United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2015 No. 23

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 11, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID W. JOLLY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

ADMIRAL ROBERT HARPER SHUMAKER ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS CAPTURE

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, February 11, 2015. What is the special significance? We become involved in our routines and our responsibilities. We greet our colleagues, and the day continues. This was not the case 50 years ago.

A young Navy pilot climbed into the cockpit of his F–8 Crusader aboard the USS *Coral Sea*, readying himself for a mission over North Vietnam.

Now, imagine yourself, Mr. Speaker, as a young naval aviator. They are some of the best that we have in our Armed Forces—some may say a little cocky. They are actually able to fly a flying engine, in essence. An F–8 Crusader can go faster than the speed of sound. They can fly missions and actually land back on a ship at night in rough seas.

So, 50 years ago today, this young naval aviator boarded his F–8 Crusader and was going to fly a low-level mission about 1,000 feet above the surface. Yet, after he took on some fire, very quickly he realized that he was in some trouble. The cockpit filled with smoke, and he had a very short amount of time to exit the plane. His parachute opened at about 35 feet above the ground, and he broke his back upon impact. This young pilot's world had just changed—and dramatically. What was he going to do with the pain? His first thought was: ''When am I going to be killed?'' He was picked up very quickly and was marched by bayonet.

The interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, is that, as the second American aviator shot down over North Vietnam, he was a prize and, therefore, was photographed. While this may not seem lucky, it was actually very fortunate in the fact that his family now knew and the people back in the United States now knew that he was alive and in captivity. He was, indeed, one of the lucky ones because, as the POWs would mount over this conflict in Vietnam, many did not have that same luck.

On having broken his back on impact, he was looking for medical attention. The medical attention he received was a white robe and a bunch of cameras, taking pictures, and as soon as the cameras left, the extent of his medical treatment ceased. He was taken to the Hoa Lo Prison, which we now affectionately know as the Hanoi Hilton. He was the one who was eventually credited with naming the Hanoi Hilton.

As those who know who have been in captivity and as many of us have read, when you are in captivity, you are able to give your captors four basic—what they call the big four—pieces of information: your name, your rank, your serial number, and your date of birth. As we know, this obviously was not going to be enough.

Over the next 8 years and a day, this naval aviator endured some of the worst torture. At some point in time, everyone breaks, and the torture that they endured and that this man endured eventually had to give—whether it was sitting on broomsticks for days at a time or tying your arms behind your back and then having your elbows brought together by ropes and then slowly risen above your head. So he did give some additional information.

His father was a lawyer but also owned a farm in Pennsylvania. The Vietnamese wanted to know how many chickens did they have. At some point in time, he said: That is pretty innocuous information. I will let them know—19 chickens. He knew when he got back to his cell, and some of these cells, Mr. Speaker, were about 3 by 9, some 4 by 9. Now, just imagine spending 10 hours in a 4-by-9-foot space, not to mention 2½ years of solitary confinement, 8 years in captivity. So he gave this additional information, and as he went back to his cell, he realized it was going to get worse and worse. He tried to take his own life, Mr. Speaker, because he thought he had let his country down.

Communication, however, was a huge savior—a savior for himself and for the other men who would be in captivity—that sense of camaraderie, that sense

Printed on recycled paper.

of making sure that your brain could continue to focus on other things, that message to keep them and their spirits up. They devised a tap code. It was a 5-by-5 metric of A, B, C, D, E and the next line of F, G, H, I, J. They left out the K because that would not make it a 5-by-5-foot box.

His courage, his integrity, his leadership and loyalty to his fellow prisoners—his love of country—cemented faith wherever present. His valor in the face of the impossible ensured that he returned with honor.

Lieutenant Commander Robert Harper Shumaker—now Admiral Shumaker—holds a near and dear place in my heart. He happens to be my uncle. When my wife and I had our first daughter, we decided to name her Harper after one of the most incredible people we know.

Mr. Speaker, my daughter gave me very clear instructions before I came here, and that was to let everyone know how much we love this American hero. In my office, I keep two pictures: one of the day he was shot down, and the other of the day he was reunited with his family. They were reminders to me not of the darkness and cruelty of war but of the power of faith and the strength of a brotherhood and the honor that no one could take away.

On the 50th anniversary of one of the darkest hours endured by an American aviator, let the record show that we stand and applaud this most revered American patriot.

PRIME MINISTER NETANYAHU'S INVITATION TO SPEAK TO A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the scheduled March 3 invitation by Speaker BOEHNER to Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu to speak to a joint session of Congress is wrong on many levels.

It is a deliberate attempt by the Israeli Prime Minister and the Speaker of the House to undercut an effort at a diplomatic solution to stop Iran from becoming a nuclear power. This is calculated to occur at a very sensitive stage in talks to reach a potential agreement to limit Iran's nuclear ambitions. Undercutting that diplomatic option is wrong for the United States. It undermines our efforts to smooth choppy waters at a time when we are deeply concerned with ISIS, Hezbollah, Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria. The potential of being able to work with Iran beyond the nuclear weapons issue is important for trying to manage many of the world's most explosive problems.

It is impossible to fully comprehend the next steps if we undercut this diplomatic effort. Why give Iran an excuse to blame the United States for a failure of negotiations and play to their hardliners, who don't want any agreement that would contain their efforts to build nuclear weapons?

There are no other good alternatives. Some of the people most eager to ultimately use military force against Iran are the same people who were so enthusiastic about going to war with Iraq. The fallout of the war with Iran would likely be as bad or worse at a time of upheaval in this troubled region.

There are other critical issues besides the negotiations with Iran. It is outrageous to think that Israel or any country would use Congress as a prop for their highly contested domestic elections. This proposed speech would be right in the middle of a short and heated Israeli election. It is unseemly and counterproductive. One has only to look at Netanyahu's television commercials from his last election—and how he used his appearance before Congress—to see where this is going.

Finally, there is the issue of respect for the Office of the President and the responsibility to conduct foreign policy. I can't imagine what the reaction would have been if Speaker NANCY PELOSI had offered French President Sarkozy an opportunity to lecture Republicans and George Bush about our disastrous policy in Iraq. Republicans would have been apoplectic.

This is not good for Israel either. It is creating a backlash at home for Netanyahu. It is creating heartburn for some of the strongest supporters of Israel in Congress, and it is straining the relationship between the administration and the Government of Israel. This drama is coming at a time when the majority of Israelis think their country is headed in the wrong direction, when Netanyahu does not have the majority support of his countrymen, when the election is quite close, with a significant number of undecided voters; and polls tell us a majority of Israelis think this speech is a bad idea.

It is unnecessary; it is unfortunate; and it is a bad precedent. Joint sessions involving heads of state and other world leaders should advance American interests and be a positive expression of our values and our opportunities, not a partisan or an ideological device. This proposed speech fails that test. The invitation should be withdrawn or rescheduled, or the Israeli Prime Minister, himself, should reconsider. I, for one, have no intention of being part of dignifying this blatant political act with my presence, because it is not good for Congress; it is not good for Israel; and it is not good for the United States.

REDEDICATING OURSELVES TO OUR NATION'S UNFINISHED WORK

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, 7 score and 12 years ago, another gentleman from Illinois went to Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, to dedicate the 4-month-old, still unfinished Union cemetery at the site of one of the bloodiest battles in American history. There he would give one of our Nation's defining speeches. Amazingly, President Lincoln's address was not even the main event of that day. Edward Everett, the former president of Harvard, was the event's main speaker, spending 2 hours lecturing about ancient Greece and how that society honored their fallen soldiers.

Everett later wrote:

> I should be glad if I could flatter myself that I came as near to the central idea of the occasion in 2 hours as President Lincoln did in 2 minutes.

In the 2½ minutes Lincoln spoke, he did more than honor our fallen soldiers. In 272 eloquent words, he reminded us that we live in a nation dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. He asked whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure.

In his address, the President also issued a challenge to his contemporaries and to generations of Americans thereafter, saying:

> It is for us, the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced.

He concluded:

> Our Nation shall have a new birth of freedom and that a government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from this Earth.

In his address, I believe, President Lincoln was asking the question: What do we as Americans mean when we say all of us ''are created equal''?

□ 1015

In the over 150 years since the Gettysburg Address, we have had our struggles, but we have also had our successes.

We have suffered the Supreme Court's decision in Plessy v. Ferguson, but we also experienced the redemption of Brown v. Board of Education. We allowed the women of this Nation to remain disenfranchised for more than a century, but we also passed the 19th Amendment, which affirmed women's right to vote.

We lived through the travesties of Jim Crow, but we also celebrated the passage of the Civil Rights Act. We watched Truman's executive action desegregate our military. We passed Don't Ask, Don't Tell—and repealed it—and DOMA, but we also have witnessed the legalization of same-sex marriage in 37 States and the District of Columbia.

All of these examples serve as reminders of the difficulties in ensuring equality for all, but they also demonstrate a nation that has responded to challenge and has been reborn. Each time, we have come a little closer to living up to the ideal that all of us are created equal.

To paraphrase Dr. King, the moral arc of our Nation may be long, but as history shows us, it bends towards justice, equality, and freedom.

In times of dissonance, inequality, and injustice, great leaders like Lincoln have reminded us of our Nation's true purpose: equality.

On Lincoln's birthday, let's rededicate ourselves to our Nation's unfinished work. Let's ensure that women get equal pay for equal work. Let's recognize all love as equal and extend marriage rights to all of our citizens once and for all. Let's strengthen the Voting Rights Act to guarantee that no one is disenfranchised and all Americans have access to this fundamental right.

Let's finish the work the Senate started and pass a comprehensive immigration reform bill. Let's pass the Employment Non-Discrimination Act so that no American can be fired simply because of who they love or who they are. Let's allow our neighbors and friends who put in a full day's work, whether in the mailroom or the boardroom, to provide their families with a living wage.

Lincoln modestly believed that ''no one would long remember'' his address that day at Gettysburg, but we do remember and strive to honor all those who have sacrificed and struggled—and continue to struggle—for equality because we believe, as Dr. King spoke of on the steps of Lincoln's own sacred memorial, ''that one day this Nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal.''

WORLD IS SILENT AS SUDAN RENEWS GENOCIDAL ATTACKS

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the deteriorating humanitarian and human rights situation inside Sudan. Regrettably, as the attention of the world has been pulled in many different directions, the people of Sudan have been forgotten.

For over a year and a half, the situation inside Sudan has been getting worse and worse. It happens quietly, out of the limelight, but the suffering of the Sudanese people is not silent. Their cries are deafening to those trying to help.

On July 22, 2004, the House of Representatives adopted House Concurrent Resolution 467 by a vote of 422–0. That resolution declared that the crimes of Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir in Darfur constituted genocide.

Over a decade later, the Sudanese government has renewed and increased its genocidal attacks in Darfur. As humanitarian agencies withdraw from the region, unable to carry out their missions in the face of unrelenting attacks, the civilian and displaced populations of Darfur are left without protection and without witnesses.

In the past weeks, the government-supported Janjaweed—now reincarnated as Bashir's Rapid Support Forces, or RSF—have intensified their scorched earth campaign of attacks, bombings, rape, displacement, and destruction.

According to the Satellite Sentinel Project and the Enough project, these forces are ''better equipped, centrally commanded, and fully integrated into the state's security apparatus, with legal immunity from prosecution.''

According to reports by United to End Genocide, since January 1, at least 20,000 innocent civilians have been forced to flee their homes in Darfur. President al-Bashir is bombing civilians, blocking the investigation of the reported mass rape of over 200 Darfuri women and, in the midst of the sharpest increase in violence in years, demanding the removal of U.N. peacekeepers.

On January 6, the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs reported that 115 villages have either been abandoned or burned to the ground in North Darfur. Attackers have forced women, children, and the elderly to leave their villages with nothing to survive on, often looting everything belonging to civilians.

It is clear that the RSF and their masters in Khartoum are engaged in a campaign to strip the people of Darfur of everything they own, anything that might keep them alive, and condemn them to increasing poverty displacement, starvation, and death. And the world—including Congress and the U.N. Security Council—remains silent.

In the border states of South Kordofan and Blue Nile, defenseless civilians in the Nuba Mountains face a relentless bombing campaign by the Sudanese Air Force and ground attacks by the Sudanese Armed Forces. On January 20, a hospital in South Kordofan run by Doctors Without Borders was deliberately targeted by an aerial bombing campaign, depriving the local population of lifesaving care.

In the past few months, under the auspices of the African Union, countries from the region, as well as the United States and Europe, have sought to bring the Bashir regime and various rebel forces to the table in order to negotiate a cessation of hostilities and promote an inclusive national dialogue. This is a worthy effort with worthy goals, but while such talks meander, Khartoum continues its genocidal campaign to impose military solutions to the political crisis facing Sudan.

President Bashir has no political solution to Sudan's problems. As the people of Darfur, South Kordofan, and Blue Nile know only too well, displacement, starvation, and death are the only strategies being pursued by the government in real time and in real life.

It is unconscionable—it is shameful—that these horrors are taking place inside Sudan in complete silence. The lack of response by the United States, by the Europeans, by the nations of the region only serves to provide Bashir with a green light to continue the killing.

Over 10 years ago, Congress called these very same actions acts of genocide and crimes against humanity. At the end of this month, I intend to reintroduce an updated version of my bipartisan bill, the Sudan Peace, Security, and Accountability Act, and demonstrate to the suffering people of Sudan—especially those in Darfur, South Kordofan, and Blue Nile—that we hear their cries and that this House intends to take action.

I ask all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in this effort.

[From United to End Genocide, Dec. 9, 2014]

WILL 2015 BE THE WORST YEAR FOR SUDAN?

(By Daniel Sullivan)

Sudan's impunity and intransigence have taken a sharp turn for the worse. That's a pretty high bar considering the country's track record since the genocide in Darfur started more than a decade ago. But even measured against a long history of abuse, Sudan's recent actions led by President Omar al-Bashir are a particularly harsh slap in the face for the international community.

In recent weeks, the Government of Sudan has newly bombed civilians in Darfur and the Nuba Mountains, blocked the investigation of a reported mass rape of over 200 Darfuri women, and, in the midst of the sharpest increase in violence and displacement in years, called for the removal of UN peacekeepers.

These new bold actions must be met with equally bold measures by the United States and the rest of the international community.

The facts are astounding. More than 430,000 people newly displaced in Darfur in 2014, the highest number since the height of the genocide. Over 2,000 bombs dropped in South Kordofan and Blue Nile since fighting began there in 2012. And new bombings in Darfur are in clear violation of UN Security Council Resolutions.

''Increased criminality'' and ''prevailing insecurity'' cited in the latest report of the UN Secretary General on Darfur including fifty-five cases of violence, nearly half by government forces, in recorded by UN peacekeepers in the last 90 days. Serious allegations of mass rape that the UN Secretary General and highest UN peacekeeping officials have insisted must be investigated.

Yet, the Sudanese government is blatant in its denial. Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir, wanted on charges of genocide by the International Criminal Court, accused the UN peacekeeping mission in Darfur (UNAMID) of being a ''security burden'' and blamed foreigners for fabricating rape allegations to ''confuse the improvement of the situation in Darfur''.

To make matters worse, this is not just an escalation of the kind of posturing the Sudanese regime has practiced in the past. Bashir is also getting new support from Russia. In a recent visit, the Russian Foreign Minister announced plans for increased military support for the Sudanese regime and the Sudanese government said that Russia supports its position on removal of UNAMID.

The irony is that as a permanent member of the UN Security Council, Russia is among those responsible for failing to support UNAMID.

On paper, the Council has given UNAMID a strong mandate, backed by the strongest authorizations under Chapter VII of the UN Charter including the use of force to protect civilians. But in reality, Sudan has been allowed to intimidate UNAMID and there has

been little accountability from the international community when the mission fails to report or act to protect civilians.

The way to address these problems is not play into the hands of the perpetrators and to remove the imperfect last line of defense for many civilians, but rather to reinforce the peacekeeping mission so that it can carry out the mission that has been set out for it.

The UN Security Council, including Russia, must live up to its own commitments in terms of justice and accountability. The year 2014 will close with the latest briefing of the UN Security Council on Darfur by the Chief Prosecutor to the International Criminal Court (ICC) Fatou Bensouda. Amazingly, this is the 20th such briefing since the Council referred the case of Darfur to the ICC.

In her last such briefing, Bensouda admonished the Security Council for its failure to take action in the face of ''total impunity'' in Darfur and called for ''a dramatic shift in this Council's approach to arresting Darfur suspects''. Six months later little has been done to support the court.

Sadly, the only dramatic shift has come on the part of the Government of Sudan whose latest intransigence is mind-bogglingly being met with more welcome than condemnation. For the sake of past victims of genocide and those now in the cross-hairs of the sharpest uptick in violence in nearly a decade, the Security Council must respond.

DEAR MADAM, DEAR SIR, DEAR COLLEAGUE,

Please find below a statement released today by Doctors Without Borders/Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) regarding the aerial bombing of a hospital operated by MSF in Sudan on January 20, forcing the suspension of medical activities.

You may find the full statement below, and on the website.

Sincerely,

MANUEL LANNAUD.

SUDAN: MSF HOSPITAL BOMBED IN SOUTH KORDOFAN

NEW YORK/PARIS, January 22, 2015.—A hospital operated by the international medical humanitarian organization Doctors Without Borders/Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) was directly targeted in an aerial bombing in Sudan on January 20, forcing the suspension of medical activities, MSF announced today.

The hospital, located in the Nuba Mountains village of Frandala in the South Kordofan region of Sudan, was bombed by the Sudanese Air Force (SAF). Repeated and targeted bombings in the region prevent the safe operation of medical activities, depriving the local population of lifesaving care.

''We condemn in the strongest terms the bombing of the Frandala hospital,''said Marc Van der Mullen, MSF head of mission. ''With more than 100 patients present, we were very lucky not to have more casualties because people simply had no time to seek protection. Everyone is shocked and frightened of further attacks.''

Approximately 150 patients and staff were in the hospital when a SAF fighter jet dropped a cluster of 13 bombs, two of which landed inside the hospital compound. The others struck just outside the hospital fence. One MSF staff member and one patient were injured. The property also suffered damage.

The attack is part of an indiscriminate bombing campaign in South Kordofan, a feature of the war between authorities in Khartoum and rebels groups in the Nuba Mountains. Health facilities are not spared, adding to the suffering of the population created by the bombing raids.

The Frandala hospital was previously bombed in June, 2014. That attack took place despite the Sudanese government's knowledge of the hospital location and its activities, which had been previously communicated to the authorities by MSF. One patient was killed in the attack and several others were wounded. The hospital also sustained significant damage. MSF publicly condemned the attack and demanded respect of medical facilities.

''Today there can be no doubt that this was a deliberate and targeted bombing on a civilian hospital structure and part of a strategy to terrorize the community,'' said Van der Mullen. ''MSF again calls on Khartoum to respect assistance provided to the population. Despite this latest setback we will try to find a way to continue to provide care to the population caught in this largely undocumented war.''

MSF is one of the few health care providers in South Kordofan. The MSF facility in Frandala, featuring outpatient and inpatient wards, began operating in 2012. Nearly 80,000 consultations have been performed, along with close to 4,000 hospitalizations.

FUND HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the President has issued an AUMF, which is the authority to determine the questions of war and peace, particularly in light of the dangers we face with ISIS. In spite of that, we are holding hostage the funding of the armor of security for this Nation, the Department of Homeland Security, the committee upon which I have sat since the horrible, heinous act of 9/11.

We take our work very seriously. We know that we oversee the national security of this Nation, along with the very important aspect and leadership of our Defense Department. Every day, we are mindful of the roles that individuals play who are a part of the Department of Homeland Security.

Rather than looking to be concerned about the dangers of unaccompanied children, as our Republican friends seem to be, challenging the President's thoughtful executive actions within the context of his constitutional authority, we are now using those reasons for holding hostage the very armor of domestic security.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you, the TSA officers that I see as I travel around this country are front liners. I speak to them all the time. They have protected this Nation from various attacks—or potential attacks, might I say—stopping threats that many of us are not even aware of. These very faithful workers, along with border security workers, will have to work without pay. There will have to be a reordering of the strategies of the Secretary of Homeland Security.

Mr. Speaker, 40,000 Border Patrol agents; 50,000 TSA personnel; 13,000 Immigration and Customs Enforcement, or ICE, officers; 40,000 Coast Guard; and 4,000 Secret Service officers will be threatened by this.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I demand that we do the right thing, with 8 legislative days left. Fund the Department of Homeland Security. Speak in a tone that is that of America. Defend our Nation. Protect our Nation. Stop this politicizing of the funding of the Department of Homeland Security.

I ask the Republicans to join me in an important patriotic effort. Fund the Department of Homeland Security.

TRIBUTE TO ERNIE BANKS, AMBASSADOR FOR BASEBALL, MR. CUB

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

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate African American History Month, I rise to acknowledge and pay tribute to one of the most outstanding athletes in the history of baseball but also one of the most congenial personalities in public life, Ernie Banks, also known as Mr. Cub, Mr. Chicago, and Mr. Ambassador for Baseball.

Ernie Banks was indeed a superior athlete, playing 19 years for the Chicago Cubs, named MVP in 1958 and 1959, named to the All-Star team 12 times, hit .274 with 512 home runs, voted into the Baseball Hall of Fame on his first year of eligibility. But it was actually his cheerful attitude and his love of the game that made him such a popular player.

Ernie was always the absolute optimist. You could always count on him to express a most positive attitude:

Everyday was a good day; let's play two.

No matter what the Cubs' record, this was the year that they could win the pennant and become World Series champions.

After his playing days were over, Ernie became a coach and was active in the community. He founded a charitable organization, became the first Black Ford Motor Company dealer in the United States, and even ran unsuccessfully for the Chicago City Council.

A few years ago, Ernie approached me about an effort he had underway to get young athletes who grew up in the inner city and depressed communities to pool some of their resources and reinvest in the rebuilding and redevelopment of these neighborhoods. He was an inspiration to stars like Magic Johnson, Isaiah Thomas, and others who are doing just that.

In 1997, he was inducted into the Baseball Hall of Fame; in 1999, he was named to the Major League Baseball All Century Team; and in 2013, he was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom by President Barack Obama.

Ernie Banks, we salute you, Mr. Cub, Mr. Chicago, Mr. Ambassador for Baseball, but most importantly, Mr. Cheerleader for Life and Positive Living.

CONGRESS IS A COEQUAL BRANCH

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

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strongest support for the invitation to have Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu address this body and to express my personal support for the Speaker's invitation.

Congress is a coequal branch. The Constitution acknowledges that. It establishes that. To suggest, as some have, that this body does not have a role in the geopolitical and diplomatic strategy of this Nation is flatly wrong.

This body, this Congress, funds our diplomatic activities. We, this body, this Congress, funds our military activities. And this body authorizes the use of military force, as acknowledged by the President just today with his delivery of a request for an authorization to use military force.

This body, this Congress, authorizes sanctions. And this body has expressed strong support in recent years for additional sanctions on Iran. We have a disagreement with the President, very respectfully, on this issue. But to suggest that this body, this Congress, this coequal branch, established by article I of the Constitution, should simply lay down its responsibility because the President of the United States suggested during the State of the Union that he will veto any additional sanctions we pass would be a dereliction of the duty of this body, of this Congress.

□ 1030

That is why we have expressed our interest and we have said to the President that we do want to hear from our greatest ally in the Middle East to express our position of how to secure the region. It is appropriate. We are a coequal branch.

At a time when the President continues negotiations with Iran over the objections of so many in this body, at a time when the administration has had to acknowledge—forced to acknowledge a secret letter to Iran, it is appropriate for this body to stand up, and it is appropriate for this body to suggest that we stand with Israel perhaps in a way that the President does not.

This body, this House, this Member, we welcome the Prime Minister here in March. We look forward to hearing his vision, the vision of our greatest ally in the region, on securing peace in the Middle East, providing for the stability of the Middle East, securing democracy, and to say with the people of Israel that we stand with you in providing for your security.

CONTINUED REMITTANCES TO SOMALIA

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, my question to all my colleagues today as I stand before this body is: If we could prevent a humanitarian disaster, would we? Should we?

Right now, Somalia may be on the brink of a preventable humanitarian disaster. My district happens to be home to one of the largest Somali American communities in the world, and it is certainly the largest in the Western Hemisphere.

My constituents have come to me and have explained in very detailed and moving ways that it is time for us to figure out this problem that we have in the United States with helping people remit money that they have earned to their loved ones in the Horn of Africa.

Somali Americans in my district are proud of the progress Somalia has made, as I am and many people around the world are. This is a nation that, for over two decades, had civil war but now has a President, a legislature, and is planning for elections in 2016.

This country is fighting off al Shabaab, a terrorist organization in league with al Qaeda, and this nation has successfully fought off famine and want of many kinds. Now, they are on another kind of problem, and this problem has to do with remittances and the ability of Somali Americans to send money to their loved ones.

It is important to understand that the progress they have made is fragile. We, in the United States, don't need to worry about sending money there right now, although we should, and we have, and we are. We need to just get out of the way to allow Somali Americans to send money to their own loved ones, and our financial system is inhibiting that.

Every year, Somali Americans send about $215 million to Somalia, a figure comparable to the entire U.S. aid package, which is approximately about $200 million a year. Individual Somali Americans send more money than the whole Government of the United States sends there, and that vital pipeline is lifesaving money that is shut off now as we speak.

The bank that provided 60 percent of the remittances or funds sent to Somalia closed accounts of businesses that transfer money from the U.S. to Somalia, and this is catastrophic.

Now, Somali Americans cannot send money to their loved ones, and Somalis can no longer receive money that they depend on for food, for school fees, for medical bills. Many of the financial institutions in the United States have chosen to avoid serving money services businesses that send money to vulnerable nations like Somalia, due to concern that the money could find its way into bank accounts of unsavory money launderers.

The goal of the U.S. financial regulator is good. We want to keep money from the money launderers and the terrorists; but do we arrive at a point where our regulation is so tight that even the legitimate money that we want to flow is being cut off?

I am calling on our government to get together—Treasury, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, State Department—and have a real conversation, how we can stop the bad money but also let the good money flow.

As I said, Somalia depends upon this money. It is a very fragile state. It is emerging from being a failed state. If they cut the remittances off, we will see catastrophic results.

One of those catastrophic results will be an opening to groups like al Shabaab, a terrorist group that argues that the United States and the West generally don't want to help Somalia.

We need to stop them from using that recruiting message by figuring out how we can achieve our goals of stopping bad money from flowing and allowing good money to flow. For years, I have been asking for agencies to work with me to prevent this foreseeable tragedy. We need to be creative about finding a solution.

The Federal Reserve Bank of New York could use its wire service to process transfers to east Africa; that is a possibility. We could follow the example of the United Kingdom and set up a safe corridors program for banks to safely transfer money while managing risk. We could provide proactive training and assistance for banks that want to serve east African communities. There is no shortage of ideas.

I urge our government to sit down at a table and figure out a way to stop the money launderers and the bad money from flowing, but to certainly allow legitimate remittances to flow. We could prevent a catastrophe if we do.

END THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY IMPASSE NOW

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

Mr. TAKAI. Aloha, Mr. Speaker.

On February 27, the Department of Homeland Security will run out of money—17 more days. If this is not resolved, at best case, approximately 200,000 workers will stay on the job without pay or be furloughed or, at worst, not work.

Mr. Speaker, I was elected to Congress and came here promising my constituents no more government shutdowns, no more Federal furloughs, and no more sequestration; yet here we are, on the verge of letting funding for Homeland Security run out and partially shutting down government. This impasse needs to end, and it needs to end now.

I say the bottom line—to paraphrase DHS Secretary Johnson's point—is security for our Nation is not free. Our homeland security cannot be hijacked by political games. We must get past this political stalemate and work out a clean bill for funding Homeland Security.

If we don't, significant portions of the Department of Homeland Security could be crippled, and hundreds of thousands of critical Federal personnel—our constituents—could be affected.

Let's remember that we are talking about some of the most critical security personnel who are working to keep

Americans safe—shuttering the DHS Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, which would no longer alert and coordinate with local law enforcement agencies, and withholding the Securing the Cities grants that pay for critical nuclear detection capacities in cities across the country; halting research and development work on countermeasures to devastating biological threats, on nuclear detection equipment, and on cargo and passenger screening technologies; crippling FEMA's preparations for future disasters, furloughing nearly 22 percent of FEMA personnel; and ending FEMA's training activities with local law enforcement for weapons of mass destruction events.

Although some DHS employees would continue to work in the event of a shutdown, they would be forced to work without pay, creating a significant distraction and dealing a direct blow to morale.

Among those who would be affected and expected to protect Americans without getting paid would be more than 40,000 Border Patrol agents and Customs and Border Protection agents; more than 50,000 TSA aviation security screeners; more than 13,000 Immigration and Customs Enforcement law enforcement agents and officers; more than 40,000 Active-Duty Coast Guard military members; and more than 4,000 Secret Service law enforcement agents and officers.

Holding hostage funding of DHS for the purpose of overturning the President's executive actions on immigration is wrong. President Obama was forced to take action because of the inaction of this House to consider a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration reform bill that the Senate passed last year. Here we are again, yet with more inaction.

We cannot waste any more time here with political bickering, and it is not fair to try to hijack Homeland Security funding with an anti-immigration agenda. The security of our Nation and our people hang in the balance.

Again, no more government shutdowns, no more Federal furloughs, no more sequestration—let's get to work, come together, answer the call of our constituents, and just pass a clean bill for DHS funding.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 40 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

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

As we meditate on all the blessings of life, we especially pray for the blessing of peace in our lives and in our world. Our fervent prayer, O God, is that people will learn to live together in reconciliation and respect so that the terrors of war and violence will be no more.

As You have created each person, we pray that You would guide our hearts and minds, that every person of every place and background might focus on Your great gift of life and so learn to live in unity.

May Your special blessings be upon the Members of this assembly in the important, sometimes difficult work they do. Give them wisdom and charity that they might work together for the common good.

May all that is done this day in the people's House be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas 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.

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST THE ISLAMIC STATE OF IRAQ AND THE LEVANT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114–9)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The so-called Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) poses a threat to the people and stability of Iraq, Syria, and the broader Middle East, and to U.S. national security. It threatens American personnel and facilities located in the region and is responsible for the deaths of U.S. citizens James Foley, Steven Sotloff, Abdul-Rahman Peter Kassig, and Kayla Mueller. If left unchecked, ISIL will pose a threat beyond the Middle East, including to the United States homeland.

I have directed a comprehensive and sustained strategy to degrade and defeat ISIL. As part of this strategy, U.S. military forces are conducting a systematic campaign of airstrikes against ISIL in Iraq and Syria. Although existing statutes provide me with the authority I need to take these actions, I have repeatedly expressed my commitment to working with the Congress to pass a bipartisan authorization for the use of military force (AUMF) against ISIL. Consistent with this commitment, I am submitting a draft AUMF that would authorize the continued use of military force to degrade and defeat ISIL.

My Administration's draft AUMF would not authorize long-term, large-scale ground combat operations like those our Nation conducted in Iraq and Afghanistan. Local forces, rather than U.S. military forces, should be deployed to conduct such operations. The authorization I propose would provide the flexibility to conduct ground combat operations in other, more limited circumstances, such as rescue operations involving U.S. or coalition personnel or the use of special operations forces to take military action against ISIL leadership. It would also authorize the use of U.S. forces in situations where ground combat operations are not expected or intended, such as intelligence collection and sharing, missions to enable kinetic strikes, or the provision of operational planning and other forms of advice and assistance to partner forces.

Although my proposed AUMF does not address the 2001 AUMF, I remain committed to working with the Congress and the American people to refine, and ultimately repeal, the 2001 AUMF. Enacting an AUMF that is specific to the threat posed by ISIL could serve as a model for how we can work together to tailor the authorities granted by the 2001 AUMF.

I can think of no better way for the Congress to join me in supporting our Nation's security than by enacting this legislation, which would show the world we are united in our resolve to counter the threat posed by ISIL.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 11, 2015*.

JOINT RESOLUTION

To authorize the limited use of the United States Armed Forces against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.

Whereas the terrorist organization that has referred to itself as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant and various other names (in this resolution referred to as ''ISIL'') poses a grave threat to the people and territorial integrity of Iraq and Syria, regional stability, and the national security interests of the United States and its allies and partners;

Whereas ISIL holds significant territory in Iraq and Syria and has stated its intention to seize more territory and demonstrated the capability to do so;

Whereas ISIL leaders have stated that they intend to conduct terrorist attacks internationally, including against the United States, its citizens, and interests;

Whereas ISIL has committed despicable acts of violence and mass executions against Muslims, regardless of sect, who do not subscribe to ISIL's depraved, violent, and oppressive ideology;

Whereas ISIL has threatened genocide and committed vicious acts of violence against religious and ethnic minority groups, including Iraqi Christian, Yezidi, and Turkmen populations;

Whereas ISIL has targeted innocent women and girls with horrific acts of violence, including abduction, enslavement, torture, rape, and forced marriage;

Whereas ISIL is responsible for the deaths of innocent United States citizens, including James Foley, Steven Sotloff, Abdul-Rahman Peter Kassig, and Kayla Mueller;

Whereas the United States is working with regional and global allies and partners to degrade and defeat ISIL, to cut off its funding, to stop the flow of foreign fighters to its ranks, and to support local communities as they reject ISIL;

Whereas the announcement of the anti-ISIL Coalition on September 5, 2014, during the NATO Summit in Wales, stated that ISIL poses a serious threat and should be countered by a broad international coalition;

Whereas the United States calls on its allies and partners, particularly in the Middle East and North Africa, that have not already done so to join and participate in the anti-ISIL Coalition;

Whereas the United States has taken military action against ISIL in accordance with its inherent right of individual and collective self-defense;

Whereas President Obama has repeatedly expressed his commitment to working with Congress to pass a bipartisan authorization for the use of military force for the anti-ISIL military campaign; and

Whereas President Obama has made clear that in this campaign it is more effective to use our unique capabilities in support of partners on the ground instead of large-scale deployments of U.S. ground forces: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This joint resolution may be cited as the ''Authorization for Use of Military Force against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.''

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The President is authorized, subject to the limitations in subsection (c), to use the Armed Forces of the United States as the President determines to be necessary and appropriate against ISIL or associated persons or forces as defined in section 5.

(b) WAR POWERS RESOLUTION REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) SPECIFIC STATUTORY AUTHORIZATION.—Consistent with section 8(a)(1) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1547(a)(1)), Congress declares that this section is intended to constitute specific statutory authorization within the meaning of section 5(b) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(b)).

(2) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—Nothing in this resolution supersedes any requirement of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.).

(c) LIMITATIONS.—The authority granted in subsection (a) does not authorize the use of the United States Armed Forces in enduring offensive ground combat operations.

SEC. 3. DURATION OF THIS AUTHORIZATION.

This authorization for the use of military force shall terminate three years after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, unless reauthorized.

SEC. 4. REPORTS.

The President shall report to Congress at least once every six months on specific actions taken pursuant to this authorization.

SEC. 5. ASSOCIATED PERSONS OR FORCES DEFINED.

In this joint resolution, the term ''associated persons or forces'' means individuals and organizations fighting for, on behalf of, or alongside ISIL or any closely-related successor entity in hostilities against the United States or its coalition partners.

SEC. 6. REPEAL OF AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE AGAINST IRAQ.

The Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107–243; 116 Stat. 1498; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) is hereby repealed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

UNEMPLOYMENT AND DISABILITY DOUBLE-DIPPING

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans who have paid into Social Security rely on the promise that it will be there for them when they become disabled and cannot work. Unfortunately, under current law, some people can get both disability benefits and unemployment benefits. That just doesn't make any sense. Disability benefits are for those who can't work. Unemployment benefits are for those who can work.

That is why I will be introducing commonsense legislation this week that will help ensure Social Security disability benefits are only for those who truly cannot work. With the disability program going broke next year, we cannot afford to continue to allow individuals to double dip. My bill will stop this double-dipping and will help ensure that the disability program is there for those who truly need it.

NATIONAL SALUTE TO VETERAN PATIENTS

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, each year, the Department of Veterans Affairs designates a week in February as the National Salute to Veterans to honor the brave men and women who have served our country. More than 98,000 veterans are cared for in the VA facilities across America, and the National Salute to Veterans is one small way to say thank you to these brave men and women.

Every year, I join with students all across Rhode Island to deliver Valentines to veterans during this week in order to pay tribute and express our appreciation for their service. This Saturday, I will visit the Providence VA Medical Center and veterans' homes across the State to personally deliver thousands of handwritten cards. This week, VA medical facilities all over will be holding many special activities to pay tribute to the veterans who have bravely served our country.

I encourage my colleagues and everyone listening to contact your nearest VA medical center and ask for Voluntary Service to get involved and salute America's heroes this week.

HONORING SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that Congress today will honor a great American patriot, Barry Goldwater, with a statue in the National Statuary Hall of the U.S. Capitol.

On July 4, 1963, I visited Washington, by bus, for the first time to participate in the National Draft Goldwater Rally. Senator Goldwater's legacy of promoting limited government, a strong national defense—leading to victory in the cold war—and protecting personal freedoms is more vital than ever. As a teenage Republican, I lived the southern Republican revolution he inspired. He helped transform the South from nonexistent, or insignificant, Republican legislative membership in 1963, culminating in 2014 with Republican legislative majorities in all States from Virginia to Texas and Oklahoma to Arkansas.

I am grateful the southern Republican revolution has created an open process in South Carolina, with Nikki Haley being the first female Governor in 340 years, with TIM SCOTT being the first popularly elected African American ever elected in the South to the U.S. Senate, and Alan Wilson being elected America's youngest attorney general.

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

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF BLOODY SUNDAY, TURNAROUND TUESDAY, AND FINAL SELMA TO MONTGOMERY VOTING RIGHTS MARCH

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor those who, in the face of violent opposition, bravely stood for what is right. This March will mark the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, and the final Selma to Montgomery voting rights march.

In 2013, I had the honor of joining Congressman JOHN LEWIS to visit some of these historic sites, including the Edmund Pettus Bridge, where nearly 8,000 foot soldiers marched to demonstrate against the denial of African Americans' right to vote. The sacrifice and perseverance of the Selma foot soldiers inspired the Nation, and in August of that year, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was signed into law.

As we continue to celebrate Black History Month, I, along with many of my colleagues, am a proud original cosponsor of H.R. 431, which would award the highest civilian honor, the Congressional Gold Medal, to the foot soldiers of the voting rights movement. The bravery of the civil rights activists demonstrated half a century ago was remarkable, but we must not forget how much still needs to be done.

KAYLA MUELLER

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about Kayla Mueller, one of my constituents, who was brutally kidnapped and killed by the Islamic State, or ISIS.

Kayla was a young woman who was still full of youthful exuberance, optimism about peace and human relations, and who was willing to put her life on the line to help others halfway around the world. She was a beautiful soul, and I know she is with God now.

I am not youthful.

I see ISIS for what it is.

This is an Islamic terrorist group that is a scourge to humanity. Our society cannot exist with barbaric and evil people who value death over life, war over peace, and chaos over order. Their evil deeds are well known—as they publicize them—genocide, mass murder, sadistic killings.

I am done. I hope you are, too.

The elimination of ISIS is long overdue. In order to defeat these terrorists, we need a strategic and comprehensive military strategy.

FUNDING HOMELAND SECURITY AND IMPROVING PORT SECURITY

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to warn of the impending danger of shutting down the Department of Homeland Security.

While terror attacks are occurring worldwide, it is unbelievable and it would be unforgivable to stop funding the Department that protects our Nation's security. Yet some in Congress are willing to shut down this Department and put our Nation at risk unless we deport 5.3 million people.

As cochair of the Ports Caucus and as the Representative of the Port of Los Angeles, I can tell you that our ports are one of the most vulnerable entryways into this country; and though I believe we should do more to protect our Nation's ports, closing the Department of Homeland Security at this time would make our ports even more vulnerable to an attack.

We must act now. Time is running out to pass legislation to keep this Department open.

□ 1215

TERRORISM THREAT NOT ON PAR WITH CLIMATE CHANGE

(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, in the administration's national security strategy unveiled last week, they went as far as to identify climate change as a threat on par with terrorism and weapons of mass destruction.

I agree that we need to continue to be cognizant and attentive of the impacts of the climate, but it is downright dangerous to equate the issue to the very real and direct threats that terrorist organizations and networks around the world pose to the lives of American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, Americans saw firsthand and will never forget the horrors of September 11, 2001.

Mr. Speaker, I also believe that thousands of U.S. troops who have fought in Afghanistan and Iraq, and the families and friends of the thousands of Americans who have paid the ultimate price, would respectfully disagree with the President.

Mr. Speaker, just this morning, the White House circulated a proposal to Congress to authorize military action to fight Islamic State terrorists—a day after it was confirmed that an American aid worker had been killed by the terrorist group.

This is a clear indication that the threat of terrorism has posed and continues to pose a much more immediate challenge to our national security and the safety of every American than climate change.

FUNDING FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, it is irresponsible to hold homeland security funds hostage simply because some of my colleagues don't like the President's action on immigration. There is a time and place to have this debate—and this isn't it.

I spent my career working in public safety and emergency preparedness with the LAPD. Security is in my blood. I know how important it is to be able to plan, prepare, and maintain the morale of those on the front lines.

If we let the Department of Homeland Security funding expire, it isn't nameless bureaucrats who will be suffering. We will shutter the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, halt R&D work to counter security threats, and end FEMA training activities with our local law enforcement. That says nothing of the 147,000 Border Patrol, ICE, and TSA officers, Active Duty Coast Guard, and Secret Service agents who will be forced to work without pay.

These men and women have our backs. We should have theirs.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, in the President's State of the Union Address he declared the need for ''21st century infrastructure.'' With today's legislation to complete the Keystone XL pipeline, we are offering him an infrastructure bill that would create jobs and promote energy security.

This study from the President's own State Department says Keystone will create about 42,000 jobs and generate about $2 billion in earnings, all while imposing a negligible environmental impact.

This project has been waiting for approval for more than 2,300 days. The Nebraska Supreme Court struck down the challenge against it. Fifty-eight percent of Americans said they support it, and a bipartisan majority in both Chambers of Congress approved it.

I urge the President to listen to the will of his constituents and, if nothing else, maybe read the reports from his own administration. The excuses have run out. It is time to build.

FUND HOMELAND SECURITY

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, as you have heard, there are only 17 days until the GOP recklessly shuts down the Department of Homeland Security—and only 6 legislative days before that happens. We have a bipartisan bill that we have already agreed to. Bring it to the floor. We will be here. We can pass it today.

When the majority leader was asked why we should pass the DHS funding bill, he said: ''Why do we have to?'' Seriously. This is about the safety of the

American people. Rather than dealing with the safety of the American people, the Republican leadership has decided to continue to pander to the extreme Tea Party voices within their party.

We ought to be taking this up as a matter of course and get back to the business of dealing with the big questions that people want us to take on, like how we can create an economy that is not rigged for the people at the top, with the rest of us paying the price. These are questions that people want us to deal with.

We ought to set aside the politics of this Homeland Security bill and bring the bill that you have already agreed to, and we will vote on it and get on with the business of the American people.

WE NEED STRONG LEADERSHIP ON TERRORISM

(Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep concern about the continued expansion of Islamic terrorist groups and the threat they pose to the American people.

Today, the President requested congressional authorization for his limited efforts against ISIS, but make no mistake: this request does not constitute a strategy, nor does it substitute for resolve.

In August, the President promised to ''degrade and destroy'' this terrorist army through airstrikes and military assistance to our partners. Since then, his efforts have remained lacking, while ISIS' sanctuary has grown to the size of Maryland.

The administration has instead courted the mullahs of Iran and signaled a willingness to work with Syria's brutal dictatorship, the Assad regime, even though they both still continue to contribute to this crisis.

History has shown us that the world pays a heavy price when we appease dictators and turn a blind eye to evil. The President has allowed the emergence of a global threat that will likely persist for years.

The American people deserve stronger leadership from their Commander in Chief and to hear directly from him how the action he is asking Congress to authorize will destroy ISIS.

FY 2015 FUNDING FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, in these challenging times, as we work to protect the country from the security threats we face, I call on the Republican leadership to bring a clean bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security to the floor.

As a senior member of the Committee on Homeland Security, I know that DHS plays a vital role in protecting us from threats like ISIL, and I strongly support those who defend our Nation, go to work every day to protect us, and particularly those who put their lives on the line.

Protecting the homeland extends beyond conventional acts of terror to things like cybersecurity, an area that I am deeply concerned about. Through endeavors like the National Cybersecurity Communications and Integration Center and US-CERT, DHS partners with industry to defend us against attacks and works to protect and assist Federal agencies from cyber assault.

Mr. Speaker, the attack on Sony and Anthem's massive data breach underscore the need for the robust cybersecurity activities supported by DHS. For the majority to prevent DHS' hardworking employees from being paid or undertaking new projects is politics trumping policy, and I urge my Republican colleagues to abandon their misguided strategy and bring a clean bill to the floor that will appropriately fund DHS.

HONORING DANE A. MILLER

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

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory and the legacy of Dr. Dane A. Miller, who passed away yesterday.

Dane was born in 1946 and, along with his wife, Mary Louise, was nothing short of the classic American success story. There is also no shortage of professional accomplishments to fully describe this industry titan.

As the founder of Biomet, now a medical device company in Warsaw, Indiana, he started the company—in true Indiana form—in a converted barn. During his time as president and CEO, he managed to grow Biomet into a company of over $2 billion in annual sales and 4,000 employees.

Dane was a brilliant man. He was a Ph.D. and a biomedical engineer known for numerous innovations in the medical device industry. Perhaps the only two things he didn't know how to do was to give up on a problem or to retire. He was tireless in his efforts. The only thing larger than his ability was his heart.

His time and energy were fully dedicated to his wife, family, and the greater community of Warsaw and his hometown of Winona Lake.

My heart goes out to his family and the innumerable people whose lives he touched. For me and so many others, Dane Miller will be a shining example of hard work, charity to one's fellow man, and doing this all while maintaining a humble spirit. He enjoyed nothing more than spending time with his friends and family. Dane has affected so many lives in wonderful ways and will long be missed.

FUND DHS

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to me to watch the Republicans recklessly play politics with our national security. That is right. Keeping America safe is why we have a Department of Homeland Security. That is what it does.

Funding for the Department of Homeland Security expires February 27. We have only 6 legislative days between now and then to pass a clean funding bill.

If we fail to pass a bill, 30,000 workers will be furloughed and the rest will work without getting paid. Really? These workers are Border Patrol Agents, TSA security screeners, immigration officers, and members of the Secret Service and Coast Guard. We rely on them to keep us safe—and they rely on us to pay them.

Shame on the Republican Party for jeopardizing our national security in a misguided attempt to score political points with the extremist wing of their base. Give us a clean bill and let us fund the Department of Homeland Security.

PASS THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE BILL

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, this year, House Republicans have hit the ground running in addressing harmful and outdated policies that have hindered job growth and hurt the American economy over the last several years. One of our first priorities has been to pass a bill to build the Keystone pipeline, which I hope will have final passage here later today.

It has been 6 years since the original Keystone pipeline application was submitted—6 long years where we would have increased job creation, energy security, lowered energy costs, and built a stronger economy.

It is time to take action where this administration has failed to and move forward with the Keystone pipeline, an issue that has broad bipartisan support and will create jobs and positively impact hardworking families across the country.

We plan on getting a lot done this Congress, and our top priority will be kick-starting our stalled economy. House Republicans remain focused on creating good-paying jobs, growing our economy, and ensuring that every hardworking American has the opportunity to succeed.

HONORING ALEX RAY

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

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Alex Ray, a Granite Stater who has made significant contributions to our State's identity and our economy.

When you ask most people in New Hampshire what restaurant captures the essence of our State, they will say the Common Man. Alex built the Common Man family of restaurants from the ground up, expanding from one location in Ashland, New Hampshire, in 1971 to 16 eateries around the State. He has also given back a great deal to communities across New Hampshire and has been involved with a wide array of philanthropic endeavors over the years.

Alex's motto for the Common Man family is simply, ''Do Good,'' which he seeks to instill in his staff and live by in his own life.

He is currently in the process of completing two beautiful new rest areas off Interstate 93. These new facilities are great examples of the public-private partnerships that have been so successful in New Hampshire.

Alex's creative and community-oriented approach to both business and philanthropy has had an incredibly positive impact over the last four decades.

I am honored to count Alex as a good friend, and I would like to express my appreciation for all his wonderful work on behalf of the citizens of New Hampshire.

FUNDING DHS

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, as the sign points out, today marks 17 days until the Department of Homeland Security shuts down, leaving our Nation's national security at risk.

Why is DHS closing down? It is closing down for the reason that it is being held hostage because it is riddled with immigration policy riders which, as we all know, have a zero chance of being signed by the President.

If funding lapses, our Nation's ports of entry will be severely impacted. For example, I represent the Port of Long Beach. They will not be able to upgrade their communications and their surveillance systems unless DHS continues and is able to put out grant funding. That is unacceptable and also very unwise.

The Senate has made clear that it will not accept the current bill and will not pass that bill in its Chamber. It is now time for the Republican leadership in this House to end their political grandstanding and bring up a clean DHS bill immediately.

□ 1230

DON'T SHUT DOWN OUR SECURITY

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because time is running out for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to act responsibly when it comes to our Nation's security. In 17 days, the money for our Homeland Security programs will be gone.

My Democratic colleagues and I are sending a very clear message to Speaker BOEHNER and the Republican majority. Don't shut down our security. It is as simple as that. Don't shut down our security.

Don't shut down the very agency that is trusted to protect the American people from threats of every kind. Don't hold our Homeland Security programs hostage until you get your way in deporting parents and families.

Don't put politics before people. That is exactly what they are doing. Seventeen days, there is no more time for these kinds of games.

At that point, thousands of vital workers will either be forced to work without pay or sent home, leaving their important jobs undone during a dangerous time in our world.

They are putting politics before people. They are putting politics before the safety of our country. Don't shut down our security. Don't shut down our security.

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE APPROVAL ACT

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to S. 1.

Here we go again. For the 11th time, House Republicans are falsely promoting the idea that Keystone will improve the economy.

They say Keystone will create 42,000 jobs. False—Keystone will create 35 permanent jobs. Republicans say the pipeline will guarantee U.S. energy independence. False—there is no concrete assurance that oil produced by the pipeline will remain in the U.S.

Along with these economic shortcomings, U.S. taxpayers will bear 100 percent of the risk if a catastrophic spill occurs. America needs job growth, reliable energy, not hypotheticals. We must be focused on investments in clean energy and infrastructure projects that create jobs and boost our economy.

With no real impact on job creation or energy security, this bill is a losing deal for everyone except the foreign company, TransCanada.

The American people and our environment deserve better than to be collateral damage for an unfounded project. I stand opposed to the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

AWARDING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO THE FOOT SOLDIERS WHO PARTICIPATED IN BLOODY SUNDAY, TURNAROUND TUESDAY, OR THE FINAL SELMA TO MONTGOMERY VOTING RIGHTS MARCH IN MARCH OF 1965

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 431) to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Foot Soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, or the final Selma to Montgomery Voting Rights March in March of 1965, which served as a catalyst for the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 431

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) March 7, 2015, will mark 50 years since the brave Foot Soldiers of the Voting Rights Movement first attempted to march from Selma to Montgomery on ''Bloody Sunday'' in protest against the denial of their right to vote, and were brutally assaulted by Alabama state troopers.

(2) Beginning in 1964, members of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee attempted to register African-Americans to vote throughout the state of Alabama.

(3) These efforts were designed to ensure that every American citizen would be able to exercise their constitutional right to vote and have their voices heard.

(4) By December of 1964, many of these efforts remained unsuccessful. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., working with leaders from the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, began to organize protests throughout Alabama.

(5) On March 7, 1965, over 500 voting rights marchers known as ''Foot Soldiers'' gathered on the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama in peaceful protest of the denial of their most sacred and constitutionally protected right—the right to vote.

(6) Led by John Lewis of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and Rev. Hosea Williams of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, these Foot Soldiers began the march towards the Alabama State Capitol in Montgomery, Alabama.

(7) As the Foot Soldiers crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge, they were confronted by a wall of Alabama state troopers who brutally attacked and beat them.

(8) Americans across the country witnessed this tragic turn of events as news stations

broadcasted the brutality on a day that would be later known as ''Bloody Sunday.''

(9) Two days later on Tuesday, March 9, 1965, nearly 2,500 Foot Soldiers led by Dr. Martin Luther King risked their lives once more and attempted a second peaceful march starting at the Edmund Pettus Bridge. This second attempted march was later known as ''Turnaround Tuesday.''

(10) Fearing for the safety of these Foot Soldiers who received no protection from federal or state authorities during this second march, Dr. King led the marchers to the base of the Edmund Pettus Bridge and stopped. Dr. King kneeled and offered a prayer of solidarity and walked back to the church.

(11) President Lyndon B. Johnson, inspired by the bravery and determination of these Foot Soldiers and the atrocities they endured, announced his plan for a voting rights bill aimed at securing the precious right to vote for all citizens during an address to Congress on March 15, 1965.

(12) On March 17, 1965, one week after ''Turnaround Tuesday'', U.S. District Judge Frank M. Johnson ruled the Foot Soldiers had a First Amendment right to petition the government through peaceful protest, and ordered federal agents to provide full protection to the Foot Soldiers during the Selma to Montgomery Voting Rights March.

(13) Judge Johnson's decision overturned Alabama Governor George Wallace's prohibition on the protest due to public safety concerns.

(14) On March 21, 1965, under the court order, the U.S. Army, the federalized Alabama National Guard, and countless federal agents and marshals escorted nearly 8,000 Foot Soldiers from the start of their heroic journey in Selma, Alabama to their safe arrival on the steps of the Alabama State Capitol Building on March 25, 1965.

(15) The extraordinary bravery and sacrifice these Foot Soldiers displayed in pursuit of a peaceful march from Selma to Montgomery brought national attention to the struggle for equal voting rights, and served as the catalyst for Congress to pass the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which President Johnson signed into law on August 6, 1965.

(16) To commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Voting Rights Movement and the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, it is befitting that Congress bestow the highest civilian honor, the Congressional Gold Medal, in 2015, to the Foot Soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday or the final Selma to Montgomery Voting Rights March during March of 1965, which served as a catalyst for the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) PRESENTATION AUTHORIZED.—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate shall make appropriate arrangements for the presentation, on behalf of Congress, of a gold medal of appropriate design to the Foot Soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, or the final Selma to Montgomery Voting Rights March during March of 1965, which served as a catalyst for the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For purposes of the presentation referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (referred to in this Act as the ''Secretary'') shall strike a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary.

(c) AWARD OF MEDAL.—Following the award of the gold medal described in subsection (a), the medal shall be given to the Selma Interpretative Center in Selma, Alabama, where it shall be available for display or temporary loan to be displayed elsewhere, as appropriate.

SEC. 3. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

The Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck pursuant to section 2 under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, and the cost of the gold medal.

SEC. 4. STATUS OF MEDALS.

(a) NATIONAL MEDALS.—The medals struck pursuant to this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

(b) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of sections 5134 and 5136 of title 31, United States Code, all medals struck under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous materials into the RECORD concerning H.R. 431, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this very important bill, H.R. 431, a bipartisan bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the foot soldiers, the courageous men and women who participated in historic days such as Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, and the final March from Selma to Montgomery to ensure voting rights for African Americans.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes, it is hard for people in today's society to realize the historical significance of the events that took place in the past. For younger people, it may seem like a lifetime ago, but for those who lived through those experiences, it may seem like it just happened yesterday.

One series of events that we cannot and must not allow to fade away are the historic marches that began in Selma in the spring of 1956. On March 7, 1965, led by two fearless men, the Reverend Hosea Williams and a man many in this Chamber know well, Representative JOHN LEWIS, 500 of those brave foot soldiers determined to have their voices heard and their right to vote be recognized as they bravely lined up at the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

These initial marchers were then brutally assaulted and beaten by Alabama State troopers as they attempted to cross the bridge, seeking to assert their constitutional right to vote. That atrocity became known as Bloody Sunday.

Two days later, nearly 2,500 foot soldiers, led by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., peacefully assembled and again attempted to cross the Edmund Pettus Bridge. The group marched to where the attacks occurred a few days before on Bloody Sunday, and at Dr. King's request, they stopped and knelt in prayer. Following the prayer, the marchers turned around and returned to Selma.

Finally then, on March 21, under the protection of the U.S. Army, Federal marshals, and the federalized Alabama National Guard at that point, that group had swollen to 8,000 foot soldiers who were escorted safely for 54 miles from Selma to Montgomery.

By the time the march reached the steps of the State capitol, that group had grown to approximately 25,000 people strong there on those steps in Montgomery.

Mr. Speaker, instead of bringing the campaign to search for voting rights to a halt, 50 years ago, the photographs and blurry television images of that violent attack on Bloody Sunday on that bridge galvanized the national attention. In fact, the first march was a catalyst for action.

Just 5 short months after the first march, Congress had passed and President Johnson had signed into law the Voting Rights Act.

Mr. Speaker, we, as a Nation, must do more to ensure voting rights are protected for all Americans, and in doing so, we must remember the sacrifices of those individuals who came before us and worked so tirelessly to make a difference and to create voting rights equality.

It is truly a privilege for me personally to stand before you today as Congress recognizes these brave men and women and the historical significance of those marches that began in Selma and forever changed the direction of our great Nation.

I thank the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for highlighting these historic events, and I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 431.

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 431 and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for joining me on the floor today to support H.R. 431. I have enjoyed our bipartisan working relationship on the House Financial Services Committee, and I am pleased today to share this debate time with him.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 431, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the foot soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, or the final Selma to Montgomery voting rights march in 1965.

March 7, 2015, will mark 50 years since the courageous foot soldiers of

the voting rights movement first attempted to march from Selma to Montgomery to protest the denial of their voting rights.

Led by our colleague JOHN LEWIS of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and Reverend Hosea Williams of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, these foot soldiers began the march towards the Alabama State Capitol in Montgomery. They pledged to keep on walking until they secured the freedoms promised to them by the U.S. Constitution.

As they crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge, a wall of Alabama State troopers were waiting at the foot of the bridge. News stations from across the country televised the brutality that followed as foot soldiers like Hosea Williams; JOHN LEWIS; Amelia Boynton Robinson; Reverend F.D. Reese; Bob Nance of Lowndes County; Albert Turner, Sr., of Perry County; and so many others were attacked on Edmund Pettus Bridge on what has become known as Bloody Sunday.

The journey of the foot soldiers we honor today was not an easy one. They were discriminated by Whites and ostracized by Blacks who were afraid to join them, but still, they persevered because they could no longer bear the burdens of second-class citizenship.

The president of the Dallas County Voters League, Reverend F.D. Reese, wasn't going to let nobody turn him around, he told me. He said that given the conditions that existed in Selma and the South at that time, he wanted to make sure that things were different.

He was willing to do whatever was necessary to ensure that people—no matter their race, color, or creed—would have the right to vote.

He said:

> The Lord gave us determination to keep moving forward. We were determined to let the Lord lead us and direct us so that all people, regardless of their color, would have access to the political process.

He went on:

> We were not at all afraid because we were determined that whatever it took, even if it meant our lives, we were going to move Alabama and the States and this Nation forward.

Amelia Boynton Robinson literally felt the blows of injustice as she was beaten on the bridge by Alabama State troopers and left for dead. Amelia's will and dignity suffered no damage, but it made her more resolved than ever to continue the fight for equal voting rights.

Two days after Bloody Sunday, over 2,500 foot soldiers, heeding the call from Dr. Martin Luther King, came to Selma to join the marchers. On March 9, 1965, led by Dr. King and Reverend Ralph Abernathy and many clergy from across this Nation, the foot soldiers once again left from the historic Brown Chapel AME Church and walked to the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

Dr. King stopped at the top of the bridge while a sea of State troopers stepped aside. On bended knees, Dr. King began to pray as the thousands of marchers joined him. As if moved by the spirit, Dr. King turned around and walked back to the church. Tuesday was not to be the day to complete the 54-mile journey. The second march attempt was known as Turnaround Tuesday.

The fight for voting rights was fought both in the streets and in the courtrooms. Attorney Fred Gray helped pave the way for the final Selma to Montgomery march. He was a member of the legal team that represented Hosea Williams, John Lewis, and Amelia Boynton Robinson in Williams v. Wallace.

Because of his work and the courage of an Alabama Federal judge, Federal Judge Frank Johnson ruled that the foot soldiers had a First Amendment right to petition the government through peaceful protest and ordered Federal agents to provide full protection to the foot soldiers during the Selma to Montgomery March.

Under court order, the U.S. Army, the federalized Alabama National Guard, and countless Federal agencies and marshals escorted more than 8,000 foot soldiers on March 21, 1965, as these brave men and women began their historic 54-mile journey from Selma to the steps of the Alabama State Capitol in Montgomery, Alabama.

The extraordinary bravery and sacrifices these foot soldiers displayed in pursuit of a peaceful march from Selma to Montgomery brought national attention to the struggle for equal voting rights and served as a catalyst for Congress to pass the Voting Rights Act of 1965 which President Lyndon Johnson signed into law on August 6, 1965.

Mr. Speaker, as Alabama's first Black Congresswoman, I know that the journey that I now take was only made possible because of the courage and bravery of the foot soldiers of the voting rights movement.

As a proud native of Selma and the U.S. Representative who now represents Selma and parts of Montgomery, I am the direct beneficiary of their sacrifice.

During this 50th commemoration of the voting rights movement and the 50th anniversary of the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, it is befitting that this august body would bestow upon the foot soldiers of the voting rights movement our highest civilian honor, a Congressional Gold Medal, for their valor and determination in relentlessly pursuing the promise of our great Constitution, that all men and women were indeed created equal.

I am proud to be joined by my colleague MARTHA ROBY and the entire Alabama congressional delegation—Representatives ADERHOLT, ROGERS, BROOKS, BYRNE, and PALMER—as original cosponsors of this Congressional Gold Medal bill.

I want to thank the more than 300 colleagues who also signed on to the bill and a special thanks to the leadership of both parties—Speaker BOEHNER, Majority Leader MCCARTHY, Minority Leader PELOSI, and Whip HOYER—for their support in getting this legislation on the floor today.

□ 1245

This would not have been possible without the help and support of Chairman HENSARLING and Ranking Member WATERS of the House Committee on Financial Services.

To the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), thank you. It is an honor to stand with you today to pay tribute to the foot soldiers of the voting rights movement.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 431, a bill that honors the foot soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, and the final march from Selma to Montgomery with a Congressional Gold Medal, which is Congress' highest civilian honor. I hope this medal serves as a powerful reminder of the many sacrifices that were made.

They say that the price of freedom is never free. Well, the foot soldiers of the voting rights movement paid the ultimate price so that this Nation could live up to the ideals of equality and justice for all. This Nation should never forget those who marched, prayed, and died in the pursuit of civil rights, voting rights, and social change.

I urge my colleagues to join us in voting in favor of H.R. 431.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY), who is the lead cosponsor of this legislation.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I, too, want to echo the sentiments of my colleague from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) in thanking leadership and all the Members on both sides of the aisle for their willingness to jump right on this so that we could achieve passage both here in the House and in the Senate in time for this most important anniversary, the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday.

I am so proud just standing here listening to my colleague. I am so proud to have the privilege and the opportunity to cosponsor this bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the brave men and women who not only changed Alabama and America, but they changed the world.

So as we look toward the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday, it is certainly fitting to honor the brave individuals who, against brutality and oppression, took a stand for their God-given rights. So thank you to my colleague, Terry Sewell, for all your hard work on this very important, worthy legislation.

I have also been honored, Mr. Speaker, to serve alongside my colleague

from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) in recruiting Members of this body and the Senate to join us in the pilgrimage led by JOHN LEWIS to Alabama for the anniversary on the 6th, 7th, and 8th of next month. I am proud to say we have a record number of colleagues that are willing to participate because of the obvious significance of this important day.

I look forward to, alongside all of my colleagues in the Alabama delegation—who again I thank as well as Ms. SEWELL for their willingness to host our colleagues from all over the country in Birmingham, in Montgomery, and Selma, and other very important places to the civil rights movement—hearing from those who lived it.

One of the things that we did alongside this Congressional Gold Medal, Mr. Speaker, was to invite our colleagues to come to a screening of the movie ''Selma.'' I have to say, as a girl growing up in Montgomery, Alabama, that did not live through this very important time in our history, it was honestly one of the more moving moments in my time in Congress, to sit in the room with our colleague, Mr. LEWIS, and experience through that visual on the screen what he lived in his life. It was a unique and special moment and one that I will personally treasure for a very long time.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is Mr. LEWIS and all those that joined him in standing up for justice that we seek to honor with this Congressional Gold Medal. There is no higher honor that we as Members of Congress can bestow, yet it seems such a small token of gratitude compared to the magnitude of the endeavors of those who lived through those days.

My daughter, Margaret, Mr. Speaker, whom you often hear me talk about—I have Margaret and George, but Margaret is in fourth grade, and like in a lot of States, in fourth grade in Alabama you learn about Alabama history. This is such an important time in her life as she learns about our State and its history, and the civil rights movement is certainly an integral part, a very important part of our history. So she is coming with me on the pilgrimage next month. She will be able to meet and know firsthand the people that fought to change the world.

It is difficult for those of us who weren't alive during the civil rights movement sometimes to wrap our minds around it, but I, alongside my daughter, am very much looking forward to this special time as Members of Congress that we have to reflect on the importance of this history.

I am, again, honored, Mr. Speaker, to be a part of this bill, and I just thank, again, all of my colleagues who very quickly joined with us so that we could get this done to honor those brave foot soldiers that changed not just our country, but the world. I, too, ask that all my colleagues join me in voting in favor of H.R. 431.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. I want to thank Ms. SEWELL for having the foresight to bring this proposal. This is most fitting that we honor the foot soldiers. They were Americans, all races, who came together and saw injustice and wanted to right it. They risked their lives. Some died in the efforts. Miss Liuzzo was killed right after the march to Montgomery. Schwerner, Chaney, and Goodman were killed over in Mississippi in conjunction with this with the Freedom Riders.

Thousands of people came to the South to see that people got the right to vote. It is hard to believe that people were denied the right to vote in this country, but they were.

I was touched by the remarks of my colleague from Alabama. It was historic. But you don't just have to see the movie and experience it to honor these people and give them a Gold Medal; you need to live it.

People are being denied voting rights today in this country. The Supreme Court emasculated the Voting Rights Act just recently. It needs to be reinstated. There are civil rights that can be performed and enacted in America today. The movement isn't over. The movement continues. A medal is good, but the spirit must continue on this floor to see that all people have their right to vote, their right to participate, and their rights not to have State judges with their lips dripping with interposition tell probate clerks not to enforce a Federal law.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS), a member of the Committee on Financial Services, which has been dealing with this issue.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of this bipartisan legislation that will award a Congressional Gold Medal to the civil rights leaders who so bravely marched for voting rights and equality from Selma, Alabama, to the State capital of Montgomery in March of 1965.

As an adopted son of the great State of Alabama, having been educated at both Auburn University and Samford University's Cumberland School of Law, it is an absolute honor to recognize these peace-loving, God-fearing patriots. These marchers, led by civil rights leaders such as Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., and my colleague from Georgia, Representative JOHN LEWIS, changed the course of our Nation's history. Ultimately, their fearless efforts led to the enactment of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The Congressional Gold Medal is the highest civilian award presented by Congress, and I can think of no better time than the 50th anniversary of this moment in our Nation's history to honor and recognize the civil rights leaders who sacrificed so greatly to bring equality to the voiceless across the United States. May their sacrifice, diligence, and dedication to this cause stand as an example to all of us as we continue to serve in this Chamber and in every aspect of our lives.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS).

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 431, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the foot soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, and the final march from Selma to Montgomery, which was a catalyst for the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

I am proud to cosponsor this bill and to stand with Congresswoman SEWELL and her delegation and one of the greatest leaders in the civil rights movement, Congressman JOHN LEWIS.

It is important that we recognize the civil rights titans whose sacrifice is an essential part of American history. As we honor yesterday's foot soldiers with a Congressional Gold Medal, let us remember that we are still in the fight.

In my home State of North Carolina, we are battling a new rollback on voters' rights. It was one of the most regressive laws we have passed. To fully honor the foot soldiers' sacrifice, we must keep fighting and restore the important protections that have been stripped from the Voting Rights Act.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for joining me in honoring these American heroes.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished House majority leader.

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

I do want to thank the authors of this bill, Congresswoman ROBY and Congresswoman SEWELL, for their work on this. I appreciate it.

We are blessed in this Nation to enjoy the privileges of democracy and to exercise our freedoms without fear, but sadly, for millions of African Americans in our history, that has not been the case.

James Cooper, author of American works like ''The Last of the Mohicans'' and ''The American Democrat,'' once said: ''The man who can right himself by a vote will seldom resort to a musket.''

The opposite is also true. People denied their rights might well resort to violence. It is not difficult to see why. With no established form of recourse, what choice do those denied their freedoms have?

But the people we honor today chose a different path. These nonviolent civil rights activists did not take the road of hate. In their generation's quest for freedom, they didn't corrupt themselves with the sins of those who worked against them. They fought for the rights due to every person—not with weapons, but with the force of rhetoric and virtue of peace.

I remember just a few years ago, I was walking with my friend Congressman JOHN LEWIS through Selma, Alabama. We walked on the same path of

the Selma to Montgomery march that JOHN led 50 years ago. We crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge in peace that day, but when JOHN led the march across the same bridge in 1965, he was beaten by a mob of State troopers and deputized citizens.

JOHN cannot remember who carried him, but wounded and bloodied, as JOHN told it to me, he was taken away to a church with a head injury. He did not know if he would even live.

Those marchers at Selma demonstrated physical courage, but they also demonstrated the highest moral courage. Under the onslaught of brutality and uncertainty, they did not match violence with violence. No. They demanded peace in the face of war, solidarity in the face of division, and love in the face of hate.

For all of America's shortcomings, these brave men and women demanded that the promise of America not be discarded but, instead, realized by being purified in practice. They held America to its promise. By doing so, they put their lives at risk, suffered ridicule and bodily harm, and yet in history they were vindicated.

□ 1300

We are gathered today in honor of those civil rights activists who suffered violence while standing in peace. We honor them for holding our Nation to the highest ideals, ensuring the true existence of liberty and justice for all and making this country keep to its promise that all men and women are created equal.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from California, NANCY PELOSI, the honorable minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentlewoman from Alabama, Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL, for her leadership and for introducing and driving forth this legislation to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the foot soldiers of Selma who fought for African Americans' right to vote. I thank her for the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting and moving and inspiring to listen to the debate on this legislation, to hear the majority leader, to hear other Members of the Congress talk about how important what happened at Selma was to our country and what promise it made for the future of our country.

I would hope that the logical conclusion of that—when we see people who are beaten and, in some instances at that time, killed, fighting for the right to vote—is that we would truly honor them not only with a Gold Medal, as wonderful as that is, but by passing the Voting Rights Act on the floor of the House.

Today, listening to our colleagues, I am reminded of a day almost a year ago, around March of last year, when we dedicated the statue of Rosa Parks in the Capitol of the United States. How exciting—an African American woman to join the ranks of all those men out there. Many more striving to bring diversity, recognizing the great leadership of Rosa Parks.

While we were there that very day, dedicating the statue of Rosa Parks, across the street at the Supreme Court they were hearing the arguments on the Voting Rights case. And it seems to me that it would have been so logical for us to be supporting the spirit of the Voting Rights Act.

Of course the Court acted, and the Congressional Black Caucus took the lead. Many of us stood on the steps while the oral arguments were going on and later came here to dedicate the statue.

But there seemed to be a total disconnect between those who were speaking in a bipartisan way about Rosa Parks and how important it was to our country and the fact that the Court was going to overturn a piece of the Voting Rights Act, and that we, 1 year later, have done nothing to correct that.

So while it is beautiful and lovely to hear all of the good words, and it is fabulous for us to be awarding this Gold Medal, frankly, I think that the foot soldiers of Selma bring added luster to the Gold Medal, as we honor them with it.

As we all know, this marks the 50th anniversary of two exceptional events in American history: the march on Selma and the passage of the Voting Rights Act. Fifty years ago, as we all know, thousands of people—students and scholars, homemakers and laborers, members of the clergy—the Greek Orthodox Church was very prominently there, and many other heroes—marched across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama.

Today, the undaunted courage and dignity of the men and women who marched continue to inspire our Nation—in fact, on the floor of the House today. Hopefully that inspiration will rise to a place in this House where we pass the Voting Rights Act.

The gentleman from Georgia, JOHN LEWIS, who was there, has been acclaimed by all of us as a national treasure and a national hero. What an honor it is to serve with him in Congress and to call him ''colleague.''

The journey from Selma to Montgomery is more than 50 miles, but fatigue did not stop the marchers. State troopers used tear gas and nightsticks. Hatred, violence, and injuries did not stop them. Those brave foot soldiers, propelled by their faith in our country to live up to its promise, continued to march because they knew the power of the ballot.

How proud all of us are, again, to serve in the House alongside Congressman JOHN LEWIS, the conscience of the Congress, who was one of the young leaders of the march toward equality and opportunity, toward justice, toward the ballot box.

The bravery of the Selma marchers summoned this Nation to action. A week after Bloody Sunday, President Lyndon Baines Johnson came to this Chamber—right there—to call on Congress to pass the Voting Rights Act. And he said at the time:

> At times, history and fate meet at a single time in a single place to shape a turning point in man's unending search for freedom. So it was at Lexington and Concord. So it was at Appomattox. So it was in Selma, Alabama.

The courage of 8,000 marchers transformed the bridge into a national symbol of how justice can conquer the status quo. Today, that steel arch bridge over the Alabama River illustrates Dr. King's observation that we all quote all the time: ''The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends towards justice.''

Today we propose to honor the foot soldiers of the Selma marches with the Congressional Gold Medal and by accepting our own responsibility to keep bending, pulling, and nudging that arc toward justice. One way we can do it is by passing the Voting Rights Act.

Just to recall, Mr. Speaker, the last time we brought up the Voting Rights Act in 2006–2007, the Senate passed it unanimously. In the House, the vote was 390–33.

There is bipartisan legislation that has been introduced which can be brought to the floor, passed, and signed into law in time for the Selma anniversary next month. And it certainly must be passed before the 50th anniversary of the signing of the Voting Rights Act on August 6, the 50th anniversary.

We must do so to push back against the same old stale, dressed-up, and renamed efforts to hamper voting access and hinder progress.

Today, as we celebrate the foot soldiers—we pay homage, we reach deep inside of us to say how inspired we all were by it and isn't it wonderful—let's look to the now and say: Right now, to honor these people, we must pass the Voting Rights Act again to correct what the Court did.

So as we pay tribute to the foot soldiers who kept on marching, we move forward from a painful past and march into a brighter, fairer future for everyone.

Again, I thank the gentlewoman from Alabama, Congresswoman SEWELL, for her leadership on this important issue.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I have no interest in politicizing this great bipartisan Gold Medal act that we currently have before us. And let's not turn this important act into a debate that will be, frankly, held in the Judiciary Committee, rather than on the House floor.

We know that the Voting Rights Act—being a man who represents a significant part of Gerald R. Ford's congressional district, it was men like him that were hand-in-hand, arm-in-arm with those in that movement that helped create the original Voting Rights Act. And I know that this body

can rise again to do the right thing and move forward in a bipartisan manner.

With that, Mr. Speaker, recognizing that the other side has numerous requests for time on this bill, particularly from the Congressional Black Caucus, I ask unanimous consent that 7 minutes of the majority's time be transferred and placed under the control of my good friend and colleague from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL), who is the Democratic manager.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding us the time. I want to thank him for the opportunity to allow the members of the Congressional Black Caucus to speak out on this important bill.

Right now, I have the honor to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland, STENY HOYER, the honorable minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. I will say to my friend from Michigan, today we are all members of the Congressional Black Caucus, one people with one commitment and one idea.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill, of which I am a cosponsor, honoring the brave men and women who marched in Selma.

This will be my 10th year participating in the Faith and Politics Institute's pilgrimage to Selma with my friend from Georgia, JOHN LEWIS.

I thank the gentlelady from Selma for leading this debate.

Those folks who marched across that bridge on March 7, known as Bloody Sunday, were met with the power of the State to prevent them from voting.

This Gold Medal would be a tribute to John and to all those who marched alongside him and all those who marched along 2 weeks later with Martin Luther King, Jr., those thousands who walked that 5-day journey from Selma to Montgomery. We ought to pass it unanimously. I hope we will.

But Martin Luther King, Jr., would not be happy with us if we just looked back in awe and reverence and did not look at today—I tell my friend from Michigan—for he would say that Congress should go further than simply honoring those who fought for their rights a half a century ago. We should pay tribute to their sacrifices and the scars they still carry by restoring the full protections of the Voting Rights Act, which the Supreme Court weakened in 2013. Martin Luther King, Jr., was about principle, but he was also about ensuring that protections would be in place.

I hope that this House will allow bipartisan legislation to restore these protections, which is cosponsored by the gentleman from Wisconsin, JIM SENSENBRENNER, the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee on the Republican side, and the gentleman from Georgia, JOHN LEWIS, a hero of Selma. These protections should move expeditiously through the House once the legislation is introduced.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for giving the gentlewoman a minute to yield to me.

I thank Representative SEWELL for her leadership in making sure Congress honors those who shook the conscience of our Nation through their courageous actions in Selma 50 years ago and in so many other places—where many fought, some were badly injured, and, yes, some died—to redeem the promise of America that all of us are created equal, endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights. And certainly in a democracy, one of the most important—if not the most important—rights that we have is to vote, to select our representatives, to select the policies under which we will live.

I thank the Speaker and the majority leader for getting behind this effort. And, again, I thank the gentlelady from Selma. How proud she must be of her hometown and of the history that was made there, not just for African Americans but for all Americans.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time at this moment.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, how many more minutes do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Alabama has 12½ minutes remaining.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentlelady from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY).

Mrs. BEATTY. I thank the gentlewoman from Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL, my good friend, and my good friend from Alabama, MARTHA ROBY, in strong support of H.R. 431, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the foot soldiers who participated in the Selma freedom marches in March of 1965.

These foot soldiers, including our colleague from Georgia, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, and the men, women, and children who marched on Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, and in the final march from Selma to Montgomery, were met with attacks and dogs, beatings, and death along the way. But, Mr. Speaker, still they marched, as many of us will march in a few weeks, to fight for equal rights and voting rights.

Mr. Speaker, let us honor the 1965 foot soldiers for their bravery and for their equality, marching for equality. I urge all Members to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 431.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

□ 1315

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Alabama, and I thank her particularly for her persistent leadership and for her generosity with inviting so many Members to her district. We have enjoyed meeting her local officials, and we have enjoyed meeting the leadership of that great city and its great history.

We make a personal commitment to her that as we travel through Selma—and it captures the essence of a town of great history—that we recognize that there is a need to invest many dollars to preserve this great city and to preserve its history. We thank her for her leadership.

To the manager, the gentleman from Michigan, let me thank you very much for your eloquent statements. Isn't it important, Mr. Speaker, to see the number of leaders of our leadership—the majority leader, the minority leader, the whip, and the minority whip—here on the floor of the House joining us in this momentous occasion?

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of working for the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, obviously at a very, very young age. It was in that atmosphere, out of their office on Auburn Avenue in Georgia, that I got the sense and the feeling of the moment of the history of Selma.

In the fictional yet truthful movie ''Selma,'' we are reminded of the song ''Glory.'' Today is an example of ''Glory.'' It is an example of the coming together of peoples around what is right, and it is a recognition that foot soldiers, though unknown even some 50 years later, are deserving of being pulled from the ashes of their last words to be able to say to them, ''Thank you.''

That is what this Congressional Gold Medal means to me and means to so many who were among the 600-plus that could be called the foot soldiers. Obviously, by working for the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, I knew at that time Ambassador Andrew Young, Hosea Williams, James Orange, and a litany of others.

Certainly, as our Congresswoman from Selma has done, we pay tribute to our leader JOHN LEWIS who, himself, was brutalized as he attempted to exercise a simple right protected by the Bill of Rights, and that is the right to freedom of speech, freedom of access, and freedom of movement.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I join in the words of President Johnson on March 15, 1965, looking back over Bloody Sunday. He said:

> I speak tonight for the dignity of man and the destiny of democracy . . . At times, history and fate meet at a single time in a single place to shape a turning point in man's unending search for freedom. So it was at Lexington and Concord. So it was a century ago at Appomattox. So it was last week in Selma, Alabama.

Yes, it was simply just last week in the thinking of so many of us as we stand on the floor of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentlewoman.

Might I say, as we vote on this, we vote together. Might I say, as much as we vote, can we do it in action and vote to reauthorize the Voting Rights Act by simply restoring section 5, giving the Supreme Court what it needs, but recognizing the importance of protecting the right to vote?

In the name of Jimmie Lee Jackson who died trying to protect his mother and grandmother, in the name of Viola Liuzzo, and in the name of Reverend James Reeb, I ask that we stand here today and vote for this legislation to honor them, but vote for reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today not only as a proud supporter, but as a cosponsor, of H.R. 431, a bill authorizing the award of the Congressional Gold Medal to the ''foot soldiers of Selma,'' those heroic souls who risked their lives for freedom and to secure the right to vote for all Americans by their participation in marches for voting rights on ''Bloody Sunday,'' ''Turnaround Tuesday,'' or the final, completed march from Selma to Montgomery in March 1965.

I thank my colleague, Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL of Alabama, for introducing this legislation paying fitting, and long overdue, tribute to those brave and determined men and women, boys and girls, persons of all races and creeds, who loved their country so much that they were willing to risk their lives to make it better, to bring it even closer to its founding ideals that all persons have dignity and the right to equal treatment under the law, and in the making of the laws, which is the fundamental essence of the right to vote. I also want to thank Congresswoman MARTHA ROBY.

Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1965, before a joint session of the Congress and the eyes of the nation, President Lyndon Johnson explained to the nation the significance of ''Bloody Sunday'':

> ''I speak tonight for the dignity of man and the destiny of democracy. . . .
>
> ''At times history and fate meet at a single time in a single place to shape a turning point in man's unending search for freedom.
>
> ''So it was at Lexington and Concord.
>
> ''So it was a century ago at Appomattox.
>
> ''So it was last week in Selma, Alabama.''

The previous Sunday, March 7, 1965, more than 600 civil rights demonstrators, including our beloved colleague, Congressman JOHN LEWIS of Georgia, were brutally attacked by state and local police at the Edmund Pettus Bridge as they marched from Selma to Montgomery in support of the right to vote.

''Bloody Sunday'' was one of the defining moments in American history because it crystallized for the nation the necessity of enacting a strong and effective federal law to protect the right to vote of every American.

No one who witnessed the violence and brutally suffered by the foot soldiers for justice who gathered at the Edmund Pettus Bridge will ever forget it; the images are deeply seared in the American memory and experience.

Mr. Speaker, what is so moving, heroic, and awe-inspiring is that the foot soldiers we honor today faced their heavily armed oppressors fortified only by their love for their country and each other and the audacious faith that their cause was just.

The example set by the foot soldiers of Selma showed everyone, here in America and around the world, that there is no force on earth as powerful as an idea whose time has come.

So it is fitting and proper, Mr. Speaker, that we honor today the heroes—the foot soldiers—who won the Bathe of Selma and helped redeem the greatest nation on earth.

But we should not forget that this victory came at great cost and that many good and dear persons lost their lives to win for others the right to vote.

Men like Jimmy Lee Jackson, who was shot by Alabama state trooper as he tried to protect his mother and grandmother from being beaten for participating in a peaceful voting rights march in Marion, Alabama.

Women like Viola Liuzzo, a housewife and mother of five, who had journeyed to Selma from Detroit to join the protests after witnessing on television the events at Edmund Pettus Bridge on ''Bloody Sunday'' and who was shot and killed by Klansmen while driving back from a trip shuttling fellow voting rights marchers to the Montgomery airport.

Persons of faith, goodwill, and non-violence like the Reverend James Reeb of Boston, a minister from Boston who heeded the call of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. to come to Selma and who succumbed to the head injuries he suffered at the hands of his white supremacists attackers on March 9, two days after Bloody Sunday.

Mr. Speaker, in the face of all this hostility, violence, brutality, and hatred, the foot soldiers of Selma would not be deterred—would not be moved—would not be turned around.

They kept their eyes on the prize and held on.

And help came the very next week when President Johnson announced to the nation that he would send to Congress for immediate action a law designed to eliminate illegal barriers to the right to vote by striking down ''restrictions to voting in all elections—Federal, State, and local—which have been used to deny Negroes the right to vote.''

On August 6, 1965, that legislation—the Voting Rights Act of 1965—was signed into law by President Johnson and for the next 48 years did more to expand our democracy and empower racial and language minorities than any act of government since the Emancipation Proclamation and adoption of the Civil War Amendments.

But our work is not done; the dreams of Dr. King and of all those who gave their lives in the struggle for justice are not behind us but still before us.

In the wake of the Supreme Court's 2013 ruling in Shelby County v. Holder, which severely crippled the Voting Rights Act, we have seen many states across our nation move to enact legislation designed to limit the ability of women, the elderly, racial and language minorities to exercise their right to vote.

In Texas alone, new voter ID laws are estimated to have prevented or deterred as many as 600,000 citizens from registering to vote in 2014.

To honor the memory of the foot soldiers of Selma, we must rededicate ourselves to a great task remaining before us—to repair the damage done to the Voting Rights Act by working to pass the Voting Rights Amendments Act of 2015, which I am proud to be one of the original cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, as I have stated many times, the 1965 Voting Rights Act is no ordinary piece of legislation.

For millions of Americans, and for many in Congress, it is sacred treasure, earned by the sweat and toil and tears and blood of ordinary Americans who showed the world it was possible to accomplish extraordinary things.

As we honor the foot soldiers of Selma by voting to pass H.R. 431 awarding them the Congressional Gold Medal, let us resolve also to restore the Voting Rights Act of 1965, so that it remains a lasting monument to their heroism and devotion to the country they loved.

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Alabama for bringing us together around this important issue.

It is my honor to be a cosponsor of this endeavor, to take this opportunity to demonstrate our appreciation and our respect for the sacrifices that were made by the foot soldiers who marched in the three marches. It is my honor always to be a part of this wonderful body that serves along with JOHN LEWIS, who happens to be one of my personal heroes.

This Congressional Gold Medal is not just simply an award. It is emblematic of a selflessness that was demonstrated by people who stood up and did the right thing and put their lives in jeopardy to ensure that we, as a democracy, had an opportunity to participate at the very highest level, and that is the level of voting.

As I stand here and thank each and every one of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle for supporting this initiative, I rise also to remind us that we have work still to be done, that the battle that was before us that we thought we won is still there to be won, and that we need to correct the actions of the Supreme Court and follow through on the actions of giving people the right to vote.

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. I thank the gentlewoman from Alabama and those others who have cosponsored this, including Congresswoman ROBY from Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is so vitally important. I take it as one of my life's greatest honors to have served for the last 20 years in the Congress with JOHN LEWIS. He literally changed our Nation through his bravery.

On a day like today, this is the date that 25 years ago, Nelson Mandela

walked out of prison and into the Presidency in South Africa, and as those foot soldiers walked across this bridge on Bloody Sunday, they helped create a circumstance in which we would have, as a President of the United States, Barack Obama. We cannot separate these issues. They are inextricably intertwined.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my colleague from Selma who represents so ably the new South that our Nation is so much better for the struggle in Selma, for the sacrifice, and not just in those who are famous like Dr. King or JOHN LEWIS, but I met at her side Ms. Boynton, a 105-year-old woman who walked across that bridge that day, just in this Capitol less than 20 days ago.

I want to thank her for her leadership on this issue and thank her as we celebrate and commemorate these 50 years and as we dedicate ourselves to fight for the right to vote for every single American without equivocation or compromise.

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, voting is the most fundamental right that we share as Americans. The foot soldiers who dared to march across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in the face of extreme racial hostility did so in the spirit of equality. We should never forget the sacrifices they made so that this Nation could live up to the ideals of equality and justice for all.

While we can never repay these foot soldiers for the sacrifices that they made, we can offer a down payment by continuing to fight against injustice wherever it exists. For as Dr. King so eloquently noted, ''Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere.''

May we be moved by the valor and determination of these foot soldiers to stomp out modern-day inequities in the name of justice. The foot soldiers of the voting rights movement set forth a powerful precedent for all of us to follow.

Whenever the rights of any one man have been denied, the rights of all are in danger. The price of freedom, as has been said before, is not free. The foot soldiers paid the ultimate price to ensure equal voting rights for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that over 300 of my colleagues in Congress—both Democrats and Republicans—have agreed to cosponsor this bill. I am proud that my colleague from Alabama Senator SESSIONS and Senator BOOKER will introduce this bill on the Senate side today.

I am humbled by the strong bipartisan support of this bill, and I would like to thank Representative MARTHA ROBY and all of the members of the Alabama delegation for standing with me in support of this bill.

Today, I am especially proud to be from Alabama. I invite my colleagues, Republican and Democrat, and all Americans, to come to Selma during the first week of March to witness living history. You, too, can witness living history.

The city of Selma and the jubilee group will be doing a host of activities all week long. Of course, the commemorative march itself will be on Sunday, March 8, as well as our President will be speaking to us in Selma on March 7.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 431. I believe that bestowing the Congressional Gold Medal to the foot soldiers of the voting rights movement is a strong reminder of the power of ordinary Americans to collectively achieve extraordinary, extraordinary social change.

I want to again thank the gentleman from Michigan for sharing with me this wonderful 40 minutes of debate. I want you to know that it is one of the highlights of my life to have the opportunity to bestow this Congressional Gold Medal to the foot soldiers of the voting rights movement.

As a proud daughter of Selma and the Representative of Selma, Montgomery, Birmingham, and Tuscaloosa, I want you to know that those of us who are the direct beneficiaries of the movement, Black and White, we owe a debt of gratitude that we can never repay.

Today goes a long way in acknowledging those unsung and noted heroes like JOHN LEWIS, but there are so many, so many, that are in our midst, in our communities, that gave that sacrifice. Today, we honor them, the foot soldiers of the voting rights movement.

I want to say again to all of my colleagues: I hope that you will take seriously this bill and what its significance is to America.

I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for sharing this time with me, and I want to thank the leadership of both parties for putting this bill on the floor in such a timely manner, so that we can get it on the President's desk before the March 7 and 8 wonderful, wonderful celebration.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I thank all of you for being here, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 431, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

To my friend, it is amazing to me today the irony as we talk about the Edmund Pettus Bridge, a man who served as the grand dragon of the Ku Klux Klan in Alabama, who just 100 years ago was serving in the U.S. Senate, and to have that be a symbol and discussed in the same breath as a man like JOHN LEWIS and Martin Luther King and so many others and in that short 50 years for us, even though we may be of a different political persuasion, for me to be here and witness the first African American to be President of these United States, what an amazing journey this has been.

Gone are the poll taxes, gone are the reading and history tests, gone are a number of those legal impediments and formal legal impediments that were there both in the North and in the South that dictated to someone where they could or couldn't live.

What has not gone—I am struck by this time and time again—is sin and hatred in human hearts. As C.S. Lewis talks about in his book ''Mere Christianity,'' by means of laws, a man can attempt to change a man's actions, but they will not succeed without a change to those men's hearts.

I think that is our legacy. I think that is our duty as Americans, and I think that is part of what we are doing here today—to honor, to recognize, and to celebrate, knowing that the journey is not done necessarily, knowing that we have other areas where we need to work on this as a society, but knowing that progress has been made.

It is truly an honor to be a part of this with you as well, my friend.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 431.

The question was taken.

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1330

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 1, KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE APPROVAL ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM FEBRUARY 16, 2015, THROUGH FEBRUARY 23, 2015

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 100 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 100

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (S. 1) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; and (2) one motion to commit.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from February 16, 2015, through February 23, 2015—

(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. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), 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.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to talk about House Resolution 100, which provides a closed rule for consideration of S. 1, the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act. Folks might find that a little unusual to talk about a bill that begins with the title S. 1, but there is a new day in Washington, D.C., that excites me, and it is that the ''open for business'' sign is there on the Senate side. It is not a function of Republicans doing this or Democrats doing that. It is a function of the process working the way that it should.

The first vote I took on the Keystone pipeline, Mr. Speaker, was back in 2011 when I was first elected to Congress. It passed the House by a wide bipartisan margin. It was never given the time of day in the United States Senate.

As we come here today, we are not just talking about approval of the Keystone XL pipeline in S. 1. We are talking about the inclusion of another bill that has passed time and time again, the Better Buildings Act. Mr. MCKINLEY from West Virginia has language that would promote energy conservation across this land, a bill that has passed time and time again in this House but has never been passed by the Senate.

It is an opportunity here today, Mr. Speaker. It is an opportunity to do those things that the American people sent us here to do: bipartisan votes, commonsense legislation for the first time in a long time, Mr. Speaker, and what I hope will be the beginning of a long trend here in the U.S. House of Representatives.

As you listened to the Clerk read, Mr. Speaker, you heard that there are a lot of different points in this bill. It is not just a bill for consideration of S. 1. It is also a bill so that when the House is not in session in D.C. next week, the Speaker will have the ability to call the House back into session to continue to conduct business because the business must continue to go on. I am glad the Rules Committee was able to include that provision as well.

Seven years ago is when the permit process started on the Keystone XL pipeline, Mr. Speaker. Since seven years ago, longer than it took to build the Hoover Dam, we have been trying to approve a small section of pipeline. I say ''trying to approve'' somewhat loosely. I think if we had been committed to getting it done, we could have absolutely gotten it done. Again, it is a commonsense piece of legislation that decides rather than building a pipeline across Canada to carry oil to Canadian refineries, which will provide lots of jobs for Canadians, if our partner to the north is willing, we will build that pipeline through America to deliver that oil to American refineries to create Americans jobs.

This is not a bill that mandates that, Mr. Speaker. The marketplace is going to control this construction decision. The marketplace is going to control where the oil is refined, and the marketplace is going to control whether or not the oil comes out of the ground to begin with.

Too often, I think we have been treating the Keystone XL pipeline approval process as if it were an environmental decision. There are those who wish the United States would reduce its reliance on fossil fuels. I am one of those. I don't think there is any advantage to be had by putting all your eggs in one energy basket. I am in favor of an all-of-the-above strategy that makes sure that America's energy security—North America's energy security—is based on multiple—multiple—avenues for energy production. But we do not get to decide in this Chamber whether or not the Canadians bring oil out of the ground. We only get to decide whether or not, once that oil comes out of the ground, it is moved with U.S. jobs and U.S. construction to U.S. refineries, or whether or not those jobs go elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, time and time again folks come to the floor and they say: Where are the jobs? Where is the jobs legislation? I am thrilled to be carrying this rule for the Rules Committee today, Mr. Speaker, because this is one of those jobs bills—bipartisan, common sense. And if we pass it here in the House today, Mr. Speaker, headed to the President's desk, that signature will change the lives of those hardworking Americans looking for jobs today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, you are not permitted to sing in the House of Representatives, and I shall not do that; but I will take this opportunity to do as my colleagues in the Rules Committee did yesterday, a little bit in advance of my friend's birthday. Today is the birthday of my friend, Mr. WOODALL. And as one who has had many more birthdays than he, I hope he has as many birthdays as me and many, many more. Happy birthday to you, ROB.

As my friends are already aware, the President has already said that he is going to veto this measure. We introduced last night the statement of the administration with reference thereto. That means that the likelihood that this bill will become law is highly improbable at best. I wish I was standing here under different circumstances. I wish that the House were about to vote on something it knows that the President will sign into law. I wish we were working on something that would actually help our economic recovery instead of hamstringing it.

I listened to my friend very attentively when he pointed out that the marketplace will dictate three different circumstances. One that he did not allude to that I will is that the marketplace will dictate where the oil, once refined if the Keystone pipeline is approved, the marketplace will dictate out there in that neverland where we don't participate, where the oil will go. Therefore, I want to make it very clear that I do not believe that it means that there will be cheaper prices in the United States of America.

I am standing here because House leadership would rather pass purely symbolic measures than work with the President. And I recognize that, as my friend has pointed out, that a long time has passed with reference to this measure. I did a little added research to determine what would Enbridge and the other companies up in Canada do in case there was no Keystone pipeline. In addition to rail, they also have plans to send oil east and west and plans to send it north. And, I might add, for all that same period of time, the resistance inside Canada, based on a number of circumstances having to do with the Beluga whale, all of the way back to farmers, having to do with environmentalists, the same as in our country, the same arguments, whether East, West, or North in Canada, have been going on while our debate has been going on here with reference to the Keystone pipeline.

The 113th Congress is going to be remembered, and I believe everyone now understands, as the least productive Congress ever. That is the one that we just came out of. However, it seems that the current Congress is going to take its best shot at accomplishing even less if we stay on the course that we are on. Virtually every bill that has come before the Rules Committee the House already passed in the 113th Congress. Most have no more hope of becoming law now than the last time around. We have yet to see one really new idea from the Republican leadership of this body, which has shown zero interest in actually doing its job, in my opinion.

How many more times are we going to have to vote to repeal so-called ObamaCare, a program that now unquestionably is improving the lives of some hardworking Americans. Instead, we are voting on bills handpicked for

their ability to demonstrate the Republicans' message of the week, regardless of chance of enactment, regardless of whether it is a good idea, regardless of whether it is something that will help everyday Americans. And because these bills are handpicked for specific purposes, most have come to the floor under a closed rule, which means that Members cannot change the measure in any way, not even to make it better and not even with bipartisan solutions.

A good example is so far this body has voted on 15 rules during this 114th Congress, of which 8 of those 15 have been closed. The closed rules we will pass this week will be numbers 9, 10, and 11. Listen, my friends, on this same measure last week and before, the United States Senate, operating under regular order that is now majority-led by Republicans, considered on this very same measure 18 amendments, six that were approved, and some of them that were offered were bipartisan.

Among the reasons I believe that the Senate majority leader determined that he would operate differently than the previous majority leader is so as to give his membership, smaller than ours, of course, an opportunity to participate in the process. All the more reason, I believe, that we should have open rules. We have new Members, too, as do they. We have Members that have ideas that may be bipartisan with reference to support and opposition to the Keystone pipeline. But no, we continue to operate under closed rules.

Do you know how many rules were closed at this same point in the last Congress? The most closed rules ever, six. The gavel might as well be a brick wall.

Furthermore, much of the legislation this Congress has voted on has evaded regular order, escaping the review, hearings, and markups that ensure appropriate deliberation and consideration. Those of us on the Rules Committee have a wonderful opportunity. We are becoming sort of like the place of first resort for legislation. It isn't coming from hearings. The American public doesn't get an opportunity to see the various committees. It just comes up to the Rules Committee and we massage it back and forth about what our views are, but it does not come under regular order.

□ 1345

Just like the original version of this bill, the House is considering the Senate version of this bill without a hearing or a markup.

These are not just academic procedural disagreements. It matters because Members are not able to represent their constituents. It matters because good ideas are being deliberately kept hidden.

I have been here a long time. I have seen some pretty great Congresses under Republican and Democratic control, and I have seen some pretty lousy ones.

But the last few years, this body has been like a hamster on a wheel, spinning and spinning, but never getting anywhere. You don't have to look farther than a couple of amendments the Senate made to this bill to see my friends spinning their wheels.

Climate change is real. Because a few Senators decided to get cute in parsing a few words, it is in the bill. We are going to vote on it. And then what?

Just yesterday, Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack announced that the United States Department of Agriculture is making more than $280 million available for rural agricultural producers and small business owners to apply for resources to purchase and install renewable energy systems or make energy efficiency improvements.

Once more, those funds were made available in the 2014 farm bill, which shows what Congress can accomplish when we work together. I might add, because farmers in this country have experienced a 37 percent reduction—and I, along with others, represent many of those rural areas—I am delighted that we were able to do that in the farm bill, and I am pleased that Secretary Vilsack made his announcement.

The Senate also included an amendment that finds that Congress should—as opposed to shall—require oil companies to pay an excise tax to fund oil spill cleanups.

While I appreciate this expression, the amendment effectively does nothing to mandate contributions to the oil liability trust fund. I would invite my colleagues on the other side to explain that. Tell us why it is that these oil companies should not be required to contribute in a mandatory manner to the oil liability trust fund. Instead, what is happening is we create the illusion that oil companies will actually be accountable in the event of a spill.

Alternatively, simply closing the tax loophole that allows oil and gas companies to deduct the cost of cleaning up oil spills would discourage oil spills and save hardworking American taxpayers an average of $1.3 billion per year.

The American people were led to believe that changing control of the Senate would lead to an end of this gridlock. But sadly, this has not been the case.

My friends are not going to be able to, like the hamster, spin their wheels continuously. Even the hamster gets tired. And sooner or later, when that hamster gets tired of the nonsense of spinning going nowhere, he either gets off or he falls off.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank my friend for his well wishes and to tell him I am sympathetic to the hamster wheel scenario that he describes.

I don't particularly enjoy these opening weeks of a new Congress, Mr. Speaker, because committees haven't gotten organized, legislation hasn't started to flow, and it puts the committee in the very unfortunate situation of having to act as the legislator, as the authorizer, to begin moving pieces of legislation to the floor.

That is unfortunate. But that is not the situation we are talking about today, Mr. Speaker. What we are talking about today is a bill that not only passed the floor of the House but went to the Senate, a bill that not just went to the Senate but went through that wonderful open debate process that my friend from Florida described and has now come back to us today.

Four years we have been trying to move this bill forward, Mr. Speaker. It is a closed rule here today so that we can act on the same legislation that the Senate has passed, so we can send this bill to the President's desk, so we can get off the hamster wheel of futility that my friend from Florida describes.

I am optimistic, Mr. Speaker. But it doesn't happen by itself. It happens with years and years of work.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), whose advocacy and leadership have made having this bill on the floor today possible.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank my friends on the other side as well on the Rules Committee. I have been before them twice now on this topic and have enjoyed it immensely.

I might say as a word of encouragement with regard to the hamster wheel, because I share the same concerns, but I am also encouraged by the fact that we are actually passing the Senate bill today. As many times as we have tried to pass this, we have never been able to get it to the President's desk. That will happen soon. That is progress, and I think we ought to celebrate the progress of that.

With regard to being the least productive Congress, veto threats before voting on important things sort of leads to gridlock, I suppose. But I don't think that should stop us from doing our job and forwarding the ideas that our constituents have asked for. My constituents want the Keystone XL pipeline built.

What we are doing today, as was teed up by the gentleman from Georgia, is, of course, talking about a Senate bill. We passed H.R. 3 when I introduced it the first week in the House, a closed rule, as the gentleman from Florida said, a simple bill. We have passed similar bills in previous Congresses, well vetted. And my colleague from North Dakota, Senator HOEVEN, who is really the originator of this whole concept, introduced S. 1.

The other reason I think we should be encouraged is not only did the Senate have an open process, they voted on 47—at least 47—amendments. That is more than three times as many amendments on S. 1 as the Senate voted on in all of the bills last year. That is progress. That is not hamsters on the wheel.

I want to take a few minutes to describe the amendments that came over from the Senate and why I suggest to leadership—and I am pleased leadership accepted—that we just simply accept the Senate amendments and move this forward rather than going to conference, although I think that would have been a good exercise for a lot of us as well.

But there were a couple of amendments introduced that deal with energy efficiency programs, as the gentleman from Georgia pointed out, dealing with federally leased and owned property, as well as schools. It sets up programs and processes and gives authority to the Department of Energy to sort of coordinate energy efficiency issues in programs and projects, which I think is a noble goal.

There is that sense of the Senate that climate change is real and not a hoax. Now, we can throw that out as sort of meaningless. But the reality is that a statement like that passed 98–1 by the Senate is a pretty strong statement. I think the President ought to view that as currency—as currency. He argues that Keystone, because oil sands are somehow supposed to emit more greenhouse gas emissions than other production—I am here to tell you it is not true, and I will point out the very specific facts on that.

But in the spirit of compromise, he has this statement that I think provides currency for him to go to Paris next December and say: This is the sense of the Congress of the United States. I hope he views it as a positive.

Senator MIKULSKI has that amendment—which the gentleman from Florida spoke to—the sense of the Senate that all forms of unrefined and unprocessed petroleum should be subject to the nominal per-barrel excise tax associated with the spill fund.

While it says it is the sense of the Senate and it isn't put into law, I think it is important to note that we are talking about a tax, an excise tax that is placed on domestic crude, for sure, not placed on—if you can imagine this now—bitumen. Bitumen is the product that comes from the oil sands, and because bitumen is not in the Tax Code, it is not subject to the excise tax. That should be corrected. We should do that in the proper order, probably through the Ways and Means Committee.

That said, it is important to note that TransCanada is 100 percent responsible for spills and cleaning them up. I sited the first Keystone pipeline through the State of North Dakota, 600 landowners' land. They had some issues in the early going at one of the pumping stations. They did clean it up. It didn't contaminate water or the surrounding area. All of the tools worked properly.

My point is that they are responsible, and that is as per each State's law. This line will be permitted in each State, and they have to be responsible for cleanup.

Another one, Senator CORNYN had an amendment: Land or interest in land for the pipeline may only be acquired through constitutionally appropriate means. That only makes sense. Maybe it doesn't need to be stated, but it is important to state, similar to the Barrasso amendment that clarifies that treaties with Indian tribes must remain in effect. That should be obvious as well, but it doesn't help to restate those important points.

I think that these amendments are important amendments, they are good amendments, and they help broaden the appeal of the bill.

I want to take this map down and I want to speak to just a few of the merits of the Keystone pipeline bill because I know them very well, the extraordinary benefits of Keystone XL.

Employment opportunities—Mr. Speaker, according to the U.S. State Department, 42,000 jobs will be supported by the construction. I can assure you, having been on the construction site of the original Keystone bill, it is true. These are real jobs. These are good jobs. Some people refer to them as temporary jobs. Referring to a pipeline project as temporary is like referring to a wind farm as only temporary construction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the generosity of the gentleman from Georgia. Thank you.

But all construction jobs are temporary until the construction is done and you move on to the next project. There are thousands of miles of pipeline under the ground in the United States. The steel workers, the truck drivers, the backhoe operators, the welders, and the local hotels and restaurants and retailers benefit tremendously. This is the make-or-break in many cases for some of these smaller businesses that benefit from the construction of this dynamic economy.

Energy security—we can't overstate energy security. We are talking about displacing Venezuelan oil. We are talking about displacing Middle East oil. In fact, the 830,000 barrels per day that will run through the Keystone pipeline into U.S. refineries is equal to about 50 percent of what we import from the Middle East. That is security.

When we talk about energy independence, that is one thing. Security means that we have our security in our own hands, and we are not subject to bad guys from other parts of the world; that, in fact, we are part of the security solution. And it relates directly to national security, I might add.

Enhanced safety—I was a pipeline regulator for years. There is no safer way to move crude oil than by a pipeline. It is the most efficient and it is the safest by far.

We have seen some of the things that happened when we cluttered our highways. In fact, the Department of Transportation in North Dakota anticipates the saving of three to six fatalities on the roads in North Dakota if this pipeline is built because, remember, it is not all Canadian oil sands. About a quarter of this capacity is reserved for Bakken crude oil as well. That removes a lot of trucks from our roads. That is much safer for the traveling public.

Trains—another issue we have. We have a lot of trains. This would represent 10 trains a week that could be hauling food to hungry people rather than oil to the marketplace.

Environmental protection—we hear a lot about the environment and the issues pertaining to it, and rightfully so. The good news is that after 6½ years of study, this is the most environmentally studied pipeline and the most sophisticated and highest-tech pipeline in the history of the world.

In fact, moving oil by rail actually emits 1.8 times more CO_2 into the air than moving it by pipeline. Moving it by truck emits 2.9 times more CO_2 than does moving it by pipeline. Moving it by barge to China, where it will be refined with far lower environmental standards than the United States, that is priceless.

Exchange with Canada—I don't think we should understate the importance of our relationship. Our number one trading partner, $2 billion a day of goods and services travels between our two countries—our top trading partner and best friend, Canada.

If we were doing this to Canadians and to Canadian companies, or if they were doing this to us, I can't imagine how we would respond. I have worked closely with the Embassy. I have worked closely with the new Premier, Premier Jim Prentice, from Alberta, who, by the way, just won the election this last fall on the pro-environmental stewardship platform.

Exchange with Canada is so important. We need to restore and care for that important relationship. I would rather enhance that relationship, quite frankly—and it gets right back to this energy security issue—than be fighting over oil or fighting to protect the transportation of oil in other places.

□ 1400

At the end of the day, with everything else that has gone on and with these other important issues, to me, the final thing is this, and it is what I would say to the President, Mr. Speaker:

You have asked for bipartisan bills. You have asked for us to work together. Here we have a bipartisan, bicameral solution, one that the American public supports in a big way, one that would create jobs, one that would lift up the middle class, Mr. President.

I would just beg, Mr. Speaker, that the President would reconsider his veto threat on this important bipartisan jobs bill and sign it when it goes to his desk so that we can get people back to work, can become less dependent on foreign sources of oil from across the sea, and can become more interdependent with our neighbors in Canada.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, would you be kind enough to tell both of us the remaining amount of time on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 18 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia has 15 minutes remaining.

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

Here we are, only 17 days before the Republican Homeland Security shutdown and with just 6 legislative days left until the Department of Homeland Security shuts down on February 28, closing down many of the crucial Department of Homeland Security operations that have kept our country safe from terrorist attacks.

If we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up a clean version of the Department of Homeland Security funding bill. With such serious consequences, it is time to put politics aside in order to strengthen our homeland and protect American families.

To discuss our proposal, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my good friend, the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge this House to immediately take up and pass a clean funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security. By defeating the previous question on the pending rule, we can immediately make in order a clean Homeland Security bill and stop the theatrics over the President's use of executive orders.

Madam Speaker, as of today, we are 134 days into what should have been the start of this fiscal year. The situation this House has caused is completely unacceptable. We simply cannot wait one more day to do the right thing, the responsible thing, and fund these critical agencies tasked with protecting this Nation.

As the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, I was involved in the bipartisan, bicameral negotiations on the omnibus spending bill that passed the House and the Senate and was signed by the President last December. That package could have contained all 12 annual spending bills because all 12 were negotiated in conference, and every one of them was ready to go.

An unfortunate decision was made by the leadership of this body to omit the Homeland Security bill, not because there were outstanding issues or continued disputes. That bill, negotiated by my good friend from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), was stripped from the omnibus because some in this body were upset by the President's executive order on immigration. They even admitted the President's actions had little to do with the Homeland Security appropriations bill. Yet that was the choice that was made on how to proceed, so the Homeland Security appropriations bill was forced to operate under a continuing resolution instead of having a full-year bill. Ironically, it meant Customs and Border Protection and Immigration and Customs Enforcement—two of the agencies tasked with defending our borders and enforcing our immigration laws—had to do without the nearly $1 billion increase they would have gotten under the full-year bill.

Delaying the full-year bill, my colleagues: limits the Department's ability to advance the Secretary's Unity of Effort initiative, designed to improve coordination in our security missions; limits the ability of the Secretary to move ahead with the Southern Border and Approaches Campaign; creates uncertainty regarding ICE's capacity to detain and deport dangerous criminals; complicates the Department's ability to deal with another influx of unaccompanied children at our border stations; delays the implementation of the new security upgrades at the White House and of the hiring increases of the U.S. Secret Service; and delays terrorism preparedness and response grants for State and local public safety personnel.

I understand that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle feel quite strongly about the President's use of executive orders on immigration policy, but I am compelled to remind those colleagues that they have every tool at their disposal to pass legislation changing the President's proposal.

This stunt, my friends, has gone on too long. It is time to admit these immigration policy decisions have little to nothing to do with the appropriations process. The Homeland Security bill should never have been held hostage in this fight.

Madam Speaker, just this week, Secretary of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson issued a sobering statement about the consequences of operating under a continuing resolution. Quite simply, ''Border security is not free.''

I couldn't agree more.

Madam Speaker, I would like to enter Secretary Johnson's statement in the RECORD.

[Department of Homeland Security Press Release, Feb. 10, 2015]

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY JEH C. JOHNSON ON THE CONSEQUENCES TO BORDER SECURITY WITHOUT A DHS APPROPRIATIONS BILL

I continue to stress the need for a DHS appropriations bill for FY 2015, unburdened by politically charged amendments that attempt to defund our executive actions on immigration reform. The President has made plain that he will veto a bill that includes such language.

At present, the Department of Homeland Security is operating on a continuing resolution that expires on February 27. As long as this Department is funded by a continuing resolution, there are a whole series of activities vital to homeland security and public safety that cannot be undertaken. The public must be aware of the real impacts to homeland security as long as DHS is funded by a continuing resolution, or, still worse, if Congress were to permit our funding to lapse altogether and the Department of Homeland Security goes into government shutdown.

Last week I issued a statement noting the impact on DHS's grant-making activity to states, local and tribal governments as long as we are on a CR. Basically, we are prevented from funding all new non-disaster assistance grants.

The public must also be aware of the impact on our ability to secure the borders as long as we operate on a CR. As part of our executive actions to reform the immigration system, the President and I have emphasized increased border security. Added border security is also a key component of the President's FY 2015 and FY 2016 budget submissions to Congress. But, as long as this Department is on a CR, and not a full-year appropriations bill, our ability to strengthen border security, to include maintaining the resources we put in place to respond to the surge in illegal migration into south Texas last summer, is constrained.

Here are some concrete examples of things we need to do, but cannot, without a full-year DHS appropriations bill for FY 2015:

Important investments in border security technology cannot be initiated, including additional resources to upgrade obsolete remote video surveillance systems and mobile video surveillance systems in the Rio Grande Valley;

Investments to increase our ability to analyze geospatial intelligence cannot be made. This is a capability critical to enhancing situational awareness of illegal border crossings and prioritizing frontline personnel and capability deployments;

Non-intrusive inspection technology at ports of entry cannot be enhanced. This technology reduces inspection times while facilitating trade and travel, and is necessary to detect illegal goods and materials, such as potential nuclear and radiological threats;

Critical enhancements to the CBP National Targeting Center's operational and analytical systems cannot be made. These support our daily operations against transnational criminal organizations by identifying terrorist and criminal threats attempting to cross our borders via land, air and sea; and

More aggressive investigations by ICE of transnational criminal organizations responsible for human smuggling and trafficking, narcotics smuggling, and cybercrime involving child exploitation and intellectual property rights violations.

Border security is not free. The men and women of DHS need a partner in Congress to fund their efforts. Time is running out. I urge Congress to act responsibly and pass a clean appropriations bill for this Department.

For more information, visit www.dhs.gov.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield the gentlewoman another 30 seconds.

Mrs. LOWEY. If my colleagues are finally serious about these programs and priorities, I urge them to join with me today. Defeat the previous question so that my colleague, Mr. HASTINGS, can offer an amendment to provide a clean, full-year appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security.

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

I was just reading an article from the AP, which is doing a fact check on whether or not a conversation about

the Department of Homeland Security is a fair and honest conversation. They say, in reality, most people will see little change if the Department's flow is halted, and some of the warnings of doom are as exaggerated as they are striking. They go on to list word after word of folks announcing those warnings.

What is striking to me, Madam Speaker, is that, if we had the same open process going on in the Senate right now that the gentleman from Florida described—the great process that brought S. 1 to the floor—we would be bringing the Department of Homeland Security bill to the floor of the Senate as well; but, as you know, the Senate minority leader today is filibustering any effort to even bring this conversation to the floor, going back to the hamster wheel my friend from Florida described earlier.

How often do we hear that? How often do we hear about the procedural stunts that get in the way of doing the business that every single one of us knows our constituents sent us here to do?

This bill, though, is one about which we can be proud. This bill, though, is one that gets to the heart of what our constituents have asked us to do. This bill, though, has been done right from the start in a bipartisan way, in an open way, and it can make a difference for people tomorrow if we pass it on the floor of the House today and send it on to the President.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, my colleague just said to me, as my friend was looking at the Associated Press' fact check, that it would seem that the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security would know a little bit more about what he is doing than would a reporter. I would hope that that is the case.

I am very pleased to yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD), my classmate and good friend.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Madam Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question on the rule, to amend it, and to make in order the House consideration of the clean, bipartisan Homeland Security Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2015, negotiated in good faith last November.

Today is February 11, 134 days into fiscal year 2015. With only 17 days remaining until the current CR expires, the House is scheduled to be in session only 6 more days. Yet this Congress is no closer than it was last December to carrying out its basic responsibility to appropriately fund the Department of Homeland Security, whose primary mission is to protect us from terrorist attacks.

Secretary Johnson has warned us over and over again that the Republican leadership's refusal to allow a vote on the clean, bipartisan funding bill is threatening the national security of our country. He tells us that, without a full-year budget, he is unable to move forward on key homeland security priorities, including new investments in border security technology; more aggressive investigations by ICE, related to drug smuggling, human smuggling, and trafficking; preparedness for responding to surges in illegal migration; security upgrades at the White House complex; and grants for State and local terrorism prevention and response capabilities; and the list goes on.

I am truly perplexed as to what it will take to convince the Republican leadership to do the right thing. Surely, before taking appropriate action, we don't need to experience attacks like those in Paris.

If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle believe the President has overreached, the answer is not to jeopardize our national security by delaying the 2015 funding for Homeland Security. If Republicans wish to circumscribe the President's discretion on immigration policy, the Constitution provides a clear path of action that runs through the authorizing committees, not through an appropriations bill.

Last week, the Senate definitively demonstrated three times that there are insufficient votes to bring up the DHS funding bill with the House-passed poison pill riders. Even if the Senate were to take up the bill, it would be vulnerable to a budget point of order because the poison pill riders have been scored by the Congressional Budget Office as having a net cost of $7.5 billion.

Republicans control majorities in both the House and the Senate, and they control the agenda. By allowing a vote on the clean, full-year, bipartisan DHS funding bill, the leadership today has the opportunity to make clear that the Nation's security takes priority over unrelated policy debates over immigration enforcement strategy. This bill addresses the most pressing needs of the Department of Homeland Security's to protect our country from harm. It would pass both Houses and would be signed by the President today, and we should send it to him.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question to make in order the consideration of a clean Homeland Security funding bill.

□ 1415

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to take the gentleman from Florida's advice and yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS), an expert on the appropriations process.

Mr. HARRIS. I want to thank the floor leader for yielding the time.

Madam Speaker, there is no amendment necessary to this rule. Three weeks ago, we passed a fully funded Department of Homeland Security. Except for the President's illegal actions, the entire rest of the Department is funded: TSA, the Coast Guard; all these critical things.

Let's review how Congress really works. The House takes an action—we did 3 weeks ago—and then the Senate is supposed to take an action. What action did they take? HARRY REID and the Democrats have blocked three efforts to even debate the bill. They know if they didn't take that action, the Senate could debate the bill and they could strike those amendments. The Democrats are free to strike the amendments that we put on the bill that limit the President's illegal actions with regards to amnesty. They know they can.

Madam Speaker, let's be honest. The last time the President shut down the government, 87 percent of DHS was fully funded. TSA was there. The Coast Guard was on the job. Yeah, there were some administrators who didn't go to work for a few days, but let me tell you, after the unemployment problem we have had in this country, there are a lot of people outside the Federal Government who don't go to work for a lot more days. That is not what the American people expect from us.

The fact is that this bill is sitting over in the Senate. The President said 22 times he didn't have the authority to do what he did on amnesty. All we did is just made it quite clear the House position is he doesn't have the authority.

So, we are not going to spend the money. We take article I seriously. We have the authority over spending, and if we think the President is taking an illegal action, we have the authority to withhold that funding—and that is what we did, fund the entire Department except for that one illegal activity the President is doing in violation of article I of the Constitution. It gives us the authority over the law.

The President said he can't rewrite the law 22 times—and he did. We are just going to keep him to his word. He can't rewrite the law.

The previous speaker said you can't do authorizations on appropriations. That is nonsense. We do it all the time. We can correct the President's mistake in the bill. We did. That is the bottom line.

The Democrat leadership in the Senate has blocked even debate on the bill. What kind of country are we when one party, the party that is really holding this bill hostage in the Senate—not the Republicans; it is the Democrats—refuses to even debate the bill? I am shocked.

Americans expect the Senate to debate. That is what we are asking them to do. That is what they are not doing. I don't understand that. Why don't they want the Homeland Security bill to be funded? I don't get it.

Madam Speaker, I will close by saying we just need to move the motion on the previous question, pass the rule, and build the Keystone pipeline.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, I would also take the opportunity to encourage the previous speaker to read Jefferson's Manual because some of the things he talked about on rules are not, at least, my understanding. So I accept his expertise on certain matters, but his ideas about what we can do in the minority strike me as strange.

Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY).

Mr. VEASEY. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I want to talk about the rule. I am rising today against the rule. And although I believe that a pipeline is absolutely the most safest and environmentally conscious way that we can transport natural resources through North America—and natural resources, for that matter, that are going to be developed. It doesn't matter what the carrier ultimately is; these are resources that will be developed. But the underlying rule, much like the prior rules we have seen on any of the Keystone pipeline votes, does not allow for Member debate. It doesn't. It doesn't allow for Member debate, and that is not how we can best move forward. Only by having an open discussion can this body fully engage in creating sound public policy.

I want to give you an example of what I am talking about. I offered an amendment in the Rules Committee which said that if the Keystone pipeline is built, we would maximize the amount of American jobs that are created or sustained in this process.

My amendment would ensure that the iron, steel, and manufactured goods made in the construction of the Keystone pipeline and facilities are made here in America. If we are going to build the pipeline in America, let's make the materials in America. That will create more jobs. That will give people more opportunity.

There has been much discussion about how we have lost so many manufacturing jobs in this country, about how we have lost ground in that area, about how people can't take care of their families because these opportunities are no longer here. If we are going to build this pipeline, let's give people the opportunity to go back to work, roll up their sleeves, and let's build these in America. There is no reason to have materials made in China to build this pipeline.

Therefore, I believe that if Republicans want to follow a jobs-focused agenda, the amendment that I am offering will make sure that we keep Americans working and not workers in China.

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say to the gentleman from Texas, my heart sits where his hearts sits—with American workers and American products. We build the best products in the world. There is absolutely no reason not to purchase the best products in the world to build something particularly as important as our pipeline.

The box we find ourselves in is that, candidly, some of us—in fact, I dare say all of us—are a little surprised the Senate was even able to move through this bill. I have not seen the Senate move like it has moved in this open process, in this expedient process. In the entire 4 years I have served in this institution, I have never seen it happen before.

It is a good bill. I don't take issue with the work the Senate did. It looks substantially similar to what we passed here in the House. We may never get a chance to send this bill to the desk.

Again, we are just trying to debate a small part of the appropriations process and the Senate right now can't even move into debate because of filibusters in the Senate.

So I say to my friend from Texas, I am absolutely sympathetic to his amendment. I would like to have an opportunity to debate more amendments on the floor of this House.

I think back to my early days here 4 years ago. We had a 3½-day what I call festival of democracy. We came down here and worked night and day on H.R. 1 until every Member had a chance to be heard. That is the way it ought to be done. And I regret that in this situation we did not have a chance to make the gentleman's amendment in order because it was a good amendment and it would absolutely be worthy of debate and consideration here on the floor of the House.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) has 4½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I would also advise my friend from Georgia that I have no further speakers. I don't know whether my friend from Georgia does or not.

Mr. WOODALL. I also have no further speakers.

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

I earlier asked several questions. I believe Mr. CRAMER addressed one of them. I have yet another that I did not ask, and I am not asking him to respond.

I might add, I think those of us here in the body—and I said this to him when he was in the Rules Committee—I do believe Mr. CRAMER from North Dakota really does have a comprehensive understanding of this matter.

While I disagreed with him about many matters, I do believe that he points out something that we need to pay attention to, in that there are already, without Keystone, a lot of pipelines in the United States of America, and in the period of time of this recent debate, there have been a lot of pipelines that have had spills and have caused major damage. Without getting into them, three of them have really been substantial. Shutoff valves become important.

We haven't discussed many of the things regarding the technology that has improved over time, but I keep hearing my colleagues talk about this being a jobs measure. Indisputably, if there were to be a pipeline built, there would be jobs.

I agree with my friends on the other side that most, if not all, construction jobs are temporary jobs, and there are those in labor unions who are very supportive of this matter for the reason that it would create jobs.

But I have in mind something that many of us have advocated for years. The greatest reminder occurred the night before last right here close to us, in Maryland, when a piece of concrete from a big, old bridge fell off and, fortunately, when I saw the lady on television, her car was damaged and she was frightened out of her wits. But she is alive and was unharmed. That is concrete off of a bridge.

There are thousands of bridges in this country, and all of us know that we could be about the business of dealing with our infrastructure, which would create a whole lot of jobs and not leave us to these ideological debates.

I might add, if we approve this matter, in order for people to litigate, they have to come here to the Federal Circuit in the District of Columbia. That does not make sense to me, and it precludes those who would want to bring actions from being able to do so. This legislation allows that as the only vehicle.

I might add, the litigation isn't concluded yet in many of the places where there may continue to be concerns—in South Dakota, where Mr. CRAMER is close to—Wyoming, Colorado, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Texas, and certainly in Nebraska.

In the midst of trying to combat all of the problems that we have here in this country, attaching conditions and ultimatums to fundamental legislation is not the way to go about addressing the policy that was earlier raised and that I will raise in the previous question with reference to immigration.

If my friends really want to debate immigration issues, they should work with us and the President to reach a comprehensive and bipartisan consensus. Perpetuating the Department of Homeland Security stalemate is as dangerous to our country's security as it is corrosive to our democratic process.

Please, let's stop the pointless politicking. Let's end these games of chicken with our national security. Pass a clean DHS funding bill, and let's get back to the business of the American people.

I didn't know that this was in the drawer in front of me. It kind of looks like a hamster. The wheel just keeps on spinning. But my little friend here is still with us and has, in many respects, like my friends, stopped, by virtue of his being inanimate, his spinning. And that is what the Republicans need to do: stop spinning like the hamster on the wheel and get on with the business of the United States of America.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and defeat the previous question. I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials.

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

There was no objection.

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

I may be an unnatural optimist, but I believe these 2 years that we are about to have in this institution are going to be the finest that I have seen in my lifetime. The reason I believe that is exactly because we are responding to the plea that my friend from Florida has made to get on about the business of the people.

It is hard being in the minority around here. It is hard. My friends on the other side of the aisle may feel like they are in the minority today. For the last 4 years, we had the Speakership in this Chamber, but I sure felt like I was in the minority.

□ 1430

The Senate, held by the party on the other side; the White House, the party on the other side—and things got to be about party, day in and day out, and it wore on me, wore on me.

That is not why I ran for Congress, Madam Speaker. It is not why you ran for Congress. It is not why any of my colleagues here ran for Congress. They ran for Congress to get about the business of the people.

We are 1 month and a week into this new session of Congress, and the Senate has already managed to do what it hasn't been able to do for 4 years, and that is hold an open debate and move legislation where Members had a chance to have their voice heard.

We have that measure in front of us today. The only thing standing between us and considering that measure, Madam Speaker, is passing this rule. I am excited about it. I am excited about it.

I am proud of what is in this underlying legislation. I am proud of the process that produced this legislation. I am proud of the leadership of folks like Mr. CRAMER who moved it through the House first.

Now, this is the Senate version, but this is the process that folks have worked in tandem. This is a process that folks back home can be proud of.

Now, that is not to say every Member of this Chamber supports this legislation, Madam Speaker. They don't, and they have myriad reasons for choosing not to support this legislation, but the majority is going to work its will.

I don't mean the majority, the Republican majority. I mean the majority—let's have a show of hands, see where people stand—and Republicans and Democrats are going to stand together and say, I support these American jobs. They are going to say, I support our largest trading partner, which is Canada. They are going to say, I support finality on a process that began 7 years ago.

I long for the debate we will have on this House floor, and I hope the gentleman from Florida and I get to manage the rule when we bring the surface transportation bill to the floor of this House because America needs that surface transportation bill. We need to build America, Madam Speaker.

What does it say when getting approval for this pipeline consumed more time than the entire construction of the Hoover Dam? Have we so hamstrung ourselves with bureaucracy that we can no longer do those great building projects as a Nation?

I hope that the answer is no, but if the answer is yes, we have the ability in this Chamber to change it to no. We are a society that does great, great things. We do have responsibilities that are great, great responsibilities, and we cannot accomplish those in a partisan way. We cannot accomplish those without partnership and cooperation.

For the next 2 years, Madam Speaker, we have an opportunity to move bills out of a Republican-led Congress that get signed by a Democratic-led White House. That is kind of the way the Founding Fathers envisioned it, and I am pleased to be a small part of it today.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 100 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 4. 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. 861) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes. 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 Appropriations. 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. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 861.

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. WOODALL. Madam 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. HASTINGS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of House Resolution 100, if ordered, and approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 183, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

YEAS—242

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

NAYS—183

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu (CA)
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
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle (PA)
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Cartwright
Duckworth
Fitzpatrick
Lee
Roe (TN)
Ruiz
Sanchez, Loretta

□ 1500

Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. DESAULNIER changed their votes from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. JONES and COFFMAN changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Madam 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 248, noes 177, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]

AYES—248

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson

Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—177

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

NOT VOTING—7

Cartwright
Duckworth
Fitzpatrick
Lee
Roe (TN)
Ruiz
Sanchez, Loretta

□ 1508

Ms. JACKSON LEE changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

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.

IN MEMORY OF KAYLA JEAN MUELLER

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

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, we, the Arizona delegation, rise today to honor the life of one of our own, one of our young, and one of our very best.

Kayla Jean Mueller of Prescott, Arizona, was a young woman full of youthful exuberance, optimism about peace and humanity, and was willing to put her life on the line to help others halfway around the world. Kayla stood as a beacon of light and hope in a time that is too often filled with darkness. She was a beautiful soul, and I know she is with God now.

While all of our hearts are heavy with the sadness of Kayla's passing, we stand here unified and strengthened to carry on her spirit, courage, and compassion that has touched millions. We must endeavor to remain brave and strong in the face of those who wish to terrify, just as Kayla did.

No parent should ever have to endure the pain and suffering of losing a child so early, but now, let us look back fondly upon her life and the many ways she made our lives better by the words she spoke: ''I find God in the suffering eyes reflected in mine. If this is how you are revealed to me, this is how I will forever seek you.''

I now yield to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK).

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Speaker, we are here today to honor Kayla Mueller, her courage, and her undying spirit and determination; and we are here to offer our hearts and prayers in comfort to her grieving family and friends.

In Arizona, in Flagstaff and in Prescott, we are all neighbors, and we are all friends. Kayla went to Northern Arizona University, which is in my hometown, Flagstaff. In talking to her friends and her professors, everyone talked about her dedication to serving others. Even if it meant going to faraway places that were dangerous, she was driven by a compassion to help the suffering.

We know that her short life is proof that one dedicated soul can touch a thousand others. Let us all keep Kayla's family in our prayers and her legacy in our hearts.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, I now ask the House to join my colleagues and me for a moment of silence to honor the immortal spirit of Kayla Mueller.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 263, nays 156, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

YEAS—263

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chu (CA)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doyle (PA)
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (LA)
Grayson
Green, Al
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lummis
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pitts
Pocan
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Takai
Takano
Thornberry

Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Wagner
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yarmuth
Yoho
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—156

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Babin
Bass
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bost
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Burgess
Capuano
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Costello (PA)
Crowley
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
Denham
DeSantis
Dingell
Dold
Duffy
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Fudge
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibson
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanna
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Honda
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hunter
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Lance
Langevin
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
LoBiondo
Love
Lowenthal
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
Meehan
Messer
Moulton
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rigell
Rogers (AL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schock
Schrader
Sewell (AL)
Sires
Slaughter
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Torres
Trott
Turner
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Gohmert

NOT VOTING—12

Cartwright
Doggett
Duckworth
Fitzpatrick
Gallego
Hoyer
Lee
Roe (TN)
Roskam
Ruiz
Sanchez, Loretta
Scott, David

□ 1518

Mr. PALMER changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote today because of a serious illness in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted: rollcall No. 71—''yea'', rollcall No. 72—''aye'', rollcall No. 73—''yea.''

KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE APPROVAL ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on S. 1.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 100, I call up the bill (S. 1) to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline, 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 100, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1

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 ''Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act''.

SEC. 2. KEYSTONE XL APPROVAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. may construct, connect, operate, and maintain the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in the application filed on May 4, 2012, by TransCanada Corporation to the Department of State (including any subsequent revision to the pipeline route within the State of Nebraska required or authorized by the State of Nebraska).

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.—The Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement issued by the Secretary of State in January 2014, regarding the pipeline referred to in subsection (a), and the environmental analysis, consultation, and review described in that document (including appendices) shall be considered to fully satisfy—

(1) all requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(2) any other provision of law that requires Federal agency consultation or review (including the consultation or review required under section 7(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536(a))) with respect to the pipeline and facilities referred to in subsection (a).

(c) PERMITS.—Any Federal permit or authorization issued before the date of enactment of this Act for the pipeline and cross-border facilities referred to in subsection (a) shall remain in effect.

(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Except for review in the Supreme Court of the United States, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction over any civil action for the review of an order or action of a Federal agency regarding the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a), and the related facilities in the United States, that are approved by this Act (including any order granting a permit or right-of-way, or any other agency action taken to construct or complete the project pursuant to Federal law).

(e) PRIVATE PROPERTY SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this Act alters any Federal, State, or local process or condition in effect on the date of enactment of this Act that is necessary to secure access from an owner of private property to construct the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a).

(f) PRIVATE PROPERTY PROTECTION.—Land or an interest in land for the pipeline and cross-border facilities described in subsection (a) may only be acquired consistently with the Constitution.

SEC. 3. COORDINATION OF ENERGY RETROFITTING ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOLS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) SCHOOL.—The term ''school'' means—

(A) an elementary school or secondary school (as defined in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801));

(B) an institution of higher education (as defined in section 102(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002(a));

(C) a school of the defense dependents' education system under the Defense Dependents' Education Act of 1978 (20 U.S.C. 921 et seq.) or established under section 2164 of title 10, United States Code;

(D) a school operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

(E) a tribally controlled school (as defined in section 5212 of the Tribally Controlled Schools Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. 2511)); and

(F) a Tribal College or University (as defined in section 316(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059c(b))).

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Energy.

(b) DESIGNATION OF LEAD AGENCY.—The Secretary, acting through the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, shall act as the lead Federal agency for coordinating and disseminating information on existing Federal programs and assistance that may be used to help initiate, develop, and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects for schools.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out coordination and outreach under subsection (b), the Secretary shall—

(1) in consultation and coordination with the appropriate Federal agencies, carry out a review of existing programs and financing mechanisms (including revolving loan funds and loan guarantees) available in or from the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Energy, the Department of Education, the Department of the Treasury, the Internal Revenue Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, and other appropriate Federal agencies with jurisdiction over energy financing and facilitation that are currently used or may be used to help initiate, develop, and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects for schools;

(2) establish a Federal cross-departmental collaborative coordination, education, and outreach effort to streamline communication and promote available Federal opportunities and assistance described in paragraph (1) for energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects that enables States, local educational agencies, and schools—

(A) to use existing Federal opportunities more effectively; and

(B) to form partnerships with Governors, State energy programs, local educational, financial, and energy officials, State and local government officials, nonprofit organizations, and other appropriate entities to support the initiation of the projects;

(3) provide technical assistance for States, local educational agencies, and schools to help develop and finance energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects—

(A) to increase the energy efficiency of buildings or facilities;

(B) to install systems that individually generate energy from renewable energy resources;

(C) to establish partnerships to leverage economies of scale and additional financing mechanisms available to larger clean energy initiatives; or

(D) to promote—

(i) the maintenance of health, environmental quality, and safety in schools, including the ambient air quality, through energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofit projects; and

(ii) the achievement of expected energy savings and renewable energy production through proper operations and maintenance practices;

(4) develop and maintain a single online resource website with contact information for relevant technical assistance and support staff in the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy for States, local educational agencies, and schools to effectively access and use Federal opportunities and assistance described in paragraph (1) to develop energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects; and

(5) establish a process for recognition of schools that—

(A) have successfully implemented energy efficiency, renewable energy, and energy retrofitting projects; and

(B) are willing to serve as resources for other local educational agencies and schools to assist initiation of similar efforts.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the implementation of this section.

SEC. 4. CONSULTATION WITH INDIAN TRIBES.

Nothing in this Act relieves the United States of its responsibility to consult with Indian nations as required under executive order 13175 (67 Fed. Reg. 67249) (November 6, 2000).

SEC. 5. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING CLIMATE CHANGE.

It is the sense of the Senate that climate change is real and not a hoax.

SEC. 6. SENSE OF SENATE REGARDING THE OIL SPILL LIABILITY TRUST FUND.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) Congress should approve a bill to ensure that all forms of bitumen or synthetic crude oil derived from bitumen are subject to the per-barrel excise tax associated with the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund established by section 9509 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

(2) it is necessary for Congress to approve a bill described in paragraph (1) because the Internal Revenue Service determined in 2011 that certain forms of petroleum are not subject to the per-barrel excise tax;

(3) under article I, section 7, clause 1 of the Constitution, the Senate may not originate a bill to raise new revenue, and thus may not originate a bill to close the legitimate and unintended loophole described in paragraph (2);

(4) if the Senate attempts to originate a bill described in paragraph (1), it would provide a substantive basis for a ''blue slip'' from the House of Representatives, which would prevent advancement of the bill; and

(5) the House of Representatives, consistent with article I, section 7, clause 1 of the Constitution, should consider and refer to the Senate a bill to ensure that all forms of bitumen or synthetic crude oil derived from bitumen are subject to the per-barrel excise tax associated with the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund established by section 9509 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

DIVISION B—ENERGY EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENT

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the ''Energy Efficiency Improvement Act of 2015''.

TITLE I—BETTER BUILDINGS

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Better Buildings Act of 2015''.

SEC. 102. ENERGY EFFICIENCY IN FEDERAL AND OTHER BUILDINGS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of General Services.

(2) COST-EFFECTIVE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURE.—The term ''cost-effective energy efficiency measure'' means any building product, material, equipment, or service, and the installing, implementing, or operating thereof, that provides energy savings in an amount that is not less than the cost of such installing, implementing, or operating.

(3) COST-EFFECTIVE WATER EFFICIENCY MEASURE.—The term ''cost-effective water efficiency measure'' means any building product, material, equipment, or service, and the installing, implementing, or operating thereof, that provides water savings in an amount that is not less than the cost of such installing, implementing, or operating.

(b) MODEL PROVISIONS, POLICIES, AND BEST PRACTICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and after providing the public with an opportunity for notice and comment, shall develop model commercial leasing provisions and best practices in accordance with this subsection.

(2) COMMERCIAL LEASING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The model commercial leasing provisions developed under this subsection shall, at a minimum, align the interests of building owners and tenants with regard to investments in cost-effective energy efficiency measures and cost-effective water efficiency measures to encourage building owners and tenants to collaborate to invest in such measures.

(B) USE OF MODEL PROVISIONS.—The Administrator may use the model commercial leasing provisions developed under this subsection in any standard leasing document that designates a Federal agency (or other client of the Administrator) as a landlord or tenant.

(C) PUBLICATION.—The Administrator shall periodically publish the model commercial leasing provisions developed under this subsection, along with explanatory materials, to encourage building owners and tenants in the private sector to use such provisions and materials.

(3) REALTY SERVICES.—The Administrator shall develop policies and practices to implement cost-effective energy efficiency measures and cost-effective water efficiency measures for the realty services provided by the Administrator to Federal agencies (or other clients of the Administrator), including periodic training of appropriate Federal employees and contractors on how to identify and evaluate those measures.

(4) STATE AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE.—The Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall make available model commercial leasing provisions and best practices developed under this subsection to State, county, and municipal governments for use in managing owned and leased building space in accordance with the goal of encouraging investment in all cost-effective energy efficiency measures and cost-effective water efficiency measures.

SEC. 103. SEPARATE SPACES WITH HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle B of title IV of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17081 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 424. SEPARATE SPACES WITH HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURES.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURE.—The term 'high-performance energy efficiency measure' means a technology, product, or practice that will result in substantial operational cost savings by reducing energy consumption and utility costs.

''(2) SEPARATE SPACES.—The term 'separate spaces' means areas within a commercial building that are leased or otherwise occupied by a tenant or other occupant for a period of time pursuant to the terms of a written agreement.

''(b) STUDY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, shall complete a study on the feasibility of—

''(A) significantly improving energy efficiency in commercial buildings through the design and construction, by owners and tenants, of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures; and

''(B) encouraging owners and tenants to implement high-performance energy efficiency measures in separate spaces.

''(2) SCOPE.—The study shall, at a minimum, include—

''(A) descriptions of—

''(i) high-performance energy efficiency measures that should be considered as part of the initial design and construction of separate spaces;

''(ii) processes that owners, tenants, architects, and engineers may replicate when designing and constructing separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures;

''(iii) policies and best practices to achieve reductions in energy intensities for lighting, plug loads, heating, cooling, cooking, laundry, and other systems to satisfy the needs of the commercial building tenant;

''(iv) return on investment and payback analyses of the incremental cost and projected energy savings of the proposed set of high-performance energy efficiency measures, including consideration of available incentives;

''(v) models and simulation methods that predict the quantity of energy used by separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures and that compare that predicted quantity to the quantity of energy used by separate spaces without high-performance energy efficiency measures but that otherwise comply with applicable building code requirements;

''(vi) measurement and verification platforms demonstrating actual energy use of high-performance energy efficiency measures installed in separate spaces, and whether such measures generate the savings intended in the initial design and construction of the separate spaces;

''(vii) best practices that encourage an integrated approach to designing and constructing separate spaces to perform at optimum energy efficiency in conjunction with the central systems of a commercial building; and

''(viii) any impact on employment resulting from the design and construction of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures; and

''(B) case studies reporting economic and energy savings returns in the design and construction of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures.

''(3) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall publish a notice in the Federal Register requesting public comments regarding effective methods, measures, and practices for the design and construction of separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures.

''(4) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall publish the study on the website of the Department of Energy.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 423 the following new item:

''Sec. 424. Separate spaces with high-performance energy efficiency measures.''.

SEC. 104. TENANT STAR PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle B of title IV of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17081 et seq.) (as amended by section 103) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 425. TENANT STAR PROGRAM.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) HIGH-PERFORMANCE ENERGY EFFICIENCY MEASURE.—The term 'high-performance energy efficiency measure' has the meaning given the term in section 424.

''(2) SEPARATE SPACES.—The term 'separate spaces' has the meaning given the term in section 424.

''(b) TENANT STAR.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall develop a voluntary program within the Energy Star program established by section 324A of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6294a), which may be known as 'Tenant Star', to promote energy efficiency in separate spaces leased by tenants or otherwise occupied within commercial buildings.

''(c) EXPANDING SURVEY DATA.—The Secretary of Energy, acting through the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, shall—

''(1) collect, through each Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey of the Energy Information Administration that is conducted after the date of enactment of this section, data on—

''(A) categories of building occupancy that are known to consume significant quantities of energy, such as occupancy by data centers, trading floors, and restaurants; and

''(B) other aspects of the property, building operation, or building occupancy determined by the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, in consultation with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, to be relevant in lowering energy consumption;

''(2) with respect to the first Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey conducted after the date of enactment of this section, to the extent full compliance with the requirements of paragraph (1) is not feasible, conduct activities to develop the capability to collect such data and begin to collect such data; and

''(3) make data collected under paragraphs (1) and (2) available to the public in aggregated form and provide such data, and any associated results, to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency for use in accordance with subsection (d).

''(d) RECOGNITION OF OWNERS AND TENANTS.—

''(1) OCCUPANCY-BASED RECOGNITION.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which sufficient data is received pursuant to subsection (c), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall, following an opportunity for public notice and comment—

''(A) in a manner similar to the Energy Star rating system for commercial buildings, develop policies and procedures to recognize tenants in commercial buildings that voluntarily achieve high levels of energy efficiency in separate spaces;

''(B) establish building occupancy categories eligible for Tenant Star recognition based on the data collected under subsection (c) and any other appropriate data sources; and

''(C) consider other forms of recognition for commercial building tenants or other occupants that lower energy consumption in separate spaces.

''(2) DESIGN- AND CONSTRUCTION-BASED RECOGNITION.—After the study required by section 424(b) is completed, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Secretary and following an opportunity for public notice and comment, may develop a voluntary program to recognize commercial building owners and tenants that use high-performance energy efficiency measures in the design and construction of separate spaces.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 424 (as added by section 103(b)) the following new item:

''Sec. 425. Tenant Star program.''.

TITLE II—GRID-ENABLED WATER HEATERS

SEC. 201. GRID-ENABLED WATER HEATERS.

Part B of title III of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act is amended—

(1) in section 325(e) (42 U.S.C. 6295(e)), by adding at the end the following:

''(6) ADDITIONAL STANDARDS FOR GRID-ENABLED WATER HEATERS.—

''(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

''(i) ACTIVATION LOCK.—The term 'activation lock' means a control mechanism (either a physical device directly on the water heater or a control system integrated into the water heater) that is locked by default and contains a physical, software, or digital communication that must be activated with an activation key to enable the product to operate at its designed specifications and capabilities and without which activation the product will provide not greater than 50 percent of the rated first hour delivery of hot water certified by the manufacturer.

''(ii) GRID-ENABLED WATER HEATER.—The term 'grid-enabled water heater' means an electric resistance water heater that—

''(I) has a rated storage tank volume of more than 75 gallons;

''(II) is manufactured on or after April 16, 2015;

''(III) has—

''(aa) an energy factor of not less than 1.061 minus the product obtained by multiplying—

''(AA) the rated storage volume of the tank, expressed in gallons; and

''(BB) 0.00168; or

''(bb) an equivalent alternative standard prescribed by the Secretary and developed pursuant to paragraph (5)(E);

''(IV) is equipped at the point of manufacture with an activation lock; and

''(V) bears a permanent label applied by the manufacturer that—

''(aa) is made of material not adversely affected by water;

''(bb) is attached by means of non-water-soluble adhesive; and

''(cc) advises purchasers and end-users of the intended and appropriate use of the product with the following notice printed in 16.5 point Arial Narrow Bold font:

'' 'IMPORTANT INFORMATION: This water heater is intended only for use as part of an electric thermal storage or demand response program. It will not provide adequate hot water unless enrolled in such a program and activated by your utility company or another program operator. Confirm the availability of a program in your local area before purchasing or installing this product.'.

''(B) REQUIREMENT.—The manufacturer or private labeler shall provide the activation key for a grid-enabled water heater only to a utility or other company that operates an electric thermal storage or demand response program that uses such a grid-enabled water heater.

''(C) REPORTS.—

''(i) MANUFACTURERS.—The Secretary shall require each manufacturer of grid-enabled water heaters to report to the Secretary annually the quantity of grid-enabled water heaters that the manufacturer ships each year.

''(ii) OPERATORS.—The Secretary shall require utilities and other demand response and thermal storage program operators to report annually the quantity of grid-enabled water heaters activated for their programs using forms of the Energy Information Agency or using such other mechanism that the Secretary determines appropriate after an opportunity for notice and comment.

''(iii) CONFIDENTIALITY REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall treat shipment data reported by manufacturers as confidential business information.

''(D) PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In 2017 and 2019, the Secretary shall publish an analysis of the data collected under subparagraph (C) to assess the extent to which shipped products are put into use in demand response and thermal storage programs.

''(ii) PREVENTION OF PRODUCT DIVERSION.—If the Secretary determines that sales of grid-enabled water heaters exceed by 15 percent or greater the quantity of such products activated for use in demand response and thermal storage programs annually, the Secretary shall, after opportunity for notice and comment, establish procedures to prevent product diversion for non-program purposes.

''(E) COMPLIANCE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraphs (A) through (D) shall remain in effect until the Secretary determines under this section that—

''(I) grid-enabled water heaters do not require a separate efficiency requirement; or

''(II) sales of grid-enabled water heaters exceed by 15 percent or greater the quantity of such products activated for use in demand response and thermal storage programs annually and procedures to prevent product diversion for non-program purposes would not be adequate to prevent such product diversion.

''(ii) EFFECTIVE DATE.—If the Secretary exercises the authority described in clause (i) or amends the efficiency requirement for grid-enabled water heaters, that action will take effect on the date described in subsection (m)(4)(A)(ii).

''(iii) CONSIDERATION.—In carrying out this section with respect to electric water heaters, the Secretary shall consider the impact on thermal storage and demand response programs, including any impact on energy savings, electric bills, peak load reduction, electric reliability, integration of renewable resources, and the environment.

''(iv) REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out this paragraph, the Secretary shall require that grid-enabled water heaters be equipped with communication capability to enable the grid-enabled water heaters to participate in ancillary services programs if the Secretary determines that the technology is available, practical, and cost-effective.'';

(2) in section 332(a) (42 U.S.C. 6302(a))—

(A) in paragraph (5), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in the first paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(C) by redesignating the second paragraph (6) as paragraph (7);

(D) in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (7) (as so redesignated), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) for any person—

''(A) to activate an activation lock for a grid-enabled water heater with knowledge that such water heater is not used as part of an electric thermal storage or demand response program;

''(B) to distribute an activation key for a grid-enabled water heater with knowledge that such activation key will be used to activate a grid-enabled water heater that is not used as part of an electric thermal storage or demand response program;

''(C) to otherwise enable a grid-enabled water heater to operate at its designed specification and capabilities with knowledge that such water heater is not used as part of an electric thermal storage or demand response program; or

''(D) to knowingly remove or render illegible the label of a grid-enabled water heater described in section 325(e)(6)(A)(ii)(V).'';

(3) in section 333(a) (42 U.S.C. 6303(a))—

(A) by striking ''section 332(a)(5)'' and inserting ''paragraph (5), (6), (7), or (8) of section 332(a)''; and

(B) by striking ''paragraph (1), (2), or (5) of section 332(a)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1), (2), (5), (6), (7), or (8) of section 332(a)''; and

(4) in section 334 (42 U.S.C. 6304)—

(A) by striking ''section 332(a)(5)'' and inserting ''paragraph (5), (6), (7), or (8) of section 332(a)''; and

(B) by striking ''section 332(a)(6)'' and inserting ''section 332(a)(7)''.

TITLE III—ENERGY INFORMATION FOR COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS

SEC. 301. ENERGY INFORMATION FOR COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS.

(a) REQUIREMENT OF BENCHMARKING AND DISCLOSURE FOR LEASING BUILDINGS WITHOUT ENERGY STAR LABELS.—Section 435(b)(2) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17091(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)''; and

(2) by striking ''signing the contract,'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following:

''signing the contract, the following requirements are met:

''(A) The space is renovated for all energy efficiency and conservation improvements that would be cost effective over the life of the lease, including improvements in lighting, windows, and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems.

''(B)(i) Subject to clause (ii), the space is benchmarked under a nationally recognized, online, free benchmarking program, with public disclosure, unless the space is a space for which owners cannot access whole building utility consumption data, including spaces—

''(I) that are located in States with privacy laws that provide that utilities shall not provide such aggregated information to multitenant building owners; and

''(II) for which tenants do not provide energy consumption information to the commercial building owner in response to a request from the building owner.

''(ii) A Federal agency that is a tenant of the space shall provide to the building owner, or authorize the owner to obtain from the utility, the energy consumption information of the space for the benchmarking and disclosure required by this subparagraph.''.

(b) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy, in collaboration with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall complete a study—

(A) on the impact of—

(i) State and local performance benchmarking and disclosure policies, and any associated building efficiency policies, for commercial and multifamily buildings; and

(ii) programs and systems in which utilities provide aggregated information regarding whole building energy consumption and usage information to owners of multitenant commercial, residential, and mixed-use buildings;

(B) that identifies best practice policy approaches studied under subparagraph (A) that have resulted in the greatest improvements in building energy efficiency; and

(C) that considers—

(i) compliance rates and the benefits and costs of the policies and programs on building owners, utilities, tenants, and other parties;

(ii) utility practices, programs, and systems that provide aggregated energy consumption information to multitenant building owners, and the impact of public utility commissions and State privacy laws on those practices, programs, and systems;

(iii) exceptions to compliance in existing laws where building owners are not able to gather or access whole building energy information from tenants or utilities;

(iv) the treatment of buildings with—

(I) multiple uses;

(II) uses for which baseline information is not available; and

(III) uses that require high levels of energy intensities, such as data centers, trading floors, and televisions studios;

(v) implementation practices, including disclosure methods and phase-in of compliance;

(vi) the safety and security of benchmarking tools offered by government agencies, and the resiliency of those tools against cyber attacks; and

(vii) international experiences with regard to building benchmarking and disclosure laws and data aggregation for multitenant buildings.

(2) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—At the conclusion of the study, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on the results of the study.

(c) CREATION AND MAINTENANCE OF DATABASE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act and following opportunity for public notice and comment, the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with other relevant agencies, shall maintain, and if necessary create, a database for the purpose of storing and making available public energy-related information on commercial and multifamily buildings, including—

(A) data provided under Federal, State, local, and other laws or programs regarding building benchmarking and energy information disclosure;

(B) information on buildings that have disclosed energy ratings and certifications; and

(C) energy-related information on buildings provided voluntarily by the owners of the buildings, only in an anonymous form unless the owner provides otherwise.

(2) COMPLEMENTARY PROGRAMS.—The database maintained pursuant to paragraph (1) shall complement and not duplicate the functions of the Environmental Protection Agency's Energy Star Portfolio Manager tool.

(d) INPUT FROM STAKEHOLDERS.—The Secretary of Energy shall seek input from stakeholders to maximize the effectiveness of the actions taken under this section.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 2 years thereafter, the Secretary of Energy shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on the progress made in complying with this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1, the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act. S. 1 passed the Senate by a bipartisan vote of 62–36. This bill is based on H.R. 3 which, last month, the House passed by a bipartisan vote of 266–153. S. 1 does not change any of the House provisions regarding the Keystone pipeline.

Here we are again on the floor with a bill that has been approved on a bipartisan basis three times in the last 4 months. It is time for the President to approve the Keystone pipeline.

His own administration has found the pipeline would have minimal impact on the environment. Congress has shown that there is Republican and Democrat support for the pipeline. The last remaining excuse for delay—pending litigation in Nebraska—has been resolved. I hope the President reconsiders his veto threat on this bill.

I think he should sign this bill because we all agree we need to invest in our Nation's infrastructure, and pipelines are critical to the economy. America's pipeline network is immense—2.6 million miles of pipe transporting natural gas, oil, and other hazardous materials.

Pipelines transport more energy product than any other mode of transportation in this country. Keystone will be a critical addition to the pipeline network, increasing our Nation's supply of oil and enhancing our energy independence.

This project will create good-paying American jobs. As the President has stated, ''First-class infrastructure attracts first-class jobs.'' Indeed, six unions representing over 3 million workers support this project, including the United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters, the International Union of Operating Engineers, the Laborers' International Union of North America, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the building and construction trade, and the Teamsters.

It is simply time to move forward on this project, so I urge all my colleagues

on both sides of the aisle to vote for S. 1, and I urge the President to sign this bill and allow infrastructure to be built in this country.

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

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

Madam Speaker, for anyone watching this debate for the 11th time who isn't familiar with the substantive reasons to oppose this legislation, I would refer them to my earlier remarks numerous times on the floor of the House because, in the interest of time, I am not going to repeat them.

I am going to say that I am pleased that this is actually a big step forward for the other side of the aisle in the House because there are two critical changes that the Senate made which go to a raging debate on the Republican side of the aisle here in the House, and that is whether or not climate change is real or a hoax.

By voting for this bill today, you are going to endorse language saying that climate change is real and not a hoax. I think that is tremendous progress for the Republican side of the aisle, who I expect will be supporting this bill to accept the reality of climate change. I am thrilled that that is in there, and their votes will be reflected in the RECORD as endorsing that language.

Secondly, Madam Speaker, one of the other substantive issues we have raised numerous times is that this foreign corporation will not—because of a bizarre ruling by the Internal Revenue Service—will not be paying into the trust fund which goes to mitigate pipeline spills, breaks, and cleanups: the oil spill liability trust fund.

We have offered that as a motion to recommit numerous times here on the floor, thinking it would be a reasonable thing to level the playing field between U.S. producers shipping oil and a Canadian company shipping oil which is going to be exported from the United States perhaps after it is refined.

Again, this will be a shift on the Republican side of the aisle because you will be voting for language that says, ''Congress should approve a bill to ensure that all forms of bitumen or synthetic crude oil derived from bitumen are subject to the per-barrel excise tax associated with the oil spill liability trust fund,'' which would be I think the first time the Republican side has endorsed any sort—well, no, there was a tax increase for inland waterways users buried in that bill in December—but this will be only the second time that Republicans here have voted to increase a tax.

I am really thrilled to see that and the fact that we will be righting that inequity, and essentially, the Republicans will be endorsing something that we have offered numerous times on the floor.

The third thing—which really isn't an improvement—is some Senators stuck in language saying that when this foreign corporation takes American citizens' private property against their will, they have to follow the Constitution.

Well, unfortunately, because of the Kelo decision—which we did try a number of years ago to clarify and overturn—the Supreme Court, in its wisdom, has ruled that you can yield the right, for economic development purposes, to a private entity to take peoples' private property.

We are going one step—or you are going one step further here by actually giving that authority to a foreign corporation. As far as I know, this is the first time in the history of the United States of America that a foreign corporation will have the right to take private property from an American citizen against their will. That isn't an improvement, just saying ''follow the Constitution,'' because of the ruling by the Supreme Court.

But the other two are great. Climate change exists. You are endorsing that implicitly by voting for this bill. We should increase taxes and impose taxes on this tar sands oil.

Again, I think this is a big breakthrough for the other side. I still won't be voting for the bill. I stand on the previous concerns I have raised. Those are all still extant, but these things will be worthy of noticing.

With that, Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) be allowed to control the balance of my time in addition to the time controlled by the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials.

□ 1530

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1, the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act, which passed bipartisan not only in the House with 266 votes, but also bipartisan in the Senate with 62 votes. As Chairman SHUSTER noted, this is a jobs bill that will create jobs, enhance our energy independence, and strengthen our national economy.

This pipeline will transport over 800,000 barrels of oil per day. That is according to the Department of Energy. It will also help create good paying jobs, over 40,000 jobs, according to the State Department.

We held a hearing in our subcommittee last week regarding the need for more transportation infrastructure for energy projects. One witness testified we will need 12,000 to 15,000 miles of new pipeline over the next 5 to 10 years. Keystone XL is just one of those new projects.

This is the most studied pipeline in our history. This is no reason to continue to stall this project. This is a safe project. America has 2.6 million miles of pipeline, providing an extremely safe way to transport energy products. The Keystone pipeline will be built the safest pipeline ever with 95 special mitigation measures, including nearly 60 recommended by the Department of Transportation, the most extensively studied and vetted pipeline project in the history of our country.

Finally, as amended in the Senate, this bill will make important strides towards greater energy efficiency. In conclusion, the Keystone XL has been under review for over 6 years and debated and voted on in the House and Senate numerous times. We need these jobs. We need this energy. We need it now.

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

Today we are voting once again to grant special treatment to TransCanada's Keystone tar sands pipeline. It is the 11th time we are voting on a special deal for the Canadian company's pipeline since Republicans took control of the House of Representatives. This Congress has much work to do on energy. Our situation is changing rapidly, and each energy-related decision we make can have long-term consequences for our environment, our economy, and our national security. But the President has made clear that he will veto this legislation, so we should stop wasting our time on it.

The Senate added many provisions to this version of the Keystone bill. Some of the provisions on energy efficiency are provisions that I and many of my colleagues can support and have supported in the past, but those provisions should be considered separately, preferably as stand-alone bills in the House and Senate. They should not be held hostage by another doomed Keystone approval bill, and they in no way come close to offsetting the harm that would be caused by Congress deeming Keystone pipeline approved.

We don't need this Canadian tar sands oil. Worldwide crude oil prices are at their lowest level in 5 years, and gasoline prices are down, too. Domestic oil production is up. Last week EPA noted that low oil prices means approval of the Keystone pipeline could be a critical factor in the economic viability of Canadian tar sands expansion. And tar sands are among the dirtiest and carbon intensive of all fossil fuels. The Keystone pipeline will create a dependence on tar sands crude, reversing the carbon pollution reductions that we need.

This pipeline is a terrible deal for America. We get all of the risks while the oil companies reap the rewards. If this pipeline spills, like Enbridge pipeline in Michigan, the heavy tar sands that flow onto the ground and into our waters, our groundwater and our surface water, will be even harder to clean up than regular oil.

Unfortunately, if there is such a spill, it will be cleaned up at U.S. taxpayer expense and the polluter won't have to pay. Why is that? Because tar sands are not considered crude oil for purposes of contributing to the oil spill liability trust fund. We have repeatedly pointed out this egregious and unjustified loophole to the majority, and we have repeatedly received assurances that it will be addressed—yet it has still not been addressed. In fact, three times in this Chamber alone, we have offered amendments to solve this problem, but the Republican majority voted each one of them down.

Now there is this new ''sense of the Senate'' language that was put into the bill by the Senate that promises further action on this issue, but it is no substitute for real legislation to protect the American taxpayer from the financial consequences of a tar sands spill. Make no mistake, this language, this sense of Congress or sense of the Senate, does nothing to change the equation and end the tar sands oil subsidy.

Recently, the President stood in this Chamber and noted that 21st century businesses need 21st century infrastructure. He said that we should ''set our sights higher than a single oil pipeline.'' Yet here we are again voting on that single oil pipeline.

It is my hope that we are nearing the end of this long cycle of futile votes to grant special treatment to this single pipeline; and it is my hope that sooner rather than later we can get back to trying to find agreement on a moderate energy policy, one that is sustainable, one that helps the U.S. economy, and one that moves us forward, not backward, in the fight against climate change. In the meantime, I urge my colleagues once again to vote ''no'' on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Madam Speaker, it was 2008 when TransCanada first submitted an application to construct the Keystone XL pipeline. Six years later, the Keystone pipeline is still awaiting approval.

What does construction of the Keystone pipeline mean for our Nation? Over 40,000 jobs, energy security, and increased economic growth. Furthermore, the State Department found that construction of the Keystone pipeline would pose little environmental risk. In fact, there would be greater environmental and safety risks from not building the pipeline.

Despite the obvious benefits and bipartisan support, the President has continued to block Keystone's approval. Now he threatens to veto the bill, effectively killing the entire Keystone program. After 6-plus years, the President has run out of excuses. It is clear that the construction of the Keystone pipeline is in our Nation's best interests, and we cannot afford to delay any longer.

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

I wanted to reference again this provision in the bill that the Senate put in. The Senate bill contains a provision boldly stating that ''climate change is real and not a hoax.'' I couldn't agree more with that, Madam Speaker, but let's be clear: the Senate Republican majority in the same breath rejected another amendment stating that climate change is caused by human activity.

Senators who voted against those amendments are out of step with the American people, including many Republicans. In a recent poll, an overwhelming majority of Americans, including almost half of Republicans, stated support for government action to fight climate change and disagreed with those who question that climate change is caused by human activity.

Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have become fond of saying that they are not scientists, and I think that we can generally agree that is true. But even though they admit they are not scientists, it doesn't stop them from questioning the science. Now, I am not a scientist either, but when actual scientists speak and say there is an overwhelming body of evidence that man-made climate change is real and happening now, I listen to the actual scientists. And saying that you are not a scientist is, in my opinion, just a way of dodging the facts.

I have to say, Madam Speaker, when I go home to New Jersey, and my district was probably more impacted by Superstorm Sandy than any other district, I don't see any disagreement between Democrats and Republicans in my district. It doesn't matter whether they are State legislators or county legislators or mayors or on the council. And I have almost as many Republican mayors and councilmen and councilwomen as I do Democrats, but all of them agree that climate change is real and caused by human activity because they are listening to the scientists and they understand that science is important and that we should pay attention to it.

In any event, the ''sense of the Senate'' language affirming that climate change is not a hoax does not fix any of the problems with the bill before us, and its inclusion doesn't mean that voting ''yes'' today will help us in the fight against climate change. In fact, voting ''yes'' today will move us backward in that fight because one of the major concerns that I have and opponents have of Keystone is because it will exploit tar sands, it will actually increase greenhouse gas significantly. And it is very possible that, without the pipeline, those tar sands will simply not be developed or exploited.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR).

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Madam Speaker, it is time to build the Keystone pipeline. Building Keystone will create jobs, expand economic opportunity, and provide our country with energy from a reliable trading partner. It is estimated that the pipeline will carry more than 30 million gallons of oil per day, and the State Department has concluded the pipeline is the safest way to transport it to market. Keystone will support job creation by moving oil to American refineries where American workers will process it. Thousands of products using refined oil are manufactured and purchased by Americans every day, and this pipeline has the potential to make those products less expensive.

The House has passed Keystone policy time and again. Ten times, in fact, the House has stood with American workers and consumers. Today, we stand with hardworking Americans looking for good-paying jobs. Today, we stand with American consumers who will see more of their hard-earned money go further at the gas pump.

Keystone helps secure our country's energy independence, lowers energy costs for every American, and supports jobs without raising taxes or adding to our debt.

It is time to pass this bill. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

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

Again, I want to make this point about the impact of low oil prices on Keystone and on exploitation of tar sands. The price of oil has dropped precipitously in the past few months and is expected to stay in the $65 to $75 per barrel range for the foreseeable future. Just last month, the price of oil actually dipped below $50 per barrel, and gas prices have fallen below $2 per gallon in some areas. Obviously, this is good news for the American consumer but bad news for tar sands producers who are struggling to remain profitable in the face of rising production costs and limited transportation options.

In a scenario where tar sands are less profitable due to low oil prices and transportation constraints, the State Department concluded that the construction of Keystone will play a pivotal role in future tar sands development and increased carbon pollution that comes from it. So just last week, EPA made clear that low oil prices mean that the pipeline's impact on future tar sands production could be substantial, with significant implications for climate change.

Now, when I was at Rules, some of my colleagues on the Republican side said: Well, if you don't build the pipeline, this tar sands oil is going to be transported by rail or by some other means, and so what is the difference if we build Keystone?

Well, the bottom line is that it is very likely that, with low oil prices, there wouldn't be the investment in tar

sands. If tar sands had to be transported by means other than the pipeline, investment would not be there. Therefore, the argument is made, obviously, that without Keystone, you might not be exploiting these tar sands and you wouldn't increase the greenhouse gases and force the major change in climate that would result from it.

So again, the point that the EPA is making that with low oil prices, a decision to approve the pipeline could be a significant factor in increased tar sands production and increased greenhouse gas emissions, and the President and the Congress need to look at this development carefully and assess its impact.

One of the reasons—and there are others, like the impact of the pipeline if there was a spill on groundwater and other things. This is one of the reasons why the President has said that the decision of whether this is in the national interest still has to be weighed, and it shouldn't be dictated to by Congress and just deemed approved because the Canadian company or others think this is appropriate. This is something that the President needs to continue to review, as he has said. That is why he is vetoing the bill. And that is, again, Madam Speaker, why we are wasting our time today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY).

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Madam Speaker, on a variety of issues, from the Environmental Protection Agency's war on coal jobs in West Virginia to the designation of ANWR in Alaska as permanent wilderness, the President has used unilateral executive action to stifle domestic energy production. It is time for the President to stop pandering to radical environmentalists and do what is right for hardworking American families.

□ 1545

The business community, organized labor, partisan majorities in Congress, and a clear majority of the American people support construction of the Keystone XL pipeline.

The President's own State Department concluded that the project is in the best economic interest of our Nation and that the project would have no impact on carbon emissions and no negative impact on the environment.

Mr. President, enough is enough. It is time to create 42,000 jobs and reduce energy prices for hardworking families. Sign this bill into law. It is time to build the Keystone XL pipeline. I ask that you do this not only for the hardworking taxpayers I represent in West Virginia but for all Americans struggling in this economy.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I, again, yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, I listened to the previous speaker on the Republican side and I don't understand how he can say that the President is trying to prevent domestic production. Domestic oil production is at a 29-year high. Whether it is oil or it is natural gas, we have never seen production of this magnitude.

Under this administration, there has been such an increase in both oil and natural gas production in comparison to any previous administration for as long as I have been here. To suggest otherwise boggles the mind, in my opinion.

I wanted to go back to another issue that we are concerned about in terms of the environment and why Keystone needs to continue to be reviewed by the President and not just be deemed approved, and that has to do, again, with oil spills and the impact on aquifers.

Again, our first priority, Madam Speaker, must be to ensure public safety. The proposed Keystone pipeline is a massive project that would carry tar sand sludge throughout the middle of America. Even supporters agree that it should not be built until we have some assurance that it will be safe.

Keystone poses real risks. Over the last few years, a litany of tragic failures have reinforced the need for strong pipeline safety standards.

In 2011, another ExxonMobil pipeline ruptured in Montana, spilling crude oil into the Yellowstone River. The oil was carried hundreds of miles down the river, threatening the livelihoods of ranchers.

In July 2010, a pipeline carrying tar sands oil ruptured near Marshall, Michigan. Over 800,000 gallons of oil spilled into the Talmadge Creek and then flowed into the Kalamazoo River. The cleanup will cost hundreds of millions of dollars. Because the diluted bitumen is heavier than water and sinks to the bottom of the river, it has proven harder to clean up than conventional crude oil.

TransCanada and its supporters have repeatedly assured the public and the Congress that we shouldn't worry about this pipeline carrying tar sand sludge through the middle of America and across the Ogallala Aquifer. They say it will be an ultra-safe state-of-the-art pipeline.

The problem, though, is that we have heard this before. TransCanada's first Keystone pipeline, which brings Canadian tar sands oil to refineries in Illinois and Oklahoma, shouldn't inspire confidence. This was a brand-new, supposedly state-of-the-art pipeline. It was predicted to spill no more than once every 7 years. But in its first year of operation, it reported 14 separate oil spills.

The largest spill occurred on May 7, 2011, when approximately 20,000 gallons of oil erupted from the pipeline in North Dakota. There was literally a 64-high geyser of oil. Amazingly, this spill was not detected by TransCanada but was reported by a local farmer.

In response to this spill and others, the pipeline safety agency issued a corrective action order temporarily shutting down the original Keystone pipeline. The agency based this action on a finding that the continued operation of the pipeline without corrective action would be hazardous to life, property, and the environment.

With this track record, we need a thorough review of whether the standards necessary to safely transport tar sands oil are in place. The proposed route of this tar sands pipeline would cross the Ogallala Aquifer.

Millions of Americans depend on this aquifer for their drinking water and for their livelihoods. If there is an oil spill, the consequences would be devastating to the Americans who depend on this precious water resource.

Again, this is another reason why we shouldn't be approving this and deem this pipeline approved.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my soon-to-be-friend from New Jersey for bringing up the oil spill issue.

In my home State of Louisiana, we actually have hundreds of thousands of barrels of oil that are unaccounted for as a result of the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. We have tens of miles of shoreline that remain oiled as a result of an oil spill that happened over 4 years ago, and this administration is doing absolutely nothing to hold the responsible parties accountable for removing that oil.

To hide behind some of these issues, such as the threat of oil spills, is absolutely absurd when at the same time they are not doing anything to protect the environment and hold responsible parties accountable.

Secondly, there is nothing that this pipeline project is going to do to further threaten the environment. In fact, it is going to make it worse if we don't build it because the oil will be transported by barge, by rail, and other less safe means of transportation.

We saw recently where the EPA released a letter contrary to what the State Department's EIS found, stating that this was going to cause a greater impact to climate change. Whatever the reality is, this pipeline does nothing to address consumption of oil. It does nothing to increase consumption. It is an absurd approach.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. And lastly, Madam Speaker, I will just say that this President for years has embraced an all-of-the-above energy strategy, all-of-the-above. This pipeline fits that criteria—it is all of the above. Perhaps I misunderstood and they were talking geographically above. It is coming from Canada. It fits that one too.

Madam Speaker, this project needs to move forward. It has been delayed far

too long. All it is going to do by not building this project is cause us to rely upon Venezuela and other non-allies for energy to power this Nation's economy.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), the ranking member of the Energy and Power Subcommittee.

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, this is deja vu all over again, as for the umpteenth time the majority party is trying to jam the Keystone XL pipeline through this Congress despite the fact that President Obama has made it pretty clear to all who will listen that this bill is headed to a veto if it ever reaches his desk.

Madam Speaker, instead of going through regular order and the committee process and working on bipartisan legislation that would ultimately create hundreds of thousands of good-paying American jobs, such as building up our infrastructure, fixing our roads and bridges, and modernizing our energy grid, instead of looking at the interests, the real interests of the American people, and working to provide the American people much-needed jobs, my friends on the other side of the aisle have repeatedly spent valuable time, time that this Congress will never, ever see again, trying to grant a regulatory earmark to the TransCanada Corporation by short-circuiting the normal permitting process and forcing President Obama's hand.

This is not a jobs bill. Madam Speaker, we need a jobs bill. But where are the jobs in this bill? Every time we talk about jobs, every time jobs develop on the floor of this House, the Republicans all run to one place: that all we need is to build the Keystone XL pipeline and that will solve America's job problem. I beg to differ with my friends on the other side of the aisle.

The State Department—our State Department—consulted with TransCanada and found out that the construction of this pipeline would directly result in about 4,000 jobs in the early stages just to build the pipeline. These jobs, Madam Speaker, will last no more than 12 months—365 days of work provided to the American people. What kind of jobs bill are we trying to perpetrate on the American people?

In addition, Madam Speaker, by building the pipeline, 42,100 1-year jobs will be created indirectly across the United States.

After the Keystone XL pipeline is completed, operation, where the permanent jobs are, the real operation where the lasting jobs are, the jobs that will provide a future for American families—college education, mortgages to pay for their home, put dinner on the table—these jobs would only amount to about 35 permanent jobs in this Nation—35. A franchise burger joint on the corner will provide more permanent jobs than this whole Keystone XL pipeline is purported to do.

Let's put these figures into perspective.

In 2014, the U.S. economy created nearly 50,000 jobs per week—50,000 per week in 2014; 230,000 jobs per month. So even taking the most favorable estimates for all the indirect and direct jobs, the Keystone XL pipeline will produce fewer jobs than the economy is already creating on its own in just 7 days—in just one week.

Taking the lowest estimate for the 35 permanent jobs again, the Keystone XL pipeline will produce even fewer jobs, in all of its massiveness, in all of the hyperbole that comes from the other side, than the economy is already creating in just 1 hour. In the next hour, Mr. Speaker, the American economy will produce more jobs than the entire Keystone XL pipeline in all of its duration—in just the next hour.

This is not a jobs bill. Where are the priorities for the other side? Why are we wasting time on this?

Let me remind my friends on the other side, in just 2 weeks—just 2 weeks—the Homeland Security Department will run out of money, putting all of the American people, our entire Nation, at risk, in just 2 weeks.

Where are your priorities? Doesn't that make more sense than wasting our time on creating 35 jobs—35 permanent jobs? We are going to be out of this place at the end of the week. Where is the priority for American security? Where is the priority for us to spend our time? What are the priorities of the majority if we are going to waste our time?

Here we go again, valuable time. Homeland Security running out of money, folks being laid off, our borders are being compromised, terrorists are going to have or could have a field day because we have not funded Homeland Security.

□ 1600

Yet we are here, wasting valuable time. Let's use this time to fund the Department of Homeland Security, and let's get off some of this nonsense that makes no sense at all.

I cannot believe, Mr. Speaker, that the American people have sent us here to work on behalf of TransCanada and to ignore the Department of Homeland Security. I can't in my wildest imagination believe that they didn't even know, that they didn't even imagine, that they didn't even think that we are here with the Department of Homeland Security on one side and the Keystone XL on the other side. Go figure. Where are their priorities?

Mr. Speaker, this bill is unnecessary. This bill will be vetoed by President Obama, and it will be sent back here DOA. We have far more important work that we should be doing on behalf of the American people.

I urge all of my colleagues to turn down this unnecessary, ill-timed, ill-conceived notion that we should be spending our valuable time on the Keystone XL and ignoring the funding for the Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my friend from Chicago that all infrastructure jobs are temporary. Based on that argument, we shouldn't build roads, bridges, highways, or pipelines. All infrastructure jobs—construction jobs—are temporary. Second, I would like to remind my colleague that he voted against the appropriations bill to fund Homeland Security.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act.

It comes into my district, by the way. It comes into my district on the gulf coast of Texas. Over 6 years has passed since the permit was applied for. The iPad was not even introduced at that time. That is how long it has been. In contrast, this Congress is acting in less than 2 months to approve the most studied pipeline in the Nation's history. The President is creating jobs all right. It is called studying pipelines so you can deny the permit.

The State Department has concluded that this pipeline will be safe and environmentally sound. Indeed, that was the first amendment I got passed on the floor of this House in Lee Terry's bill—the State Department's own language.

The pipeline strengthens our relationship with an important ally, and it creates thousands of jobs for the American people.

The other side is saying some funny things:

They say that drilling and oil production is at a 29-year high. Great. Let's continue this process. Let's make it better. Let's make it longer. I didn't even think about that. You are right. Energy independence is right around the corner. You are onto something here, so let's continue that;

The other side says there is danger from oil spills. The truth is that the pipeline industry has a 99 percent safety rating. You cannot say that about trucking. You cannot say that about rail. You cannot say that about barge;

They say this is the umpteenth time the Republicans have passed this bill. On November 4, as I recall, the Americans elected some umpteen new Republicans. I think they are sending a message that they want energy independence, that they want a change. They understand that the Keystone pipeline means energy independence.

Yes, this House will pass this bill. We will send it to the President. A little over a year ago, the President said, if Congress wouldn't act, he had a phone and a pen, and he would. Now Congress is acting, and he is saying: I have got a pen, and I am going to veto.

Which way is it, Mr. President? You can't have it both ways.

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

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Maybe, if the people on the other side of the aisle don't vote for this bill, we will get it passed, and the President will veto it. Then maybe Americans will elect some umpteen more Republicans.

It is time to move this bill and get it done.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) has 15 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I want to thank our ranking member for allowing me to have 2 minutes to talk about how I support the Keystone pipeline. We have a little diversity on our side.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1, the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act.

I represent a refinery and chemical plant community in Houston, east Harris County, Texas. We have five refineries in my area alone, which would use that Keystone crude oil. In fact, Congressman WEBER has the eastern leg of it, and I have the western leg that actually stops in our district. We have two, big, old, huge tanks in Channelview, Texas, which are ready to get that oil and distribute it to our refineries. We have refineries, literally, from Corpus Christi over to Pascagoula in the Gulf of Mexico, on the gulf coast, that could use that crude oil. They are already using heavier crude from other parts of the world.

It has taken 6 years to get this permit for the pipeline's development. This is the longest study of any cross-border pipeline that I have ever seen. Unfortunately, because of the backlog, we have 11 other cross-border projects that have not moved through the process. Some of these are just a simple name change, and that is the problem. The Presidential permitting process has broken down. That is why Congress needs to act. The State Department has studied the project four different times. Each time, they have come back and have said that the environmental and climate impacts would be negligible.

Let me talk about the jobs issue.

We will have a year of high-paid pipefitters, teamsters, laborers, electrical workers—you name it. Those are great jobs, and they are high paying for a year. Construction jobs are temporary. Then they will go on to another job, and, frankly, in Texas, we have no shortage of need for pipelines even though I have never not lived on a pipeline easement in Houston, Texas.

The bill is not as perfect as I would like, but we need to send this bill to the President—it got out of the Senate—and give the President a chance to do it. We need cross-border pipelines whether it is Canada to the United States, Texas to Mexico, or the United States to Mexico, or back.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S.1, the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act. I represent a refinery/chemical plants. The refineries on the Gulf Coast will use the crude oil.

I rise in support of this bill because I support North American energy development.

The pipeline has been in development and waiting for approval for six years. This is the longest study of any cross-border pipeline that I have ever seen.

Unfortunately, because of this backlog, there are now 11 other cross-border projects that have not moved through the process.

Some of these projects are as simple as a name change.

The Presidential Permitting Process has become nothing more than a political game.

Opponents of domestic infrastructure projects use the process to delay projects endlessly in an attempt to raise money under the guise of environmental protection.

The State Department has studied this project four different times.

Each time, the Department reported back that the environmental and climate impacts would be negligible.

However, opponents of the project do not like that answer so they continue their attack until the project is deferred.

Opponents of the project now decry that because oil prices are low, more studies should be conducted.

Opponents cite low oil prices as a reason the federal government shouldn't approve the project.

Last time I checked, the federal government wasn't involved in private business decisions.

If oil prices remain low, the market will dictate which projects remain viable and which do not.

The federal government has one job to do and should complete its work in a timely fashion.

Further, opponents claim that Keystone XL will only result in 35 permanent jobs.

What they fail to address is that Keystone XL, along with the majority of other cross-border facilities, will create thousands of construction jobs.

Those who oppose the project say, those are only temporary jobs.

Well, to my friends who oppose the project, construction jobs by their very nature are temporary jobs.

But I can tell you this, the pipefitters, operating engineers, electrical and Teamster laborers that work on their segment of the pipeline are darn happy to have that job.

That is a large paycheck to help support his or her family.

I continue to urge support for the Keystone XL pipeline.

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

Once again, I ask my colleagues to support this bill, this pipeline, that is said to have been the most studied and will be the safest pipeline. It will help out one of our great allies, and it will help us keep energy costs down in this country. It will create over 40,000 infrastructure jobs. Yes, they are temporary, but as we all know, those jobs will go to helping the families of the construction workers. They will move on to other jobs, and these will also be a spinoff to other jobs to help keep this pipeline viable for years to come.

Let me finish with a final quote from a well-known American—an American respected by the other side of the aisle, an American trusted by the other side of the aisle, an American listened to by the other side of the aisle. He says:

> The pipeline increases the diversity of available supplies among the United States' worldwide crude oil sources in a time of considerable political tension in other major oil producing countries and regions; it shortens the transportation pathway for crude oil supplies; and it increases crude oil supplies from a major non-Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries producer. Canada is a stable and reliable ally and trading partner of the United States with which we have free trade agreements which augment the security of this energy supply.
>
> The approval of the permit sends a positive economic signal, in a difficult economic period, about the future reliability and availability of a portion of the United States' energy imports, and in the immediate term, this shovel-ready project will provide construction jobs for workers in the United States.

That American, ladies and gentlemen, is President Barack Obama. He said that in 2009, but he was talking about the Enbridge Alberta Clipper. I don't know what has changed, but this quote could go right towards this pipeline. It does all of the same things, and it has all of the positive impact that that pipeline has. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, to send it to the President, and to ask the President to reconsider his veto threat.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) control the remainder of my time.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Here we are, once again, to debate legislation on the Keystone XL pipeline. For the past 6 years, this project has been thoroughly vetted by the Congress and the administration. There is no question in my mind that the Keystone XL is in the national interest, so let's look again at the facts:

It is a jobs project. The President's own State Department has confirmed that Keystone is going to support 42,000 jobs across the country;

Keystone is going to be safe. Yes, it is. Pipelines remain one of the very safest and most efficient ways to transport energy, and Keystone is going to rank at the top of the class when it comes to safety. The pipeline, in fact, is going to incorporate some 59 additional safety standards proposed by

PHMSA, and it will adhere to the rigorous new pipeline safety standards on which I worked with John Dingell to get signed into law in the last Congress;

Keystone is better for the environment. Yes, it is. We know that Canada is going to continue to develop its rich oil sands regardless of whether we build the pipeline. If we don't build it, that oil is going to continue to get to the marketplace through other, more carbon-intensive means;

Keystone is going to enhance our energy security and help energy prices stay stable and affordable. We know this respite from high gas prices won't last forever, and prices have already begun to tick back up. By bringing more North American energy to the market, the pipeline can help protect us against future price spikes and overseas disruptions. We want as much certainty in the marketplace as we can.

The President said last week that, again, another reason he is against this is that gas prices are low. Yesterday's Wall Street Journal headline above the fold reads: ''Oil-Price Rebound Predicted.'' That is right. They are going to go up. Americans understand supply and demand. The Keystone pipeline is very positive for us in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the RECORD a letter that we received just an hour or so ago from the Canadian Embassy.

CANADIAN EMBASSY,
February 10, 2015.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY, I was quite disappointed to read the comments from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) with respect to the Keystone XL (KXL) application.

The EPA derives its greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) calculations from a study using data from 2005, two years before iPhones existed, completely neglecting the innovation and emissions reductions that have since occurred in the oil sands.

Just as communication technology has advanced in the last ten years, so too has scientific analysis of the oil sands. There are more recent credible scientific numbers on oil sands emissions reductions. Canadian government data show that per barrel emissions have fallen 28% from 1990 to 2012. In 2014, both IHS-CERA (Dan Yergin's consultancy) and the California Air Resources Board data showed that average oil sands GHG emissions are in the same range as Venezuelan and Californian heavy oil and lower than several types of Venezuelan and Californian crudes. Furthermore, IHS-CERA has determined that 45% of the crude oils consumed in the United States are within the same GHG intensity range as those of the oil sands.

The EPA selected the highest GHG value among four studies considered by the State Department, and then assumed that KXL flows at capacity over fifty years, that KXL transports only oil sands crude, and most egregiously that the only crude displaced is Saudi light. By contrast, the State Department reported oil sands incremental emissions as a range from 1.3 to 27.4 megatonnes annually. The lower figure compared oil sands to Venezuelan and Mexican heavy crudes that would be displaced. The higher figure compared oil sands to Saudi light crude, an international benchmark, which your Department noted, is not a direct competitor for heavy crude oil refineries. Clearly, the correct comparison is to the lower figure, not the higher figure.

In its April 22nd, 2013 comments on the same data, the EPA calculated an oil sands incremental GHG value some 46% lower than it is now claiming, and made no effort to explain why its calculation has now increased by 46%.

The EPA chose to ignore that the oil sands are produced in the only jurisdiction supplying oil to the United States that has imposed a carbon fee which is used to fund clean energy technologies.

The EPA questions the State Department's finding that, absent KXL, incremental volumes of Canadian oil will move to the U.S. Gulf Coast by rail. The EPA chose rather conveniently not to examine data for the last two years. Since the KXL application was first delayed in November 2011, crude oil by rail exports from Canada to the U.S. have jumped ten-fold, and continue to expand.

The EPA neither discusses nor disputes the State Department's findings that rail represents 28–42% higher GHG emissions than KXL.

The EPA neither discusses nor disputes the State Department's findings on safety. The State Department originally reported that KXL would represent one injury and no fatalities annually, as compared to 49 injuries and six fatalities for rail, then revised the rail figures from 49 to 189 injuries, and from six to 28 fatalities.

The EPA chose to ignore that Canada, an ally, has committed to an absolute reduction in our GHG emissions. No other major oil supplier to the United States can make this statement. In 2012, Canada's GHG emissions were down 5.1%, with more work ahead of us.

One is left with the conclusion that there has been significant distortion and omission to arrive at the EPA's conclusions.

There is no significant difference between the GHG emissions from oil sands crude oil and from other heavy crude oils that would be displaced at the U.S. Gulf Coast. As compared to rail. KXL represents lower GHG emissions, as well as lower environmental and public safety risks.

We would be pleased to discuss the gap between the EPA comments and the scientific analysis of the State Department.

Thank you for the opportunity to raise this issue with you.

Sincerely,

GARY DOER,
Ambassador.

Mr. UPTON. In the letter from the Ambassador of Canada, he makes a number of good points, but he concludes by saying this:

''There is no significant difference between the GHG emissions from oil sands crude oil and from other heavy crude oils that would be displaced at the U.S. Gulf Coast. As compared to rail, KXL represents lower GHG emissions, as well as lower environmental and public safety risks.''

The evidence is in. The case ought to be closed. There is no good reason for President Obama not to join with Republicans and Democrats to say, yes, it is time to build.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, how much time is now on the Republican side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 13½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey has 2 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the sponsor of the House-passed bill.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I spent several minutes articulating the details of the benefits of this bill. I am grateful to Senator HOEVEN, my Senator from North Dakota, for introducing it in the Senate.

I want to answer just a couple of the questions because I think there are legitimate concerns being raised by my friends on the other side.

With regard to the price of oil being about $50 and being low and that it, therefore, somehow negates the need for the pipeline, there are two things I would say. 2,336 days ago, the price of oil was approaching $50, and TransCanada still applied for the pipeline. In fact, at low prices, the cost of transportation is an even more important consideration, and oil transported by rail costs about $10 a barrel more than it does by pipeline. The pipeline is even more important in this environment.

□ 1615

With regard to the pump station spill in North Dakota, on the original pipeline, I know it well. I sited that line. The good news was that everything worked. The alarms went off. The bells shut down. The farmer even called the company. There was a spill. It was corrected. There was no negative environmental impact.

With regard to the types of jobs, I saw them firsthand. These are permanent jobs. Yes, they are temporary on that particular job, but 88 percent of the steel used in the Keystone XL pipeline has been sourced from North Carolina. That is 88 percent.

I want to finish by reading this quote from Danny Hendrix. Danny says this with regard to what kind of jobs will be created by the XL:

> They've got health care for another year. They've got a pension credit for when they retire. It means that those families have got health care, dental care—so it means a lot. It means they can make a house payment. It means they can send their kids to college.

Danny Hendrix is a business manager for Pipeliners Local 798 in Tulsa, Oklahoma.

These are real jobs, and to belittle them in any way, Mr. Speaker, to degrade them in any way, is intellectually dishonest and disrespectful.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Keystone XL pipeline. It is going to create 42,000 jobs. By the way, those jobs that you are talking about that will be part-time, I guarantee you the Department of Labor will include them in their numbers when they talk about how great we are becoming.

This is the most federally reviewed pipeline in U.S. history—it is 6 years—

and the thing about this that is most impressive is it doesn't cost the American taxpayer one single penny. It is privately funded. And I would guarantee you that along that pipeline, as it is constructed, all those communities are going to benefit from the fact they have people working there, staying in their hotels, buying their food, enhancing their local economy.

How many more times do we have to talk about this? This is not a Republican issue, by the way. This is an American issue. A majority of the American people support this, and Democrats and Republicans in both the House and the Senate. It is bipartisan and bicameral. My goodness, how rare is that? Business groups and labor unions. You know what? Even President Bill Clinton and President Bush agree this is something that needs to be done.

News outlets from Bloomberg to The Washington Post to USA Today all say: Build it.

USA Today gets it right. They say:

> On the merits, the Obama administration should long ago have said yes . . . but the White House seems to have been paralyzed by its fear of angering our ally Canada if it says no or infuriating Democratic environmentalists if it says yes . . . It is long past time to say yes.

President Obama must say ''yes'' to new jobs, he must say ''yes'' to bipartisanship, he must say ''yes'' to good government, he must say ''yes'' to America, and he must say ''yes'' to the Keystone pipeline. It is long past due, my friends.

Let's move American forward, let's become energy self-sustaining, and let's be the leader in the world when it comes to energy. This debate is way past time, and the thought that we shouldn't do it now because the oil market is down, my goodness, nothing could be further from the truth.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Speaker, I am having kind of a deja vu moment and a holy cow moment both at the same time. It is deja vu because we already passed a Homeland Security funding bill. So that bill has shifted to the Senate. Somebody apparently didn't get that memo. I am having this holy cow moment because I can't believe I am standing up here in support of the Senate-passed Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act.

Mr. Speaker, the broad support for building the Keystone XL pipeline is truly remarkable. This bill is bipartisan. It is bicameral. In fact, it commanded a supermajority in the Senate. A majority of the American people want to see the pipeline constructed. The pipeline has been studied and studied and studied again, in fact, way up to the State Department, which approved the pipeline more than a year ago.

This kind of support for a piece of legislation is a rarity in Washington. It doesn't get any better than this. And that is because the pipeline has unquestionable merit. It directly creates jobs. It is a shot in the arm for our energy economy. It will make America more energy secure, an aspiration of Presidents and Congresses for decades. And it is now within our grasp if we choose to seize it. Why our President would choose to veto this bill is beyond rational explanation. Its economic benefits could not be more evident.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope the President reconsiders his threat to veto this so American workers can finally start to construct and reap the benefits for the American people.

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of approving the Keystone XL pipeline. The pipeline is widely supported by Americans and by a bipartisan majority in this House and in the Senate.

In the more than 6 years since the application to build the pipeline, the President has refused to authorize it, citing two reasons. Number one, environmental challenges. But, Mr. Speaker, the pipeline has undergone numerous environmental assessments, and the U.S. State Department's Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement confirms the minimal impact of the pipeline on the environment.

Number two, legal challenges. But, Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 2015, the Nebraska Supreme Court approved the pathway of the pipeline.

The President has no more excuses to deny the completion of the Keystone XL, and I urge him to rescind his veto threat of this critical energy and infrastructure bill.

Americans want a true all-of-the-above energy policy that boosts our goal of North American energy independence, benefits consumers, creates jobs, protects our environment, and preserves our natural resources.

This bill accomplishes all of those goals. However, Mr. Speaker, the President continues to block this essential energy and infrastructure project and the jobs it would provide to our hardworking American families.

Further, due to the bureaucratic delays of the past 6 years, this project is now costing 50 percent more than its original announcement.

In my district alone, the pipeline has supported over 600 jobs at Welspun Tubular, headquartered in Little Rock, Arkansas, where 700 miles of this pipe are stacked up at the rail head ready to put in the ground.

Mr. Speaker, if approved, this project will provide thousands more jobs and over $3.4 billion for our Nation's economy. The President is out of excuses. It is time to approve this project.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said this is the time to pass it. It is not the time to pass it. The time to pass it is after all the reports and studies are in. The State Department hasn't completed its study.

It is kind of like what we are doing in this Congress. We are not going by our regular procedures. We are not having bills in committee and opportunities for amendments on the floor because we bring things up here to make it the political issue du jour.

This is not the time for the bill, just like it is not the time for the Prime Minister to come and speak from that well. It should be after his election and after the negotiations with Iran are over. This should be after the State Department has told us what their opinion is, and then let the President make his decision.

We should go back to regular order. I hope the House will return to regular order.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act.

I think on both sides all we talk about is creating jobs. For 6 years, this project has been studied. We hear that over and over again. Every environmental report has been favorable. In fact, the President's own State Department says that the construction of this pipeline will create tens of thousands of jobs.

At a time when millions of Americans are struggling, this is a project that is ready to go. As we said, we have pipeline stacked up and ready to put in the ground.

The Keystone pipeline is not just important to growing our economy. This project is critical to securing North American energy independence and reducing our dependence on foreign oil.

Congress has taken action with bipartisan support, and finally we will put this priority on the President's desk. I urge the President to listen to the American people who support this project and reconsider his threat to veto this critical legislation.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding time and the work you have done on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1 to approve the Keystone XL pipeline after what has turned out to be an unacceptable 6-year delay by the Obama administration.

Many have stated that this bill is about creating jobs. And guess what? They are right. The pipeline would create over 40,000 jobs without a dime of taxpayer funding, helping to pull eager American workers out of the unemployment line.

Approval of the pipeline would also bring down energy costs here at home, lifting a huge burden on hardworking families, small businesses, and farmers.

Moreover, clearing the construction of the Keystone pipeline puts us closer to North American energy independence to reduce our dependence on oil from foreign sources that are all too often at odds with America's interests and our national security.

So the bill we debate today is about jobs. It is about making energy more affordable. But it is also about making our country safer. This bill will help us stop funding both sides of the war on terror.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that we have any further speakers. I am willing to close, if the gentleman goes first.

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

The bill grants a regulatory earmark to TransCanada Corporation, effectively exempting TransCanada's Keystone tar sands pipeline from all Federal permitting requirements, including requirements that apply to every other construction project in the country.

Keystone will increase carbon pollution and threaten critical water resources. Tar sands are a dirty, high-polluting fuel. On a lifecycle basis, tar sands crude produces up to 40 percent more carbon pollution than conventional oil. And even with the current proposed route, leaks from the highly corrosive crude in the pipeline would still threaten the aquifer, a critical resource for drinking water and irrigation.

Mr. Speaker, we don't need this dirty oil. Since Keystone was proposed, we have cut U.S. oil demand. We have dramatically boosted less-polluting U.S. oil production. In fact, much of the tar sands oil will not go to America but will go through America and be exported overseas. This leaves the United States with all the risk and no reward.

I would urge my colleagues once again to vote ''no'' on this legislation. It is not good for this country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is not new science. We have got existing oil and gas pipelines that cross the border. We have got a million miles of pipeline or so within the United States. Safety standards, rightly so, are a lot higher than they used to be, and we will continue to oversee this.

Canada is our friend. We get oil and gas from Canada today. We have expanded many of our refineries by billions of dollars trying to get prepared for new pipeline commodities coming from the north.

It is time to build this. It has been 6 years. I remember well Secretary of State Hillary Clinton a number of years ago saying that they would be ready before the end of that year to complete their studies to get this thing done. Well, 6 years has now come, and it is time for us to act.

The Nebraska Supreme Court has ruled the way that they did in support of this. We know that the carbon footprint is less by putting it in a pipeline, and we know that it is safer than other means of transportation.

Again, we know that Canada is going to sell this oil somewhere. And if they don't get it in a pipeline here to the U.S., that pipeline is going to go 2,000 miles to the east and get on a boat or a barge—a higher carbon footprint. Isn't it better to do it here, to build it, put it in a pipeline here in the U.S.?

□ 1630

This bill, we were accepting the Senate bill. Yes, they finally passed this bill. Let's pass this bill this afternoon. Let's send it to the President. Let's hope that he might reconsider a proposed veto on this bill, and let's deal with the issue, and let's get it done.

There is a reason why better than 65 percent of Americans support this. They understand it. They understand supply and demand. We want gas prices to stay stable. We know that this oil that we get from Canada will displace oil coming either from the Middle East or from Venezuela. Why is that not a good thing?

Please vote ''yes.''

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 100, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

MOTION TO COMMIT

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to commit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. CAPPS. Yes, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to commit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Capps moves to commit the bill S. 1 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

After section 2, insert the following (and redesignate subsequent sections accordingly):

SEC. 3. REQUIREMENT THAT TRANSCANADA KEYSTONE PIPELINE, L.P. PAY FOR ANY OIL SPILL CLEANUP ON AMERICAN SOIL.

In the approval process authorized under section 2, TransCanada Keystone Pipeline, L.P. shall certify to the President that diluted bitumen and other materials derived from tar sands or oil sands that are transported through the Keystone XL pipeline will be treated as crude oil for the purposes of determining contributions that fund the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.

Mr. UPTON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order against the motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer the final amendment to this bill.

Passage of this amendment will not prevent passage of the underlying bill. If it is adopted, my amendment will simply be incorporated into the bill, and the bill would be immediately voted upon.

Mr. Speaker, no matter if you support or oppose Keystone XL, we can all agree that extracting and transporting oil has some serious risks. It only takes one small crack, one small mistake, to cause a major oil spill and a catastrophe, irreparable damage to the surrounding communities and to the environment.

History has shown us that there is simply no such thing as a spillproof well or pipeline. Accidents happen, and they will continue to happen, regardless of what we are told by the oil companies building and maintaining the pipelines.

In fact, accidents have already happened 14 times on the existing section of the Keystone pipeline, and these oil spills don't just devastate the surrounding environment. They harm lives and livelihoods as well.

In 1969, my home district in California experienced one of the worst oil spills in American history. I saw, firsthand, the devastating damage to our local economy, to human health, to property, to natural resources. We have sadly seen this happen far too many times since then in communities all around this country.

The Deepwater Horizon disaster cost 11 lives, billions of dollars in economic damages, and untold devastation to the delicate ecosystem of the gulf. That very same year, we saw as well a terrible spill in Kalamazoo, Michigan. This spill was particularly noteworthy because it involved tar sands oil, which is the same type of oil that would flow through the Keystone pipeline.

Tar sands oil is much harder to clean up than standard crude, which is one of the reasons the spill took nearly $1 billion and several years to clean up.

Mr. Speaker, despite numerous assurances that Keystone XL will be safer and that the risk of a spill will be minimal, safer simply does not equal safe. That is why we have the oil spill liability trust fund, to ensure that the oil companies that create these messes will also pay for them to clean them up.

This trust fund is financed by an 8 cents per-barrel fee on crude oil and petroleum products, but TransCanada is currently not even required to contribute to the trust fund for Keystone

because tar sands oil is not considered crude oil for purposes of this program—a loophole, if I have ever heard of one.

If there is a spill, taxpayers and local communities, not those responsible, could be stuck paying for this cleanup. That is why I am offering this straightforward amendment.

My amendment would simply require TransCanada to certify that it will pay the same per-barrel fee for its tar sands oil as it does for its regular crude. It would ensure that TransCanada—and not taxpayers—pay to clean up its own mess in the event of a spill.

I have offered this amendment several times before, both in committee and here on the floor, so the majority should be quite familiar with this issue. In fact, the majority has assured us on several occasions that they would work with us, on Ways and Means Committee as well, to resolve this issue; yet the majority has failed to even propose a meaningful solution, let alone bring one to the floor for a vote.

Mr. Speaker, this is a straightforward issue that should have bipartisan support. We taxpayers, if we are going to bear 100 percent of the risk of an oil spill from this Keystone pipeline, the least we can do is to ensure that those that are responsible for it also pay to clean it up.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment, to protect American taxpayers, and hold oil companies accountable.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the gentlewoman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I might just start off by asking my dear friend from California a quick question: If this motion was adopted, would she be voting for the bill? Yes or no.

I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. CAPPS. As I said in my opening remarks, I would not, but as we know, the bill would still pass.

Mr. UPTON. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentlelady's interest on this, and I share her concern.

I would note, and I know that I would also speak for my colleague, Chairman SHUSTER, as we did write then-chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Dave Camp, back in 2012, May 21, I sent a letter to the Ways and Means chair encouraging that this exemption be—loophole—be fixed.

As you know, meaningful tax reform did not emerge from the last Congress. I remain absolutely committed to resolving this, as I know BILL SHUSTER has said so on the RECORD.

Besides that though, it has been years that we have been debating this, and we finally have a bill out of the Senate. They took a whole month on the other side. They considered lots of amendments. They adopted three. We are accepting those three amendments when this bill passes today, as we did not go to conference.

As we know, this is a jurisdictional issue, that neither our committee nor Transportation has jurisdiction over tax issues. That is why we were not able to include that provision here, and that is, frankly, why the Senate was not able to adopt it on the Senate side either, because it would have been a blue slip issue.

We view this on our side as a procedural issue. We don't want to send it back to the Senate. Who knows when we are going to get it back after the last month that they had.

I would urge my colleagues on our side to vote ''no'' on this procedural vote. To the folks on your side that are voting, just know that we remain committed to closing this loophole.

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 commit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to commit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to commit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 431.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 181, nays 241, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 74]

YEAS—181

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

NAYS—241

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Ellmers
Emmer
Farenthold
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schock
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster

Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Cartwright
Duckworth
Fitzpatrick
Hoyer
Kaptur
Lee
Roe (TN)
Ruiz
Sanchez, Loretta
Scott, David

□ 1704

Messrs. FINCHER, NEUGEBAUER, and MARCHANT changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. JONES, CICILLINE, POLIS, and SWALWELL of California changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to commit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 270, nays 152, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—270

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

NAYS—152

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu (CA)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Cartwright
Doggett
Duckworth
Fitzpatrick
Hoyer
Kaptur
Lee
Roe (TN)
Ruiz
Sanchez, Loretta

□ 1713

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AWARDING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO THE FOOT SOLDIERS WHO PARTICIPATED IN BLOODY SUNDAY, TURNAROUND TUESDAY, OR THE FINAL SELMA TO MONTGOMERY VOTING RIGHTS MARCH IN MARCH OF 1965

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 431) to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Foot Soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, or the final Selma to Montgomery Voting Rights March in March of 1965, which served as a catalyst for the Voting Rights Act of 1965, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]

YEAS—420

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle (PA)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu (CA)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle (PA)

Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lieu (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—12

Cartwright
Coffman
Duckworth
Fitzpatrick
Frelinghuysen
Goodlatte
Hoyer
Kaptur
Lee
Roe (TN)
Ruiz
Sanchez, Loretta

□ 1724

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during the last vote of the second series on February 11, 2015. Had I been present, I would have voted yes on H.R. 431, legislation to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Foot Soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, or the final Selma to Montgomery Voting Rights March in March of 1965, which served as a catalyst for the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote today because of a serious illness in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted: rollcall No. 74—"nay," rollcall No. 75—"yea," rollcall No. 76—"yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 75 and 76 I was unavoidably detained outside of Washington, DC. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN WES COOLEY

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

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the entire Oregon delegation who are with me to inform the House of the passing of our former colleague Wes Cooley.

Wes Cooley was born in Los Angeles in 1932. He graduated from the University of Southern California, served in the Army, raced motorcycles professionally, and among other business ventures, he owned a vitamin supplements company and ranched in Oregon.

Wes Cooley cared deeply for his community and his State, prompting him to run successfully for and serve in the Oregon State Senate before being elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1994, where he served one term. He worked hard, and he cared deeply about the rural West and the country.

Last week, Wes passed away in Bend, Oregon, after a long illness. Our thoughts and our prayers are with his wife, Rosemary, and his family during this difficult time of loss.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Oregon delegation, I ask that the House observe a moment of silence in memory of former Congressman Wes Cooley.

RECOGNIZING THE PASSING OF MY FRIEND LARRY SILVERTON

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

Mr. SCHIFF. I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to recognize the passing of my friend Larry Silverton.

How do I describe Larry? A lot of words apply: businessman, lawyer, father, friend, Democrat, and mensch. He was generous, funny, endearing, and a little zany.

He met me for breakfast one morning in Burbank and looked a bit disheveled.

I said: What happened?

He said: Well, I rode here.

I said: On your bicycle?

He said: Don't be ridiculous—on my motorcycle.

He was well in his eighties at the time.

My fondest memories, though, were riding horses with Larry and talking politics. He was equally at home on horseback or in the middle of a discussion of the Keystone pipeline.

He was a wonderfully good man, and if he were watching us here today, he would probably say: A tribute on the floor of the House, not too shabby.

Good-bye, Larry. You were my very good friend, and you will be missed.

PROTECTING ACCESS TO SPEECH-GENERATING DEVICES

(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 rise today to speak about an important issue for millions of Americans, and that is protecting access to speech-generating devices.

For those living with ALS and other neurological and degenerative disabilities, these life-improving devices give them the ability to communicate with their friends and their loved ones, something that we all take for granted.

Unfortunately, a government agency is now threatening to limit access to speech-generating devices, causing unnecessary hardship for those who are living with ALS or other disabilities.

That is why I have helped author H.R. 628, the Steve Gleason Act, to ensure that Medicare's most vulnerable patients have access to the communication technology that they deserve during the most challenging points in their lives. The bill is named after NFL pro Steve Gleason, who has championed the needs of the ALS community.

Mr. Speaker, passage of this important legislation will make a world of difference for those that are suffering from degenerative disabilities and their families.

□ 1730

HONORING THE LIFE OF COACH JERRY TARKANIAN

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a heavy heart to mourn the loss and honor the life of my friend, Coach Jerry Tarkanian, who passed away this morning.

A leader and a role model, both on and off the court, ''the Shark'' was not only a legendary collegiate men's basketball coach, but a pillar in the Las Vegas community.

As coach at UNLV, he led the Running Rebels to a 509–105 record over 19 seasons, four Final Four appearances, and an NCAA championship in 1990. In 2013, he was inducted into the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame, and a statue of him was placed outside UNLV's Thomas & Mack Center, which houses the basketball court bearing his name.

Coach Tarkanian was known for giving young players a second chance. He supported numerous charities and programs that helped build character, life skills, and talent that fostered success in later life.

My thoughts go out to his wife and his family, and I am sure the coach is looking down and chewing on that famous towel in Heaven.

STEELWORKERS REFINERY STRIKE

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Members, last Friday and Saturday I visited and walked with United Steelworkers union members who are on strike for health and safety issues in our east Houston congressional district.

Their jobs are very dangerous. They produce refined products and chemicals that our Nation needs. We have, sadly, lost lives recently in the industry, and to have men and women working 10-plus straight days for shifts of 10 hours is not reasonable.

These men and women work hard in a dangerous occupation, and they should not have to go on strike for safety. Safety is important to employees and companies. Let's settle the strike with new safety standards so that no family has to worry that their loved one will not come home from work.

HONORING JEROME ''BIG DUCK'' SMITH

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

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in my continuing recognition of Black History Month to honor Freedom Rider and civil rights legend Jerome ''Big Duck'' Smith. An active mentor of youth in New Orleans, he earned his nickname because there is usually a line of children waddling behind him.

From a young age, Big Duck was not intimidated by what he viewed as the racial norms in New Orleans. When he was 10 years old, he removed a screen that acted as a barrier between Black and White passengers on a New Orleans streetcar, causing some uneasiness. An older Black woman riding the streetcar took him off the car and told him ''never, ever stop'' and that she was proud of him for what he had done. This show of support would light a fire within him to fight for racial justice.

Jerome Smith would go on to become part of the Freedom Riders, a group that looked to desegregate bus terminals across the Deep South. Also, he helped found the New Orleans chapter of the Congress of Racial Equality, one of the big four civil rights organizations.

Today, Big Duck is the director of Tambourine and Fan, a youth organization in New Orleans that engages young people on the civil rights movement, leadership, and the importance of political engagement. His work for the civil rights movement and with youth throughout the city is an inspiration not only to me, but to the entire region. Big Duck embodies the never-ending struggle for justice and equality of opportunity.

ELIMINATING ISIS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, over the last 24 hours, we have heard that a wonderful young woman from Arizona, whose family is now mourning, lost her life somewhere in Syria at the hands of a violent and barbaric group by the name of ISIS. I hope that it brings all Americans together around the importance of eliminating this dastardly group, and to begin to look inwardly to make sure that we attack this cancer at its beginning and to be able to stop the radicalization that comes about through the Internet and many of the young people in this country.

I introduced earlier this year the No Fly Foreign Soldiers Act to ensure that those who may leave this country and then attempt to fly back are, in fact, detected. There are many things we can do on the end of passing law, but we must also respond that we not attack any religion for just its beliefs and begin to educate people about the values of many different religions.

That is what this young American sought to do. She went to save the vulnerable. And so we must isolate ISIS as it is and stand with those who recognize the greatness of America and the diversity of our religions and the diversity of the people.

I sadly offer my sympathy for the Muslims that were killed at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. We must fight those who are here attempting to do harm and must recognize that we have a goodness in our country and emphasize the fact that we live and can live in harmony. But ISIS must be our target, not those whose faith may be considered a faith that we do not understand or maybe even disagree with.

STOP OBAMA'S EXECUTIVE AMNESTY

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BRAT).

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, on November 4, the American people spoke loudly and clearly on illegal immigration and President Obama's repeated overreaches of his authority. Yet within weeks of the election, the President tried to singlehandedly rewrite America's immigration laws by granting amnesty by executive decree to 5 million illegal aliens already in this country. It was a move that he previously said he had no constitutional authority to execute. He also acknowledged that only Congress could rewrite the laws. But he did it anyway.

In response, the House took a firm stand last month to pass a bill to stop the President's illegal and unconstitutional decree that grants amnesty, work permits, and Federal benefits to illegal aliens. The bill fully funds the Department of Homeland Security for the rest of the year, but it also prohibits the Department from carrying out the President's illegal act. Let me repeat that last line. This bill fully funds the Department of Homeland Security. It just says that in order to get that funding, the Department cannot break the law.

That is just common sense. The American people don't want the Federal Government breaking the law, and it is up to Congress to make sure that no Federal funds are used illegally.

Yet today, Senate Democrats are currently united in opposing this bill. Recent polling shows that Americans overwhelmingly oppose the President's

executive immigrations actions 58 to 36. I call on my Senate colleagues to support the Constitution and the rule of law and pass H.R. 240 as it was passed in the House.

The President's amnesty scheme is not only illegal, it is patently unconstitutional. It creates a dangerous precedent where future Presidents can ignore laws they don't agree with and expand their own power beyond its legal boundaries, threatening the very liberty of the American people.

Our constitutionally guaranteed liberties, our rule of law and economic opportunities are precisely the things that immigrants come to America to experience. Our Constitution, rule of law, and economic prosperity are precisely the things that we will be giving up if we allow the President to break our laws to give amnesty and work permits to those who are here illegally.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS).

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, about 5 weeks ago, Members of this body stood on the House floor and we all raised our hands and we all swore an oath of office to support and defend the Constitution. It is the same oath that Members in the other body, in the Senate, take. I think it is an oath that means something. It is not just window dressing. We have a responsibility to conform the actions of this body and to counteract actions of other branches of government if those actions are not consistent with the Constitution.

And so here we have an instance in which the President is on record 22 different times saying he does not have the authority to grant work permits unilaterally, 5 million of them, to people in the country illegally. He can't give Social Security numbers or benefits without an act of Congress. And yet, after losing the election, he did it. When he did it, a number of Members in his own party in the Senate said they were concerned about what he did, and they didn't think that it could be done by executive fiat and that changes to immigration law had to happen through Congress.

And so we are in a curious situation now because the House has passed a bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security but to constrain the President from acting illegally, because the government has to follow the law just like any other citizen. And you have a situation in the Senate in which the Democrats, including those seven Senators who said that this is problematic, they are blocking even having a debate on the bill. Forget about being opposed to the bill in its final form or if you don't get an amendment, they will not even let it come to the floor so it can be debated.

To me, this is the most important type of debate, when it goes to the central purpose of our oath: to support and defend the Constitution. I think they need to go on record about why they think this is constitutional. What limits are there for the President in terms of exercising this executive power? Can he legislate lower tax rates? Can he legislate in the field of environmental law or workplace safety law that the Congress doesn't support?

I think what you are seeing is a dereliction of duty by those Senators who are unwilling to have a discussion and they are unwilling to debate. They are putting protecting the political interests of a President in their own party over their duty to support and defend the Constitution of the United States.

If you were right on the issues and you knew that what he did was constitutional, then you should have no problem going to the floor and making that case to the American people. The fact that they are unwilling to do that, I believe, is proof positive that they know that case cannot be made, and, in fact, they would not be able to make it.

So I appreciate my friend from Georgia reserving this time. I think this is something that absolutely needs to have a thorough debate; and the American people overwhelmingly are opposed to what the President did, so let's debate it. If you don't like what we did, offer your suggestion, but the idea that you can go run and hide is something that is not consistent with our duties or with our oath of office.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fine remarks by the gentleman from Florida.

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), the State from which our Declaration of Independence was passed and the very Constitution we are speaking about was debated and proposed to this great Union.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank my colleague from Georgia for organizing this very important discussion that we are having here today.

Three weeks ago, this House passed a bill to fund the lawful operations of the Department of Homeland Security. Our bill provides nearly $40 billion for the protection of our Nation, with a $100 million increase for border security and $600 million more for Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

Democrats in the Senate, however, now refuse to vote on funding these important programs because they are insisting on funding President Obama's unlawful amnesty order for 5 million illegal aliens.

The dollars that hardworking taxpayers send to Washington should not be used to fund any unlawful order, including President Obama's amnesty order.

And how do we know that the President's action is unlawful? Well, I remember what the President said repeatedly. For example, in 2011, the President said:

> With respect to the notion that I can just suspend deportations through executive order, that is just not the case because there are laws on the books that Congress has passed. For me to simply, through executive order, ignore those congressional mandates would not conform with my appropriate role as President.

Funding for the Department of Homeland Security runs out in 16 days. The House acted 21 days ago. It is time for the Senate to act.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS).

□ 1745

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Georgia, BARRY LOUDERMILK, for the leadership that he has shown in putting this event together where we on the House floor can try to help explain to the American people what is at stake here with the President's executive amnesty.

Mr. Speaker, in that vein, I rise to speak in opposition to President Obama's illegal and unconstitutional executive amnesty for illegal aliens. Why? Because I was elected by Americans to represent Americans in Washington, D.C. While, clearly, protecting the United States Constitution is the number one reason to fight President Obama's illegal and unconstitutional conduct, a close second reason is the economic welfare of American families searching for jobs that will empower them to take care of their own families.

In that vein, a report by the Center for Immigration Studies is very instructive. The Center for Immigration Studies did a report based on Federal Government data. It was collected from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Department of Homeland Security, and the Census Bureau. And this is what they found.

From the first quarter of the year 2000 to the first quarter of the year 2014, a 14-year period, with respect to people in America who are ages 16 to 65—and I will repeat that—ages 16 to 65, which is far and away the largest block by age of working Americans, the American economy for that 16 to 65 age group created 5.6 million net new jobs. Some would say that is pretty good—5.6 million net new jobs.

But do you know how many of those jobs went to American-born citizens? Do you know the answer to that question? Well, I would submit to you that every American citizen should—and they ought to be outraged by the answer. Of those 5.6 million net jobs created over a 14-year period in the United States of America for people ages 16 to 65, American-born citizens had a net loss of 127,000 jobs.

And you wonder why the polling data shows that Americans still believe they are in a recession. The answer is American-born citizens are still in a recession.

Well, who got those jobs? Well, according to the Center for Immigration Studies report, 5.7 million net job gains were by two groups: illegal aliens, plus lawful immigrants.

So look at the priorities of our Federal Government over the last 14 years.

Look at the priorities established by President Obama's executive amnesty. The priorities do not lie with American citizens. Rather, they lie with people of all kinds other than American citizens.

We had 127,000 net job losses, but that doesn't really tell the whole picture. We also had population growth in the 16 to 65 age bracket for American-born citizens during that 14-year period of time.

So do you know how many more Americans are unemployed today—jobless—in the 16 to 65 age bracket because of America's faulty, porous like a sieve immigration policies? Seventeen million.

And you wonder why our youth are despondent, you wonder why they are depressed with the job circumstances they face, you wonder why American families cannot earn a living with the wages that are now being paid. It is because there are so many people in the White House, on K Street, and other places who are lobbying the United States Congress to dramatically increase the labor supply by bringing in illegal aliens and lawful immigrants to suppress wages and to take jobs from American families. That is wrong.

Now, you have heard the argument often raised: Well, Americans won't do those jobs. Let me tell you about those jobs for a moment. We have got two categories: illegal aliens and lawful immigrants.

Well, you can make the argument that illegal aliens are seeking the blue collar jobs and that perhaps Americans won't do them at the suppressed wages now being paid.

With respect to lawful immigrants it is a different picture. Over those 14 years, in that 16 to 65 age bracket, American-born citizens lost jobs while lawful immigrants gained jobs in these fields: engineering, architecture, health care, sales, office staff. Those are good-paying jobs that when I was growing up American citizens used to be able to compete for and get but which are now being denied because of immigration policies.

Those are sobering numbers, those are startling numbers. So sobering, so depressing, that I challenged my staff. I said, This report can't be right.

So my congressional staff went to the raw data from the Census Bureau, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the Department of Homeland Security, and they confirmed that the Center for Immigration Studies data was correct. Which brings us back to President Obama's executive amnesty that does so much damage to American citizens.

The House has done its job. We have passed legislation to defund executive amnesty to prevent the President from doing what he has been doing. The problem, as has been the last 4 years that I have been in the United States Congress and hopefully won't be the case for the next 2 years, lies with the United States Senate.

Media reports say that we are in an impasse, that the Democrats are standing with illegal aliens and shunning American families and filibustering. And the Republican leadership is professing: We don't have the firepower, we don't have the 60 votes, we are stymied, we can't end this filibuster.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is another option.

Let's think back for a moment and let's look at HARRY REID when he was Senate majority leader and the power that he wielded. And what did he do? He said: I am not going to let the filibuster stop me from achieving my political goals. And he exercised the nuclear option. And then under HARRY REID you did not need 60 votes for appointments of Barack Obama-submitted appointees; rather, a mere majority would work.

Well, if HARRY REID and the Democratic majority can do that, if they can stand up for their beliefs, however wrong those beliefs may be, then where is our Republican Senate leadership, and why aren't they doing the same thing? We have 54 Republican Senators. MITCH MCCONNELL last time I checked is the Senate Republican majority leader.

All of our Senators have said they object to executive amnesty. Why don't they do the same thing in respect to bills that we have to pass to prevent government shutdowns, bills dealing with spending matters, and say only 51 votes are needed; no longer can a minority with a filibuster shut down the United States Government?

And so with that, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that it is time for the United States Senate to change their rules to reflect the will of the American people. And certainly if those rules can be changed for mere appointments by a President, they can also be changed to protect the United States Constitution and the separation of powers.

Mr. Speaker, I can't speak for any Senators or, for that matter, any elected officials in Washington, D.C., but I can speak for me and I can speak for the people of the Tennessee Valley of the State of Alabama. I vote to put the jobs and wage interests of struggling American families over the interests of illegal aliens. I encourage all Senators of both parties to do the same. Respect the wishes of the American people, act on behalf of the American people, and if you do that America will continue to prosper and the rule of law in America will continue to prevail.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for those passionate words.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield a portion of my time to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY), my freshman colleague.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, Congressman JIM JORDAN and Congressman BARRY LOUDERMILK, for arranging this special session tonight to address a critical issue looming before our Nation.

Senator HARRY REID and the President are currently risking the full funding of our national security to protect the President's unilateral and unconstitutional executive action on amnesty.

On 22 occasions, President Obama himself said he did not have the authority to grant executive amnesty before flipping and denying the will of the American people and taking unilateral action anyway. This attitude follows a pattern of unilateral action, executive action, including the President's war on coal, and it must be stopped.

Now, Senator REID and his allies continue to block any consideration of the bill passed by the House to fund the Department of Homeland Security. This obstruction is intended to protect the President's unconstitutional executive amnesty.

Sadly, no one is surprised that this President would use this unlawful, unilateral action to pursue his own radical agenda. But now Senator REID and the President are edging closer to putting the American people in danger to protect that agenda.

The Constitution clearly gives the power of the purse to the United States House of Representatives—this Chamber right here. And the American people said clearly last year that they expect us to use our authority over spending to keep government operating in a responsible manner.

I call upon Senator REID, President Obama, and their Democrat allies to end this political gamesmanship. Instead, bring up the bill to fund Homeland Security for consideration and passage.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from West Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, as you can tell, we have people from all over this great Union that have risen here today to speak, not just from the South. I would like to yield a portion of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), my great friend.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman leading tonight's discussion on the floor. As we do so, we think about the people back at home and across this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are hurting. Americans are hurting because they are out of work, Americans are hurting because they lost jobs, they find they can't find new jobs. Families are hurting because of this. Families, Mr. Speaker, are also hurting because they are waiting for other fellow family members to be able to join them here in this country through the legal immigration process. They are patiently going through all the processes that we have set up in this country to process it, and they are hurting as they wait for their family members to join them.

As we come here to the floor today as Members of Congress, we understand that this government has to ensure that everyone plays by the rules, including this administration.

As Members of Congress, we are obligated to uphold the Constitution, and that is exactly what this House has done by defunding the President's unconstitutional actions in which he granted amnesty. Added to that, he provided working permits to over 5 million illegal immigrants, thereby creating additional problems for those Americans who are out of work and creating additional problems for those Americans who are waiting for their fellow family members to come into this country through the legal immigration process.

Mr. Speaker, the House has done its job. We have acted. We have fully funded—this is important—we have fully funded the Department of Homeland Security while at the same time undoing the damage the President's unprecedented executive amnesty is having on our Republic and, more important, on our American families.

The President's actions to grant de facto amnesty has broad-reaching consequences for many of my constituents and constituents all across the United States as well.

It is unfair. It is not only unfair, it is irresponsible to divert resources away from legal applications of those who, as I said before, are patiently waiting and going through the legal process of immigration to give it to those who have broken the law.

It is also reckless to reward those who have blatantly broken the law with work permits, allowing them to compete directly with those Americans and those American families who are hurting because they are out of work today and are finding themselves in a hard position to find work.

So because of this, Mr. Speaker, I call on our Senators who are blocking a vote on the bill: do not turn your backs on the millions of Americans who are struggling to find work, do not turn your back on those who have immigrated here legally, and do not turn your back on those who are still waiting to try to immigrate into this country legally as well.

□ 1800

It is time, Mr. Speaker, for the Senate to act. It is time for the Senate to end its obstruction. It is time to move this bill.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. I thank my friend from New Jersey for those appropriate words.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my good friend and freshman colleague from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER).

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, we are rapidly approaching a crossroads regarding the President's executive actions that provide de facto amnesty for millions of illegal immigrants.

On February 27, the appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security runs out. Here are the facts:

The House has done exactly what the American people have asked. We have passed a bill that fully funds the Department of Homeland Security, including broadly supported amendments that would defund the President's illegal executive orders.

Now the time has come for the Senate to engage. Sadly, they are not even debating the issue. Senate Democrats are now blocking the consideration of the bill. I strongly urge the Senate majority leader, MITCH MCCONNELL, to hold the line and to work diligently.

The President's overreach needs to be stopped. This is a constitutional issue, not an immigration one. Are we not outraged at such abuse? The President has violated his own words, attempting to enforce authoritative actions he repeatedly said he did not have. In fact, 22 times he has said he did not have the constitutional privilege to do so. This administration's opinion on other issues may continue to evolve or change, but may I remind him the Constitution has not changed.

I am calling on not only my constituents but on our fellow citizens across this land to let your voices be heard. Demand results from your leaders.

I would like to thank my colleague from Georgia for organizing this meeting to allow our voices to be heard in a very loud manner.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate all of the comments that have been made here today. As you can tell, this is not a party issue. This is not about Republicans or Democrats or conservatives. This is about our Constitution. This is about American principles and the rule of law, but, more importantly, it is about fairness. It is about the American Dream. It is about those who are working hard every day. It is about the children and our future.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the beautiful State of Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I certainly thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I have cherished the privilege to chair the Subcommittee on the Constitution in this body, and throughout the Obama administration, I have been bewildered many times by this President's many casual dismissals of constitutional principle and the respect for the rule of law, itself, in America.

However, I now believe that the President's recent actions related to illegal immigration constitute a fundamental and seminal abrogation of his sworn oath to the Constitution. If left unchallenged, Mr. Speaker, this President's unconstitutional act could create a precedent that could threaten to place a permanent crack in the very foundations of this Republic. Consequently, the issue before us now is about far more than illegal immigration—it is about protecting the Constitution of the United States of America.

Now it is both the prerogative and the solemn responsibility of this House and of the U.S. Senate to uphold our own collective oath to the Constitution. Through the constitutional power of the purse, we must stand with and for the American people and refuse to fund this unconstitutional action by this President. We must call upon the Senate to continue to hold multiple votes for cloture so that this Nation can discover and understand who it is who prevents us from doing our constitutional duty.

Mr. Speaker, failing that, we must now call upon the United States Senate to subordinate its own cloture rules to the United States Constitution and to use their rules to change their rules for that purpose if it becomes a choice between the Senate cloture rules and the United States Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, Daniel Webster once said:

> Hold on, my friends, to the Constitution and to the Republic for which it stands, for miracles do not cluster; and what has happened once in 6,000 years may never happen again. So hold on to the Constitution, for, if the American Constitution should fail, there will be anarchy throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, our duty is clear.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. I thank my good friend from the Grand Canyon State. No truer words have ever been spoken.

Mr. Speaker, many of us sat in this very room back in January, and we listened to the President as he gave his State of the Union Address. He outlined a complete program, from the cradle to the grave, of what government would do—take over the rights of individuals. Many of us heard from citizens across the Nation that they were opposed to that. Mr. Speaker, if we allow this President to continue on legislating from the Oval Office, I would submit there is nothing standing in the way for him to implement every one of his plans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for bringing this key issue to us on the floor tonight.

Mr. Speaker, in November, the voters sent a very loud message to Washington, D.C. Now, they elected a lot of Republicans, but I tell my Republican friends that they weren't affirming our principles so much as they were desperate for a check and a balance against a President whose policies were frightening to them but also whose actions lay outside the bounds of laws that he was constrained by and constitutional constraints on his actions also. He, himself, admitted that multiple times, maybe more than 20 times, saying: I don't have the right to do it—as his own party chastised him and tried to force him into these executive actions, which he ultimately took. He said at one point: I am not the emperor.

Are we now to believe that he declares himself to be such? That is the basic question that faces us now.

The people of America want this institution called Congress—the House and the Senate together—to operate properly. I think, as much as anything else, the voters were expressing discontent that 380-plus bills from this

House were stalled on the other side of the Capitol, never making their way in any form to the floor of the Senate.

The people expect to see the issues up here and wrangled about. They want the tension between the two parties' different ideological points of view pulling at the fabric of the ideas in front of us. They are not so much concerned about the next bill. They are concerned about our vision for America and where we would take it, and they are frightened of a President who himself would take on actions which they knew were contrary to the good of the future of the country and that were certainly outside the boundaries of the laws which restrain even the President, because this country believes that not even the President is above the law.

So the questions before us are very critical. There are some who are saying: You all in the House have passed a DHS bill, and it is all your way or no way. I beg to differ. We sent our version of a Keystone pipeline bill to the Senate. The Senate made significant changes. They sent that back, and, just today, we sent the bill with the changes, the changes that were brought by Democrats in the Senate. The Senate Democrats allowed the bill to come up for debate. They amended the bill. There are more amendments in this one bill than have been heard in the previous year, total, so the system is working properly. We just sent that bill to the President. We are going to ask him to sign it or to turn it down. The people will have an opinion now about the outcome of whether the President signs it or doesn't sign it.

In contrast, look at what is happening with the DHS bill. The Senate Democrats, under HARRY REID, are saying: No, we are going to block it again. There is no debate, and there is no discussion, and there are no more ideas that are going to come in front of this Senate. I think that the American people are going to have the same opinion that they had about REID's blocking all of the bills that came from the House before. I think that to be the case.

At any rate, we in the House have passed our bill. The Senate should either obstruct or move forward. There are many fashions to do both, but the American people are looking and judging because they desperately want an institution that functions. They are not really significantly interested if it functions for Democrat rule or Republican rule. I think what they want is a system that is passing commonsense legislation, guaranteeing that the future of this country will be solid and sound. Then we can build a healthy economy, where everyone has got opportunity and where everyone has a chance to succeed based on the merits of his work.

That is not what this President is putting in line, and that is the question before the House now as the Senate twice has rejected or has, maybe, even three times rejected the opportunity to debate the issue. I just calmly tell the American people that we are here, prepared to do the work you sent us to do. We will continue to do it. All you have to do is express your opinions to this body.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, we have heard from Representatives of the people of this Nation from all across the country. So far, I have yielded to Representatives from Florida, Alabama, West Virginia, New Jersey, North Carolina, Arizona, and New Mexico.

Now I yield to a good friend and patriot from the State that has seen and has participated in creating so much of the history of this Nation. He is the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. I thank Mr. LOUDERMILK for putting this together this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I was thinking about the situation we are in, and it came to my mind that there is a reason that the legislature is supposed to make the laws. There is a reason that we have a debate and that we discuss all of the different facets, because what also came to mind is the fact that the folks who have been legalized by the President's unconstitutional action will now get a Social Security number. With that, it will allow them to qualify for the earned income tax credit. As well, many will qualify for the child tax credit. Now, the IRS Code, Mr. Speaker, allows taxes to be amended back 3 years, and these folks who have just now received their Social Security numbers will be able to receive this payment retroactively.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker: Where is the fairness in that? I mean, what is fair about an illegal amnesty bonus? a bonus for breaking the law? What is fair about an immigrant's standing in line, coming here legally, wading through the process, only to watch somebody come right around him into this Nation, getting a Social Security number and, not only that, getting paid for doing that?

What is fair about hardworking, taxpaying Americans knowing that they can't get a break on their taxes because that money has got to go to somebody who came here expressly to break the law? What is fair about all of the children of all of these hardworking, tax-paying Americans being saddled with debt for the rest of their futures and their children's futures and those of their children's children for the sake of an illegal amnesty bonus? It is a bonus for breaking the law. What is fair about that, Mr. Speaker?

Now it is in the Senate, and the Senate is saying: Well, maybe the House should send another bill. The House sent a bill. It is the will of the House. It is the Senate's turn. With all due respect, if you don't want to vote for the bill, we get that. Vote ''no.'' You can explain that to your constituents—you can explain that to your voters—but it is more important to you to pay somebody a bonus for coming here illegally. You can explain that.

The point is that they don't even want to have the vote. They are making sure there will be no vote. We are saying give this bill its chance; give it its day. If you have got a better idea, if you have got a different idea, that is great. That is wonderful. Let's see it. Pass your bill and send it over, and we will work together to pass something along.

I would say this to the leader of the Senate: It is time you make the rules, Mr. Leader. If now is not the time to change those rules in favor of the Constitution, when is the time? Instead of being concerned about 40-some years of tradition and of the way we run the Senate—instead of being concerned about that—how about being concerned about hundreds of years in favor of the Constitution? When President Obama didn't like the rule, apparently, even though he said 20 times or so that he had to abide by the Constitution, he just changed it. He just disregarded it.

□ 1815

And when HARRY REID didn't like the rule—a couple hundreds years of votes in cloture and the nuclear rule in the Senate—he just changed it. Right?

We are not asking to change it all the time, but when it comes down to a constitutional crisis, when it comes down to a division of powers, do you want to stand up for a bonus for acting illegally, for breaking the law, or do you want to stand up for the Constitution?

If that is not the time to change the rules for the President's unconstitutional executive action, if that is not the time to change the rules, Mr. MCCONNELL, when is the time? The time is now.

Pass a bill. Whatever your bill is, have a vote, ''yes'' or ''no,'' send it to the House, and we will work it out. This legislation, this issue demands your attention. It demands a vote. It deserves a vote. The American people need to know. They deserve to know where their elected representatives in the Senate stand, not to just not vote on anything. They didn't send them there to just not vote. They sent them there to make a decision, ''yes'' or ''no.''

We get it. If you want to vote ''no,'' good for you. You explain that. If you want to vote ''yes,'' great. But have the vote. There is no reason to not change the rule if it gets us to a vote and upholds the Constitution. As a matter of fact, if it takes changing the rules to uphold the Constitution, this is one Representative of the Fourth District of Pennsylvania who thinks it is worth it.

With that, Mr. Speaker, again, I ask you: What is fair? What is fair about giving these bonuses to people who just received a Social Security card and who have been operating outside of the law for years? They receive their Social Security Card and they get a bonus.

You try that. Having worked here as a person who was born in this country,

you try to work under the table and then just apply and see if you will get a bonus from the IRS. Let me tell you what you get, Mr. Speaker. You will get a visit from the IRS, but it won't be for a bonus.

Think about fairness, Mr. Leader in the Senate. Change the rules. Let's move this bill forward.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, as you can see, this is a very passionate issue for many of us—not just because of politics but because this is about the heart of our Nation. This is the basis, the foundation of our Nation.

I now yield to a good friend and another freshman colleague from the great State of Arkansas (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. I thank my colleague for yielding. I am pleased to have this time on the floor to talk about this important issue that faces our Congress.

On more than 22 occasions, President Obama has told audiences that, on the advice of his counsel, his attorneys, he could in fact not do what he has just proposed to do last November of 2014.

He stated that he did not have the statutory authority to defer deportation of over 5 million people who are in our country illegally, thereby granting them rights to drivers' licenses, work permits, Social Security, and health benefits.

For example, in 2013, the President stated that implementing immigration ''reform'' through executive action was ''difficult to defend legally'' and ''not an option.'' He has repeatedly told the American people that he is a President, not a king, not a emperor.

Mr. Speaker, I will place in the RECORD the 22 times that the President has uttered these words that say that he does not have the authority to take executive action on immigration.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S TWENTY-TWO STATEMENTS ON HIS LACK OF AUTHORITY TO HANDLE IMMIGRATION POLICY BY EXECUTIVE ACTION

With the White House poised to grant executive amnesty any day now despite the American people's staunch opposition, on Sunday President Obama was asked about the many, many statements he made in the past about his inability to unilaterally change or ignore immigration law. His response was astonishingly brazen: ''Actually, my position hasn't changed. When I was talking to the advocates, their interest was in me, through executive action, duplicating the legislation that was stalled in Congress.''

This is a flagrant untruth: ''In fact, most of the questions that were posed to the president over the past several years were about the very thing that he is expected to announce within a matter of days,'' reported The New York Times. ''[T]he questions actually specifically addressed the sorts of actions that he is contemplating now,'' The Washington Post's Fact Checker agreed, awarding President Obama the rare ''Upside-Down Pinocchio,'' which signifies ''a major-league flip-flop.'' Even FactCheck.org piled on.

President Obama is once again trying to mislead Americans, but he can't run from what he's said over and over (and over) again. Not only are Americans not stupid—they can read:

1. ''I take the Constitution very seriously. The biggest problems that we're facing right now have to do with [the president] trying to bring more and more power into the executive branch and not go through Congress at all. And that's what I intend to reverse when I'm President of the United States of America.'' (3/31/08)

2. ''We've got a government designed by the Founders so that there'd be checks and balances. You don't want a president who's too powerful or a Congress that's too powerful or a court that's too powerful. Everybody's got their own role. Congress's job is to pass legislation. The president can veto it or he can sign it. . . . I believe in the Constitution and I will obey the Constitution of the United States. We're not going to use signing statements as a way of doing an end-run around Congress.'' (5/19/08)

3. ''Comprehensive reform, that's how we're going to solve this problem. . . . Anybody who tells you it's going to be easy or that I can wave a magic wand and make it happen hasn't been paying attention to how this town works.'' (5/5/10)

4. ''[T]here are those in the immigrants' rights community who have argued passionately that we should simply provide those who are [here] illegally with legal status, or at least ignore the laws on the books and put an end to deportation until we have better laws. . . . I believe such an indiscriminate approach would be both unwise and unfair. It would suggest to those thinking about coming here illegally that there will be no repercussions for such a decision. And this could lead to a surge in more illegal immigration. And it would also ignore the millions of people around the world who are waiting in line to come here legally. Ultimately, our nation, like all nations, has the right and obligation to control its borders and set laws for residency and citizenship. And no matter how decent they are, no matter their reasons, the 11 million who broke these laws should be held accountable.'' (7/1/10)

5. ''I do have an obligation to make sure that I am following some of the rules. I can't simply ignore laws that are out there. I've got to work to make sure that they are changed.'' (10/14/10)

6. ''I am president, I am not king. I can't do these things just by myself. We have a system of government that requires the Congress to work with the Executive Branch to make it happen. I'm committed to making it happen, but I've got to have some partners to do it. . . . The main thing we have to do to stop deportations is to change the laws. . . . [T]he most important thing that we can do is to change the law because the way the system works—again, I just want to repeat, I'm president, I'm not king. If Congress has laws on the books that says that people who are here who are not documented have to be deported, then I can exercise some flexibility in terms of where we deploy our resources, to focus on people who are really causing problems as a opposed to families who are just trying to work and support themselves. But there's a limit to the discretion that I can show because I am obliged to execute the law. That's what the Executive Branch means. I can't just make the laws up by myself. So the most important thing that we can do is focus on changing the underlying laws.'' (10/25/10)

7. ''America is a nation of laws, which means I, as the President, am obligated to enforce the law. I don't have a choice about that. That's part of my job. But I can advocate for changes in the law so that we have a country that is both respectful of the law but also continues to be a great nation of immigrants. . . . With respect to the notion that I can just suspend deportations through executive order, that's just not the case, because there are laws on the books that Congress has passed. . . [W]e've got three branches of government. Congress passes the law. The executive branch's job is to enforce and implement those laws. And then the judiciary has to interpret the laws. There are enough laws on the books by Congress that are very clear in terms of how we have to enforce our immigration system that for me to simply through executive order ignore those congressional mandates would not conform with my appropriate role as President.'' (3/28/11)

8. ''I can't solve this problem by myself. . . . [W]e're going to have to have bipartisan support in order to make it happen. . . . I can't do it by myself. We're going to have to change the laws in Congress, but I'm confident we can make it happen.'' (4/20/11)

9. ''I know some here wish that I could just bypass Congress and change the law myself But that's not how democracy works. See, democracy is hard. But it's right. Changing our laws means doing the hard work of changing minds and changing votes, one by one.'' (4/29/11)

10. ''Sometimes when I talk to immigration advocates, they wish I could just bypass Congress and change the law myself. But that's not how a democracy works. What we really need to do is to keep up the fight to pass genuine, comprehensive reform. That is the ultimate solution to this problem. That's what I'm committed to doing.'' (5/10/11)

11. ''I swore an oath to uphold the laws on the books . . . Now, I know some people want me to bypass Congress and change the laws on my own. Believe me, the idea of doing things on my own is very tempting. I promise you. Not just on immigration reform. But that's not how our system works. That's not how our democracy functions. That's not how our Constitution is written.'' (7/25/11)

12. ''So what we've tried to do is within the constraints of the laws on the books, we've tried to be as fair, humane, just as we can, recognizing, though, that the laws themselves need to be changed. . . . The most important thing for your viewers and listeners and readers to understand is that in order to change our laws, we've got to get it through the House of Representatives, which is currently controlled by Republicans, and we've got to get 60 votes in the Senate. . . . Administratively, we can't ignore the law. . . . I just have to continue to say this notion that somehow I can just change the laws unilaterally is just not true. We are doing everything we can administratively. But the fact of the matter is there are laws on the books that I have to enforce. And I think there's been a great disservice done to the cause of getting the DREAM Act passed and getting comprehensive immigration passed by perpetrating the notion that somehow, by myself, I can go and do these things. It's just not true. . . . We live in a democracy. You have to pass bills through the legislature, and then I can sign it. And if all the attention is focused away from the legislative process, then that is going to lead to a constant dead-end. We have to recognize how the system works, and then apply pressure to those places where votes can be gotten and, ultimately, we can get this thing solved.'' (9/28/11)

In June 2012, President Obama unilaterally granted deferred action for childhood arrivals (DACA), allowing ''eligible individuals who do not present a risk to national security or public safety . . . to request temporary relief from deportation proceedings and apply for work authorization.'' He then argued that he had already done everything he could legally do on his own:

13. ''Now, what I've always said is, as the head of the executive branch, there's a limit to what I can do. Part of the reason that deportations went up was Congress put a whole lot of money into it, and when you have a lot

of resources and a lot more agents involved, then there are going to be higher numbers. What we've said is, let's make sure that you're not misdirecting those resources. But we're still going to, ultimately, have to change the laws in order to avoid some of the heartbreaking stories that you see coming up occasionally. And that's why this continues to be a top priority of mine. . . . And we will continue to make sure that how we enforce is done as fairly and justly as possible. But until we have a law in place that provides a pathway for legalization and/or citizenship for the folks in question, we're going to continue to be bound by the law. . . . And so part of the challenge as President is constantly saying, 'what authorities do I have?' '' (9/20/12)

14. ''We are a nation of immigrants. . . . But we're also a nation of laws. So what I've said is, we need to fix a broken immigration system. And I've done everything that I can on my own[.]'' (10/16/12)

15. ''I'm not a king. I am the head of the executive branch of government. I'm required to follow the law. And that's what we've done. But what I've also said is, let's make sure that we're applying the law in a way that takes into account people's humanity. That's the reason that we moved forward on deferred action. Within the confines of the law we said, we have some discretion in terms of how we apply this law.'' (1/30/13)

16. ''I'm not a king. You know, my job as the head of the executive branch ultimately is to carry out the law. And, you know, when it comes to enforcement of our immigration laws, we've got some discretion. We can prioritize what we do. But we can't simply ignore the law. When it comes to the dreamers, we were able to identify that group and say, 'These folks are generally not a risk. They're not involved in crime. . . . And so let's prioritize our enforcement resources.' But to sort through all the possible cases of everybody who might have a sympathetic story to tell is very difficult to do. This is why we need comprehensive immigration reform. To make sure that once and for all, in a way that is, you know, ratified by Congress, we can say that there is a pathway to citizenship for people who are staying out of trouble, who are trying to do the right thing, who've put down roots here. . . . My job is to carry out the law. And so Congress gives us a whole bunch of resources. They give us an order that we've got to go out there and enforce the laws that are on the books. . . . If this was an issue that I could do unilaterally I would have done it a long time ago. . . . The way our system works is Congress has to pass legislation. I then get an opportunity to sign it and implement it.'' (1/30/13)

17. ''This is something I've struggled with throughout my presidency. The problem is that I'm the president of the United States, I'm not the emperor of the United States. My job is to execute laws that are passed. And Congress right now has not changed what I consider to be a broken immigration system. And what that means is that we have certain obligations to enforce the laws that are in place even if we think that in many cases the results may be tragic. . . . [W]e've kind of stretched our administrative flexibility as much as we can[.]'' (2/14/13)

18. ''I think that it is very important for us to recognize that the way to solve this problem has to be legislative. I can do some things and have done some things that make a difference in the lives of people by determining how our enforcement should focus. . . . And we've been able to provide help through deferred action for young people . . . But this is a problem that needs to be fixed legislatively.'' (7/16/13)

19. ''My job in the executive branch is supposed to be to carry out the laws that are passed. Congress has said 'here is the law' when it comes to those who are undocumented, and they've allocated a whole bunch of money for enforcement. And, what I have been able to do is to make a legal argument that I think is absolutely right, which is that given the resources that we have, we can't do everything that Congress has asked us to do. What we can do is then carve out the DREAM Act folks, saying young people who have basically grown up here are Americans that we should welcome. . . . But if we start broadening that, then essentially I would be ignoring the law in a way that I think would be very difficult to defend legally. So that's not an option. . . . What I've said is there is a there's a path to get this done, and that's through Congress.'' (9/17/13)

20. ''[I]f, in fact, I could solve all these problems without passing laws in Congress, then I would do so. But we're also a nation of laws. That's part of our tradition. And so the easy way out is to try to yell and pretend like I can do something by violating our laws. And what I'm proposing is the harder path, which is to use our democratic processes to achieve the same goal that you want to achieve. . . . It is not simply a matter of us just saying we're going to violate the law. That's not our tradition. The great thing about this country is we have this wonderful process of democracy, and sometimes it is messy, and sometimes it is hard, but ultimately, justice and truth win out.'' (11/25/13)

21. ''I am the Champion-in-Chief of comprehensive immigration reform. But what I've said in the past remains true, which is until Congress passes a new law, then I am constrained in terms of what I am able to do. What I've done is to use my prosecutorial discretion, because you can't enforce the laws across the board for 11 or 12 million people, there aren't the resources there. What we've said is focus on folks who are engaged in criminal activity, focus on people who are engaged in gang activity. Do not focus on young people, who we're calling DREAMers . . . That already stretched my administrative capacity very far. But I was confident that that was the right thing to do. But at a certain point the reason that these deportations are taking place is, Congress said, 'you have to enforce these laws.' They fund the hiring of officials at the department that's charged with enforcing. And I cannot ignore those laws any more than I could ignore, you know, any of the other laws that are on the books. That's why it's so important for us to get comprehensive immigration reform done this year.'' (3/6/14)

22. ''I think that I never have a green light [to push the limits of executive power]. I'm bound by the Constitution; I'm bound by separation of powers. There are some things we can't do. Congress has the power of the purse, for example. . . . Congress has to pass a budget and authorize spending. So I don't have a green light. . . . My preference in all these instances is to work with Congress, because not only can Congress do more, but it's going to be longer-lasting.'' (8/6/14)

Further, notwithstanding the President's own legal argument to the contrary, Mr. Obama's supporters argue that he simply is doing what Presidents Reagan and Bush 41 did. This statement is simply not true. Instead, President Reagan and Bush responded in a statutorily acceptable matter to an ambiguity in a specific law and did not seek to circumvent or prevent enforcement of the law as it was written.

I supported recent House legislative action to defund the President's executive actions based on the facts above, as well as my view that Congress must in fact fix our broken immigration system by legislation.

The separation of powers argument here is clear. In article I of the U.S. Constitution, Congress is granted the enumerated power of setting uniform law for naturalizing our citizens.

Mr. Obama's approach violates this provision by both exceeding his constitutional authority as well as his sworn obligation to faithfully execute the laws as passed by Congress.

While we are all familiar with the Executive's obligation to faithfully execute, we must focus on the cynical distrust that doing the opposite causes among our citizens.

James Madison in Federalist 51 discussed the need for each branch of government to guard against overreach by another. ''When such an overreach occurs,'' Madison stated, ''ambition must be counteracted by ambition.'' And clearly, our government works best when each branch stays within its prescribed boundaries.

Supreme Court Justice Kennedy argued this in a recent separation of powers case before the court when he said:

> Liberty is always at stake when one or more of the branches seek to transgress the separation of powers.

As a matter of principle, as a matter of our role in Congress, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to stand up for the proper separation of powers and assert that Congress alone can debate and enact such sweeping changes to our immigration system.

Mr. Speaker, Members seeking to reform our broken immigration system should support our efforts to rein in this tyranny of the Executive. Only then can Congress work together to craft the proper solutions to fix our broken system. Only then will Congress come together and insist on a border that is secure and fully functioning as a cornerstone of our homeland security.

With a land, sea, and air border that knows who and why people are entering our beloved Nation, we can then turn our attention to those many connecting facets of our system: visa overstays; lack of a balanced, well-staffed, and functioning guest worker program; adequate welcome and legal openings for those facing persecution; speedy adjudication for those aliens who are detained; opportunities for needed workers, professors, and students in our universities; and finally, a process for handling those among us who remain outside our legal tax and societal systems.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to stand up for the first branch and our constitutional prerogative. Take action on our Homeland Security bill and send it back to the House.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Again, Mr. Speaker, you can see that Representatives from all across the Nation have stood here today and represented the people of this Nation on how important this issue is.

Mr. Speaker, we live in one of the most dangerous times in American history. Innocent American citizens are targeted by extreme Islamic terrorists at home and around the world.

On September 11, 2001, even the sanctity of our homeland was proven to be vulnerable. And now, an organization considered too evil and too extreme by other terrorist organizations is calling for homegrown terrorists to carry out unspeakable acts of violence against innocent Americans—acts which we have witnessed in the past year.

Since 2001, there have been more than 60 coordinated terrorist plots against Americans on American soil. These perpetrators of evil planned to execute their violence in the places where innocent civilians live, work, and play. They have targeted civilians on aircraft, at military installations, mass gatherings of citizens, sporting activities, restaurants, and shopping malls—the very places where Americans should expect to feel safe and secure.

However, the current administration continues to deny the ideology that motivates these acts of evil. When a known sympathizer to terrorist organizations chooses to carry out his evil acts against coworkers, it is passed off as workplace violence. When our Embassy in Benghazi was invaded and officials of the United States Government were slain at the hands of known terrorists, it was spun as a violent response to a YouTube video.

When a military pilot of an allied country was murdered in the most horrific and painful way, the President referred to the perpetrators as a cult of death, not extremist Islamic terrorists.

With the rise and the expansion of ISIS, our citizens, military, and first responders are in more danger than ever before, and we must be vigilant to protect our citizens and our national interests.

Following the terrorist attacks of 9/11, our government recognized that the threat of organized and well-planned acts by international terrorist organizations required new and dedicated resources to protect American citizens. In response, the Department of Homeland Security was created, and resources were allocated by Congress to protect our homeland from future devastating acts of terrorism.

Since the turn of the century, terrorists have plotted over 60 attacks against our Nation. Thankfully, more than 50 of these were thwarted by U.S. law enforcement and our intelligence community, while others were stopped with the cooperation of law enforcement from other nations.

In the past several months, the threat against America has grown exponentially. ISIS is one of the most well-funded, the most organized, the best armed, and the most ruthless terrorist organization in the history of the world.

Even al Qaeda, which planned and executed the most devastating attack on American soil since the Japanese raid on Pearl Harbor, pales in comparison to the organization and resources of ISIS.

Recently, ISIS has expanded well beyond traditional communication tactics used by other terrorist organizations and has engaged in an effective Internet and social media campaign to recruit foreign fighters to join their ranks. They are purposefully, Mr. Speaker, targeting our youth by using popular video games to appeal to thrill seekers. They are promising that these young people can live out the fantasy world that they experience in their games.

Today, we are experiencing what may be the largest convergence of terrorist activity in history. As a result of the growth and the recruitment of ISIS, foreign fighters are swarming to Syria to join the ranks of the international jihad.

While it is virtually impossible to stop every act of terrorism against Americans, I believe the Department of Homeland Security, our military, and law enforcement agencies have done an exceptional job. However, we are only days away from the current funding of the Department of Homeland Security expiring, which, even according to this administration, could put us at grave risk.

During the first week of this 114th Congress, the House of Representatives took quick and decisive action to ensure that the Department of Homeland Security will continue to function at full capacity. We passed a funding measure that would ensure that all public safety functions within the Department are fully funded so that the agency can fulfill its mission.

Unfortunately, a few Senate Democrats are filibustering this bill and are keeping it from even coming to the floor for consideration. The Democratic Party is putting our national security at risk through their insistence that the President be able to grant 5 million illegal aliens legal status so they can receive work permits, tax refunds, and public assistance.

The President's recent executive order on amnesty places the safety of every citizen in jeopardy and eliminates job opportunities for hard-working Americans. At a time when millions of Americans are struggling simply to make ends meet, the President should be focused on providing American jobs, not introducing millions of new laborers into the workforce. Since the President assumed office, he has already issued almost 5.5 million work permits to foreign laborers.

The Senate now has the perfect opportunity to protect the safety of all Americans by approving House Resolution 240, a bill that would defund the President's executive order on amnesty, yet they refuse to take up this commonsense measure and do what is right for the American people. By not taking action, the Senate is relinquishing control to the President to continue carrying out these actions without the consent of Congress.

Today, my office and the office of every Member of Congress received a formal request from the White House to authorize the President to use military force to fight against ISIS. It is ironic that, on one hand, the President is asking to send our young men and women overseas to fight against terrorism but, on the other hand, he and Senate Democrats are willing to put our security at risk at home so he can, without constitutional authority, saturate the American workforce with foreign labor who have entered this Nation illegally.

□ 1830

Instead of working to strengthen our economy and secure our jobs for American citizens, the President seems to be more concerned with providing jobs for illegal immigrants.

He has even threatened to veto the Keystone pipeline, a bill that we just passed here just a couple of hours ago. He has already threatened that he is going to veto this bill with one stroke of his pen, a bill that would create more than 40,000 jobs; but with another, he is willing to add 5 million illegal immigrants to an already struggling job market.

Mr. President, the American people are hurting. Many families are spending countless hours around the kitchen table discussing how to pay their bills and live within their means. These families should not have to compete for jobs with those who are not legal U.S. citizens.

The American people should be calling on the Democrats in the Senate to stop their filibuster of H.R. 240. It is time for the President, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Senate to put the American people first and help hard-working Americans find jobs.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TROTT). The Chair will remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair and to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

THE ISSUE OF TRADE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the opportunity to utilize the time allotted to the Democrats in the House to speak to the issue of trade. There are many who see this issue as an important issue.

Others are now beginning to understand some of the dynamics as they relate to free trade versus fair trade and just what the dynamics of some of the last decades were, as recent past history has indicated, as they relate to

American jobs and the American economy.

This will be a good opportunity for us to address in fuller terms the issues of trade that we believe need to be addressed significantly well before we go forward with these negotiated contracts that could cause undesirable results, rather than those for which we all, I would believe, want to work—the opportunity to provide for individuals to tether the American Dream, to be able to go forth with dignity, to assume jobs that allow them to express their skills and God-given talents, and to be able to have that soulfulness of earning a paycheck.

We want to focus on those issues here this evening. There are many who would suggest that a fast track is of great concern. Fast track is that circumventing of the responsibilities of Congress—the ability of Congress—to get more in depth with the proposed agreement, to understand fully what those impacts of the agreements might be on their local economy, on their State economy, and certainly on the national scene.

It is important for us, I believe, to invest ourselves as a House. I would encourage those viewing this evening to ask their individual Members of Congress where they are on the fast track.

Do you stand for the concept that goes back to the days of President Nixon, that gave a more expedited process and perhaps more authority over to the executive branch to get these contracts done? Or do you stand for the scrutiny that should rest with the Congress to make certain that no undue pressure is put on our local jobs and economy, falsely so?

I believe that we do have that responsibility. As we have seen in recent years, we have grown the trade deficit of this Nation into the trillions of dollars. The challenge exists here, in the House, in this Congress, both Houses being faced with the added pressures of understanding what the dynamics of our trade deals are all about.

The first step of which we express concern is that fast track concept where we, again, do not allow for the fullest efforts of Congress to be utilized—where we can amend, where we can adjust, where we can advise—and simply a thumbs-up/thumbs-down doesn't quite cut it for the people we represent, the working families the great many of us dub the ''middle class of America.''

As I enter into this discussion, I am reminded of the district that I represent in upstate New York that basically witnesses—hosts—the confluence of the Hudson River and Mohawk River.

Those two valleys merge in the district that I represent, and they were the gateway, designed as an Erie Canal, barge canal system, that produced not only a stronger economy for New York, developed a port out of a little town called New York City, and then gave birth to a necklace of communities dubbed ''mill towns'' that became the epicenters of invention and innovation.

It was there that many an immigrant tethered his or her dream, the American Dream, at those factory sites, where they were able to climb that ladder of opportunity, where they were able to lift their family's potential simply through the investment of hard work, pouring forth somehow their ability to land those jobs, and then to provide the creative genius that oftentimes developed new product lines or better product lines.

That was a heyday of the American economy that, again, started through these mill towns. They became those locations of hope and prosperity. Then it led to a westward movement, an industrial revolution where we were the kingpin of the world's economy.

We know the world dynamics are different today. We know that we need to adjust and respond, but we do that thoughtfully. We do it mindfully. We do it in a way that is academically measured, so that we don't introduce free trade but, instead, value fair trade, making certain that fair trade doesn't dispense unnecessarily of American jobs, that does not deflate our economy and finds us working on something, competing on something—the likes of an unlevel playing field. We need to have that level playing field be the result.

Tonight, we are talking about some of those trade negotiations that will come forth. The most recent now is being viewed as a huge impact on the world's economy. A great percentage of the world's economy will be impacted by the TPP, the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

We have to make certain that it is done correctly, that it is done sensitively, that it keeps in mind that the American contribution to all of this should provide us an ample opportunity, an equal opportunity, to compete for jobs.

What has happened is that we have had these trade negotiations develop well beyond the original dynamics of trade barriers and tariffs. They are incorporating far more information and dynamics than just those barriers. We may reach to items like collective bargaining opportunities or environmental standards or guidelines for public health or requirements for public safety.

If we relinquish some of those hard-fought battles in this country to make safer a workplace or to have a product be as safe as possible or where we have been sound stewards of the environment or we have offered dignity to workers to collectively bargain, to unite as an effort to score for better benefits and just remuneration for the work that they do, we want to make certain that those standards are not dumbed down, that they are not reduced, that the world comply with those given opportunities for which decades' worth of sweat equity was poured forth.

Advocacy was echoed in the halls of government to make certain that these justified outcomes were fought for and realized and made statutorily etched into our government and our laws.

We do not take this lightly. We take this effort as a serious challenge, one that would address some of these hidden impacts that aren't often shared well enough with the general public that we serve that are represented here in this Chamber.

It is important for us to understand one of those growing concerns happens to be currency manipulation. It is one of those sneak attacks that really provides for a grossly unlevel playing field. We are discussing a critical aspect of the global economy and trade policy that has been ignored for far too long.

This currency manipulation is causing a lot of concern on both sides of the aisle and is now pushing legislators to speak more forcefully. When countries manipulate their currency, it makes foreign-produced goods all the cheaper. That should signal an alarm.

It doesn't end there. It also suggests or creates a situation where United States exports are less competitive. It doesn't end there because, as we lose in that battle, where we are less competitive, it then drains our economy by contributing to the downward pressure on wages in many sectors of our economy.

We have seen this tremendous impact in trade deficit that has been produced in this country because of failed negotiated contracts and because of the impact of currency manipulation.

Now, I understand that currency manipulation is not something most people talk about. It is not easy to conceptualize how devaluation of China's yuan or Japan's yen could impact us so severely. It puts American jobs in jeopardy. That is why we need to consider this issue much more seriously.

We need to make certain that a structured response to this manipulation is part of the negotiations and part of statute from the Federal perspective. Millions of jobs, I would suggest, are at stake.

If a country is going to cheat by devaluating its currency to make its products cheaper, it hurts America, and that hurt should not be tolerated. It is as simple as that.

For anyone that claims to support unfettered free trade, I urge them to engage in this issue. Persisting currency manipulation distorts markets. It is as simple as that. As long as it is allowed to continue, trade cannot be free, trade cannot be fair.

Now, there is a growing bipartisan consensus that strong and enforceable currency rules are needed, needed to ensure a level playing field for both the legislative perspective and as part of any new free trade agreement. We believe, many of us, that it should be part of statutory reform but, indeed, included in those agreements that are struck.

Few actions by foreign governments do more to disrupt free trade and harm the United States job market than currency manipulation.

A wide array of economic think tanks—including the Laffer Center at the Pacific Research Institute, the Peterson Institute for International Economics, the Economic Policy Institute, and the Center for Automotive Research—have all published what are extensive studies and commentaries supporting a crackdown on currency manipulation.

These groups hold varying and diverse views on the benefits of free trade, so they may not all be coming from the same perspective, but all are united in their sense that trade cannot be free or fair if countries are allowed to cheat by manipulating their currencies.

The Peterson Institute has support indicated for currency as a chapter in the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Certainly, the former economic adviser to the Vice President has also supported including a currency chapter in the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

The Peterson Institute has estimated that America's trade deficit has averaged some $200 billion to $500 billion per year higher as a result of the manipulation.

□ 1845

That is happening from many angles, primarily from forces in China and Japan. Let me repeat those stats. $200 billion to $500 billion per year is the estimate for our trade deficit coming from some sound think tanks as a result of currency manipulation.

The Peterson Institute also estimates that interventions in currency markets by foreign governments have cost United States workers as many as 5 million jobs over the last decade. So I believe it speaks to us profoundly and should cause us to respond to the challenges of protecting jobs, American jobs, through the issues of fairness. This is not asking for some unfair competitive advantage. It is simply reminding the world that we understand what is happening out there as dynamics work against us and that we are going to do what we can to inspire fairness in the process.

The EPI, the Economic Policy Institute, found that ending currency manipulation could reduce the United States trade deficit by as much as $500 billion within 3 years and create as many as 5.8 million—5.8 million—American jobs. These are statistics that should not be taken lightly. They are reports that should feed our senses and build our passion to do what is correct here, to make certain that we inspire the sort of reforms to this process and to Federal law that would make for a much fairer outcome, a more fair outcome for the American public.

Certainly there is no greater issue that rests before Congress these days than creating the climate that allows for private sector job growth. Now, government may not create jobs. That may not be our purpose, prime purpose, but we certainly can do all within our power to create the sort of climate, the environment that allows for job growth to be maximized.

As we move into this desire to have world trade work as powerfully as it can and as fairly as it can for those of us in this country, we need to make certain that some of these reforms are embraced, and embraced in as enthusiastic a manner and expeditious a process as possible.

There was a report released just last week by EPI highlighting the negative impact that the Trans-Pacific Partnership would have on the United States' jobs if currency manipulation is not addressed, and that report, dubbed Currency Manipulation and the 896,000 United States Jobs Lost Due to the United States-Japan Trade Deficit, contains estimates for job displacement for every congressional district. We are making certain that all of our colleagues know of this information. These are data that are relevant to the people that we represent. These are data that challenge us.

I know that the study found that over 46,000 jobs would be displaced in New York State, including 1800 in the 20th Congressional District of New York, my home district. That is due, again, to the massive trade deficit that this Nation endures with Japan, a deficit that has been fueled primarily by currency manipulation.

So how do we address currency manipulation? How does it work? To identify manipulation, we need first and foremost to look at three criteria, criteria that are based on the International Monetary Fund's definition.

First, does the country of concern have large reserves of foreign currency, does the country have sustained trade surpluses, and does the country continue to buy large amounts of foreign currency?

Worth repeating. Does the country have large reserves of foreign currency, does the country have sustained trade surpluses, and does the country continue to buy large amounts of foreign currency?

Undervalued exchange rates allow the manipulating country to boost exports of their products and then put imports from other countries that are not cheating at tremendous disadvantage. Floating currencies should be self-adjusting based on trade deficits and surpluses. Cheaper dollars will lead to more exports and a balancing of the deficit over time. It is an ebb and flow relationship, and there is a natural tendency for that ebb and flow; but when enters in a greed factor, it can change those results and change them severely. The natural trend is not allowed to occur when a country intervenes in that currency market.

Countries like China and Japan have prevented this self-correcting process by buying United States currency. This artificially strengthens the dollar and keeps us importing relatively cheap goods produced abroad.

We already have a significant trade deficit with Japan, and that is very much measured in the automobile industry. Our trade deficit with Japan is second only to our trade deficit with China, and the majority of that deficit is in the automotive sector.

Now, if you are to talk to any of our colleagues from Michigan, they will tell you about the devastation that has been borne upon, laid upon that auto industry in their home State. They have shared with us some very painful statistics. Well, the majority of that deficit, as I said, is in the automotive sector as it relates to Japan and China.

Japan, for instance, imports one American car for every 100 Japanese cars imported into the United States each year. That is one car, one car imported from America into Japan for every 100 Japanese cars that are imported into the United States each year. That pattern can't continue. That is an easily predictable devastating outcome.

Ford Motor calculates that the weakened yen of Japan added some $6,000 in profit, on average, per car imported from Japan in the years 2012 to 2013. So if you have that $6,000 advantage built into the sales price, where do you think we are going? It is allowing for such a devastating impact on the American worker, the autoworker of this country. It is unrealistic to have us as a nation to stand silently and not echo some order of concern.

So what can the Congress do? Well, the House of Representatives should pass the Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act, and the administration should require strong and enforceable currency manipulation provisions in the TPP, in the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Bipartisan groups in the House and in the United States Senate here in Congress are introducing legislation which would use United States trade law to fight currency manipulation and provide consequences for countries that indeed do cheat.

In the 113th Congress, the Currency Reform for Fair Trade Act, of which I was cosponsor, would have enabled the Department of Commerce to impose countervailing duties to offset the impact of currency manipulation. If you want to cheat, you pay. We are not going to stand for unfair trade. That bill had 157 bipartisan cosponsors, and identical legislation was passed with bipartisan support back in 2010.

The legislation is identical to the House bill that passed with overwhelming bipartisan support in 2010. That bill is consistent with the World Trade Organization and its rules. I think that this bill is written intelligently to conform to our trade agreement rules by considering currency devaluations as an illegal trade subsidy.

We already have mechanisms for addressing other illegal subsidies, but a bill such as that one, which is a start to addressing the problem, will not end

the practice of currency manipulation. We also need to include provisions in our trade agreements. Those provisions included in those agreements would provide our trading partners with a strong deterrent for manipulating their currency in the first place. We also have to make sure that our trade obligations explicitly allow this approach to targeting currency manipulation.

So I believe there are efforts within our grasp that we can work to achieve, that the changes and the reforms that we can provide will enable us to breathe free and grow and enhance the opportunities of our manufacturing sector.

Now, we think back to the booming economy we had in the 1950s and 1960s. We think of all the post-World War II growth of this Nation. We think of the tethering of the American Dream. We think of the passion of immigrants who had come here to climb those ladders of economic opportunity. We think of the generations that were strengthened by those who made the journey. It was their dream to provide a better life for them and their children and their grandchildren, and they saw it happening within these mill towns, those epicenters of which I spoke, epicenters of invention and innovation, of creative genius that enabled us to be the best we could possibly be and where there was hope abounding in our communities.

We can bring back that spirit. We can call for justice, social and economic justice as it relates to workers, as it relates to a world scene where there is a thought for those in the middle-income community, the middle class of America, the working families of America, strengthened and empowered because we get it here in Washington, where we speak to forces like counterforces, like currency manipulation that doesn't give us a fair shot, that creates an unlevel playing field, that will cost us dearly in jobs and in the growth of our economy.

So there is much work to be done. We need to make certain that as stewards of these agreements we are insisting that our strength be heard at the table, that we make certain that we are informed about issues like child labor laws, about the rights for collective bargaining, about environmental standards, about the need for public health and public safety to be addressed in the workplace and in the product line that is developed.

These are standards that are uniquely American at times, that should lift the world along with the people of this great country. We don't abandon those championing efforts that enabled us to be a stronger people, a safer people, building a stronger tomorrow. We don't abandon those principles. We build upon them. We share them with the other nations of the world.

As I mentioned to a group of labor individuals in my district recently, there are consequences galore if we continue down this path.

□ 1900

We are selling short the American worker. We are offshoring jobs that we can ill afford to ship away.

But it is beyond that. Not only does the American worker lose her job, not only does the American worker lose his hope, we then find economies around the world accepting the fact that their citizens are working for 75 cents an hour. Where is the justice to any of the workers around the world? This is an impact that has a ripple effect that pours forth in painful measure with insensitivity and gross, gross negative outcomes.

We can do better than that. We can be a country that will stand tall and know from the growth and progress that we have achieved through our halls of government, through the efforts of labor and unionized forces that came through labor and said, We are better than this. We need to share in the wealth of our economy.

We need to make certain that we respect our labor forces. The unionized efforts gave us sound benefits and sound salaries and good working conditions, acceptable standards. We are not going to ship that away. We are not going to allow for currency manipulation and the undoing of the American ideals, to be forsaken for the sake of a factor that has taken this global economy and produced these outcomes that are grossly unfair.

When we see a trade deficit in the trillions of dollars, when we understand that addressing currency manipulation can undo by hundreds of millions of dollars a deficit in a short order of 3 years, we can make a difference. We can be a force of change. We can be the voice of reason. We need to be that leader at the table.

Congress needs to be involved, invested in this opportunity. We need to make certain that the academics guide us here, that we pay attention to the data that are speaking to our senses.

We are rejecting all for which we fought. We are rejecting all for which labor painfully organized and achieved successful outcomes. If there is not justice for all in this process, it will not work.

But the American standard, the American appeal, the American hope that has been a beacon to people around the world should be that guiding force, should be the noble effort that allows all of us to understand that by committing to these issues of social and economic justice, we will have strengthened not only the American worker but workers around the world. An unlevel playing field simply does not work here. And offshoring jobs is the painful, gross neglect of the American Dream. The American Dream was one that found people playing by the rules, rolling up their sleeves, and expecting to taste success.

We can still build that aura within the halls of government. We can create those standards that determine a fair and just outcome. And we can speak soulfully to the people who are counting on us in the given communities they call home across this great expanse called the United States of America. We have always been that higher standard. We have always been the people in search of a better tomorrow. We have always been a society indebted to justice.

Throughout our annals of history, stories replete of us making a difference by working our process called government, by making certain it empowers the individuals and families of this Nation in a way that simply speaks to what is right. We know it is right here.

There have been a number of folks in this House championing the effort of fair trade, talking about the inclusion of Congress in a way that allows for amendments and improvements to agreements and certainly an outspoken force that speaks to holding fast to those standards that speak to the wisdom that guides us, of being fair and respectful to those who labor, who labor steadfastly, who ask only to be treated as an equal partner in this process.

It is an honor to represent those voices that speak so profoundly well in the workplace, asking for that dignity of work, asking for just remuneration for the sweat equity that they pour forth in wanting to have just that better step forward for their children and their grandchildren as they grow to their tomorrows, filled with hope. We can provide hope. We can build change. And we can issue justice if we put our mind, heart, and souls to that effort. I suggest we can do it. It is within our grasp.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity and yield back the balance of my time.

CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORITY VERSUS PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity tonight to address a very important matter regarding the role of the Congress. And I would associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from New York (Mr. TONKO) about the role that this body plays in trade but also the role that this body plays in foreign policy and matters of diplomacy.

Every American watches the news each day. We all see the same stories, be it ISIS, be it terror around the globe. We know that we, as a nation, are engaged against a threat that, left unchecked, could cause great harm to our homeland and to American interests abroad. We also have heard in recent news the conversation about the Prime Minister of Israel addressing our Nation.

We have seen the President's negotiations with Cuba, the President's negotiations with Iran, and it begs the question: What is the role of Congress in all of these matters, in these matters of foreign policy and foreign affairs?

So I appreciate the opportunity tonight to discuss a view of our side of the aisle and many in this Congress. I will be joined by my colleague from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) shortly to specifically talk about the role that Congress provides in setting the direction of our Nation's foreign policy.

This body is a coequal branch. We are established under article I of the Constitution, just as the administration is established under article II. We are coequal branches.

This body, most every American knows, has the authority to declare war. This body does, this Congress does. We fund our diplomatic activities. We fund our military activities. We authorize the use of military force, as was affirmed by the President today in sending such a request to this body to ask for the constitutional affirmation of this body, of this Congress. And we do so routinely.

So when we come across events where sometimes people question why Congress would inject itself into matters of national security, into matters of foreign affairs, let's revisit why and the important role that Congress has served.

This body, this Congress rejected the President's negotiation of the Treaty of Versailles in 1919 and 1920. This body rejected the President's negotiation of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in 1999. This body did that, reflecting the will of our constituents, of this Nation. This body, very importantly, investigated the Iran-Contra affair. This body investigated the intelligence activities related to 9/11. This body investigated the events of 2011 in Libya.

We have the authority of the purse as well, as spending originates in this body. We have used that authority to limit the transfer of detainees at Guantanamo, over the objection of the President.

We have used the constitutional authority of this body in matters of foreign aid and, at times, withholding foreign aid. Following the capture of Osama bin Laden and questions about Pakistan's role, this body responded by putting restrictions on that foreign aid. And, yes, this body provides billions to Israel as a matter of not only protecting the security of Israel but furthering our national security in the Middle East.

So it is appropriate then to raise questions very respectfully and in a way that reflects our constitutional responsibility of the President's decisions at times. We are one Nation. We are united in providing for the security of our country, but sometimes we have different ideas. And it is okay to raise questions on the President's decisions.

Consider the President's recent actions and the concerns of this body over the negotiations to return Bowe Bergdahl that involved the release of five prisoners from Guantanamo, in contravention of a law passed by this Congress and signed by the President. He provided no notice of that.

We know that this President sent a secret letter to the Supreme Leader of Iran during a time of critical negotiations that many of us have concerns about and during a time when many of us have asked for additional sanctions on Iran, not fewer sanctions.

We know this President has attempted to negotiate with the Castro regime to normalize relations in Cuba.

We know that the President sent a message to Putin just before his last election, saying, If you just give me time and wait until after the election, I will have more flexibility. He delivered that message to the Russian President.

So it is okay that those of us in this body have raised those questions.

The President has the authority to do most of what I just said, although I object to his no notice in the Bowe Bergdahl case. But we also have the authority to provide oversight and to exert our role in this.

So how do we do that? We do that in three or four areas that are very ripe right now for conversation, for debate, and in a way that attracts the attention and the interest of our constituents, of the American people that send us here to represent them.

We saw today the President's request for an Authorization for Use of Military Force. I appreciate the President sending that request to this Congress. I believe we should have done that last September. I was one of a few Members of Congress who signed my name onto an Authorization for Use of Military Force that we introduced last Congress prior to the President sending his resolution to this body. I believe we had a constitutional responsibility to do that, as this body, to ask: Are we a nation at war? And if so, are we willing to incur the sacrifice necessary to win that war?

I am encouraged that the President today, during his press conference, said that by working with the Congress and by negotiating on the language that we can make this resolution even stronger. And I think we will see that. I hope we will see that in the coming weeks and the coming months.

The language in the Authorization for Use of Military Force that prohibits no enduring offensive ground troops I think causes much consternation for many in this body. Are we really going to pass a resolution that restricts the tools of our own warfare when it comes to providing for the national security of the United States?

The President will have his opportunity to make his case. This body will have our opportunity to make that case as well.

Limiting or sunsetting the authorization to 3 years I think is something that we should begin to talk about. It is okay for us to have to revisit a responsible Authorization for Use of Military Force in 3 years so that we don't find ourselves with a President years from now relying on an authorization that can be 10, 11, or 12 years old. We need to have that debate in this body and represent our view of how we respond to ISIS because the President's view has created much concern.

We saw at the National Prayer Breakfast that he suggested that the foundation of our response to ISIS needed to start with our own humility, by looking at our own history.

I appreciate the academic conversation the President would like to have on that. But that sentiment, in itself, compromises our own national security, in my opinion, because it suggests that we first must look inward before responding to what is a pending national security threat, a threat to our homeland and a threat to our national interests.

We need to have a debate whether or not we believe that an air campaign is sufficient. For the President to suggest that no ground troops will be required, that somehow that is a way of providing for the safety of our men and women in uniform, ignores the very risk of those who will be engaging in a dangerous air campaign and will continue to do so every day. And what happens if we lose one of our pilots? What happens if one of our pilots is captured, like the Jordanian pilot that was captured and, as we all saw, the tragic end that he met? Are we, as a nation, prepared to respond and rescue? Are we going to put boots on the ground? Should we put boots on the ground? That is a debate we need to have.

None of us are advocating for an extended war. None of us are advocating for putting men and women in harm's way. But if we are going to engage, as a nation, with our partners to defeat a threat to the United States, we need to have an honest debate about how we do that and not start the debate by restricting how we intend to do that.

□ 1915

We also have a role in the future of Guantanamo. I have introduced legislation, H.R. 654, which would prevent the President of the United States from handing over our naval base at Guantanamo to the Cuban regime without congressional approval. This is very different from the debate over the future of the prison and very different from the debate over the transfer of detainees.

Mr. Speaker, this simply says that we, as the United States, have a naval station 90 miles off our shore, and when Raul Castro demands that we return that to the Cuban people and pay reparations to the Cuban Government as terms of negotiation, my legislation says, No, Mr. President, you may not do that without coming to this body to ask for authorization. Certainly, I would not lend my vote to that.

I was pleased to hear testimony in the other body, in the Senate, when the administration said that is not a matter they would consider, but as we have seen in the President's negotiations in the past, it gives us reason to pause.

My legislation would simply codify the restriction that says that the Guantanamo Naval Base may not be returned to the Cuban people without congressional approval.

Finally, we do have a role in inviting a foreign leader to address this body, Prime Minister Netanyahu. It is fully appropriate as a coequal branch of this government to invite and to ask for Netanyahu to address us about his vision of security in the region, his vision of peace in the region—his vision of security—and also his vision of the current negotiations with Iran.

No Member of this body should shy away from receiving an address from the Prime Minister of Israel. We should stand resolute—Republicans, Independents, and Democrats—and be here for that address and not insult the Prime Minister and the people of Israel by turning it into a political game of boycotting an address by the Prime Minister.

We should be here showing our support for the security of Israel, for the people of Israel, and, yes, for the Prime Minister's leadership. This is appropriate. We can disagree with the administration without being disagreeable.

As we engage in oversight, Mr. Speaker, it is important that we continue this dialogue, and we do, as the President very respectfully suggested, and I want to thank him again for the tone of his remarks today when he said he hopes the AUMF can be better by working with the Congress.

I would ask for the same of the administration when our Speaker steps out and invites Prime Minister Netanyahu because it represents the interests of this body when it comes to Israel and to the current negotiation with Iran.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be joined this evening to discuss this further by a fine colleague of mine in this body, Representative RODNEY DAVIS from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Well, thank you to the gentleman from Florida for actually putting this Special Order together tonight and also for yielding me time.

You brought up a great number of issues that I think are very important to many of us, regardless of whether or not you represent 800,000 constituents in Florida or—like me—800,000 constituents in central and southwestern Illinois.

I will tell you, DAVID, that the other night, I was cleaning out one of my son's pockets in his jacket because I was throwing it into the laundry, and I pulled out a copy of the Constitution that he got at school.

I flipped through it, and I reread article I, article II, article III, and the Bill of Rights. You learn something new each time. What you don't forget is that our forefathers who created this great institution understood that it took equal powers. It took equal branches of government to produce the freedoms that we here in America sometimes take for granted.

It is exactly what you said about let's work with each branch of government. We can disagree without being disagreeable. You address so many issues. I would like to actually talk back and forth on some of those.

Let's start with the invitation to Prime Minister Netanyahu. We have a tremendous disagreement on whether or not the United States should unilaterally enter into negotiations with the terrorist State of Iran.

I worry. I worry what it means for America and what it means for our closest ally in the Middle East, Israel, if Iran finally was given access to a functional nuclear weapon. What would they do with that? Whom would they provide that technology to? It is something in a geopolitical sense that we have to be concerned about in our position as Members of Congress.

These are issues that we have to put a check and balance on the administration to ensure that we are working towards what is the common goal for our allies.

I think that Prime Minister Netanyahu's being invited to this great institution to come here to address the United States Congress, to address 435 Members of this House and many others, to talk about how we are working together as allies, I don't think that is an insult.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I say: What took so long? Why did it take the Speaker of the House to put the invitation out? Why did the administration continue to block this? These are the types of issues that we as an equal branch of government have to address in this body. That is why we are happy to talk about many of the other issues.

You mentioned Guantanamo Bay. I am a proud cosponsor of your bill that is going to ensure that this administration cannot negotiate away the United States' ownership of Guantanamo Bay, regardless of whether or not the President is going to—which I think is a terrible policy—regardless of whether or not the President is going to clear out Guantanamo Bay of the terrorists who are there because they want to hurt Americans.

I think we need to ensure that there is a law of the land that does not allow this administration to negotiate away a very important base in Cuba that protects Americans.

Mr. Speaker, these are the types of issues, foreign policy issues—ISIS is one that I know we will be able to discuss tonight and others—but I am happy to begin a discussion on whatever it is you think is most important when it comes to America's foreign policy and our ability to be that oversight branch, that equal branch to the executive branch.

Mr. JOLLY. I thank my colleague. Let's, for a moment, stay on the topic of Prime Minister Netanyahu.

One of the reasons we take to the floor is to make sure that the voices are heard from all over the political spectrum. As the media and some in this body have gained the attention of the media by suggesting that the Prime Minister shouldn't attend, it is important for those of us who believe he should to take time to discuss why that is.

Most people know and understand—but some people don't—the significance of our partnership with Israel and what it means in one of the most volatile regions of the world.

This is a nation that has committed to democracy, to peace, to freedom, to representation, and to security; and they are doing so in an incredibly volatile region. All that they have asked of the United States over the years is that we stand with them in their own courage to promote peace, security, and freedom of their own people.

I would say, as I mentioned earlier, for those who have chosen not to attend, I certainly respect that decision, but I think it sends a message that is wrong to say not just to the people of Israel, but to the Prime Minister himself.

Not only is there a political message trying to be delivered by those that don't attend, but there is also this notion that, somehow, those of us in this body better understand the internal politics in Israel better than the elected leaders.

Why should we not trust that Prime Minister Netanyahu understands what is best for his nation? Why should we try to suggest that we know better than Prime Minister Netanyahu what is right for Israel and for the people of Israel? To suggest otherwise is demeaning both to the Prime Minister, as well as to the people of Israel.

I look forward to the Prime Minister's address, and I think this body, as we make decisions both about Iran sanctions but also about our aid to the people of Israel, I think this body has an opportunity to learn from the Prime Minister and to understand the issue better as we begin to make decisions.

I look forward to the Prime Minister's address to this body.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Well, like my colleague, Mr. JOLLY, I look forward to the Prime Minister's address, too. It is really beyond what I thought serving as a Member of Congress we would see here, and it is the sheer pettiness of the fact that the Speaker of the House invited the Prime Minister and many decided to say they are going to boycott this.

Do you know what—boycott it. If that is your idea of your freedom of speech, go ahead. We will fill the seats. We will make sure that Prime Minister Netanyahu understands that America stands with him and his nation as our greatest allies in the Middle East.

When that happens, he will come here, he will be received with a reception that is worthy of the Prime Minister of Israel, and I am just honored to be able to sit in this room and to hear why our bilateral relationship is of the utmost importance.

Mr. Speaker, I wish we didn't have this pettiness here in this Congress because I think the American people are sick and tired of the infighting. I think they are wanting us to govern together.

This is just one more example that goes out to the American people that tells them that people in Washington in this institution can't get along. I hate to say it, but they are wrong on many issues because we do get along, but on this one, it is so important that we show respect to our greatest ally.

Mr. Speaker, I notice we have been joined by our colleague from California (Mr. VALADAO), who I think wants to participate in this discussion on Prime Minister Netanyahu also.

Mr. JOLLY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, a couple of years ago, I had the opportunity to go visit Israel and actually spend some time with Prime Minister Netanyahu. That was, for me, probably one of the most enlightening trips I have been on, to have the opportunity to actually see what they are experiencing there and to see how important our relationship is to the folks there in Israel, but also to us here in the U.S.

We learn so much from the technology that they use to protect their borders, to protect themselves from terrorists, and we see the situation that we have got going on with ISIS now today, and we need that relationship more than ever, something that can actually truly make a difference because we truly are under attack at all times.

We have got people around this world—and now, we are hearing today in committee, it was mentioned that there are a lot of people within our own borders today, so it truly is a scary time.

To have someone with the experience that Netanyahu has and to see what he has seen over the years and to bring that and share that with us here in our Chamber where we pass the laws, where we are here, sworn to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, but also the people here, and that is our number one priority, and to have the opportunity to have him speak to us, I think, is an honor.

Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward to that opportunity. I think it is something that will help all of us here in Congress truly understand what we are up against and what needs to be done. I think it is something that most of us are smart enough to attend. There are a few that choose not to, but I think that is going to be a very small group of people.

Again, Mr. JOLLY, I appreciate the opportunity.

Mr. JOLLY. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

It can't be lost in this conversation about the pending address from the Prime Minister. As we mentioned, the security of Israel in a very volatile region, it is a region that is the center of much of the presence of ISIS.

As we often see the political debate, the TV commentary, and the radio commentary about how we define ISIS, the fact is that if we are not willing to define our enemy, we will never defeat our enemy. We know that we face a threat, an organization that has declared war on us, and we don't get to choose the threats we face as a nation. We certainly wish we could. We only get to choose how we respond to those threats.

The President's submittal of an AUMF request today is the right one. This body, I think, can have a very respectful debate about the terms of how we confront ISIS, about the authority, the authorization that we want to provide this administration for how he engages.

I think the most critical thing we can do, though, is not tie the hands of our men and women in uniform and the leadership of our Department of Defense as they make decisions how to execute our campaign against this radical organization.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am, again, so proud to be joined by my colleague from Florida and my colleague from California.

When we talk about ISIS, this is a true threat to Americans abroad. I have never in my lifetime seen such a savage organization who finds it entertaining to show the death of innocent civilians.

□ 1930

Let us also recognize that most of the civilians who have been killed by ISIS have been fellow Muslims. So it is not something that we here in America with our freedoms that we enjoy can comprehend. I think we have to do everything we can to eradicate them, to destroy them and ensure that they never get a foothold in any type of nation-state whatsoever because their plans will be to do one thing, and that is to kill Americans.

Part of our job as Members of Congress is to come here and make some pretty tough decisions. These are decisions that none of us, when we stood up to get sworn in in this institution, thought we would have to make, but they are decisions that the American people demand that we make. We are being demanded to ensure that America remains safe here in the homeland and Americans should remain safe abroad.

The President talks about a trajectory of peace. I don't know what he is looking at. It seems like a flat line of destruction to me. We have an opportunity now to put forth an Authorization for Use of Military Force, something I never wished that we would vote on in this House, but we are forced to by the failures of the foreign policy coming out of this administration in dealing with ISIS.

I stood on this floor and I said I am willing to stand with the President, who told me this strategy of using air superiority and working with our allies on the ground was going to work. It is clearly not working. The last thing I wanted to do was stand here and offer up an opportunity for American Special Forces and ground forces to partner with allies to go in and defeat ISIS, but it may be the only chance we have.

And this Authorization for Use of Military Force, I like the fact that it may expire in 3 years. Let it be reauthorized. But the fact of the matter is we need the President to stand up and be the Commander in Chief. We can put any piece of paper in front of him and his administration that we want, but if he is not willing to do the job and be the Commander in Chief, to destroy, defeat, and ensure that America remains safe here and abroad, then he is not doing the job that he was elected to do.

We will do our job. We will pass an Authorization for Use of Military Force, and we will give the President the opportunity to fight ISIS, but we have to make sure that our men and women in the military are the ones who are put at the forefront of what matters most, and the only thing that we should consider is that the American military, our soldiers, our men and women who fight for our freedoms, should be given the opportunity to do what they are trained to do.

Let's not play politics with destroying ISIS. Let's actually allow our men and women in uniform to do just that. They can do it. They have done it throughout history, and that is exactly what we need to continue to do in this institution. Let's work together. Let's make this happen.

Mr. JOLLY. I want to associate myself with my colleague's remarks and simply close with this. It is important to revisit the context of how we brought this up tonight. We are one nation. The President, the Congress, we are united as Americans, as elected officials of this country, to protect the national security of the United States.

The point of tonight's Special Order is that just as the President exercises his article II authority, this body also has a responsibility to exercise our article I authority, and that is okay. That is why we have the greatest republic that has ever been on the face of this Earth. Because we can have these debates in a constructive way between a President with one view of how to respond, a Congress with another, but know every day that we as a nation, the President and this body, are resolved to eradicate the threat of ISIS from the face of this Earth. We will do that.

As I mentioned, just as the President asks us to consider an authorization to use military force, we must also ask

the President to understand our interest in how this war to defeat ISIS is executed. And on issues of Iran, Cuba, and others, we will work together. We will have our differences and disagreements, but we remain one United States resolved to protect the security of our interests.

I look forward to a very healthy debate on these issues in the coming months.

I yield to Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I thank the gentleman again for organizing this opportunity.

I just want to remind all of our fellow colleagues, it is a privilege to serve in this great institution. These decisions that we will make will not be easy, but the decisions we make will be judged in history as to what happens here and what the future holds. Let's make sure that we make our forefathers and those who follow us proud to be Members of Congress. Let's do the right thing.

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

BORDER SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I come before this body today, again, to talk about the very important issue of border security.

My district is Arizona's Second Congressional District. I represent about 85 miles of the southern border. We have border residents and ranchers who every day are dealing with transnational criminal organizations that are trafficking drugs and people and weapons and money through their property, putting their lives at risk, often having them have to make difficult decisions, potentially life-and-death decisions.

As we stand today, this administration has done nothing to secure our border. This is a national security threat. It is a public safety threat. The people of southern Arizona need to be heard, and that is why I am organizing some time to address this issue.

I appreciate one of my colleagues, the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO), joining this conversation. This is a serious issue. We do have a bill, Secure Our Borders First Act. I am a cosponsor of the bill, and I believe it is an important bill that should unite this body to move forward and address this issue. I don't want to play politics with it.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO).

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative MCSALLY. I had an opportunity to go to your home State a couple of weeks ago and spend some time with you on the border. I have spent quite a bit of time here in Washington over the last 2 years talking about immigration reform. I do believe that we have to fix the problem. We have to address the situation we have with immigration in general. But something that I learned a lot about on that trip which I knew before, until I really got to experience and see for myself, I didn't realize how bad the situation on the border was and what our border agents face on a day-to-day basis, with people coming in with tools that I happened to use in my shop when I am building stuff, saws and torches and different types of equipment, just to get through the fence. When you see the situation we have got with the types of drugs and the types of people crossing the border on a daily basis, it is truly a situation that has to be resolved and looked at in a totally different way.

Chairman MCCAUL came up with a piece of legislation to address this, going along the whole border in a piece-by-piece manner. It looks at each part of the border and how it needs to be addressed. From that tour and the time I spent on the border, I got to see how important it was; from the California portion in San Diego and how people are getting across the border and the type of tunnels they are digging to the type of aircraft that people are flying, the drones that you can buy for a couple thousand bucks online; and even down to your part of the border where we got to see people cutting through the fence and actually making ramps and driving over barriers that weren't able to be cut; down to Texas to the Rio Grande when we traveled the river and saw what the situation was there, where people can hide and how narrow that area is.

The bill that was introduced helps secure the border because it looks at each portion of the border separately and individually and addresses it as a problem in itself. It puts technology in those places where it can truly make a difference. That border with this legislation can actually be secured—as much as we possibly can. Then we can move on with the rest of what has to be done. Obviously, fixing our guest worker programs and fixing our visa programs and the type of legal immigration that we welcome in this country because this country was built on immigrants. But we want to make sure that we secure the border first.

I am thrilled to be here and spend some time with you this evening talking about such an important issue. I appreciate the invitation.

Ms. MCSALLY. Congressman VALADAO, I appreciate you coming to visit my district. Twenty-one Members of this body came to southern Arizona to see what these border residents and ranchers are dealing with on a daily basis, to include our chairman, Chairman MCCAUL. I really appreciated your willingness to come see firsthand and listen to the ranchers and border residents.

We have men and women in uniform in our communities that are doing the best they can. But the strategy that they have been given in our sector is just not working, and they need some better tools and they need a better strategy so that we can use intelligence-driven operations, we can use technology where it works, we can have barriers where they work. Ideally, we need to be detecting the illegal activity of the cartels well south so that we are able to then monitor and either deter the breaches or intercept them as soon as possible when they come over the border.

Some of the additions that I added into the bill were to create a rapid reaction force so that they quickly intercept, and directing the Border Patrol to be patrolling at the border to the maximum extent possible. Right now there is a multilayered approach in these rural areas. It is called a Defense in Depth strategy. It relies on taking sometimes, what they say, hours to days to intercept illegal activity. The problem with that is, during those hours to days, these cartels are transiting over private property.

Whereas in the past, sometimes, these ranchers, look, they have always had a humanitarian heart. If they saw individuals who were coming over illegally to find work, if they needed water, they would help them and then they would call border security. But now they don't know who they are. As the numbers have gone down, the cartel activity, the drug mules, the potential violence, the violent history of the individuals who are apprehended have gone up. So they don't know who it is that is crossing their property right now.

Rancher Rob Krentz, in 2010, went out to help someone, and that is the last we have heard of him. He was murdered on his own property. They still don't know who did that as he was out there responding.

We have stories of individuals in my district. You have heard some of them. We hear more every single day where, generally speaking, they are on alert. They usually don't go out of their homes unless they are armed, and they often don't go out unless it is in daylight hours. So it is impacting their lives and their livelihood, and they are constantly dealing with cut fences and loose cattle or killed cattle and all of the implications that come with these cartels that are trafficking across their property and around their homes, like break-ins and other things that come with that.

So I really appreciate your willingness to come down and see that firsthand.

For those who are listening and watching, I want to make sure they know: Call your Congressman. This is a good bill. We have to get this thing passed. If we can't unite this body around securing our border, what can we unite around? This is something that we need to get done. It is what we have been asked to do. On our side of the aisle, as Republicans, we always hear our colleagues say to secure the border first. Well, this is an opportunity to do that. I stand today to support that bill again.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) to join the conversation.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank one of my newest colleagues, Congresswoman MARTHA MCSALLY, who has shown true leadership on this issue because it is personal. It is your district. Just like many issues that we face in the Midwest are issues that you and I will talk about but you don't have to experience, but these are issues that you see and we hear about. You see many cases where the border is not secure, where drug cartels are coming through private property. We in Illinois cannot imagine someone walking through our backyard hauling drugs and criminals. These are things that we don't experience, but we have to experience as Members of this institution because every vote we take impacts every single citizen in this great country.

I just am proud that you are willing to stand up and talk about the issues that matter most to this debate, and that is how we secure our borders, because once we do, we can fix our broken immigration system. We can fix the process that we already have, called the naturalization process, and ensure that we have a system that is going to work.

My fear, though, is that many in this debate, they don't want to see this problem fixed because they want to use it as a political hammer.

I will tell a personal story very quickly. I can remember doing one of my public meetings and having an organization come in and talk to me about their view of how we make our border more secure. As I was going to another public meeting, this organization decided to send members to my house and send the same message to my then 12-year-old son. Bullying tactics like that are not conducive to solving problems, not just in this institution but in this great country.

That is why I am so proud to be able to stand here with both of you today and talk about the issues that are important, and the fact that we are willing to talk about it and find solutions and begin our address towards making those solutions real is the reason why we came to this institution.

□ 1945

Thank you for your leadership, both of you, on many issues, especially this one. I hope, some day, I can follow in the footsteps of my colleague from California and visit your district and see the same things he did.

Ms. MCSALLY. Well, you can come down any time. The door is open. We are ready to show anyone, really, from this body, so that they can see firsthand what we are dealing with.

I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for his comments and his encouragement and his support to this bill in this initiative. We have got to find like-minded individuals to move this forward because that is what the American people are asking us to do.

When we were hosting the CODEL down at the Ladd ranch, Jack Ladd and John Ladd, just amazing and wonderful Americans and hardworking people who gave us their perspective, along with many other ranchers. If you remember, one of the ranchers said: Look, these mules are just trafficking through our neighborhoods, but they are going to yours.

Once they hit the highway and they are able to get around, they are moving on to Phoenix, they are moving over to California, they are moving up to Illinois. They are bringing their drugs to all over the United States. There is cartel presence in many of these States. This is a very sophisticated criminal organization. Even though it starts in my district, it is impacting everyone in the country, related to their presence in everybody's district.

This is the time. We have been talking about border security for a very long time, and there have been efforts. With putting up some of the additional barriers, we have seen the efforts and how that has delayed activity, for sure. We have seen how the San Diego sector has really done a fantastic job in order to go from what was literally just an open border to having much better control.

But this is a sophisticated organization, these cartels, and they adjust. What do they do? They adjusted into my sector. Even as we put up some barriers, it basically funneled them into these rural areas, so that these criminals were trafficking through the ranchers' neighborhoods and border residences.

Again, we were the highest sector since 1998 until last year, as far as the number of apprehensions, but as we said on the trip, we don't know what the denominator is.

If all we are doing is measuring the numerator of how many individuals we have caught or apprehended, but the Border Patrol does not have situational awareness to be able to see all activity and then intercept the activity, we don't even know what those numbers are.

We have got to have the political will now to address this very important issue, so that we can bring the promise home to the people who live in my community and then in the rest of the country.

This is not hard. This is a good bill. In our sector, it provides additional resources, it provides additional technologies to increase the situational awareness. It holds Border Patrol and the senior appointees in Homeland Security accountable for securing the border, and it provides the resources and the capabilities that they need in order to gain situational awareness and operational control.

I have heard many of our colleagues—and if you all want to join on this discussion—say, Just build a fence, just build a fence. Look, we have built some fences in southern Arizona, and those fences and those vehicle barriers and the pedestrian fences, they are delaying activity, for sure.

What we have seen is these sophisticated cartels have got scouts on hilltops, they have got good communication devices, they have got incredible equipment, and they are across those fences. They either go over it, through it, or under it; and they do it in very fast time.

A barrier is certainly one element of a strategy in order to slow down the activity, but that is not the only answer. It is very costly, about $5 million a mile for some of this fencing, so where it is appropriate, it definitely needs to be put up.

But if we don't actually have Border Patrol actively monitoring where the fence line is, using intelligence-driven operations, and then intercepting the activity, patrolling right at the border on the south of John Ladd's ranch, not on the north side, then we are still not going to be able to stop these breaches because they will happen.

For those who don't understand that, I welcome them to come to Arizona and see that.

I yield again to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO), my colleague.

Mr. VALADAO. I appreciate the opportunity again.

But, no, that is something we hear about a lot in the district. Everybody just says: Build a fence, follow the existing law.

Most people don't know the technology out there. Like you said, they literally have scouts. They have got people every so often, every so many yards or 100 yards, whatever the distance, spotting where the Border Patrol agents are. They know everything about these Border Patrol agents.

I heard a story that one of the people crossing the border actually had a booklet with all the names, addresses, and the tendencies of each and every Border Patrol agent.

They knew if they chewed gum, if they chewed tobacco, if they read a book while they were sitting there. They knew how slow they drove from checkpoint to checkpoint. They knew everything about this person. They knew exactly how long they would have those openings to get across.

They knew how to dig a tunnel. There was a tunnel they found that was 90 feet underground, 700 yards long, and the only reason they found that wasn't

because of technology—because they don't have the technology to find that—it was because they found an informant that opened their mouth and told them where it was at, and they were able to stop that.

It is amazing how much is out there and what these people are doing, and anyone that believes just building a fence is going to work—they are going to go under it, they are going to buy those drones to go over it.

I heard stories of cannons that are literally firing bales of drugs over the top. There are so many opportunities out there. For anybody to believe that just enforcing the law the way it is written today, it will never work—it just won't—because the technology is out there.

If you ask any police officer on the street or any parent out there, you can't do everything the same you did 50 years ago because your children have way better technology to do stuff, our prisoners in our prison system have much more opportunity, and now, these folks have unbelievable amounts of technology out there to get across or to bring their drugs across.

Like you mentioned earlier, the problem has changed. What the folks in your district had mentioned to me was 20 years ago, 15 years ago, it was a large number of people—it was families, it was those that we see typically working on farms—who are out here just looking for an opportunity.

The folks coming across today are dangerous. They are cartels. They are trying to bring drugs. They are bringing problems into this country. A lot of times—like one of your constituents—someone's life was taken. It is a truly sad situation.

But it has to be addressed in a way that actually solves our problems. We don't just take votes here because of sending out a press release. We solve problems. Legislation that we introduce and that we pass and that we vote on has to solve problems for the American people. That is what we are responsible to do, and that is what I want to do.

So again, I thank you for the opportunity.

Ms. MCSALLY. Thank you. Again, I appreciate the gentleman from California. Thank you so much for your perspectives.

I agree. If anyone thinks, if anyone in this body thinks, let's just build a fence, I would invite you to please come to southern Arizona and see the doggy doors that are cut—even in California, the doggy doors, as they call them—that get cut out in less than 60 seconds and where individuals are still coming through.

So those barriers are helpful, but they are a speed bump. We are dealing with sophisticated organizations that are much more nimble than we are. When we come up with a different strategy, they are able to react much more quickly.

But we have got men and women in Border Patrol right now that if they are able to detect any sort of activity, they just start tracking them sometimes by themselves, they are out there tracking them, without any situational awareness as to what they are tracking, who they are tracking, what do they have on them, are they armed, are they not armed, what is their intent.

Some of the other things in this bill actually help provide them with the situational awareness that they need. Some of it is bringing technologies back that we have used overseas so that we can just have motion sensing and know what is moving and what is not moving so we don't have to bother lining agents up on the border, but we can respond and react with intelligence.

Mr. DAVIS, would you like to join us again and provide some more comments? I yield to you.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Absolutely. And it relates to the fact that sometimes the policies that are put in place through administrative rules or by this body hinder our ability to achieve the goals that Americans want us to achieve.

We could build fencing, but you know there are many times people will find a way around that fence. And that doesn't mean let's not do it, but what it means is let's also enact policies that will not hinder our Border Patrol agents from actually doing their job.

One of my colleagues from Illinois flies National Guard duty over the southern border and talks about how different groups will overwhelm a single Border Patrol agent. And understand that a majority of those who are trying to cross into America will get in. Some won't, but a majority will. And it is worth the risk to many.

Frankly, if we weren't living in this great country, we would probably want to be here too. This is a wonderful country that is the beacon of hope for so many throughout this globe.

But we also have to take into consideration the impact that it has in this country. And we need to make sure that we put policies in place that allow our border to be secure by making sure our Border Patrol agents have the tools and the ability to address the problem that both of you have addressed so well this evening.

So thank you again for being here. Thank you again for being willing to stand up, because it is not an easy issue to talk about. It is not an easy issue because it has become so politicized. But I commend you for that because we have to stand up and take courage. We have to take courageous stances, and we have to take courageous votes that may not make all of our constituents happy. But these are opportunities to lead, and that is exactly why we all came to Congress.

Again, thank you to my colleague.

Ms. MCSALLY. Thank you, Mr. DAVIS, for your kind words and your support.

I come from a very diverse district and a very split district. I won by 167 votes to get here. So we are a very diverse and split district.

But I will tell you, this is a unifying issue, even in my district. When I look at the things that are going to unify us, it is making sure that we are safe and secure and have economic opportunity. Throughout my district, people agree we need to secure the border.

Now, they also want to look for thoughtful solutions to modernize and revamp our legal immigration system so that those who want to come here to work and are going to contribute to our economy have a legal way to do that. We need to work on those challenges as well. As we talk about it in southern Arizona, we need a high fence and a wide gate, sort of metaphorically.

What that means is, let's focus our border security on transnational criminal organizations and the public safety and national security threat, but we also need to make sure we have got good economic development and opportunities for individuals to come here legally, and also for commerce to be able to flow, which is a separate issue. They often get lumped in together and oftentimes these issues get hijacked by others who have other intentions that are trying to politicize it.

But I think every American—Democrat, Independent, Republican—can agree that they want their families to be safe and secure from transnational criminal organizations. I can't find anyone who doesn't agree to that.

So why is this not an issue that would unify this body? Why is this not an issue that we could work together on within our party and then across to the other side of the aisle to actually get the job done, to use commonsense solutions, to give the situational awareness, the tools they need, to hold Homeland Security accountable, to secure our border once and for all, direct a better strategy sector by sector, to provide that situational awareness and operational control?

I strongly support this bill. I appreciate the leadership of Chairman MCCAUL, my colleagues who have joined me here tonight, and others who have gotten behind this bill. And I want to urge those who are watching and listening to please call your Congressman, tell him to support the Secure Our Borders First Act, and let's get this thing through the House, through the Senate, and signed by the President.

This is not time to play politics with border security. The residents and the ranchers in my community cannot wait any longer in order to have that fear go away so that they can feel like they can sleep well at night and their livelihood is not at stake and their families are not at risk. We owe it to them to take action.

Let's figure out how to unify, work through any sort of solutions that we need to in order to get to a commonsense agreement, and let's pass this bill.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 12, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

403. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Irish Potatoes Grown in Colorado; Relaxation of the Handling Regulation for Area No. 3 [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0092; FV15-948-1 IR] received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

404. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of the Salable Quantity and Allotment Percentage for Class 3 (Native) Spearmint Oil for the 2014-2015 Marketing Year [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-13-0087; FV14-985-1B IR] received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

405. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oranges and Grapefruit Grown in Lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0054; FV14-906-3 FIR] received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

406. A letter from the Under Secretary, Rural Development, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Rural Development Regulations — Update to FmHA References and to Census References (RIN: 0570-AA30) received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

407. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's annual report listing all repairs and maintenance performed on any covered Navy vessel in any shipyard outside the United States or Guam during Fiscal Year 2014, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7310; to the Committee on Armed Services.

408. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Community Planning and Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's Major interim rule — Housing Trust Fund [Docket No.: FR-5246-I-03] (RIN: 2506-AC30) received February 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

409. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Annual Funding Notice for Defined Benefit Plans (RIN: 1210-AB18) received February 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

410. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Fluorescent Lamp Ballasts [Docket No.: EERE-2009-BT-TP-0016] (RIN: 1904-AB99) received February 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

411. A letter from the Deputy Director — ODRM, CDC/NIOSH, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Closed-Circuit Escape Respirators; Extension of Transition Period [Docket No.: CDC-2015-0004; NIOSH-280] (RIN: 0920-AA60) received January 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

412. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Washington; Redesignation to Attainment for the Tacoma-Pierce County Nonattainment Area and Approval of Associated Maintenance Plan for the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter Standard [EPA-R10-OAR-2014-0808; FRL-9922-81-Region 10] received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

413. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Transportation Conformity and Conformity of General Federal Actions [EPA-R06-OAR-2011-0938; FRL-9922-73-Region 6] received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

414. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Carolina; Inspection and Maintenance Program Updates [EPA-R04-OAR-2013-0772; FRL-9922-42-Region 4] received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

415. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Difenoconazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0151; FRL-9920-98] received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

416. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Flutriafol; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0482; FRL-9922-06] received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

417. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Regulation of Fuels and Fuel Additives: Extension of the Reformulated Gasoline Program to Maine's Southern Counties [EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0283; FRL-9921-82-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS19) received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

418. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revision to the Arizona State Implementation Plan; Nogales Nonattainment Area; Fine Particulate Matter Emissions Inventories [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0450; FRL-9922-74-Region 9] received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

419. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Placer County Air Pollution Control District and San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0731; FRL-9921-37-Region 9] received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

420. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the Clean Air Act Section 110 Submission Requirements for State Implementation Plans and Notice of Availability of an Option for Electronic Reporting [EPA-HQ-OAR-2015-0045; FRL-9922-54-OAR] received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

421. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Silverton, Texas) Station KXDJ(FM), Spearman, Texas [MB Docket No.: 14-156] (RM-11725) (File No.: BPH-20140519AHY) received February 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

422. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 14-55, Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance to the Netherlands, pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

423. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions to the Unverified List (UVL) [Docket No.: 141104925-4925-01] (RIN: 0694-AG35) received February 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

424. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — U.S.-India Bilateral Understanding: Additional Revisions to the U.S. Export and Reexport Controls Under the Export Administration Regulations [Docket No.: 130405339-3339-01] (RIN: 0694-AF72) received January 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

425. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Russian Sanctions: Licensing Policy for the Crimea Region of Ukraine [Docket No.: 141218999-4999-01] (RIN: 0694-AG43) received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

426. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 13-114, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

427. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's Annual Performance Report (APR) for Fiscal Years 2014-

2016 and the Annual Performance Plan, pursuant to Public Law 111-352; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

428. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's fiscal year 2014 Performance and Accountability Report, prepared in accordance with OMB Circular A-136 and part 6 of Circular A-11; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

429. A letter from the Executive Resources Program Manager, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

430. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; List of Authorized Fisheries and Gear [Docket No.: 130904784-4999-02] (RIN: 0648-BD67) received February 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

431. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 130925836-4174-02] (RIN: 0648-XD654) received February 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

432. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2014 report to Congress on H-1B Petitions, pursuant to Public Law 105-277, div. C, title IV, section 416(c); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

433. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a status report on the Bureau of Prisons' compliance with the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997, pursuant to Public Law 105-33; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

434. A letter from the Under Secretary for Policy, Department of Transportation, transmitting a letter regarding the Department's response to the National Transportation Safety Board's 2015 Most Wanted List, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 1135(e)(1); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

435. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Attorney General's first quarterly report of FY 2015 on the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994, pursuant to Public Law 110-389; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Veterans' Affairs.

436. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's Congressional Justification of Budget Estimates for Fiscal Year 2016, including the Performance Plan for the year, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 231f(f); Public Law 93-445, title I, section 416; jointly to the Committees on Appropriations, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means.

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. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. POLIS, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 860. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to amend the process by which students with certain special circumstances apply for Federal financial aid; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 861. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, 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. FARENTHOLD (for himself and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 862. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide that the first sale doctrine applies to any computer program that enables a machine or other product to operate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 863. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify the treatment of seasonal positions for purposes of the employer shared responsibility requirement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 864. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prohibit the exclusion of individuals from service on a Federal jury on account of sexual orientation or gender identity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 865. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to limit the liability of health care professionals who volunteer to provide health care services in response to a disaster; 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. BLACK (for herself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. STEWART, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. SALMON, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. HUELSKAMP):

H.R. 866. A bill to achieve domestic energy independence by empowering States to control the development and production of all forms of energy on all available Federal land; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. FINCHER):

H.R. 867. A bill to exempt the natural aging process in the determination of the production period for distilled spirits under section 263A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEWART (for himself and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 868. A bill to provide for coordination between the TRICARE program and eligibility for making contributions to a health savings account, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. REICHERT (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 869. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to broaden the special rules for certain governmental plans under section 105(j) to include plans established by political subdivisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 870. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to treat Puerto Rico as a State for purposes of chapter 9 of such title relating to the adjustment of debts of municipalities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 871. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to direct the Bureau of Prisons to provide certain voting information to Federal prisoners upon their release from prison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITTMAN (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 872. A bill to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 873. A bill to promote energy efficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HULTGREN (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 874. A bill to amend the Department of Energy High-End Computing Revitalization Act of 2004 to improve the high-end computing research and development program of the Department of Energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.R. 875. A bill to provide for alternative financing arrangements for the provision of certain services and the construction and maintenance of infrastructure at land border ports of entry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Judiciary, Homeland Security, and Agriculture, 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. DOGGETT (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana):

H.R. 876. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals to provide certain notifications to individuals classified by such hospitals under observation status rather than admitted as inpatients of such hospitals; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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 Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (for herself, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. VELA):

H.R. 877. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (for herself, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. VELA):

H.R. 878. A bill to provide for the authorization of border, maritime, and transportation security responsibilities and functions in the Department of Homeland Security and the establishment of United States Customs and Border Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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. GUINTA:

H.R. 879. A bill to repeal the ''Cadillac Tax'' on middle class Americans' health plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 880. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify and make permanent the research credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. JONES, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 881. A bill to prohibit certain nutrition rules with respect to foods sold at schools as a fundraiser; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. FARR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KIND, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 882. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to improve environmental literacy to better prepare students for postsecondary education and careers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 883. A bill to provide emergency funding for port of entry personnel and infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Appropriations, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. RIBBLE (for himself, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. EMMER, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. KIND, Mr. KLINE, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 884. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to reissue final rules relating to listing of the gray wolf in the Western Great Lakes and Wyoming under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. BASS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DENT, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 885. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTERMAN (for himself, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BLUM, Mr. HILL, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. CRAWFORD):

H.R. 886. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to permit States to impose workforce requirements for individuals made eligible for medical assistance under the amendments made by the Affordable Care Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 887. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to the treatment of patient encounters in ambulatory surgical centers in determining meaningful EHR use, and for other purposes; 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. CAPUANO:

H.R. 888. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to require certain systemically important entities to account for the financial benefit they receive as a result of the expectations on the part of shareholders, creditors, and counterparties of such entities that the Government will shield them from losses in the event of failure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 889. A bill to amend chapter 97 of title 28, United States Code, to clarify the exception to foreign sovereign immunity set forth in section 1605(a)(3) of such title; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 890. A bill to correct the boundaries of the John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System Unit P16; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CUELLAR:

H.R. 891. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 141 Paloma Drive in Floresville, Texas, as the ''Floresville Veterans Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 892. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to prohibit the paying of premium subsidies on policies based on the actual market price of an agricultural commodity at the time of harvest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, and Mr. ASHFORD):

H.R. 893. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (for himself, Mr. LANCE, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. TONKO, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. DENT):

H.R. 894. A bill to extend the authorization of the Highlands Conservation Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. TAKAI):

H.R. 895. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding Native Hawaiian education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.R. 896. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify when the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency has the authority to prohibit the specification of a defined area, or deny or restrict the use of a defined area for specification, as a disposal site under section 404 of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.R. 897. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 898. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the equalization of the excise tax on liquefied natural gas and liquefied petroleum gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 899. A bill to require the country of origin of certain special immigrant religious workers to extend reciprocal immigration treatment to nationals of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LABRADOR (for himself, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. COOK, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 900. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide for congressional and State approval of national monuments and restrictions on the use of national monuments; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 901. A bill to prohibit accessing pornographic web sites from Federal computers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. NEAL (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms.

DELAURO, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KIND, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. ESTY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 902. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements in the earned income tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 903. A bill to require notification of individuals of breaches of personally identifiable information through Exchanges under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 904. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine the feasibility of designating the study area as the Black Metropolis National Heritage Area in the State of Illinois, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. THORNBERRY (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. LANCE):

H.R. 905. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the equalization of the excise tax on liquefied natural gas and per energy equivalent of diesel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 906. A bill to modify the efficiency standards for grid-enabled water heaters; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.J. Res. 31. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the permissible sources of funding for elections for public office and State ballot measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H. Res. 104. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should provide Congress with a detailed deployment and troop commitment plan prior to approval for authorization to commit United States Armed Forces to fight the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE (for himself and Mr. WALBERG):

H. Res. 105. A resolution calling for the protection of religious minority rights and freedoms worldwide; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. LANCE):

H. Res. 106. A resolution supporting quality of life for prostate cancer patients; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. Res. 107. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the third week in October as National School Bus Safety Week and for the designation of Wednesday of that week as National School Bus Drivers Appreciation Day; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

2. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Ohio, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 54, urging the Congress to continue the full funding and production of the F-35; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Ohio, relative to Senate Resolution No. 410, urging the Department of Commerce to conduct a thorough investigation into unfair trade practices of foreign glass manufacturers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Ohio, relative to Substitute House Resolution No. 283, urging the Congress and the Department of Defense to protect and uphold the religious and free speech rights of military service members; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs.

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. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 860.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.R. 861.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 9

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 862.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section 8, Clause 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 863.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

Within the Enumerated Powers of the U.S. Constitution, Congress is granted the power to law and collect taxes. This provision grants Congress the authority over this particular piece of legislation.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 864.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment XIV, Section 1

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 865.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 866.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Tenth Amendment stating that, ''The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.'' and

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 providing that ''Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States. . . .''

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 867.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution: Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 868.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 869.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Clause I of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 870.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to establish uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the United States Constitution; to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution such power, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution; and to make rules and regulations respecting the U.S. territories, as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 871.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the United States Constitution related to general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 872.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the power to regulate commerce and relations between the United States and Indian tribes, and to pass all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, as well as all other Power vested by the Constitution.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 873.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. HULTGREN:
H.R. 874.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, to provide for the common defense and general welfare;
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper,
By Mr. CUELLAR:
H.R. 875.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
THE U.S. CONSTITUTION
ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS
CLAUSE 18
The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.
By Mr. DOGGETT:
H.R. 876.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.
By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:
H.R. 877.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8, clause 1; and Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.
By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:
H.R. 878.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8, clause 1; and Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.
By Mr. GUINTA:
H.R. 879.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section VIII Clause I: The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the Unites States
Article I Section VII Clause III: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among several States, and with Indian Tribes;
Article I Section VII Clause XVIII: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.
By Mr. BRADY of Texas:
H.R. 880.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which gives Congress the ''power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises . . .''
By Mr. POE of Texas:
H.R. 881.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18
By Mr. SARBANES:
H.R. 882.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause.
By Mr. O'ROURKE:
H.R. 883.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18
The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof
By Mr. RIBBLE:
H.R. 884.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.
By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:
H.R. 885.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Fifteenth Amendment, Section 2 Section 1: The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the U.S. or by any state on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.
By Mr. WESTERMAN:
H.R. 886.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Section 8 Clause 1
By Mrs. BLACK:
H.R. 887.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.
By Mr. CAPUANO:
H.R. 888.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I Sec. 8, Clause 3: ''The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''
By Mr. CHABOT:
H.R. 889.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority on which this legislation is based is found in article I, section 8, clause 9; article III, section 1, clause 1; and article III, section 2, clause 2, of the Constitution, which grant Congress authority over federal courts.
By Mr. CLAWSON of Florida:
H.R. 890.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1:
The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States
By Mr. CUELLAR:
H.R. 891.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
THE U.S. CONSTITUTION
ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS
CLAUSE 18
The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof
By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:
H.R. 892.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The ability to regulate interstate commerce pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.
By Mr. FORTENBERRY:
H.R. 893.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority for this bill is pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:
H.R. 894.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution
By Ms. GABBARD:
H.R. 895.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, also known as the Commerce Clause.
By Mr. GIBBS:
H.R. 896.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce among the several States)
By Mr. GIBBS:
H.R. 897.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the Constitutional authority for this legislation in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, that grants Congress the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested by Congress in the Constitution of the United States or in any department or officer thereof.
By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:
H.R. 898.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. KING of Iowa:
H.R. 899.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. LABRADOR:
H.R. 900.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This legislation has been written pursuant to Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2, which gives Congress the authority ''To dispose or and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.''
By Mr. MEADOWS:
H.R. 901.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
''The Congress shall have the 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 Department or Officer thereof.''—Article 1, Section 8
By Mr. NEAL:
H.R. 902.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I and the 16th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.
By Mr. PITTS:
H.R. 903.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which states that Congress shall have the power ''to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states . . .''

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 904.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: ''The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States:''

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: ''To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.''

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 905.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 906.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.J. Res. 31.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the U.S. Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 9: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 25: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 27: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 38: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 124: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 169: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 173: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 174: Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 178: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 188: Mr. WELCH, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 198: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 204: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 210: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 232: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 270: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.

H.R. 280: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 317: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 353: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 393: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 402: Mr. HILL, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 431: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SCALISE, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 443: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 445: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 448: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 452: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 456: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 465: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 471: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 472: Mr. NUGENT and Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 486: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 508: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 519: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 528: Mr. POSEY, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 529: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 537: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 540: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 543: Mr. HENSARLING and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 546: Mr. NUNES, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 555: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 556: Mr. SABLAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 560: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 571: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 572: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. YODER, and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 577: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. JONES, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 592: Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 594: Mr. TROTT, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 595: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 598: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 601: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BOST, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 603: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 612: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. COLE, Mr. TROTT, and Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 622: Mr. BARTON and Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 633: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 638: Mr. JONES, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 650: Mr. NUGENT and Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 654: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BARR, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 667: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 676: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 681: Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 708: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 721: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 731: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 742: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 746: Mr. COHEN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FARR, and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 751: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 756: Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 766: Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 767: Mr. DENT and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 782: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 789: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 793: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FLEISCHMANN and Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 794: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 800: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 801: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 803: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. BABIN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 814: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 818: Mr. ROSS and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 842: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 845: Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 850: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 855: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 858: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.J. Res. 9: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.J. Res. 25: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H. Con. Res. 13: Mr. WITTMAN.

H. Res. 14: Mr. SANFORD, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. DOGGETT.

H. Res. 15: Mr. COSTA.

H. Res. 28: Ms. MENG, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. DEUTCH.

H. Res. 54: Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H. Res. 62: Mr. PAULSEN.

H. Res. 67: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Res. 93: Mr. DEUTCH.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Clarksville, Tennessee, relative to Resolution 20-2014-15, supporting the maintenance of current troop levels at Fort Campbell; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5. Also, a petition of the City of Port Townsend, Washington, relative to Resolution No. 14-058, designating City shorelines as a Maritime Heritage Area; to the Committee on Natural Resources.