. It can't be stacked in one direction or the other direction. You have to create that transparency that allows for vibrant, unfettered dialogue.

And I say this as a scientist, as someone who has been on advisory boards.

Now, the importance of what the EPA does and what advice they provide Congress is incredibly important. I will just share: I am a lifelong Californian. I grew up in southern California. I grew up at a time where I could actually see the air that I was breathing, where there were days that they ordered us to stay inside.

It is through legislation, it is through working with industry, it is through looking at science that you cannot only both protect our citizens, protect our environment, but also advance industry.

I applaud the Science Committee and Chairman SMITH for taking up this debate. But let's do it in a way that not only is built on sound science, is built on evidence, but also allows multiple perspectives, not just from one side or the other side, not just from one group or another group, but creates this context where we can have vibrant debate, where we can get the best and most sound science, and we can get the best advice, which is what this group is supposed to do. They are supposed to advise Congress and allow us to do our job, which is to protect the citizens of the United States.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to some of the comments made on the other side of the aisle.

All of us would be concerned if we thought we were getting advice that had been conflicted financially. I share that concern. In fact, that was one of the primary reasons that we wrote this bill. This bill, to say it again, seeks for transparency and it seeks for openness.

If you are worried about industry experts being stacked on the SABs and providing biased opinion and expertise, I would ask you to give me an example of this. Because I can give you an example of exactly the opposite happening.

I will say it once again: 60 percent of the current Members of the SAB have $140 million in direct government grants. Now, that is a clear conflict. And yet once again, we are still willing to work with that. We are not seeking to exclude those members; we are simply seeking for transparency and openness, and for that same standard to be applied to industry experts as well who could help us with their background and their expertise.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Utah (Mr. STEWART) for introducing H.R. 1442, the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act. I rise in strong support of this piece of legislation.

As Mr. STEWART said, this bill will increase transparency and give Americans more opportunities for public input and participation on Science Advisory Board activities.

I believe this legislation builds on the progress that we have made on improving the Science Advisory Board.

I represent a district where agriculture is the economic driver and a way of life. So it concerns me when I learned that farmers did not even have a seat at the table on the EPA Science Advisory Board.

And the EPA Science Advisory Board, Mr. Speaker, considers rules that impact agriculture.

By working together on the farm bill, my colleague Representative PETERSON and I were able to ensure that farmers have a stronger voice when it comes to EPA regulations.

For the first time, agriculture interests will be represented within the SAB. I can report that EPA has made progress in standing up this ag-related committee, and I believe the voices and input provided by farmers and producers to the EPA will make for more commonsense policy.

H.R. 1422 will provide the public with more access to scientific information and more opportunities to comment on board actions.

This legislation also ensures that State and local government officials would be part of the Science Advisory Board. And as my colleague alluded to earlier, we cannot have a Science Advisory Board made up primarily of individuals who receive grant funding from the Federal Government to make decisions that affect them.

Again, I rise in support of this bill. I thank my colleague from Utah.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, at this point in time I am happy to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT). I also want to mention that not only is Mr. HOLT a scientist and a great Member of Congress but also has been named, starting in February of 2015, the new CEO of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Oregon. I rise in opposition to this legislation, H.R. 1422, as yet another attempt to gut the EPA and to reform it into an advocate for industry.

Now, the proponents make claims that sound noble and virtuous, like increasing transparency and participation.

But make no mistake: the bill is simply a way to increase the role and influence of special interests, to tip the scales in favor of these special interests, and to decrease actual scientific input into the EPA decisions and rulemaking.

Let me try to explain what is wrong here. Take, for example, the section in this bill that limits participation of board members who have relevant expertise.

Now, EPA has an advisory board whose job it is to review scientific and technical information being used as a basis for agency regulations. However, section 2 of this bill states: ''Board members may not participate in advisory activities that directly or indirectly involve review and evaluation of their own work.''

Now, what does that worthy-sounding clause mean? Here is how it has been explained to me. If the EPA board member is a leading scientist in a field and has published works that are well cited by other scientists and works that would be used to establish the scientific findings affecting possible regulations, that board member would be prohibited from reviewing any such materials before the board related to her or his expertise because it draws on the scientific work of that person.

Now, I realize Congress sometimes has trouble dealing with expertise, but this bill is a solution in search of a problem. The EPA advisory board does and should use science; not industry science, not government science—science.

Science works so well and provides the most reliable knowledge because it is based on evidence, the validity of which is determined by other scientists in the free exchange of information. Expertise and influence of a claim in science and its application shouldn't be determined by the highest bidder or the politically most powerful.

The science should be allowed to operate. This restricts it or would restrict it if this were to become law.

Now, to make this bill even worse, while the bill would exclude experts advising in areas of their expertise, it would allow people with corporate or special-interest bias to affect the rulemaking if they only state their affiliation.

Now, while it sounds good to say you are increasing transparency, in reality

this simply strengthens the role of special interests—biased interests—in the process.

I urge all Members to carefully review the language and think about these implications. I think they will come to a decision to vote ''no.''

Mr. STEWART. Well, once again, I just have to respond to some of the things that the opposition is saying.

This is essentially their argument: we think it is okay that 60 percent of SAB members have $140 million in direct government grants, and we think it is okay that those same members are then allowed to provide their own peer review of their own work. That is okay.

I think it is very commonsensical to realize there are inherent objections and inherent conflicts in allowing that sort of structure to continue to exist.

It is not gutting the EPA, as was claimed, to ask to increase transparency. It is not gutting the EPA to ask for balance. That is all this bill does.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS), my good friend.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Utah for allowing me to speak on this bill on the floor. As the body may know, the gentleman from Utah succeeded me as chairman of that committee. We had numerous hearings about the EPA Science Advisory Board. So I am glad that one of the results of those years of hearings was H.R. 1422, and I rise to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I hope America is watching. The opponents of this bill clearly and simply believe that people who work for the government know best.

We have heard 60 percent of the Science Advisory Board works for the government. They received millions and millions of dollars in grants from the EPA. They work for the government. The other side wants America to believe that because they work for the government they know better.

Mr. Speaker, I did science, and I had an academic appointment. You know, the joke was that people who can, do, and people who can't, teach; that people who don't really know how to do something end up in an academic institution and end up teaching. I have got to tell you, there was some truth to that.

What this bill does, it says that the Scientific Advisory Board ought to be made up of more than just academics because that is really who makes up the board now. It actually ought to be made up of people who are in the field.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you, you know that some of the corporations who are affected by the EPA hire the best scientists they can because they have to deal with the EPA, and those scientific minds, in fact, work in the private sector. They don't work for government.

What is wrong with a balanced approach? The gentleman from California said we should be unbiased, unfettered, and transparent. That is what the Science Advisory Board ought to be.

How can you be unbiased if you come up with the wrong conclusion, the Science Advisory Board? You are biting the hand that feeds you. Because 60 percent of those scientists derive their grants from the EPA.

There is no way they can be unbiased.

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

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, they are neither unbiased nor unfettered. We know fully and truly, as the gentleman from Texas said, because of the revelations of Mr. Gruber, that transparency is not a major objective of the administration. And I am afraid that has filtered down to the EPA.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1422 makes sense. The best advice is from a balanced group of advisers. It is unbalanced at the EPA now. This bill will provide some balance. I encourage the body to pass H.R. 1422.

□ 1415

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

I just want to respond, with all due respect, to my colleagues who are promoting this bill and asking for balance.

On the contrary, what this bill achieves is not balance because, as explained, under this bill, people who are employed by the industry with a financial conflict of interest can serve as long as they disclose their conflict.

That is in contrast to current practice, which is biased, which is balanced by membership, but people with financial conflicts of interest do not currently serve on this Science Advisory Board.

Just to clarify, it isn't just that people who are employed by industry with a financial conflict of interest will be able to serve; under this bill, people who receive some type of grant cannot participate.

Now, just to clarify, these are not government employees. These are employees of research institutions, universities, who may have received some government grant funding. They are not employed by the government. They are not government employees, and that is a big distinction. They are not beholden to any particular government agency, so that is the big difference.

I agree that we should have balance and transparency, but unfortunately, this bill takes us in the wrong direction.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah has 11 minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Oregon has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, before I yield to my friend, the gentlewoman from Tennessee, I would very quickly like to make a point. Once again, all we are seeking is fairness and transparency, and the opposition is claiming that it is okay for government-sponsored and -granted scientists to sit on this board.

In fact, it is okay that 60 percent of them have tens of millions of dollars of government funding, but it is not okay for anyone from the industry, and it is completely transparent how unfair that standard would be.

The second point I would make is this: we are not claiming that either of them should be forbidden to serve on these boards. We are just asking that they disclose those financial agreements and let the American people decide, and that certainly seems to be a fair standard and hardly the minimum that we could ask.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), my good friend.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the sponsor of the legislation, the gentleman from Utah, for the excellent job that he has done in preparing this legislation and bringing it to the body.

If you were to go with me into my district in Tennessee—19 counties, 10,000 square miles—one of the things that you would hear in every community discussion is a certain amount of disdain for Federal agencies.

Now, we all expect we are going to hear about not liking the IRS, but the number one agency in my district to dislike, to be frustrated with, to want to get control of, to reform is the EPA, and that is because whether you are a small business owner or a painter or a manufacturer or a farmer who is growing food to go on the table, you get hassled by the EPA with all sorts of frivolous and nonsensical rules and regulations and interpretations.

Quite frankly, the American people are tired of it, and they look at us and they say, ''Tell me what you are going to do about it.''

Now, Mr. Speaker, today is a day that, yes, indeed, we can do something about this and a component of it, the Science Advisory Board—isn't it so interesting that these agencies create this tangled web of different boards and advisory capacities, and it is all to insulate their cronies, and it is all to help them shield millions of taxpayer dollars, money coming out of the pockets of hardworking taxpayers, that are going to their cronies, who are receiving these grants.

The American people are saying, ''Stop it. Get it under control. Get a handle on this.'' This is one of the ways that we do it.

The chairman has spoken eloquently about the membership and the makeup of the Science Advisory Board, the cronyism that is taking place there, and the need for it to stop, the ability to have these conflicts of interest brought out of smoke-filled rooms and moved

into the transparency of sunlight and knowledge of the American people. It is a great disinfectant. It is time for it to be put on the EPA, and certainly, H.R. 1422 is a great way to go about that.

We wouldn't even be here discussing this today and there would be no need at all for H.R. 1422 if the EPA were to follow their own peer-review handbook, but I guess Grubergate has gone governmentwide. What we are seeing is they are all trying to find ways to squirrel this away and to hide and to not have that transparency.

It is time to pass this legislation. It is time to bring transparency to the process.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, as we conclude this debate, there are three things that we should keep in mind. The current content or makeup of the SAB is somewhere between 51 and 52 members because there are some in transition as new members come and go. Of those, let's say, 52, only nine are nonuniversity background, and of those, only five and sometimes six represent industry.

The industry experts have much to offer. If you don't think that, say, for example, with the hydraulic fracking board that that technology is changing rapidly, it certainly is, and we need to take advantage of that.

The second thing I would say is public comment. The American people are smart, and the American people are those that are most affected by some of the standards and the rules that the EPA would suggest. We should listen to them, and this bill allows a process where they can be listened to.

Finally, the third thing, we are requesting that 10 percent—a mere 10 percent of these board members come from State, local, or tribal governments. That hardly seems like a bar that is too high to cross in getting input from lay States and localities.

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

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

The bill before us today does undertake the laudable goal of improving transparency at the EPA.

However, as I stated previously and as my colleagues mentioned, this bill, as written, does not accomplish that goal; instead, H.R. 1422 will increase the influence of industry on EPA decisionmaking, including industry members with a financial conflict of interest, while reducing the role of qualified academic researchers in helping to guide regulatory action that is based on sound science.

The Union of Concerned Scientists said:

> At the same time, this bill encourages corporate experts to join the SAB. It creates roadblocks for academic experts to meaningfully participate by banning experts' participation and advising activities that directly or indirectly involve review and evaluation of their own work.
>
> This effectively turns the idea of conflict of interest on its head with the bizarre presumption that corporate experts with direct financial interests are not affected, while academics who work on these issues are.

Breast Cancer Action wrote:

> This bill's overly broad restriction, that a member of the SAB cannot participate in a discussion that cites the member's own work, is counterproductive and goes far beyond the commonsense limits imposed by the National Academies.
>
> Of course, a scientist with expertise on topics that SAB addresses likely will have done peer-reviewed studies and other work on that topic. That makes the scientist's evaluation more valuable, not less.

Mr. Speaker, we can and should work together to improve EPA's approach to reviewing the science underpinning regulations, but this legislation will only damage and delay the process and not bring us the transparency my colleagues seek.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STEWART. Could I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), my comrade.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity of coming here and talking about this issue.

My relationship with the Environmental Protection Agency has been infrequent, thankfully, but it has also not necessarily been successful or positive. In an issue that dealt specifically with my hometown and county, to be very honest, the science that was used by the Environmental Protection Agency to make the decision was flawed.

The State clearly showed that it was flawed; yet that did not make a difference in their ultimate decision, which led me to believe that the decision was perhaps more politically motivated than it was scientifically motivated.

I realize this advisory board, though, is in place to try to mitigate against those circumstances taking place, but if that advisory board is going to work, it has to have the balance of input that is necessary for that.

I am frustrated that out of the 50-plus members of this board, only two have backgrounds in State and local governments and those from only specific States. This board desperately needs that kind of input from those entities that have a day-to-day working relationship with these issues.

If that is not there, if that is not remedied, then the board itself is going to be flawed, and it is not going to fulfill the purpose for which it was designed.

I fully support this bill because this advisory board has an effort and a job to fill to mitigate problems before those problems develop, and if it is not an effective board, then we should either reform it, as this bill tries to do, or we should eliminate it, but it can be reformed. It should be reformed. This is a step to actually reform it, to make sure that there is better input for better decisions to be made.

I congratulate the gentleman from my home State of Utah for coming up with a bill that solves a real problem and does it in a fair and professional way.

Mr. STEWART. With that, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, but before I do, though, I would like to enter into the RECORD the letters from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and others that I mentioned in my previous testimony.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, November 18, 2014.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation representing the interests of more than three million businesses of all sizes, sectors, and regions, as well as state and local chambers and industry associations, and dedicated to promoting, protecting, and defending America's free enterprise system, supports H.R. 1422, the ''EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2013.'' This bill would help ensure that the Science Advisory Board (SAB), which directly counsels the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on scientific and technical issues, is unbiased and transparent in performing its duties.

The bill would establish requirements that SAB members are qualified experts, that conflicts of interest and sources of bias are disclosed, that the views of members—including dissenting members—are available to the public, and that the public has the opportunity to participate in the advisory activities of the Board and view EPA's responses. Because EPA relies on SAB reviews and studies to support new regulations, standards, guidance, assessments of risk, and other actions, the actions of the SAB must be transparent and accountable. This is a critical safeguard to assure the public that the data Federal agencies rely on is scientifically sound and unbiased.

The EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act would improve the transparency and trustworthiness of scientific and technical reviews that EPA relies on to justify its actions. The American public must have confidence that the scientific and technical data driving regulatory action can be trusted. Accordingly, the Chamber supports H.R. 1422.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION®,
Washington, DC, November 18, 2014.

Chairman LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: I am writing on behalf of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the nation's largest general farm organization. We have reviewed H.R. 1422, The Science Advisory Board Reform Act. AFBF strongly supports this legislation and is committed to working with you in pressing for its swift consideration.

The Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) should be a critical part of the scientific foundation of EPA's regulatory process. Rather than promoting fairness, transparency and independence to ensure unbiased

scientific advice, EPA has failed to follow its own Peer Review Handbook and used its position to silence dissenting scientific experts. A weak and partial SAB undermines public trust and hurts the quality of regulatory decisions. American Farm Bureau Federation supports H.R. 1422 because Farmers and Ranchers deserve good governance and regulations based on meaningful scientific review.

H.R. 1422 reforms the SAB process by strengthening public participation, improving the process of selecting expert advisors, reducing conflicts of interest and enhancing transparency. The legislation draws from EPA's own Peer Review Handbook and recommendations from the Bipartisan Policy Center to urge sensible reforms. H.R. 1422 improves the review process and makes the SAB a more useful tool in regulatory decision making.

H.R. 1422 reinforces the SAB process as a tool that can help policymakers with complex issues while preventing EPA from muzzling impartial scientific advice. This legislation deserves strong, bipartisan support. We applaud your leadership in this effort and will continue to work with you to ensure passage of H.R. 1422.

Sincerely,

BOB STALLMAN,
President.

APRIL 10, 2013.

Hon. CHRIS STEWART,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Environment Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We are writing on behalf of the American Alliance for Innovation (AAI), a large and diverse coalition of trade associations representing a broad spectrum of the American economy.

It is paramount that chemicals and metals producers, manufacturers, distributors, importers, users, and consumers have confidence that there is a transparent federal chemical management system in place that is both grounded in sound science and will deliver timely safety decisions. Oversight of the safe production and use of chemicals affects us all, which is why we support your efforts to improve the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Science Advisory Board (SAB) and its committees.

The SAB is a critical part of the EPA's quality control process that was established to ensure that the Agency produces credible information to help guide regulatory decisions at all levels of government. We all agree, therefore, that the SAB must provide meaningful, balanced, and independent reviews of the science conducted and used by EPA, and we support advancing your bill, H.R. 1422 (the ''EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2013'') in this Congress.

We are encouraged to see that your legislation takes into account public policy recommendations from the National Academy of Sciences and the Bipartisan Policy Council, as well as input that the Committee has received from numerous experts and stakeholder groups. H.R. 1422 will greatly enhance the current peer review process in many important ways by strengthening policies to address conflicts of interest, while at the same time ensuring that a wide range of scientific perspectives are represented on panels. The bill will also increase the utility of SAB panels by improving the process for public engagement and ensuring that scientific concerns are clearly addressed and communicated.

We are committed to working with you and the Members of the Science Committee to move this legislation forward, and we urge all members of Congress to support its passage.

Sincerely,

Adhesive and Sealant Council; Alkylphenols & Ethoxylates Research Council; American Architectural Manufacturers Association; American Chemistry Council; American Coke & Coal Chemicals Institute; American Farm Bureau Federation®; American Fiber Manufacturers Association; American Forest & Paper Association; American Gas Association; American Road & Transportation Builders Association; American Wood Council; Automotive Aftermarket Industry Association; Corn Refiners Association; CropLife America; Fashion Jewelry & Accessories Trade Association.

Halogenated Solvents Industry Alliance, Inc.; Institute of Makers of Explosives; National Association of Chemical Distributors; National Association of Manufacturers; National Oilseed Processors Association; National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc.; Nickel Institute; Oregon Women In Timber; Pine Chemicals Association, Inc.; Portland Cement Association; Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment; The Fertilizer Institute; The Vinyl Institute; Treated Wood Council.

SMALL BUSINESS & ENTREPRENEURSHIP COUNCIL,
Vienna, VA, November 17, 2014.

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

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE STEWART: The Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council (SBE Council) is pleased to support H.R. 1422, the ''EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2013.''

H.R. 1422 reforms the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Science Advisory Board (SAB) and its subpanels by strengthening public participation, improving the process for selecting expert advisors, expanding transparency requirements, and limiting nonscientific policy advice. The reforms proposed by H.R. 1422 are especially critical given the growing impact of EPA's regulations on America's small business sector, and the self-serving science used as the basis to advance controversial rulemakings.

H.R. 1422 will restore balance and independence to the scientific advisory process at EPA. The bill addresses key concerns with the SAB, such as placing limitations on its members who receive environmental research grants, applying conflict of interest standards, and ensuring balance on the board's membership. These are common sense reforms that will strengthen SAB's integrity and work.

SBE Council and its Center for Regulatory Solutions (CRS) are dedicated to reforming the regulatory system to ensure small businesses and entrepreneurs operate and compete under rational rules. H.R. 1422 is an important step that will enable a more rationale and friendly environment for U.S. entrepreneurship.

SBE Council looks forward to working with your office to advance this important piece of legislation.

Sincerely,

KAREN KERRIGAN,
President & CEO.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS,
Washington, DC, November 18, 2014.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES: The National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), the largest manufacturing association in the United States representing small and large manufacturers in every industrial sector and in all 50 states, urges you to support H.R. 1422 (Rep. Stewart, UT–R), the EPA Science Advisory Act of 2013. H.R. 1422 would modernize the policies and procedures governing the Science Advisory Board (SAB) of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to ensure that the SAB is best equipped to provide independent, transparent and balanced reviews of the science the EPA uses to guide its regulatory decisions.

Manufacturers support policies that favor markets, adhere to sound principles of science and risk assessment and are informed by a public rulemaking process that is open and inclusive. The work of the SAB, which serves a quality control function for the science the EPA uses to justify new regulations, must be completely neutral. Any appearance of bias, however slight, could undermine the EPA's mission to protect public health and welfare.

H.R. 1422 would strengthen the SAB by limiting conflicts of interest, encouraging public comment, prohibiting panel members from peer reviewing their own work, and ensuring that the makeup of SAB panels reflects the diversity of views among federal, state, local and tribal experts. H.R. 1422 would implement provisions and recommendations from the National Academy of Sciences, the Federal Advisory Committee Act, and the EPA's own peer-review handbook.

As the costs of environmental regulations escalate, the scientific justification for those regulations must be sound. H.R 1422 is a strong step in the right direction. Manufacturers urge you to vote in favor of H.R. 1422.

Sincerely,

ROSS EISENBERG,
Vice President,
Energy and Resources Policy.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, thank you for considering my bill, H.R. 1422, the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2013, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

To reiterate what has been said multiple times here, this legislation addresses how the EPA is systematically silencing voices of dissent on the Science Advisory Board, ignoring calls for independence and balanced participation, and preventing the board from responding to congressional requests.

Science is a valuable tool to help policymakers navigate complex issues. However, when inconvenient scientific conclusions are disregarded or when dissenting voices are muzzled, a frank discussion becomes impossible, and that is certainly what we have seen.

The EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act addresses these shortcomings by strengthening public participation and public comment opportunities and improving the makeup of the Science Advisory Board and its subpanels.

The bill reinforces peer review requirements and reduces conflicts of interest. It provides opportunities for the dissenting panelists to make their views known and requires communication of uncertainties and scientific findings and conclusions.

The Science Advisory Board Reform Act promotes fairness, transparency, and independence to ensure unbiased scientific advice. Surely, that is something that we could ask for the American people. Surely, that is something

that the opposition could support. In fact, surely, that is something that the White House would support.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I encourage a ''yea'' vote on this matter, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman CHRIS STEWART, former Chairman of the Science Committee's Environment Subcommittee, for his hard work on this important piece of legislation. H.R. 1422, The Science Advisory Board Reform Act, ensures balanced and transparent review of regulatory science.

Specifically, it strengthens the Board's independence so that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) cannot further its regulatory ambitions under the guise of science.

Costly regulations often lead to a loss of jobs and higher electricity bills and gasoline prices for Americans.

The EPA has an extensive track record of twisting the science to justify their actions. Behind the scenes, however, there is a review process that was intended to provide a critical check on the Agency's conclusions.

The EPA's Science Advisory Board (SAB) was intended to provide a meaningful, balanced, and independent assessment of the science that supports the Agency's regulations. Unfortunately, this vision is not being realized.

The EPA undermines the Board's independence and prevents it from providing advice to Congress. As a result, the valuable advice these experts can provide is wasted.

At a time when the Agency is pursuing the most aggressive regulatory agenda in its 44 year history, it is critical that the Board function as intended.

Despite the existing requirement that EPA's advisory panels be ''fairly balanced in terms of point of view represented,'' the Science Committee has identified a number of problems that undermine the panel's credibility and work product. These include:

A majority of the members of EPA's key advisory panels have received money from the EPA. Often the research they are reviewing is directly related to the money they received. This creates at least the appearance of a conflict of interest.

Many of the panelists have taken very public and even political positions on issues they are advising about. For example, a lead reviewer of EPA's hydraulic fracturing study plan published an anti-fracking article entitled ''Regulate, Baby, Regulate.'' This is clearly not an objective viewpoint.

Public participation is limited during most Board meetings; interested parties have almost no ability to comment on the scope of the work—and meeting records are often kept secret.

The EPA routinely excludes private sector experts while stacking the review panels with individuals who will give the EPA the answer it wants.

H.R. 1422 expands transparency requirements, improves the process for selecting expert advisors, and strengthens public participation requirements.

The bill requires that uncertainties in the Agency's scientific conclusions be communicated and limits the SAB from providing partisan policy advice.

This legislation is pro-science. It restores the SAB as an important defender of scientific integrity. These common sense reforms will make EPA's decisions more credible and balanced.

I thank the gentleman froth Utah, Mr. Stewart for his leadership on this bill and urge my colleagues to support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 1422 is postponed.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1701

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

EPA SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD REFORM ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1422) to amend the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 to provide for Scientific Advisory Board member qualifications, public participation, and for other purposes, will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When proceedings were postponed earlier today, all time for debate on the bill, as amended, had expired.

AMENDMENT PRINTED IN PART A OF HOUSE REPORT 113–626 OFFERED BY MR. STEWART

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 7, through page 9, line 1, redesignate subsections (a) through (e) as subsections (b) through (f), respectively.

Page 3, after line 6, insert the following new subsection:

(a) INDEPENDENT ADVICE.—Section 8(a) of the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 4365(a)) is amended by inserting ''independently'' after ''Advisory Board which shall''.

Page 3, line 14, strike ''in consultation with the Administrator''.

Page 3, lines 18 through 20, strike ''select Board'' and all that follows through ''and shall''.

Page 4, line 18, strike ''and'' and insert ''or''.

Page 5, line 3, insert ''the Interior,'' after ''Energy,''.

Page 5, line 5, strike ''them'' and insert ''each''.

Page 6, line 17, insert ''or draft'' before ''risk''.

Page 6, line 18, strike ''and''.

Page 6, line 19, redesignate subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C).

Page 6, after line 18, insert the following new subparagraph:

(B) by striking ''formal''; and

Page 6, line 19, insert ''or draft'' before ''risk''.

Page 6, line 22, insert ''or draft'' before ''risk''.

Page 7, line 10, insert ''(1)(A)'' after ''(e)'' both places it appears.

Page 7, lines 13, 17, and 19, redesignate paragraphs (1) through (3) as clauses (i) through (iii), respectively, and conform the margins accordingly.

Page 7, lines 22 and 23, strike ''by adding after subsection (g) the following'' and inserting ''by amending subsection (h) to read as follows''.

Page 9, lines 2 and 3, strike ''by adding after subsection (h), as added by subsection (d) of this section, the following'' and inserting ''by amending subsection (i) to read as follows''.

Page 9, line 11, insert ''or Congress'' after ''the Administrator''.

Page 9, line 15, strike ''and the Administrator'' and insert '', the Administrator, and Congress''.

Page 9, line 19, after paragraph (4) insert the following new paragraph:

''(5) The Board shall be fully and timely responsive to Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 756, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, this amendment makes a number of technical and conforming changes to address revisions to the existing statute that occurred with the passage of the farm bill. I am pleased to have worked with Representative DAVIS to strengthen the changes to the statute that he was able to secure in passage of the farm bill.

This amendment is critical to ensure that the underlying bill can be properly applied to existing statute. Just this morning, the legislation received the support of the American Farm Bureau, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

I ask for your support, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my good friend from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

I want to state again that I have appreciated Mr. STEWART's collaboration on bills that have come through the Science Committee in the past, and I definitely appreciate his intent to strengthen and bring more transparency to the Science Advisory Board. However, as explained previously and as I will explain, this bill and this amendment do not accomplish what needs to be done.

Although my friend's amendment seems to make mostly minor and technical corrections, there are a few

changes that raise concern. One consequence of this bill is the expansion of the scope of the Science Advisory Board's work to include risk or hazard assessments proposed by the Agency. Unfortunately, the amendment offered exacerbates this burden and potential delay by adding draft work being done by the Agency to the board's workload.

A letter from several leading environmental groups, including the Natural Resources Defense Council and the Environmental Defense Fund, note that the inclusion of risk and hazard assessments already represents a ''dramatic and unnecessary expansion.''

It would ''increase the burden on the Science Advisory Board and slow the board's ability to complete its tasked objectives.'' Asking the board to constantly peer over the shoulder of the Agency at this stage is an inefficient and ineffective use of the board.

I am also concerned about another part of the amendment that requires the board ''be fully and timely responsive to Congress.'' This seems inconsistent with language in the underlying bill that requires the board to ''avoid making policy determinations or recommendations.''

The amendment appears to put the board in a precarious position, making it vulnerable to political interference and placing a shadow over the independence that we all agree the board should have. The Science Advisory Board can provide Congress and the EPA with important scientific advice, but it should not be beholden to Congress or the EPA Administrator.

Finally, it is clear that this bill would have a serious impact on the membership of the Science Advisory Board in a way that will prohibit qualified scientists from providing their advice to the EPA. Unfortunately, this amendment only deepens that impact by increasing the number of prohibited activities.

If this amendment is adopted, the bill would read:

> Board members may not participate in advisory activities that directly or indirectly involve review or evaluation of their own work.

I want to clearly illustrate what that means. If the EPA were to consider a rule involving gravity, for example, and if Albert Einstein were alive, this bill would prohibit him from offering expert advice, as that is a subject with which he has had ''direct'' involvement.

That is obviously an absurd result that would result in fewer qualified people serving. We should want the smartest and most knowledgeable scientists advising the EPA; instead, this bill prohibits them from doing so.

Again, I have great respect for my friend from Utah. I am proud that we have worked together in the past and hope we can find areas where we agree going forward, both with the remainder of the 113th and in the 114th Congress.

Unfortunately, regardless of what happens with this amendment, I will have to oppose the bill, but I look forward to continuing to work on this issue.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, we have debated these issues throughout the day. I believe that we have made our case. I believe that we have made our case persuasively. I believe our case is complete.

This amendment is technical in nature. I believe that the bill itself is common sense. It will lead to good government. It will lead to better government at least. It will lead to better advice and counsel given to the EPA through these reforms of the Science Advisory Board. I urge all Members to support it. I look forward to the vote.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

The question is on the amendment by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 184, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 523]

YEAS—232

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NAYS—184

Adams
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Moran
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—18

Braley (IA)	Gingrey (GA)	Mullin
Campbell	Gutiérrez	Negrete McLeod
Cassidy	Hall	Smith (NJ)
Chaffetz	Hinojosa	Smith (WA)
Duckworth	LaMalfa	Southerland
Fattah	Moore	Tiberi

□ 1733

Ms. HAHN and Ms. PINGREE of Maine changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 523, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Stated against:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 523, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

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

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Yes, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1422 to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end of the bill the following:

SEC. 5. PROTECTING TAXPAYERS FROM CONFLICTS OF INTEREST BASED ON PERSONAL PROFIT.

No person shall be a member of the Environmental Protection Agency Science Advisory Board if they represent a corporation or a trade association that has a direct or indirect financial interest in the outcome of decisions based on recommendations made by the Board.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill it or send it back to committee. If it is adopted, it will move immediately to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, since 1978, the Environmental Protection Agency's Science Advisory Board has been tasked with external, independent advice on the scientific and technical aspects of environmental issues to help inform environmental decisions, and this commonsense amendment is critical to protecting the integrity of the SAB.

It simply says:

No person shall be a member of the Environmental Protection Agency Science Advisory Board if they represent a corporation or a trade association that has a direct or indirect financial interest in the outcome of decisions based on recommendations made by the board.

My colleagues, a simple notion, a commonsense notion: if someone has a financial interest, they should not serve on the board.

The Science Advisory Board has some of the most distinguished scientists in their fields, folks like Dr. William Schlesinger, from Dutchess County in the Hudson Valley, in my neck of the woods, who has served as a member of the Science Advisory Board. Dr. Schlesinger is a good example of the kind of people we have on this board. He is the president emeritus of the Cary Institute of Ecosystem Studies, an ecological research institute in Millbrook, New York. He has spent 30 years investigating the link between environmental chemistry and global climate change, and his expertise has informed numerous pieces of legislation, such as the Clean Air Act.

America is the world leader in research, with an unprecedented number of scientists like Dr. Schlesinger in academic institutions, not because we politicize science, but because we don't politicize science. Their entire life's work has been devoted to serving the public and to leaving our country a better place. It is why it is imperative that we continue to allow the most knowledgeable scientific and technical experts from our research institutions to serve without conflict, without a paycheck in the offing. So far, scientists on the SAB have been instrumental in creating real reforms to the Clean Air Act, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the Clean Water Act, the Toxic Substances Control Act, and the Safe Drinking Water Act.

Science is not political. We shouldn't fear science, and we shouldn't politicize science. We should not monetize science, and we should not make it political today. We should ban these conflicts and trust in our scientists. We must continue to allow the SAB to implement impartial scientific recommendations, and we simply must prohibit scientists who can profit from decisions from making recommendations as part of the board.

This bill now requires a new disclosure requirement for SAB members, but there is a glaring omission. It fails to effectively prevent persons with key financial conflicts from serving. That is why I urge my colleagues to support my commonsense amendment. We must not allow corporations to influence this process by sending corporation-funded scientists onto the board. We must not allow corporation-funded scientists to drown out genuine scientific debate. My goodness. This amendment would simply ensure that the science board continues its integrity of serving science, not serving itself or any one political agenda.

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

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation, and I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of a point of order is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, the motion to recommit offered by the opposition today is one thing and one thing only, and that is an attempt to stop what is a reasonable and commonsense bill.

I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I was taken aback, but I was not surprised by what I heard during today's debate.

Contrary to what we just heard, no current member of the SAB can be a registered lobbyist. Mr. GRAYSON from Florida offered that as an amendment. We accepted that amendment. It is not a part of this bill. Asking for transparency is not gutting the EPA. Asking for public involvement is not gutting the EPA. You have to twist yourself into a pretzel to object to this bill for anything other than purely partisan reasons.

If 60 percent of the members of the Science Advisory Board are receiving more than $140 million in direct government grants, then let's recognize that, and let's ask for transparency. If public comments are regularly ignored—if they are not even given the least or the barest of consideration—let's be honest, and let's try to fix that. If State, local, and industry experts are precluded from sitting and participating on these boards, then let's open the door for their participation and their experience. They have valuable expertise. We should take advantage of that.

Transparency, public involvement, accountability—those are the only things that we are asking for in this bill. Improving balance and transparency in the EPA is not something that should be controversial. We should be able to agree to a balanced, a fair, and a transparent process.

□ 1745

This bill is supported in its current form by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Farm Bureau—I could go on and on. There are more than 20 organizations that are supporting this bill.

To my fellow Members, there are only two very simple choices to make here: stand up now and vote ''no'' on the motion to recommit and vote ''yes'' on final passage. Let's make the EPA transparent. Let's make them accountable. Let's make them true to the science that they have vowed to defend.

With that, Mr. Speaker, 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

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. 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 195, noes 225, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 524]

AYES—195

Adams
Barber
Barrow (GA)
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Honda
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Peterson
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rahall
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—225

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—14

Campbell
Cassidy
Diaz-Balart
Duckworth
Fattah
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Hall
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Negrete McLeod
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)

□ 1752

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Ms. BONAMICI. 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 229, noes 191, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 525]

AYES—229

Aderholt
Amash
Amodei
Bachmann
Bachus
Barletta
Barr
Barrow (GA)
Barton
Benishek
Bentivolio
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coble
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Conaway
Cook
Cotton
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Daines
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guthrie
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Latham
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matheson
McAllister
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Petri
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Rahall
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stewart
Stockman
Stutzman
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IN)

NOES—191

Adams
Barber
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera (CA)
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gibson

Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Holt
Horsford
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Michaud
Miller, George
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters (CA)
Peters (MI)
Pingree (ME)
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Campbell
Cassidy
Duckworth
Fattah
Hall
Honda
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Negrete McLeod
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Stivers
Young (AK)

□ 1801

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. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 525, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

REMEMBERING FORMER MINNESOTA CONGRESSMAN BILL FRENZEL

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you with the members of the Minnesota House delegation after the sad news reached us that former Congressman Bill Frenzel passed away yesterday. For two decades, Bill Frenzel represented Minnesota's Third Congressional District, epitomizing the very best in public service.

Bill was a visionary and a leader on budget, tax, and trade issues, advocating for new trade agreements to open new markets for American products and services. Just last month, he was given the Order of the Aztec Eagle award from the Mexican Government for his work on the North American Free Trade Agreement. That is the highest award that can be bestowed on a noncitizen.

Bill will be especially remembered, though, for his temperament and kindness that led him to build constructive relationships on both sides of the aisle, a model that we should all continue to work on and reflect in this House. Personally, I will remember him as a great mentor and a friend and for his valuable advice.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that we rise for a moment of silence in the memory of Congressman Bill Frenzel.

CONDEMNING TERRORIST ACTS IN JERUSALEM

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the horrific attacks and murder that happened in Jerusalem today should be condemned by all people of goodwill. Four rabbis were praying in the synagogue, and in marched Palestinian thugs and murderers with meat cleavers and other weapons and horrifically murdered these four people who were in the midst of prayer.

Three of the four people who were killed were American citizens, and our hearts go out to each and every one of their families.

One of the gentlemen who was murdered is the brother-in-law of a prominent rabbi in my district. The rabbi in my district is Rabbi Jonathan Rosenblatt. We learned this morning that his brother-in-law was one of the victims.

Mr. Speaker, I favor a two-state solution in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, but Palestinians must know that they will never have their state on the backs of terror. They will never achieve statehood on the backs of terror. The more they use terror to try to achieve their political aims, the more that it will not happen.

So I take the floor today with all people of goodwill in condemning these horrific murders. Terror has no place. These wanton acts of terror and murder need to be condemned by all people of goodwill. There is no justification whatsoever for these barbarous acts.

IN MEMORY OF RICK RICHARDSON

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great American, a great Georgian, a patriot, and a great personal friend, and that is Rick Richardson, who passed away on November 14 from a sudden stroke.

Rick served the Georgia GOP for 25 years as the president and a national board member of the Georgia State Young Republicans and the Fourth District Republican Party chairman. He had a tremendous impact on his fellow staff members and the chairman of the State party and all 159 counties of Georgia through his humble and hard-working attitude.

Rick was not only the party's go-to guy for history on any level, but a great friend to all who knew him. Rick's father and mother should take great pride in raising a son who touched so many lives and will continue to do so in the days ahead.

In return, Rick, who lost his father at a young age, stayed by his surviving mother, who is 92 years of age, whom he cared for and loved.

Today, may we reflect on Rick's singular character and the tremendous work he did for the State of Georgia, the Republican Party, his family, and for the country. Let us not forget him, a proud son, faithful servant, an example of what it means to be a selfless leader.

IRAN AND THE JOINT PLAN OF ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RICE of South Carolina). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with some other colleagues to talk about the important issue of Iran.

As you may know, on November 24, a mere 6 days from now, the Joint Plan of Action expires. And what that means is that the United States and the other P5+1—and that means the permanent members of the Security Council plus another country, six countries—have been negotiating, with the U.S. taking the lead, with Iran to come to some kind of agreement if perhaps Iran would stop its mad quest to develop weapons of mass destruction.

Many of us are concerned, Mr. Speaker, here in Congress that we may not end up with a very good negotiated settlement. Now, the President has said that it is better to have no deal than to have a bad deal, and Secretary of State John Kerry has said the same thing, and that is exactly what we want to see happen.

I am joined tonight by several colleagues who will be talking about this important issue. So I would like to just move right now and yield to a good friend and colleague, a member of the Armed Services Committee, JACKIE WALORSKI of Indiana.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, with a comprehensive nuclear agreement deadline less than a week away, the need to stop Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon has never been greater. With its thousands of gas centrifuges, Iran now has the capability to enrich uranium to a grade suitable for use in nuclear reactors or to a higher grade suitable for use in nuclear warheads.

Iran is the leading state sponsor of terrorism and continues with heinous human rights abuses, oppressing freedom of speech, religion, and press, and more. Additionally, Iran continues to oppose our national security interests

and those of our key allies while oppressing their own people.

There is no question that a nuclear-armed Iran would dramatically change the balance of power in the Middle East and threaten freedom and peace for the rest of the world. It could also encourage other Middle Eastern nations to develop nuclear weapons on their own, further reducing our influence in that critical region of the world.

For us to be able to trust Iran, along with the rest of the international community, Iran must change their behavior. A real possibility exists that a deadline extension provides them with an opportunity to build a nuclear bomb. In light of this, the only real solution is to force Iran to make serious concessions and robust sanctions.

We must be especially careful about any decisions to lift or ease sanctions. Once lifted, sanctions cannot easily be restored. The risk of a miscalculation or a misstep in the weeks and months ahead is very real and grave, and the threat of nuclear war is catastrophic. If there is to be any hope of reaching a peaceful deal, and if Iran wants prosperity and success for its people, it must cooperate with the IAEA, stop its pursuit of a nuclear weapon, stop its sponsorship of terrorism, and stop its human rights abuses.

Mr. LAMBORN. I would like to ask the gentlelady, you mentioned an important point. You talked about what would happen if Iran did, God forbid, achieve the ability to have a nuclear bomb.

What would other countries in the region do? What are some of the countries you feel would be compelled to have their own version of a nuclear weapon?

□ 1815

Mrs. WALORSKI. I appreciate the question from my friend from Colorado. I think that as we have served together in many of the committees, especially the Armed Services Committee, and we have looked at the map of that area, knowing that if the door is open to Iran, every single other country in the Middle East that does not have a nuclear weapon will aspire to do so. And let's not forget that in the middle of all of this chaos that is being created by Iran, and unlimited ways that cannot be verified of what they are doing because there is no cooperation whatsoever, let's not forget that our one and only ally that is sitting over there in the Middle East, they just had another terrorist episode of rabbis and American citizens killed. Worshipping in a synagogue is their first target. We know from all of the work that we have done in the committee during this Congress that the United States of America is their target as well.

So I thank the gentleman for yielding, and for the question.

Mr. LAMBORN. I appreciate that, and I think we would agree that of the other countries in the region almost without a doubt Saudi Arabia would want its own bomb.

Mrs. WALORSKI. For sure.

Mr. LAMBORN. Egypt would want its own bomb. Turkey would want its own bomb. And others. Others would aspire, but they would have the money and possibly the technology to actually achieve that, or buy it from another country.

Mrs. WALORSKI. True. And let's not forget, given the culture right now in the Middle East and given what we are looking at right now with all of the other instability, with ISIL, with questions from this administration, with a strength-through-peace policy a long grasp away, and let's not forget that we have heard time and time again over just the few years that I have been in Congress, from our friends and our allies who no longer trust us—and we know that our enemies no longer fear us—that if we open that door to a nuclear Iran, we will never get back the threat of a nuclear bomb. I appreciate the question.

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to invite another Member to speak. RON DESANTIS represents part of the State of Florida, and I am privileged to call him a colleague and a friend. I now yield to Mr. DESANTIS.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, Iran is a totalitarian Islamic state, a state that has been at war with our country since the Iranian revolution in 1979. They chant ''death to America'' and consider the United States to be the Great Satan. And they have acted on their anti-American beliefs throughout the years.

The revolution was founded, and Iran proceeded to hold more than 50 American Embassy personnel hostage for over 400 days, and they commandeered our embassy, which is itself an act of war. Iran sponsored the massacre of 241 U.S. Marines at the Marine Corps barracks in Beirut in 1983 through their proxy Hezbollah. Iran supported the bombing of the Khobar Towers in 1996 which killed 19 United States Air Force personnel and wounded 372 more. During combat operations in Iraq, from particularly 2006 through 2008, Iranian-backed terror groups killed hundreds of U.S. servicemembers, often via deadly EFP attacks.

Iran is the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, and they have been so for an awful long time. And yet, and this is very troubling to myself and certainly to many of my colleagues, the President of the United States recently saw fit to write a secret letter to the Ayatollah Khamenei to stress U.S.-Iran ''shared interest'' in battling the Islamic State. The idea that defeating a terrorist group requires enlisting the support of the leading state sponsor of terrorism is a complete nonstarter. It is naive, and it is also dangerous.

Now, in exchange for Iran's support supposedly against fighting ISIS fighters, will the President in exchange make concessions regarding Iran's nuclear program? Will he green-light a right for Iran to enrich uranium for ''peaceful purposes''?

I fear we are heading toward a potentially catastrophic outcome if we pursue this course of action. One, we know that Iran cannot be trusted to have any capabilities that could lead to nuclear weapons. They will not honor their agreements. We cannot even verify all of the facilities that they have, and consistently we have never been able to do that.

So I think Iran will likely only strike a deal in which they can cheat and in which they will develop a nuclear weapon. And, of course, that would be a disaster not only for the region but for the world.

The other possibility alongside that, if you are looking to Iran to help fight terrorism, which is incredible, even if you are successful at defeating ISIS by helping Iran, Iran is going to fill that vacuum. You are going to see a Shia Crescent from the Iran-Afghanistan border to the Mediterranean Sea. Iraq will be an Iranian puppet state. I know they had a lot of influence even before ISIS arrived on the scene, but this will dramatically increase their influence. And, of course, they have reliable proxies in Lebanon, Hezbollah, and they are one of the leading supporters of Hamas in the Gaza Strip.

So we need to fight the Islamic State, don't get me wrong, but our policies should seek to weaken the Sunni extremism that is represented by the Islamic State and ISIS fighters, and we also want to weaken Iran and make Iran less powerful throughout the region. I think the Congress here, we can't allow the President to give away the store in a deal that he says he is not even willing to submit to the Congress for approval.

Now we know that HARRY REID will not allow a vote on increased sanctions against Iran. That means one of the first orders of business of the new Congress in January, a Congress in which REID will be demoted to minority leader, will be to consider and vote on enacting tough new sanctions against the Iranian regime. I think the flaw in this whole process has been as the sanctions started to bite, the administration relaxed the sanctions, gave the Iranian regime a lifeline, and we have been kind of playing this song and dance ever since then.

I think me and many of my colleagues here believe that would have been the time to increase sanctions, make them tougher because ultimately Iran is going to respond to strength and to firmness. So this is no time to stand idly by. We in Congress cannot allow a bad deal to take root that clears the way for Iran to develop nuclear weapons. And let's just be clear: we do not share any interests with Iran's terror state. They are an enemy of our country, and they should be treated as such.

I would say to my friend from Colorado that I appreciate you organizing this tonight. I know that we voted long ago to hold Iran accountable here in the House, and it hasn't gone anywhere in the Senate. It almost seems as if it has kind of fallen off the radar screen a little bit here in the Congress. It is important to get this back on the front burner. I think that under no circumstances can we just sit here and allow the President to strike a deal which gives Iran too many concessions, and then have him just go around Congress and Congress not have any say in it at all.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman what would happen over in the Senate if HARRY REID were to allow for a vote on, let's say, the Menendez-Kirk language on tougher sanctions if Iran leaves the negotiating table?

Mr. DESANTIS. Well, I think that not only would it pass the Senate—and we already know in the House it is a clear veto-proof majority here—I believe we would see a veto-proof majority. And not just the bare 67 for that, I think you would see over 70 Senators vote for that.

And that is why it is important for us to make our voice heard because look, the President is the President. He has certain foreign policy prerogatives, but he is way out of step with the American people and with the Congress on this issue. And I think this has gone on long enough. I think we need to make our voice heard.

Mr. LAMBORN. It is interesting, it was tough sanctions that brought Iran to the negotiating table in the first place. Now the administration had to be drug kicking and screaming to have tougher sanctions that Congress initiated and pushed for. They ultimately relented and enforced those, and I approve of that. But it was not their initiative. It was Congress's initiative.

Today, as you just said, RON, Congress is pushing once again, and the administration for some reason is digging in its heels, and yet tougher sanctions is what brought Iran to the table. If Iran is serious about having a deal, what is wrong with saying if it falls apart we will reimpose tougher sanctions, but if you do do an acceptable deal, nothing happens along those lines?

Mr. DESANTIS. Well, part of the problem I see is they have delayed these deadlines. I think on November 20, they may delay it further. To me, that may just be a ruse for Iran to be buying time because ultimately time will be on their side. If they are getting relief from the sanctions, they can then pursue their objectives as they see them. I think it is important that we not allow this to just keep going on. If there is no deal to be had, then let's act and let's hold Iran accountable immediately.

Mr. LAMBORN. Well, I appreciate your comments and thank you for saying that. Also, let me ask you one further question. You talked about Iran as a state sponsor of terrorism and you touched on the fact that they contributed to the death of some of our finest young men and women in this country who died in Iraq. Can you elaborate on that?

Mr. DESANTIS. Yes, absolutely. I think a lot of people know there were a lot of tough years in Iraq, particularly after the overthrow of Saddam Hussein. You had a massive insurgency. That initial insurgency in 2004 in places like Fallujah that reared again in 2005, 2006, and 2007 and was finally defeated by the surge was primarily a Sunni insurgency, and so that is what a lot of Americans think about when they think about what is going on in Iraq. And no doubt, that was huge fighting. We lost very good men and women in that. Eventually we were able to defeat AQI, I might add, in 2007–2008.

In the Baghdad area and some of the parts of southern Iraq where it is overwhelmingly Shia, the groups that would rise up against the United States would be the Shiite militia groups, which are backed and funded by the Iranian regime. In fact, Iran's Quds force of the Revolutionary Guard Corps, that is a designated terrorist organization. Quds force was involved in Iraq. They were known for doing—and we know about the IED attacks, roadside bombs, those were very serious. They did EFP attacks, which are explosively formed penetrators, and kind of the scuttle you would hear in Iraq was that no one wants to get hit by an IED, obviously, but a lot of people could survive that. If you got hit by an EFP, it would blow everything to smithereens. So these were deadly attacks, and you are talking about hundreds and hundreds of U.S. servicemembers, and it was Iran who was funding that, orchestrating that.

And even now today in Iraq, you have Quds forces in Baghdad. Some of these Shiite militias that are fighting ISIS are backed by Iran. I remember Prime Minister Netanyahu made this point several months ago, and he knows the region obviously as well as anybody because he has got to. When you see these Iranian-backed terror groups, and then you see Sunni terror groups like those represented by ISIS, you don't want to pick a side there; you want both of them to eventually fail.

So that strategy in order to make that succeed is going to be different than the President writing a letter to the Ayatollah asking to ally against ISIS. We have no interest with Iran. The idea that we are going to align with them, align with them for what? You fight one terrorist group to reward a state sponsor of terror? That just doesn't make sense, and I think it is dangerous when coupled with what is going on with the nuclear negotiations. There is really potential to have some serious policy miscalculations here that will be detrimental to our national security and to our allies' national security.

Mr. LAMBORN. Thank you so much for your remarks. You have helped enlighten everybody on how important it is that we not have a bad deal with Iran. The President has said that no deal is better than a bad deal, and yet I am afraid that is what we are tiptoeing to. And in 6 days, if we don't have a deal, I have no doubt that there will be a request for an extension of time. But I haven't seen up to now, and there are only 6 days left, that this joint plan of action has materialized, has produced any kind of solid deal, and that is very troubling.

Representative DESANTIS made a good point about Iran as a state sponsor of terrorism, in fact, the leading worldwide state sponsor of terrorism. That is very troubling. For that reason Congress in the past and the Security Council have said, Iran, you must stop your state sponsor of terrorism. Both the Security Council of the United Nations and Congress have said that you need to stop your ballistic missile program.

□ 1830

Also the Security Council and Congress have said, ''You need to stop your nuclear enrichment program.'' Those three elements are not something that are snatched out of thin air. They have a history. There is a reason why those three things are so troubling to Congress and to the Security Council of the United Nations.

For that reason, I offered an amendment during the discussion of the National Defense Authorization Act on the floor here in the House this summer saying that those three elements need to be part of a comprehensive agreement with Iran. The House went along with that, totally agreed with that.

I want the Senate to act on the NDAA. I hope that they can adopt that same language because, once again—and I will just repeat—that is language that has already been agreed to by the House, by the Senate, by Congress, as well as by the Security Council of the UN.

I want to see, in 6 days, an agreement with Iran where those three elements are dominant, where we have stopping of their nuclear enrichment, stopping of their ballistic missile program, and stopping their state sponsor of terrorism. Anything short of that is going to be very troubling, Mr. Speaker.

I am concerned that we may have an administration that does not enforce those three vital elements of a deal, but they need to be part of a deal.

Our hearts really go out to the families of those who were killed in that sad and tragic terrorist attack in Jerusalem earlier today. It just shows that the Middle East is a very troubled place. There are those who do not want peace, and they will resort to violence and death and destruction. That is a very sad and tragic thing.

When we look at Iran—and we know that Iran wants to destroy Israel—and

yet Israel is only the Little Satan, the United States is the Great Satan—so when we look at containing Iran, it is not just to protect Israel—although that is important and vital as far as it goes—but also Iran is a threat to Europe, to the United States, to the whole Western World.

Iran has a set of values, at least up until today, where they call Israel the Little Satan and the U.S. the Great Satan.

Just recently, the President of Iran came out with a plan how he would go about destroying Israel. This kind of rhetoric is just unacceptable and tragic. I find it very hard, Mr. Speaker, to trust Iran with a negotiated agreement that doesn't have those verified elements, those three vital elements: stopping their nuclear enrichment, stopping their ballistic missile development, and stopping the state sponsorship of terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, if we don't have a good agreement in 6 days, I am just afraid that we need to reimpose the strong sanctions that brought Iran to the negotiating table in the first place. I know that if the majority leader of the Senate who will be in office for the next 6 weeks or so—HARRY REID—if he were to allow a vote of the Senate, there is no doubt they would agree to stronger sanction language.

The Kirk-Menendez language would do just that. The House previously had passed almost identical language establishing the same doctrine, that if Iran leaves the negotiating table and does not have an acceptable deal with the U.S. and the rest of the P5+1, that we will reimpose tough sanctions.

That obviously was having an effect because that brought them to the negotiating table. We need to have tough sanctions waiting in the wings, waiting in reserve, if Iran does not do the right thing.

I don't understand why the administration is fighting and resisting a vote in the Senate and saying that that will somehow offend or humiliate or drive away the Iranians. It is what brought them to the negotiating table in the first place. They understand strength and force.

Mr. Speaker, there are some people in some countries in this world that view weakness as provocative and they move in and take advantage of that. Iran is one of those countries, history has shown.

If we show strength and resolve and decisiveness to them, then they are more likely to respond in the right way. If we show weakness, then they are more likely to take advantage of that. I think we show strength to Iran during this time of negotiation—we have 6 more days before the deadline—by making a statement that, ''Hey, if you don't back off, then we are going to reimpose these tough sanctions, sanctions that have bite to them.'' That is what brought them to the negotiating table, and it has to be part of what we do going forward.

Mr. Speaker, it is just really important that we show strength to Iran, and we only have 6 days left. We don't want a bad deal, no deal is better than a bad deal, but I am very apprehensive. You have heard from others as well. Up until now, the prognosis hasn't been good. We haven't heard of breakthroughs or concessions in the negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, with those things in mind, I think that we just need to urge the administration to show resolve, to show strength, to allow Congress, especially the Senate which hasn't yet taken a position because they have been denied the ability to vote, although we have done it here in the House, to say, ''Iran, you have to come back to the table and have a serious negotiation where you do agree to stop enrichment, stop ballistic missile production, and stop state sponsorship of terrorism, and if you don't do those things, we will have tougher sanctions come back in force.''

We shouldn't deny the Senate that chance for a vote. We should allow them to have that vote. We have taken that position here in the House. It is the right position.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank my colleagues for this time that we have had. We are going to be watching for the next 6 days. I think that it is one of the most vital issues that is hanging out there in world politics today. It affects Israel, but it affects even so much more.

I think the Western World will be totally affected in a negative way if Iran doesn't come clean and have a concession on nuclear enrichment, on state sponsorship of terrorism, and on ballistic missiles.

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

A ROADMAP FOR PROSPERITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE) for 30 minutes.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am here to talk about a roadmap for prosperity of this country.

I think the elections last week, in large part, didn't deal as much with Republicans and Democrats as it dealt with a frustration over the lagging lack of prosperity this country has experienced for the last 7 years. I think that there are ways to solve that, that are complicated, but there is a pathway that we can pursue that involves a lot of common sense.

If you will look at these charts that I have here, Mr. Speaker, what I have here with this blue line that goes up until 2007 and trends down thereafter is median household income. You can see, Mr. Speaker, it drops from a peak of $56,000 annually in 2007 down to just over $51,000 today, a drop of over 10 percent for the median American family.

Mr. Speaker, at the same time, this red line represents the cost that these families incur. The red line actually is food cost. You can see that they have risen from an inflation-adjusted basis of 190 to 240, almost 20 percent, Mr. Speaker. At the same time their incomes have declined over 10 percent, their costs for food have gone up over 20 percent.

Then the bottom graph here represents their cost for fuel and utilities, and you can see here that they have risen almost 20 percent as well.

My belief, Mr. Speaker, is that the cause of the decline in the income, as well as the cause of the rise in the cost in fuels and food, is largely from policies that come out of Washington. These are not things that are beyond repair. These are things that we can fix, so what we have to do is lay out a roadmap, a plan, to restore the prosperity that we have enjoyed for over 200 years.

Mr. Speaker, before I forget, I want to credit my good friend, Professor Michael Porter from Harvard, with a lot of these slides that I am using because I am stealing a lot of those from him, but this chart here, Mr. Speaker, is a breakdown of jobs in the American economy.

The red at the bottom is jobs that we have to compete with, with the rest of the world, manufacturing jobs, for example, that can be done anywhere in the world. The top part is jobs that serve local markets, things like health care that have to be delivered here, things like services, like, for example, real estate or tourism services, things that have to be delivered here.

This chart begins at 1998, but you can actually go back even further, and what you would see is in the area of service jobs, things that have to be handled locally, the number of jobs has risen. It certainly dipped around 2007, but it is coming back up.

But in the areas of what we call tradeable jobs, jobs that can be done anywhere in the world, the number of Americans working in those jobs has declined in this chart over the last 16 years, but you could go back even further, a very disturbing trend.

Now, why is that occurring? Why is it that tradeable jobs have left our shores and continue to leave our shores? Mr. Speaker, why is it that we continue to read in the newspapers every month about another American iconic company like Pfizer or like Burger King moving their headquarters out of our country?

□ 1845

Well, there are a number of reasons for that, and the most obvious reason is because we have the highest corporate tax rate in the world. If they want to be an American company, they have to pay extra for that.

This chart at the top represents the corporate tax rates of the OECD countries, and you can see the red line at the end represents America. The average rate is 25½ percent, and we are at 39 percent.

When the President says things, Mr. Speaker, like, ''Our American companies should be willing to pay the highest tax rate in the world to be patriotic,'' he is missing some real important points.

One is that any company, American or otherwise, doing business in America will pay American tax rates on the profits they earn in our country, but these iconic American companies that are leaving our shores have to compete worldwide, and competition is tooth and nail, and only the strongest competitor will survive.

Mr. Speaker, if you have an iconic American company that has to pay taxes at 39 percent here in this country competing on the same product line with a company that has to pay 15 percent in Ireland or in Canada, in the end, which company will survive? You see, Mr. Speaker, it is not about patriotism. That is nonsense. It is about survival.

Mr. Speaker, how do we end this cycle? How do we convince our iconic American companies, our large employers, to stay in this country and to convince those that have left our country to come back?

Before I came here, I had one other elected office. I was a tax attorney and a CPA for 25 years, and I helped companies structure their business in the smartest way for taxes, for regulatory purposes, and to make a profit.

Once I retired from that, I ran for one other office, and that was as the chairman of Horry County Council in Horry County, South Carolina, where Myrtle Beach is.

Horry County had a problem because most all of its job creation was in the tourism industry, and the tourism industry is great, but it produces an inordinate amount of seasonal jobs and jobs with relatively low pay. They needed to diversify their industry, and many other counties in the State were doing a better job of it.

Once I became chairman of the county council, I started to look at why that was and what we needed to do, and it was obvious that we had many, many assets. The problem was we weren't even in the game. We weren't even trying to compete.

Once we laid out a roadmap to enter the competition to attract industry and jobs, it didn't take very long. Companies responded quickly. Thousands of jobs had been created. All we had to do was enter the competition.

Counties across this country compete with other counties for jobs. States across this country compete with other States for jobs, States like Texas, which has done a fantastic job. South Carolina has done a fantastic job of creating a favorable business tax environment, favorable regulatory environment, and has done tort reform, and lo and behold, companies come.

Company after company after company leave States like California or Washington State and come to States like Texas or South Carolina, and you can see the result in South Carolina with BMW, Amazon, Boeing, Michelin, Continental, and on and on and on. All they had to do was decide to compete, and industry responded.

You see, before I became chairman of the county council in Horry County, the attitude there was that we were the leader in tourism, and they are great at tourism. We are big, and we have a lot of advantages, and we really don't need to compete for business. But guess what, it wasn't working.

Once we changed our attitude, people responded quickly, and I believe the attitude here in Washington is the same. Look, we are big. We don't have the biggest economy in the world anymore. China overtook us. We have one of the biggest economies in the world. We have great capital markets. We have great consumer markets.

We don't have to try to compete. Business is going to come anyway. But guess what, just like in Horry County, it is not working in the country either, and if we simply decide to compete for industry, with all of the advantages that we have, I believe no one can stop us.

My friend Michael Porter is, as I said, an economics professor at Harvard Business School. He has been there for decades. He has written multiple books on competitive theory. He has come here to Congress with me, and we scheduled seminars with Congressmen from both sides of the aisle to talk about what this country needs to do to be competitive. We have been in front of over 100 Congressmen, and this is the roadmap that he lays out. I am not going to claim authorship. This is the roadmap that he lays out.

His book is, ''On Competition,'' by Michael Porter. It is one of many. Michael Porter sits on the board of public companies. He represents countries around the world. He has written this roadmap for the United States. If we will adopt the attitude that we are going to be competitive in the world, we can expect to see American companies coming back, more foreign investment in the United States, and millions and millions of American jobs created and our economy lifted from its meager growth to above trend and restore our American prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at these things one by one. One of them is lowering the corporate tax rate, and as I pointed out earlier, this one is common sense. We have the highest corporate tax rate in the world. Does that mean that we have to collect less revenue? No.

Our corporate Tax Code is incredibly complex. It is filled with deductions and credits, many of which make sense but others that don't. It needs to be cleaned up. DAVE CAMP and the House Ways and Means Committee put out a proposal to do it last year.

I agree with, by far, the bulk of it. The House needs to take it up—or something like it—and we need to get it over to the Senate, and we need to get corporate tax reform. The President agrees we need corporate tax reform, but the President thinks we need to raise revenue.

The goal here, Mr. Speaker, is not to increase taxes. The goal here is to make our country more competitive. Why? Because then we will have more business and we will have more jobs and we will raise revenue that way, rather than by raising taxes. If we boost our economy, the revenue will come.

The second item on this menu, Mr. Speaker, is taxing overseas profits earned by American companies only where they are earned. We are the only remaining OECD country with a global tax system. Everywhere else, they pay taxes where they earned the money, and they can bring the money home without paying taxes.

But here in America, our multinational companies—companies like GE, GM, and every alphabet soup company that you can name—if they earn profits overseas and they pay taxes at the lower rate over there, they know if they ever bring that money back to the United States, they have to pay it at 39 percent.

So what do they do? They park that money overseas. It is only common sense. They are competing tooth and nail worldwide. To make any other choice puts them at a huge disadvantage.

So let's say we have an American company that has a billion dollars in profits in India and they need to build a factory and are looking for where to build that billion dollar factory. Do you think they are going to bring that money back and pay 40 percent taxes in the United States to build that factory? No.

What they are going to do is build that factory in India and employ a thousand people there instead of employing a thousand Americans, so we need to change our global tax system.

We need to ease the immigration of highly-skilled immigrants. Mr. Speaker, I am for comprehensive immigration reform, but I am not for the kind of immigration reform the President is talking about.

Mr. Speaker, we have the most liberal legal immigration system in the world. We allow 1.2 million legal immigrants every year. The problem with our system is that most every OECD country that has looked at this has decided they are going to use immigration as a mechanism to be more competitive. Other countries are already working on this.

So what they do is they say, ''Okay. You can immigrate into our country if you have a skill that we need. They allow people with high skill sets and high education to come to the front of the line to immigrate.''

Our immigration system is exactly the reverse. It is completely counterintuitive. Sixty-five percent of the immigration that we allow is not based on skill set but based on family relationship.

Only 12 percent of our immigration is based on skill set, and what is the result? The result of that, as I have read, is that as many as 42 percent of the new applications for Medicaid come from immigrants. At a disproportionately large amount, legal immigrants rely on our social safety net, and that makes us less rather than more competitive.

We need comprehensive immigration reform, but what that means to me is that we need to base our immigration largely on skill set. I am not saying eliminate immigration based on family relationship, but I am saying make that a much smaller piece of the pie.

Another problem with our immigration system is with our student visa program. We have the best universities in the world. People come from all over. In fact, I think I read yesterday that there were a record number of foreign students in American universities.

So the problem is when they get their degree and after their student visa expires, under our immigration system, we require that they go back to their home country. We prevent them from staying here.

They have to go back to their home country for a period of years before they can even apply to come back to the United States. We have given them the best education in the world, and we force them out of this country.

So what does that mean, practically? Let's say we have a gentleman from China who gets an engineering degree from MIT and has the best idea in the world to manufacture whatever it might be, but he can't stay here and do that. He can't even apply.

He has to go back home and do his initial public offering and build his plant there and employ thousands of people there, rather than using the education that our American universities gave him to create thousands of jobs here in this country.

There are so many things about our immigration system and there are so many things about so many areas of Federal law that are clearly counterintuitive. They are exactly the opposite of what they need to be to make this country competitive.

Next, we have addressing distortions and abuses in our trading system. I am not going to spend a whole lot of time on this, but let me just say that, at one time, we were so advanced, we were so competitive, we were so much far ahead of the rest of the world, that we could adopt trading plans that weren't necessarily to our benefit.

We can't afford to do that anymore. We need to have free trade. We need to have fair trade.

□ 1900

Improving American logistics, communications and energy infrastructure. Everybody knows we need infrastructure to be competitive. We do so many things to hold ourselves up: roads, bridges, pipelines, and everything else. Federal regulation drags out projects for not just years—decades—and drives up cost.

When the Port of Miami has been working on trying to get their environmental permit to deepen their port to 50 feet for post-Panamax ships for over a decade; when the Port of Charleston, in my home State of South Carolina, has been under study for 4 years to determine whether they can go from 46 feet to 52 feet so that they can take these post-Panama Canal ships, and they are hoping that they get that port deepened by the year 2020, in the end everybody knows that port is going to get done. In the end, there will be little or no environmental damage, and what there is will be mitigated, but it is going to take a decade of wrangling to get to where we can deepen our port.

Let me tell you how important that is. Right now, I think one in five families' incomes in South Carolina are related to the use of that port. Companies in South Carolina, shipping or importing or exporting, it takes $3,000 to ship a container from the Port of Charleston to Shanghai on ships as they exist today. When the Panama Canal opens and the new ships come through, that will drop the cost of transportation by 20 to 30 percent. So instead of it costing $3,000 to ship a container from Charleston to Shanghai, it will cost $2,200.

If an importer or exporter in South Carolina or in the Southeast doesn't have access to one of those ports, they start out $800 per container behind the rest of the world. So there are only two of those ports that can take these ships right now on the east coast: Norfolk and Baltimore. If a manufacturer or an importer or an exporter is looking to where they are going to locate their business, do you think they are going to locate in a place that they are going to start out $800 per container behind the rest of the world?

And it is going to take us till 2020 to get approvals to get this port deepened?

So many of these environmental rules are just mechanisms to delay progress. In the end, we know this port is going to get done. Let's get busy and dig this port, and then we can talk about what we need to do to mitigate. But why are we going to hold it up for a decade and put my home State and this country at another competitive disadvantage?

We need to work on infrastructure. We need to find a way to get the highway trust fund funded. We need to eliminate a lot of the uncertainty. So many of these problems that are listed here, because they haven't been solved, they create so much uncertainty in the economy. It makes it very difficult for businesses to invest.

The Federal Government is an incredibly complex organization, yet it hasn't had a budget in 5 years until last year—not even a budget, not even for a year. Any complex organization, to make rational decisions, has to have long-term planning, and we can't even do a budget for a year.

We continually kick the can down the road, things likes the highway trust fund, things like the SGR, the doc fix. The Federal Government has got to resolve these things, remove these uncertainties so that people know how to plan and invest.

I skipped over one here: responsible development of our oil and gas reserves. The administration has thrown up every roadblock that you could throw up to development of our reserves. We have had the largest oil and gas boom in history in the last 6 years.

Eight years ago, when President Bush was in, they were talking about something called peak oil theory, where they said we had already discovered all of the recoverable oil and it was going to get lower and lower, and it was going to be harder and harder to recover and that we were at our finite limits.

That shows you how wrong science can be, because in the last 5 years we have had the largest oil boom in history right here in the United States. Yet, at the same time, the day that President Obama was sworn in, gas was $1.80 a gallon. Google it. It went up as high as $3.75 a gallon just a few months ago, and it has been gradually backing down because, despite all of the roadblocks and all of the burdens that we have placed on developing this oil, private industry is figuring out how to get it done. We won't let them build pipelines, so they put it on rail. We try to regulate them out of the rail business, and they figure out a way around that.

The administration is using executive orders to broaden the clean air rules and the Clean Water Act to do everything they can to prevent the development of these oil and gas reserves, and the result of that is that the price of fuel is artificially high because they want us off of these fossil fuels and they want us on alternative energy.

You know what? So do I. But I want it when the technology can deliver it at a competitive price. I don't want to artificially inflate the cost of fossil fuels simply to force us on to alternative energy, because, you see, cheap, reliable energy is another factor that makes us competitive.

How does it make us competitive? Well, number one, it lowers the cost of a company doing business in the United States if they have cheap, reliable energy. That is obvious.

But another problem is we do have the largest consumer market in the world. Two-thirds of our economy is based on consumer spending. And when you have declining income, what does that do to consumer spending? Obviously, it goes down. When you have increasing expenses for fuel and home utilities, with the war on coal, that affects the cost of food, so all these things rise. That takes money out of the consumers' pockets when they already have declining income.

What do you think that does to our economy? What do you think that does to our competitiveness?

So we need low-cost energy because, A, it makes it cheaper for companies to do business here and will bring jobs here, but it also puts more money in consumers' pockets.

When the President was first elected, he said we need a stimulus program, and he put in something called a payroll tax holiday that gave everybody, the average working man, $90 a month more in his pocket. But at the same time, with his policies for energy, with the war on coal taking our coal plants offline, that increases the cost to the average consumer by about $40 per household a month.

If putting $90 a month in his pocket is stimulus, what does taking $40 a month out of his pocket do? That is ''de-stimulus.''

Then when his policies forced up the price of gasoline from a $1.80 a gallon—it was $3.80 a gallon; now it is $2.80 or $3—every dollar a gallon costs the average consumer another $90 a month. Now the payroll tax holiday is gone. Instead of putting $90 a month in the consumers' pocket to stimulate the economy, we are taking $200 a month out of their pocket. What does that do to the economy?

This one is a no-brainer. We need to do everything we can to responsibly develop our fuel reserves; and we need low-cost, reliable energy in this country to, A, encourage companies to come here for the low energy cost and, B, to put more money in consumers' pockets to stimulate our economy.

The last thing on this list is create a sustainable Federal budget, including entitlement reform. I will run through this, but I am about out of time.

Entitlements are on a collision course with bankruptcy. Nobody who understands it will argue that point. These things have got to be done. They create so much uncertainty. They create instability in our economy, and they are nothing but future taxes.

The House Budget Committee, of which I am a member, has put out a budget that would balance in 10 years. For the last 2 years in a row that I have been in the Congress, and I believe 2 years before that, they have not even been taken up by the Senate. We need to put our budget on a path to balancing. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office agrees and says that where we are is unsustainable.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for your patience with me. Thank you for allowing me to lay out my road map. I hope that the Republicans and the Democrats and everybody will consider this as a pathway to a prosperous future.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FATTAH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1086. An Act to reauthorize and improve the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on November 17, 2014, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 1233. To amend chapter 22 of title 44, United States Code, popularly known as the Presidential Records Act, to establish procedures for the consideration of claims of constitutionally based privilege against disclosure of Presidential records, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4194. To provide for the elimination or modification of Federal reporting requirements.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 19, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7739. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Jan-Marc Jouas, United States Air Force, and his advancement on the retired list to the grade of lieutenant general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7740. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b) FM Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (McCall, Idaho) [MB Docket No.: 14-69] [RM-11716] received October 9, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7741. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination pursuant to Section 552(c)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act to provide commodities and services for immediate assistance to Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7742. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Memorandum of Justification for a drawdown under section 506(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to provide assistance to Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7743. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-462, ''License to Carry a Pistol Temporary Amendment Act of 2014''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7744. A letter from the Acting Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, ''District of Columbia Public Schools' Budget Development and Execution Processes Were Not Sufficient to Avoid Divisional Over- and Under-Spending''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7745. A letter from the Acting Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, ''Improved Oversight of the UDC Land Grant Endowment Fund is Required''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7746. A letter from the Acting Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, ''District Special Events Processes Can Be Improved''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7747. A letter from the Acting Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, ''Metropolitan Police Department First Amendment Investigations Complied with District Law in 2013''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7748. A letter from the Acting Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, ''Certification of Revised Fiscal Year 2014 Total Local Source General Fund Revenues (Net of Dedicated Taxes) in Support of the District's Issuance of General Obligation Bonds (Series 2014A and 2014B)''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7749. A letter from the Clerk, Court of Appeals, transmitting an opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, United States of America v. P.H. Glatfelter Company and NCR Corporation, No. 13-2436 & 13-2441, (September 25, 2014); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7750. A letter from the Federal Liaison Officer, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Renaming of Express Mail to Priority Mail Express [Docket No.: PTO-P-2014-0045] (RIN: 0651-AC98) received October 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7751. A letter from the Manager, EP Rulings and Agreements, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Update for Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2014-62] received October 20, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7752. A letter from the Administrator, TSA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Administration's certification that the level of screening services and protection provided at Roswell International Air Center (ROW) will be equal to or greater than the level that would be provided at the airport by TSA Transportation Security Officers; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

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. LAMBORN:

H.R. 5727. A bill to require certifications by prospective contractors with the United States Government that they are not boycotting persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WALDEN, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 5728. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 and title 17, United States Code, to extend expiring provisions relating to the retransmission of signals of television broadcast stations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN):

H.R. 5729. A bill to expand the program of priority review to encourage treatments for tropical diseases; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 5730. A bill to make nine month foreclosure and eviction protections for servicemembers permanent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 5731. A bill to extend foreclosure and eviction protections for servicemembers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself and Mr. ROSKAM):

H.R. 5732. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to crack down on fraud in the Medicare program to protect seniors, people with disabilities, and taxpayers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 5733. A bill to require the Director of the Congressional Budget Office to calculate a carbon score for each bill or resolution; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, 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. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 5734. A bill to achieve a lasting peace in the Middle East and improve the economic situation for its people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 5735. A bill to facilitate the expedited review of applications of aliens applying for admission to the United States under section 101(a)(15)(J) who are coming to the United States to participate in a program under which they will receive graduate medical education or training; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5736. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation located in Bethel, Alaska; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois:

H. Res. 758. A resolution strongly condemning the actions of the Russian Federation, under President Vladimir Putin, which has carried out a policy of aggression against neighboring countries aimed at political and economic domination; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

320. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to House Joint Resolution 26, urging Congress to provide a means for consistently and equitably sharing with all oil and gas producing states a portion of revenue generated from oil and gas development on the outer continental shelf; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

321. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 22, requesting the Congress of the United States to call a convention of the states to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

322. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to House Joint Resolution 25, urging Congress to restore the presumption of a service connection for Agent Orange exposure to United States Veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

323. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 24, relating to certain holiday practices at federal Veterans Health Administration facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

324. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to House Joint Resolution 20, urging the President of the United States and the Congress to repeal the excise tax on medical devices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

325. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 15, opposing any international designation of Alaska land or water as an international park, world heritage site, biosphere reserve, Ramsar site, or other classification of land or water that affects the use of land or water by the state or an Alaska Native corporation without approval by the U.S. Congress and the Alaska State Legislature; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Foreign Affairs.

326. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 22, opposing the warrantless collection of telephone call data by the National Security Agency; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Intelligence (Permanent Select).

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. LAMBORN:

H.R. 5727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 5728.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 5729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 as applied to healthcare.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 5730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 5731.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 5732.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 5733.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law, and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H.R. 5734.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

''The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 5735.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5736.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 60: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 139: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 471: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 651: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 702: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 713: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 872: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 956: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 1070: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1094: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 1343: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1563: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 1667: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1942: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 1953: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 2018: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 2224: Mr. GRIMM.

H.R. 2312: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2500: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 2504: Mr. POCAN, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 2591: Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 2654: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 2673: Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 2745: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas.
H.R. 2788: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 2794: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 2847: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GRIMM, and Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 3116: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 3382: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 3398: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 3424: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 3461: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3543: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. HAHN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 3583: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 3662: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 3708: Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 3717: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 3750: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 3852: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 3877: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 3888: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 4083: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 4407: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 4510: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 4525: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 4608: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 4612: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 4748: Ms. JENKINS and Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 4772: Mr. ROSKAM.
H.R. 4927: Mr. KLINE and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 4930: Ms. NORTON, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 5059: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BARR, and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 5083: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 5091: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 5110: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 5182: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
H.R. 5186: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
H.R. 5241: Mr. TURNER, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 5267: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 5353: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 5354: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 5403: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 5460: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 5475: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 5484: Mr. BUCSHON.
H.R. 5599: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 5617: Ms. TITUS and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 5644: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 5646: Mr. SCHOCK.
H.R. 5655: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 5686: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 5700: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 5706: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 5710: Mr. BERA of California.
H.J. Res. 26: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H. Con. Res. 70: Mr. LANCE.
H. Con. Res. 117: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H. Res. 208: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. GRIMM.
H. Res. 596: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. CHABOT.
H. Res. 728: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. TITUS, and Ms. ESTY.
H. Res. 735: Mr. PEARCE and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H. Res. 738: Mr. ROONEY.
H. Res. 755: Mr. GRIMM, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. POLIS, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. FATTAH.
H. Res. 757: Mr. TERRY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. BROUN of Georgia.