United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 24, 2015 No. 102

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 24, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN J. DUNCAN, Jr. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 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.

REBUILDING OUR NATION'S INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a flurry of activity regarding infrastructure funding in recent days. We had the first hearing in the Ways and Means Committee in the 55 months since my Republican friends took over to deal with transportation finance. There have been press conferences and proposals, and actually, a few other hearings have been scheduled.

Despite all the furor, there is only one solution which is broadly supported, which is easy to implement, and which does the job. That solution is raising the gas tax.

Now, we heard at the hearing on Ways and Means the three basic arguments that are offered against that: that it is not politically possible, that there is really no time to do this so we have to extend it to the end of the year, and that this would somehow be a burden on families.

Actually, that is not true. The notion that it is not politically possible is not remotely the case. There are 20 States in the last 2½ years that have stepped up to raise their gas taxes.

Ironically, information submitted by the American Road & Transportation Builders Association at our Ways and Means hearing pointed out that the legislators in those States who voted to increase the gas tax were reelected at an over 90 percent rate, and the legislators that voted for the gas tax in the States were reelected at a higher percentage than those who voted against it.

If anybody needs more proof, just look at what has happened already this year where six very red States—Idaho; Utah; South Dakota; Iowa; Nebraska, overriding a Governor's veto; and Georgia—have all met their responsibilities raising the gas tax. It absolutely is something that can be done with a little political courage.

The notion that somehow there is no time, that we have got to fuss around and it is going to take extensive hearings to come forward with the proposal—well, only if it is a complex, convoluted, untested, and controversial proposal. Raising the gas tax would take about 1 week's work, could be implemented quickly, and is the simplest and least expensive revenue measure to implement.

What about this notion that somehow it is a burden on American families? Well, the proposal that I have introduced would cost less than 25 cents a day, and those families that would pay the increased user fees are suffering over $350 a year damage to their vehicles from poorly maintained roads. The American Society of Civil Engineers suggests that that cost per family is going to be over a $1,000 a year by 2020. And the American public is paying by being stuck in traffic, in congestion, costing $120 billion a year. It costs money to them—money that could have been used for more productive purposes—and time away from their families.

Imagine if we just came back from our July recess and dedicated the week of July 13 to solving the infrastructure crisis in this country where America is falling apart and falling behind. The people who were experts at the hearing that weren't heard from could have answered all those questions.

Where else are we going to find something that is broadly supported by business and labor, by truckers and AAA, bicyclist, engineers, environmentalists, local governments? We would have all of those people before us supporting a solution to this important challenge. I can't think of any other issue that would bring all those people together and support congressional action.

We could stop the slide of America falling apart and falling behind. We could put hundreds of thousands of people to work at family-wage jobs all across America while we strengthen our communities, make them more livable, and provide an economic boost for the future.

Why don't we do that? Why can't we take ''yes'' for an answer, deal with the broadest coalition of support for any major issue, and have another victory like we did with the SGR? We can do it, and it is hard to think of something that would be more important.

Printed on recycled paper.

HEALTHCARE.GOV DATA BREACH

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

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, throughout my life, I have learned that the American people are strong and resilient. Throughout our history, we have shown time and time again our unique ability to overcome every obstacle and every adversary that has blocked our path to freedom. This resilience is what has advanced our Nation from being a ragtag rabble of citizens who took up arms in the American Revolution to being the greatest superpower in the world.

Throughout our advancement as a nation, we have not always been perfect. In fact, we have made some grave mistakes. However, our shared dedication to liberty and justice for all people has put us back on course. And though it sometimes takes years, or even generations, the spirit of American exceptionalism overshadows our mistakes and, with the spirit of forgiveness and reconciliation, we move forward.

However, when the government and its leaders purposefully mislead the American people, they are much less willing to forgive and forget, especially when such deception puts the people at risk, threatens their God-given rights or the sovereignty of this Nation. Mr. Speaker, I fear the American people and the Members of this Congress have, once again, been deceived, and I intend to get to the bottom of it.

When the 111th Congress ran through this body the Affordable Care Act, the American people were sold a bill of goods with deceiving statements and deceptive promises, statements such as, ''If you like your healthcare plan, you can keep it.'' Although this disastrous legislation passed against the will of the people, some Americans trusted that the law would not take away their chosen healthcare plan. Unfortunately, the American people found out the hard way they have been deceived.

Now, Mr. Speaker, new reports give evidence of another deception surrounding ObamaCare. Prior to the launch of the healthcare.gov Web site, officials of this administration assured Congress and the American people that personal information submitted via the ObamaCare Web site would be secure and would not be permanently stored. However, new evidence suggests this may have been just another bait-and-switch tactic.

Contrary to what we have been told, the government is apparently storing American citizens' personal identifiable information obtained through the healthcare.gov Web site. If this is indeed true, then, this is not only another assault on the good faith of the American people, but, more importantly, it puts them at significant personal risk.

This government has recently shown its inability to secure computer systems and protect sensitive information. In the past several months, we have been inundated with reports of security breaches of government computer systems, disclosing personal and official information that potentially harms our national security.

With many Americans being forced into the government healthcare exchange, over 11 million people have registered with healthcare.gov. A breach of this system could be larger and potentially more disastrous than any of the previous breaches, which is a serious concern.

Mr. Speaker, the last time I checked, our Founders gave us a government of the people, not a government of elitists, establishment, or executive privilege. We are a nation of laws, not a nation of feelings or good intentions. We are bound by the Constitution, but that Constitution is only as sound as the integrity of those who have sworn to uphold it.

The American people expect their government to operate within the constraints of the Constitution, the limits of the law, and to be transparent and accountable. Unconstrained activity by government agencies has gone on far too long, and now their deceptions and reckless behavior is threatening the safety and the security of the American people. These actions put the future of our Nation at great risk, and they must stop.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight of Science, Space, and Technology, I intend to diligently pursue this issue, to find the truth, expose those who have violated the trust of the American people, and ensure the illegal collection of data by our government is stopped and the previously collected data is permanently removed.

I intend to use the power given to this body through our Constitution and the trust invested in us by the American people to right these wrongs. Our citizens deserve better than this, and I am committed to ensuring that the American people have a nation that is once again free, safe, and full of opportunity.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week, nine parishioners were shot and killed inside Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina, one of the oldest African American churches in the United States.

In the days following the horrific tragedy in Charleston, we paused to reflect and send our prayers to families grieving an unimaginable loss. I wish this tragedy in Charleston were an isolated incident, but it seems to be part of a terrible recurring pattern.

After national tragedies, society should engage in a discussion about how to address and potentially prevent such tragedies from happening again. Let's remember that after Katrina, we talked about FEMA and national readiness. But the gun lobby doesn't want us to have this conversation. They accuse anyone who tries with exploiting the deaths of innocent people.

With that logic, we couldn't talk about solutions when 13 people were killed and 8 were injured during the shooting in the Washington, D.C., Navy Yard; or after a person opened fire during a midnight screening of a film, ''The Dark Knight Rises'' in 2012, killing 12 and injuring 58 others; or when 28 people were shot and killed, including 20 innocent children, at Sandy Hook Elementary School; or when a man shot 3 people and killed 7 others at a Sikh temple in Oak Creek, Wisconsin; or when 14 people were shot and 6 were killed in 2011 during a constituent meeting hosted by our colleague, Congresswoman Gabby Giffords, in a supermarket parking lot in Tucson; or when a man opened fire in Fort Hood, Texas, in 2009, killing 13 people, injuring 30 others; or in 2008 when a man opened fired at a lecture hall at Northern Illinois University, shooting 21 students and killing 6; or when a senior at Virginia Tech went on a shooting rampage on campus in 2007, killing 33 people and injuring 23 others; or when 2 seniors at Columbine High School attacked their classmates and teachers, wounding 24 and killing 15; or in Chicago and cities across the country which experience gun tragedies every day.

Yet, since I have come to this Congress nearly 7 years ago, the people's House has refused to hold even one hearing on the epidemic of gun violence we are facing.

Last Sunday alone, in Chicago, 14 people were shot and 1 man was killed, all within a matter of hours. In May, Chicago saw 300 people shot and 37 people killed in shootings. Every day in America, 297 people are shot and nearly 90 people are killed by guns.

According to Harvard University researchers, the rate of mass shootings has increased threefold since 2011, occurring an average of every 64 days. Let me repeat that. A mass shooting occurs in the U.S. on the average of every 64 days.

□ 1015

When will enough be enough? When will we stand up and say we may not be able to stop every crime, but we can stop some of them and at least minimize the damage of others? When will we realize and acknowledge that this type of mass violence does not happen in other advanced countries? When will we finally be able to have a national discussion about gun violence?

Instead, the gun lobby stymies debate by arguing that no gun regulation can prevent criminals and the mentally ill from killing people with guns, but I don't buy that. Sure, no single law or set of laws can prevent every act of

senseless violence. Ending the American epidemic of gun violence will require more than a change in law.

It is clear we need a change in our culture; but oftentimes, changing our culture starts with changing our laws. By enacting reasonable reforms, we can make a difference. We can make it more difficult for would-be assassins to access guns. We can ensure every gun in America is purchased after a background check rather than only 60 percent of guns, as is currently the case.

We can crack down on the flow of illegal guns onto our streets by improving gun trafficking data, and we can reduce the fatality rate by banning assault rifles and high-capacity magazines that are designed exclusively for killing dozens of people at once.

Let's face it, when you have an assault rifle with a high-capacity magazine, you are not hunting deer; you are hunting people. The gun lobby tries to argue that any attempt to regulate gun access is an attempt to restrict all gun access, but there is such a thing as commonsense, middle-ground gun reform, and most gun owners support it.

Can we stop every shooting? No. But can we reduce their frequency and deadliness? Absolutely—the first step toward keeping dangerous guns out of the hands of dangerous people is to begin the conversation. Let's break the silence, stop the violence, and start the conversation.

NO DEAL IS BETTER THAN A BAD DEAL

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration and Tehran are yet again running up against another deadline. This one comes next Tuesday when the clock expires on reaching a comprehensive nuclear deal.

Mr. Speaker, if you head over to whitehouse.gov, there is a site outlining the current nuclear negotiations. On the front page of this Web site, when discussing what a possible deal with Iran should do, it states: ''prevent Iran from using the cover of negotiations to continue advancing its nuclear program as we seek to negotiate a long-term comprehensive solution that addresses all of the international community's concerns.''

Mr. Speaker, what have we seen in reality? It is a possible deal that could block international inspectors from having unrestricted access to all of Iran's nuclear sites to verify their compliance. Mr. Speaker, what could Iran possibly have to hide if their nuclear work is solely for peaceful purposes?

We have also seen a deal that doesn't require Iran to disclose all of its previous nuclear work and possible military dimensions. It is a bad deal because, if Iran expects the world to trust them and lift sanctions, why not come clean?

I also see a deal that could lift all sanctions once the ink is dried, which is a bad deal, because what would this instant relief be rewarding? Years of covert work, violations of U.N. resolutions, and the export of terror across the globe—no one in good faith could say that the deal before the world right now prevents Iran from obtaining a pathway to the bomb. If anything, Mr. Speaker, it puts them on a pathway to the bomb.

It has been clear for some time now that this administration has been negotiating not with Iran, but with itself. We have seen them consistently move the goalpost on what they are willing to accept with respect to essential components of a good deal. This ranges from the number of centrifuges to inspections to the dismantling of nuclear infrastructure.

The parameters of what this administration is willing to accept has moved so many times, I don't believe it would surprise anyone if reports emerged before next Tuesday that showed even more concessions have been made.

Mr. Speaker, the administration needs to prevent Iran from having a pathway to the bomb. They need to hold good on their word that no deal is better than a bad deal.

Mr. Speaker, I don't see how anyone right now, with the exception of Iran, could accept the reported deal as a ''good deal.'' Let's not settle for a bad deal; let's not stand for a nuclear Iran.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stress the importance of reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank's charter, which has served this Nation well. The Export-Import Bank is an important program used to support our Nation's entrepreneurs—the best in the world—and keep them competitive in today's global economy.

It is a tool. It is a tool that has enjoyed bipartisan support over the years, just like trade agreements are a tool to, in fact, increase jobs here in America, good-paying jobs.

The Bank provides trade financing to solutions to boost U.S. job growth, and it has been successful in increasing exports for American goods and services—American goods that are made here—at no cost—no cost—to the American taxpayer.

This program is set to expire, sadly, tomorrow—tomorrow. Unfortunately, the House Republican leadership is refusing to bring it to the floor for a vote, with thousands of American jobs at risk.

Now, if the Bank charter expires, American workers and American businesses that are trying to sell their products and goods overseas face a completely unnecessary blow to their ability to compete.

In total, the Ex-Im Bank—otherwise known, abbreviated—has created and sustained over 1.5 million jobs in the private sector since 2007 alone—1.5 million jobs since 2007. Last year alone, the Bank sustained over 164,000 export-related American good-paying jobs.

If you want to build it in America, you have got to ensure that American workers and businesses can compete. The Ex-Im Bank represents a vital pillar, therefore, in our ability to be competitive overseas, and it has had significant impacts in the San Joaquin Valley that I represent.

Why? Well, many of the businesses that I talk to that use the Ex-Im Bank tell me: JIM, we have the ability to compete. We make our products better, but when we are sitting at the table with foreign competitors, many of these countries want to know, do you have a financing plan in place?

It is because, contingent upon their ability to choose us or choose our competitors, many of these countries want to know that this can be financially put together in a fashion so that the deal works for everybody, and that is what the Bank does.

In my district alone, the Ex-Im Bank has afforded a number of small business exporters—some of which are minority and women owned—to have exports in places all over the world, places like India, Mexico, Turkey, Hong Kong; and I could go on. These businesses export $77 million worth of goods, ranging from machinery to manufacturing to crop production of the variety and diversity of agricultural exports that we do in California.

As a matter of fact, in California, the Ex-Im Bank has resulted in increased exports of over $27 billion. Now, let's put this in perspective. Last year, California exported $174 billion in products.

The Ex-Im Bank was responsible for helping to finance $27 billion of that $174 billion. As a matter of fact, $19.4 billion of the $174 billion that was exported last year from California were agricultural products grown in the San Joaquin Valley.

The Bank helps level the playing field, therefore, for American workers and American businesses, allowing them to compete and succeed in the global economy that we live in today. That is just the facts.

In these trying times, the last thing Congress should be doing is jeopardizing the economic health of our Nation by refusing to provide Americans with the tools—the tools, which is what this Bank is—they need to compete effectively in the global marketplace.

It is important to note that there is a vast bipartisan support for renewing the Bank's charter. Let me be clear. Despite attempts to paint this as a partisan issue, I do not believe it is. Sadly, though, there are some of my colleagues on the other side who have decided to play partisan politics with the Bank. That, then, therefore threatens American jobs, halting economic

growth and undermining American businesses' ability of all sizes to compete in this global market.

Now is the time for long-term reauthorization of the Bank so that American entrepreneurs can use this tool to create more jobs in our country. This can only happen with bipartisan support. I stand and ask my colleagues to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank on behalf of American workers and American businesses.

NUCLEAR DEAL WITH IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the single greatest threat to the national security of the United States is Iran's drive for nuclear weapons. The result of the negotiations being conducted by President Obama and our Western allies will shape the long-term security and stability of the United States for years to come.

Iran is the world's leading sponsor of terror, a stronghold for terrorists whose very mission is to spread oppression. Iranian leaders have called for the complete annihilation of Israel, calling Israel a ''barbaric, wolflike, and infanticidal regime.'' Iranian leaders have said that the United States of America has ''no place among the nations.''

By its own declaration, Iran is not looking for a peaceful path of coexistence. There can be nothing more dangerous for America or our allies than a nuclear-armed Iran. That is why a bad deal with Iran, one that leaves the door open for Iranian nuclear weapons, must be avoided at all costs.

In order to alleviate these concerns, the President and his national security team have said over and over that a bad deal is worse than no deal at all; but will that sentiment actually stop this administration from entering into a bad deal with Iran? What I have seen so far, through the framework agreement released in April, raises serious concerns.

Under this framework agreement, not a single Iranian nuclear centrifuge will be dismantled. No nuclear facilities will be shut down. While some of Iran's nuclear infrastructure will be temporarily warehoused, most of Iran's nuclear infrastructure will remain completely intact. All of these factors point to a flawed understanding of a ''good deal'' by President Obama; yet this is the deal we may well be given.

Twenty years ago, the United States was negotiating with another country on nuclear weapons development. During these talks with the Soviet Union and Gorbachev in the 1980s, President Ronald Reagan used the proverb ''trust, but verify'' throughout those discussions.

I do not see this administration using that same tactic. In fact, it seems to me that in regards to Iran, the Obama administration is operating on the principle of ''trust and don't verify.''

As things stand, these ongoing nuclear negotiations are placing far too much faith in a country that has proven itself both deceptive and unpredictable.

Mr. President, a good deal must contain the following five points: first, a deal that requires anytime, anywhere inspections; second, a deal that would only lift sanctions when Iran demonstrates compliance with its obligations; third, a deal must require Iran to provide a complete report of its past nuclear activities; fourth, a deal must require Iran to dismantle its nuclear weapons infrastructure; and, last but not least, a good deal must not allow Iran to become a nuclear state ever.

Without these conditions in place, the United States will, without a doubt, be prioritizing a bad deal over no deal at all.

□ 1030

HONORING DICK HORIGAN ON HIS 90TH BIRTHDAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a very dear friend, Dick Horigan.

Richard hails from my hometown of Amsterdam, New York. Dick turns 90 on Friday, and it is worth noting this milestone because he has epitomized the generosity, humility, and dedication of the World War II generation, and he has made Amsterdam a better place as a result.

Richard T. Horigan wasn't born in Amsterdam, nor did he grow up there. In horse racing terms, a sport he continues to enjoy at the nearby historic Saratoga Race Course, Dick was a ''shipper'' from Scranton, Pennsylvania.

After serving in the Navy in the Pacific during World War II, he enrolled in Georgetown University. On a blind date, he met Marie Smeallie, the beautiful daughter of Donald and Agnes Smeallie of Amsterdam, and they were married shortly thereafter. Upon Dick's graduation from Georgetown law school, Marie convinced him to move to Amsterdam and begin his law practice there.

Since 1951, Dick has been a pillar of our community. Retired now, he was very active in the American Bar Association and the American College of Trial Lawyers. Dick was the consummate attorney and a leader in his field. He was the village attorney for nearby Hagaman, and practiced before the United States District Court, the Northern District of New York, and the United States Court of Appeals.

In the 1970s, he struck out on his own, and his son, Tim, joined him to start Horigan & Horigan, which continues to be one of the top firms not only in Amsterdam, but throughout New York's greater capital region.

While his love of his profession is strong, his love of family is even stronger. When Marie passed away in 1977, he found himself spending more and more time with Ellie Smeallie, who had been widowed many years earlier. In 1979, Ellie and Dick were married. This good-looking couple merged two great families and brought them even closer together.

Dick is the patriarch of 13 children, 33 grandchildren, and, yes, 3 great-grandchildren. While many of them live outside of the region now, they all come back to visit, especially in August, when the historic Saratoga Race Course is open.

In addition to horse racing, his other passions include golfing and helping St. Mary's Catholic Church, where I would often see him at mass in the mornings.

We wish a happy 90th birthday to Richard Horigan. I hope there are many more to come, Dick. You are a beloved, reliable patriarch of an awesome clan. You are a respected, loyal friend to countless many, including myself.

My message here on the House floor is: To a great man, have a great day. It is my honor to recognize your 90th birthday.

ENDLESS WAR IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the week before last, the greatly respected conservative columnist Thomas Sowell wrote:

> What lessons might we learn from the whole experience of the Iraq war? If nothing else, we should never again imagine that we can engage in nation building in the sweeping sense that term acquired in Iraq—least of all, building a democratic Arab nation in a region of the world that has never had such a thing in a history that goes back thousands of years.

The week before last, the longtime conservative leader David Keene wrote in the Washington Times about our Middle East wars:

> The concept of U.S. national interests was stretched beyond any rational meaning with the argument that ''democracies don't go to war with democracies,'' so rebuilding the world in our own image was seen as our ultimate national interest.

Mr. Keene went on and said:

> America took on more than we could possibly handle. The result is a generation of young Americans who have never known peace, a decade in which thousands of our best have died or been maimed with little to show for their sacrifices, our enemies have multiplied, and the national debt has skyrocketed.

The week before last, the publisher of The American Conservative magazine, Jon Utley, wrote an article entitled: ''12 Reasons America Doesn't Win Its Wars.'' The Magazine said:

> Too many parties now benefit from perpetual warmongering for the U.S. to ever conclude its military conflicts.

Mr. Utley quoted conservative columnist Peggy Noonan, who wrote:

> We spend too much on the military, which not only adds to our debt, but guarantees that our weapons will be used.

She quoted one expert, who said:

> Policymakers will find uses for them to justify their expense, which will implicate us in crises that are none of our business.

Conservative icon William F. Buckley, shortly before he passed away, came out strongly against the war in Iraq. He wrote:

> A respect for the power of the United States is engendered by our success in engagements in which we take part. A point is reached when tenacity conveys not steadfastness of purpose but misapplication of pride.

He added that if the war dragged on, as it certainly has:

> There has been skepticism about our venture, there will be contempt.

A couple of weeks ago, we saw an Iraq army, which we have trained for years and on which we have spent megabillions, cutting and running at the first sign of a fight. We should not be sending our young men and women to lead and/or fight in any war where the people in that country are not willing to fight for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, fiscal conservatives should be the ones most horrified by and most opposed to the horrendous waste and trillions of dollars we have spent on these very unnecessary wars in the Middle East.

Last week, 19 Republicans voted for a resolution saying that we should bring our troops home from Iraq and Afghanistan. The Republican leadership of the Foreign Affairs Committee did not want any Republicans to speak in favor of that resolution, so Mr. JONES, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. MASSIE requested, and received, time from the Democratic sponsor, Mr. MCGOVERN.

I did not want to do that, but I at least wanted to point out today that there has been nothing conservative about our policy of permanent, forever, endless war in the Middle East.

In his most famous speech, President Eisenhower warned us against the military industrial complex. We should not be going to war in wars that are more about money and power and prestige than they are about any serious threat to the United States. I think President Eisenhower would be shocked at how far we have gone down that path that he warned us against.

UPCOMING SUPREME COURT DECISION IN OBERGEFELL V. HODGES, TANCO V. HASLAM, DEBOER V. SNYDER, AND BOURKE V. BESHEAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express the profound hope that, in its upcoming decision, the Supreme Court will strike down laws that prohibit same-sex couples from marrying and to ensure that all States recognize lawful marriages performed elsewhere.

These four cases—Obergefell v. Hodges, Tanco v. Haslam, DeBoer v. Snyder, and Bourke v. Beshear—are an opportunity for the Court to end legal discrimination against committed gay and lesbian couples and their children and to reestablish marriage as a civil right, one that is ''fundamental to our very existence and survival,'' as it was called by Justice Warren in Loving v. Virginia in 1967. As a country, we can no longer allow State governments to burden their citizens by refusing to grant marriage licenses based on whom they love.

Since my earliest days in the New York State Assembly, I have fought alongside the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender community for equality under the law. I spoke out in opposition when, in 1996, Congress, for the first time, created a Federal definition of marriage with the Defense of Marriage Act, or DOMA, solely for the purpose of excluding gays and lesbians from receiving Federal marriage benefits; and I have long carried legislation to repeal this insidious law, from offering the Respect for Marriage Act to leading the congressional amicus briefs in both Windsor and the current marriage equality cases before the Court. Yet even a full repeal of DOMA would still leave individuals vulnerable to continued State discrimination, which is why there must be a guaranteed right to access to benefits of marriage regardless of where a couple may reside.

When my constituent and friend Edith Windsor began dating Thea Spyer in 1965 and accepted her proposal in 1967, she was not thinking about how the government would view her relationship. She was thinking about the joy and happiness that comes from beginning to shape a life with a partner she loved. Forty years after that proposal, they were able to legally marry in Canada, outside of the country and State they called home.

No one in a free and just country should be forced to leave their home, traveling away from friends and family across State lines, in order to get married. Nor should anyone be faced with the humiliation of being denied government benefits, the tragedy of being barred from a partner's hospital bedside, or the indignity of being refused any of the other thousands of benefits that come with marriage that millions of Americans access every day because a State refuses to recognize their otherwise lawful marriage.

Denying recognition of same-sex relationships signals to the couple, their family, and all others that their bond in love is less deserving of respect, harming the individuals and creating divisions within the fabric of our society.

After Thea's death, Edith bravely fought all the way to the Supreme Court, in the United States v. Windsor, to establish what so many of us have known for decades: that laws that deny recognition of legal same-sex marriages serve no legitimate purpose, stigmatize and shame American families, and are a deprivation of the equal liberty guarantee of the Constitution's Fifth Amendment.

It is time for the long arc of history to continue to bend towards justice and for similarly discriminatory State laws to be struck down once and for all.

Should the Court rule for equality, there will be no losers. No one will be harmed by the granting and recognition of same-sex marriages. Those claiming otherwise are either promoting discredited claims about the dangers of gays and lesbians or falsely believe they have the right to involve themselves in the private affairs of others.

More than 70 percent of Americans already live in jurisdictions that provide for same-sex marriages. It is unconscionable that anyone would propose to continue to deny universal access and recognition, as well as the associated safety and security, to these families.

The Court has the immediate responsibility to expand upon its decision in Windsor to ensure that State laws comply with established basic constitutional protections and that all Americans are given the equal respect and support they deserve.

Much as in Loving v. Virginia, which also rolled back government-enforced marriage discrimination based on race, outdated prejudices and intolerance cannot be allowed to rule the day. It is time that we make the Constitution's promise of equality a reality for gay and lesbian couples throughout the Nation.

Regardless of the forthcoming decision, we have a long way to go to ensure full equality for LGBT Americans who can still be fired from their jobs, denied housing, and turned away from stores simply for being who they are. We must work together to pass comprehensive nondiscrimination legislation to protect these vulnerable Americans.

SPYING AND SNOOPING BY GOVERNMENT ON AMERICANS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, like most Americans, I store a lot on my computer and on my phone: family photographs, personal calendars, emails, schedules, and even weekend to-do lists, or, as my wife calls them, honey-do lists. But this information stored on a phone like the one I have here is not private from the prying, spying eyes of government.

Most Americans have no idea that Big Brother can snoop on tweets, g-chats, texts, Instagrams, and even emails. Anything that is stored in the cloud is available to be spied on by government, as long as it is older than 180 days.

Now, why is that? Well, it goes back to the outdated Electronic Communications Privacy Act of 1986. That act protects the privacy of emails that are less than 6 months old. 1986, those were the days before the World Wide Web even existed. Many of us—I do—have staff that weren't even born before 1986.

We stored letters in folders, filing cabinets, and desk drawers. No one knew what the cloud was because the cloud didn't even exist. There was not any broadband, no social media, no tablets, or smartphones.

The relatively few people who used email—and I remember when email was invented—never imagined keeping emails longer than it took to send it or read it. So it was perfectly reasonable that, in 1986, lawmakers tried to protect emails, but only did so for 180 days. Who would keep anything online for longer than 6 months? Well, three decades later, we know. Everybody stores their emails.

Under current law, every email and text, every Google doc and Facebook message, every photograph of our vacation, is subject to government inspection without a warrant, without probable cause, and without our knowledge if it is older than 6 months. That is an invasion of privacy.

Constitutional protection for 6 months only? That is nonsense.

What is worse, some government agencies don't want the law changed. The Securities and Exchange Commission is lobbying to keep the law on the books. Why does the SEC want to maintain this spying ability? Well, I suspect they want to be able to read our personal financial records and communications without the constitutional protection of a search warrant and without our knowledge. Spying on the citizens by government sounds like conduct reminiscent of the old Soviet Union, to me.

The SEC is not the only government agency that has access to emails over 6 months old.

□ 1045

Any government agency can go and confiscate emails older than 6 months, without a warrant, without probable cause, and without knowledge of the person. This is a clear violation of the Constitution, in my opinion.

Mr. Speaker, if you go back to snail mail and you write a letter and you put a stamp on it and you put it in the mailbox, that letter floats around the fruited plain until it ends up in somebody's possession. Government generally cannot seize that letter without a warrant and go in and snoop around and look in there and see what it is.

Email is a form of communication. Why should government have the ability to snoop around in our personal emails? They don't have that right, even though they have the ability.

Whatever our political disagreements, on both sides, most Americans, I believe, share the conviction that privacy is protected by the Fourth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution: to protect us from unreasonable searches and seizures from government; protect us in our persons, houses, papers, and personal effects.

Government agents can't raid homes or tap into phones or read mail without showing a judge they have probable cause that a crime was committed; then a search warrant must be obtained.

Mr. Speaker, I was a judge for 22 years in Texas, and officers would come to me with search warrants, and I would read and see if they had probable cause. If they did, I would sign a warrant. That is what the Constitution requires before you can go snoop around and spy on Americans. Why should our possessions and communications be less private just because they are online?

Well, they shouldn't be. That is why I have teamed up with Representative ZOE LOFGREN, on the other side, and lots of other Members of Congress in both parties, to introduce legislation to update the outdated ECPA law. There is also a bill in the Senate that enjoys the same support.

Our bills restore ECPA's original purpose, to protect privacy in the ways we live, communicate, learn, and transact business and recreate today. This legislation would protect the sacred right of privacy from the ever-increasing spying government trolls in America.

Our mission is simple: extend constitutional protections to communications and records that Americans store online for any amount of time. There is no need to delay. The bill is written. The votes are there. Let's pass the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, technology may change, but the Constitution remains the same. Thomas Jefferson said in the Declaration of Independence:

> Government is created to protect our rights.

It is about time we make government protect the right of privacy, rather than violate the right of privacy.

And that is just the way it is.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF DR. ELSON FLOYD

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Elson Floyd, the president of Washington State University, who passed away this past weekend.

Let me start with a little bit of background. Every member of my family went to the University of Washington, so I was actually raised to root for the UW Huskies and to root against the Washington State University Cougars.

Now, before Dr. Floyd passed, I admitted to him that, having worked with him over the years and having admired his leadership, I suddenly found myself rooting for Washington State University, too. You will be glad to know that eventually my family started talking to me again.

I was proud to call Elson Floyd a friend and a partner. He led the university during incredibly difficult times in our economy, and he never hesitated to make tough decisions that he believed would be best for his university and best for his students. That even included cutting his own salary during the Great Recession. He fought for opportunities for his students, and in fact, the number of students of color at WSU doubled during his tenure.

I think it is worth pointing out, he wasn't just a leader for Washington State University, he was a leader and a visionary for all of higher education in Washington State. It wasn't just about what was good for Washington State University, it was what was good for higher education.

How do we make sure we have an ethic where we are advocating for more people to have more opportunities to get more education to higher levels? He understood that. He understood that because he understood that education is the door of economic opportunity because he had lived it himself.

He did all he could to ensure that opportunity was felt, not just in Pullman, Washington, and not just at the University of Washington in Seattle, but all throughout our State. We saw in my neck of the woods at Olympic College in Bremerton where, because of Dr. Floyd's leadership, WSU set up a 4-year program in engineering.

That sounds kind of wonky, but here is the reality of it. What he did changed lives. It meant that young people in Bremerton could see the opportunity to actually learn at home, study for 4 years, get a degree in engineering, and then go work in private industry or go work at our shipyard.

There are now young people who have opportunities that they would have never had before if it hadn't been for Elson Floyd's leadership. What he did changed lives. He was such a good man. He was ethical, and he was wise, and he had that extraordinary combination of big heart and big brain and courage.

His life has been celebrated in the days since he passed, and I just want to be one of the people to celebrate him. I am going to miss him, and I want to extend to the entire WSU community my condolences.

Most importantly, I want his family to know that we lost a very special person and that our thoughts and prayers are with them.

GOVERNMENT WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, one of the things I hear from my constituents so regularly is: What are you

doing about our Nation's debt? What are you doing about this out-of-control budget?

From time to time, at our committee, we would hold hearings on an inspector general report and actually look at some waste. This started our office thinking and some of us on the Budget Committee thinking about: How do you begin to quantify that and hold these agencies accountable?

As one of my constituents said: You know, it seems that they are always after one of us, a small-business owner, but they never go ask a Federal bureaucrat or a Federal agency to pony up or to pay back money or to be held accountable.

In our office, our interns this summer have worked with us on a project to actually begin to quantify this waste and to look at these inspector general reports.

Mr. Speaker, this is what we found. Just taking the reports from the 70 agencies that have inspector generals and looking at a 4-year period of time, from 2011 to 2014, what we found is this: we could put our finger on $105.7 billion of waste, and that is $105.7 billion of waste, of taxpayer money that is being wasted. It has been identified by the inspector general's office. That works out to about $1.5 billion for each of these 70 agencies.

Now, what was of concern to us was the fact that many of these agencies are doing nothing about it; and we found that, when you look at the reports that have been issued, which total 81 different reports, the reports for which a management decision was made during the reporting period was only 30 of those reports.

Mr. Speaker, 30 times, management said that they are going to go in and they are going to take an action in response to the recommendations that the inspector general has found.

Now, one of the things that we looked at was where these wasteful occurrences continue to happen and who are the repeat offenders when you look at these IG reports.

Let me give you some examples, Mr. Speaker. Department of Defense, $38.2 billion that has been identified—this is one of the reasons that Republicans are pushing to audit the DOD and hold people accountable for the wasteful spending.

Health and Human Services, $10.3 billion—we found that $2 billion went toward the ObamaCare Web site, which still is barely working.

Department of Agriculture, $9.2 billion; Social Security Administration, $9.1 billion; Department of Energy, $7.7 billion—and by the way, Solyndra, a green energy firm, filed for bankruptcy in September 2011, after they got 536 million taxpayer dollars. The list goes on and on.

What we are going to do—and I commend Chairman PRICE for pushing forward to hold some hearings with these inspector generals, with these departments, to drill down on the total number of reports and to hold them accountable for not taking an action and looking for ways that we, as Members of Congress, can charge back these agencies for the continued misuse—not occasional misuse, not one time misuse, but continued misuse of taxpayer dollars.

When you look at the list of these agencies and what they have done, year after year, there are some of these agencies that end up in the top 10 offenders every year—2014, Department of Defense, HUD, Health and Human Services, Department of Energy, Social Security, Department of Agriculture, VA, Homeland Security, Department of Education, Department of State, and the Agency for International Development.

You can look at 2013, continuing down the list, the top 10 again, Defense, HUD, Energy, Health and Human Services, Railroad Retirement Board, Homeland Security, Agriculture, Social Security Administration, Department of Education, and Department of State—repeated waste, fraud, and abuse of the taxpayer money.

When I came to Congress in January 2003, our freshman class decided our project was going to be rooting out wasteful Washington spending. We continue to be committed to that, and I submit our findings to the body for their review and understanding.

INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORTS—WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE

2011–2014

Total waste (70 agencies) = $105.7 billion

Average waste of the 70 agencies = $1.5 billion

Waste by year:

Our findings

2011 = $20.1 billion

2012 = $19.5 billion

2013 = $40.9 billion

2014 = $25.2 billion

Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity & Efficiency

2011 = $17.2 billion

2012 = $12.8 billion

2013 = $35.1 billion

2014 = n/a

11 agencies accumulated over $1 billion in waste over the 4 years:

1. Dept. of Defense—$38.2 billion
2. Dept. of Health & Human Services—$10.3 billion
3. Dept. of Agriculture—$9.2 billion
4. Social Security Administration—$9.1 billion
5. HUD—$ 7.7 billion
6. Dept. of Energy—$7.7 billion
7. Dept. of Homeland Security—$5.9 billion
8. VA—$3.9 billion
9. Dept. of Education—$3.2 billion
10. Railroad Retirement Board—$2.5 billion
11. Dept. of State—$1.1 billion

Top 10 in 2014 Total Waste

1. Dept. of Defense—$10.4 billion
2. HUD—$2.9 billion
3. Dept. Health & Human Services—$2.7 billion
4. Dept. of Energy—$2.6 billion

S. Social Security Administration—$2.5 billion

6. Dept. of Agriculture—$992.7 million
7. VA—$957.1 million
8. Dept. of Homeland Security—$345.5 million
9. Dept. of Education—$273.4 million
10. Dept. of State—$264.8 million
11. Agency for International Development—$202.9 million

Top 10 in 2013 Total Waste

1. Dept. of Defense—$23.9 billion
2. HUD—$2.9 billion
3. Dept. of Energy—$2.6 billion
4. Dept. of Health and Human Services—$2.5 billion
5. Railroad Retirement Board—$2.2 billion
6. Dept. of Homeland Security—$1.6 billion
7. Dept. of Agriculture—$1.5 billion
8. Social Security Administration—$1.4 billion
9. Dept. of Education—$606.6 million
10. Dept. of State—$266.1 million

Top 10 in 2012 Total Waste

1. Social Security Administration—$3.4 billion
2. Dept. of Defense—$3.0 billion
3. Dept. of Homeland Security—$2.3 billion
4. Dept. of Health & Human Services—$2.3 billion
5. Dept. of Agriculture—$2.0 billion
6. HUD—$1.4 billion
7. Dept. of Energy—$1.2 billion
8. Dept. of Education—$999.4 million
9. Securities and Exchange Commission—$557.1 million
10. Treasury Inspector General on Tax Administration—$404.2 million

Top 10 in 2011 Total Waste

1. Dept. of Agriculture—$4.7 billion
2. Dept. of Health & Human Services—$2.9 billion
3. VA—$2.8 billion
4. Social Security Administration—$1.8 billion
5. Dept. of Homeland Security—$1.6 billion
6. Dept. of Education—$1.3 billion
7. Dept. of Energy—$1.2 billion
8. Dept. of Defense—$979 million
9. Securities and Exchange Commission—$566.9 million
10. HUD—$395.9 million

Other agencies total waste 2011–2014 (no particular order). . .

EPA—$404.7 million

FCC—$24.4 million

Dept. of Labor—$147.1 million

Dept. of Treasury—$38.9 million

Dept. of Commerce—$467.1 million

Dept. of Transportation—$478.4 million.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF KEN FARFSING

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Mr. Ken Farfsing, upon his retirement as the city manager of the city of Signal Hill, California, which will be this coming week, on June 30.

I have had the pleasure of working with Ken on local and statewide issues for almost 20 years, while I served on the Long Beach City Council, as a member of the California State Legislature, and now, as a Member of the United States Congress. I consider Ken to be a dear friend.

Ken has served for over 33 years, in community development, redevelopment, economic development, and city management in five southern California communities. He has spent the last 19 years, however, serving the city of Signal Hill, and I am honored to recognize his outstanding career.

Ken began his career with the city of Santa Fe Springs in California in 1981

as an intern. In 1985, he was promoted to community development director. In 1988, he continued his career as the community development director for the city of Downey. He later became Downey's assistant city manager and director of economic development. He served as the city manager in the city of South Pasadena for 4 years before coming to the city of Signal Hill.

Under his guidance, the city of Signal Hill established three commercial centers, the Town Center North, the Town Center West, and the Signal Hill Gateway Center.

He facilitated the relocation of a Mercedes Benz dealership to Signal Hill and the expansion of the Glenn E. Thomas Dodge dealership, growing sales and tax revenues from $6 million to more than $12 million. Additionally, he completed the development of six community parks and a new police station.

Ken has been active in regional issues, also, and he has been a leader with expertise on water issues, working with 27 of the area's Gateway Cities Council of Governments on water, storm water, and urban runoff regulations and practices.

He has served as the chair of the city manager's steering committee for the Gateway Cities manager's group, and he was a member of the water quality task force for the League of California Cities.

As you can tell, I respect and admire Ken Farfsing's leadership and service to the community of Signal Hill, and he will be greatly missed. I want to wish him the very best as he retires. His impact on the city of Signal Hill will always be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in thanking Ken Farfsing for his 19 years of public service within the city of Signal Hill.

□ 1100

POWER OF THE PURSE ACT OF 2015

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

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Power of the Purse Act of 2015. I wrote this bill to restore Congress' ability to set priorities within Federal spending and, quite frankly, to better control it. To do that, my bill simply removes the firewall that exists within sequestration between defense spending and nondiscretionary spending. It allows Congress to regain the power of the purse so that we can take discretionary spending and take defense spending, but right now, the firewall requires us to spend equally on both. The Constitution gives the power of the purse clearly to Congress, and, as elected Representatives, we have an obligation to make the hard choices about where your tax dollars are spent.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take you back to 2011. The country was facing its third year in a row with trillion-dollar deficits. Republicans and Democrats alike here in the House, Republicans and Democrats in the Senate, and the President of the United States signed into law the Budget Control Act, the result of a failure of Congress to come to a better agreement.

The intention of that act was to control spending, to put caps on spending. But to get Democrats to agree to it, we had to say we would only spend 50 percent of discretionary spending on defense spending; yet Republicans, we would only put 50 percent on nondefense spending. So we locked ourselves and tied our hands, but we couldn't actually prioritize.

In 2011, you could make the argument, as some did—I was here at the time, but prior to that, I was not here—when they argued that we should spend more money here in the United States on domestic spending, and they passed an $800 billion stimulus bill. They had the ability to do that and adjust to the global financial crisis. In 2011, they responded to the terrorist attacks and decided to spend more money on defense.

But today we don't get to respond. We have to say, 50 percent here, 50 percent there, without regard to the circumstances that we face. This makes no sense at all.

Today we are facing a new and an unprecedented number of threats. They are coming at us from all around the world. ISIS poses one of the greatest terrorist threats that we have seen since 9/11, while Iraq, Syria, and Yemen descend further into chaos. Iran remains committed to advancing its nuclear infrastructure while continuing to meddle and support instability in the region. And we have seen an alarming rise in cyber threats from both nonstate and state actors like Russia, Iran, and North Korea. China has started to build islands in the China Sea, raising tensions in Southeast Asia.

By removing the arbitrary firewall that exists under sequestration, budget caps on defense and nondefense discretionary spending, we restore spending control back to the Congress, and we can appropriately respond to these international and global threats and require more focus on defense.

Tomorrow could be just as well something else. It could be infrastructure right here at home or education. This is National Alzheimer's Month. Maybe it would be spending more there to cure that horrible disease. We need to have the ability here to respond to the climate and environment that we face today, not what it was 4 years ago. My bill simply allows us to do that. By taking the taxpayer dollars that are sent by hard-working taxpayers here, it allows this Congress to make the determination on what the priorities ought to be at the time that we face those priorities.

Now, I know Democrats are concerned that we will just blow up and spend more money on defense, and Republicans are concerned that if Democrats control it they would spend more money on discretionary spending. My bill does not remove the caps, but it does make this Congress have to debate with each other and find a conclusion that makes the most sense for the American people, because times have changed right here in the Congress.

Today there are many Republicans who are more libertarian-minded, and they would prefer not to spend money on defense. They would prefer to spend it domestically. Rather than building roads in Afghanistan, they would prefer to build roads here. I have got colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle that feel we need to focus on national defense. They serve on the House Armed Services Committee or the Foreign Affairs Committee and are well aware of the national defense threats that we face. But we can't do anything because we reluctantly hold onto bad policy.

My bill is designed to correct this once and for all. By removing the firewall, we get to have the control of the purse once again that the Constitution has given us.

Benjamin Franklin said that a nation is best off when control of its money is handled by those who are the most ''immediate representatives of the people.'' This Chamber, Mr. Speaker, is called the people's House. Each of us represent well over 700,000 Americans, and our job is to represent them to the best of our ability. We should not and can not continue to tie our hands with some arbitrary decision that was made maybe out of necessity 4 years ago but doesn't recognize the threat today.

I encourage my colleagues to be part of this process and to cosponsor the Power of the Purse Act of 2015.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 4 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

Dr. Chandra Bhanu Satpathy, Shri Sai Cultural & Community Center, Seattle, Washington, offered the following prayer:

O, Lord, by Your will, we are born in different nations, speak different languages, and follow different religions and cultures; yet we are all Your children and ever grateful for Your love and protection.

Evoke in us pious thoughts and feelings to shun all hatred and violence

and become worthy of Your services. Bless our future generations to imbibe this spirit of love, sacrifice, and cooperation.

Guide us in following saints like Shirdi Sai Baba, who proclaimed in Hindi ''sabka malik ek,'' meaning ''God is the master of all.'' Inspire us, as Your trustees, to nourish and protect the world around us to sustain all life.

Guide us along the ethical and holistic path of self-control, purity of purpose, and dedication enshrined in the Shrimad Bhagavad Gita.

O, Lord, bless this august assembly and this Nation in performing its national and global responsibilities towards furthering the cause of humanity.

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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT 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.

WELCOMING DR. CHANDRA BHANU SATPATHY

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege this morning to welcome our guest chaplain, Dr. Chandra Bhanu Satpathy.

Dr. Satpathy deserves great credit for his earnest and humble leadership of the global Sai movement, which celebrates the teachings and ideals of Shirdi Sai Baba, the most respected of the Indian Perfect Masters and renowned for his teachings of compassion and acceptance.

This year marks the 25th anniversary of the global Sai movement, and I can't think of a time when the values of peace, respect, and compassion are needed more here in our own country and in other parts of the world.

Dr. Satpathy's moving invocation this morning serves as a motivation to each of us gathered here to always remember what ultimately unites us far outweighs what divides us, regardless of language, culture, or creed.

Thank you, Dr. Satpathy, for being here today. Thank you for your exemplary leadership in the spirit of Sai Baba's teachings, and thank you for sharing your vision for a peaceful future.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

THANKS TO CLEVELAND COUNTY COMMUNITY

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, Americans across the country awoke to the horrific news of nine lives ended in an act of hatred and senseless violence that occurred at Charleston's AME Church.

The senseless act of violence shocked the country and left the Carolinas in a high state of anxiety as the suspect remained on the run. Fortunately, due to the vigilance of quick thinking of one of my constituents and the professional work of local law enforcement, the perpetrator of this heinous act was brought to quick justice.

Thursday morning, Gastonia's Debbie Dills spotted the suspect and his car after having seen photos on the morning news. She quickly called 911, alerted local law enforcement to its whereabouts, and then the Shelby Police Department took over pursuing the suspect and arresting him. A little over 12 hours after the event occurred, the monster who committed this heinous act was in custody.

I want to express my gratitude to Ms. Dills, the Shelby Police Department, local law enforcement, and the entire Cleveland County community for their work in assisting in this arrest.

Their quick thinking and professional work brought this manhunt to a close and allowed all Americans to begin the mourning process for the nine innocent lives that were ended just a week ago.

GUN VIOLENCE IN CHICAGO

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the three individuals killed and 32 injured by gun violence last weekend in Chicago.

They included a 17-year-old boy shot in the head, a 27-year-old man shot to death in his car, and a man who died shielding his mother from bullets fired outside of their home.

In recent days, our media has been gripped by tragic displays of violence. Charleston is what happens when racism and hate find a gun. Charleston is yet another gut-wrenching reminder that, as leaders, we can't stay silent on gun violence or racism. How many more deadly weekends will we allow on our watch? What will you do to stop the next Newtown or Charleston?

We can pass background checks and other commonsense gun safety measures; but in addition and most importantly, we need meaningful conversations and actions around racism, both individual and systemic, to truly have a safe and secure Nation with equal treatment and opportunity for all.

REMEMBERING EMANUEL AME CHURCH

(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, last week, nine extraordinary men and women were killed at the Wednesday night Bible study at historic Mother Emanuel AME Church in my birthplace of Charleston. I am grateful for their memories.

Reverend Sharonda Coleman-Singleton, Cynthia Hurd, Tywanza Sanders, Susie Jackson, Myra Thompson, Ethel Lee Lance, Reverend Daniel Simmons, Reverend Depayne Middleton-Doctor, along with Pastor Clementa Pinckney were all leaders of our community and in their church. One served the youth as a high school track coach, one a lifelong librarian, one a recent college graduate with a bright future ahead of him. Many served their church. Each had a clear love of God and love for their fellow man as followers of Jesus Christ.

The loss of Reverend Senator Clementa Pinckney has been personal, as he was a fellow State legislator. I was honored to host the senator, his wife, and daughters when they visited the Capitol a few years ago. He grew up in Richland as a lifelong friend of my former chief of staff Eric Dell.

A hate-filled, drug-crazed murderer tried to divide our citizens, but he failed, and South Carolinians have unified in love, prayer, and respect.

RENEW THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to lodge my objection that this House is going to recess tomorrow without taking up the renewal of the Export-Import Bank. This is a time when American businesspeople are doing everything they can think of to compete abroad. American manufacturers are seeking to export our goods.

This is an outfit that stands up for American exporting manufacturers. It supports 1.5 million American manufacturing jobs—good-paying, family-sustaining jobs. We can't recess without renewing the Export-Import Bank.

In my district alone, 600 people are employed by companies that benefit

materially from the Ex-Im Bank: Universal Industrial Gases in Easton; Fluortek, Inc., in Easton; Victaulic Company of America in Easton; Noble Biomaterials, Inc., in Scranton; Lehighton Electronics in Lehighton; and Copperhead Chemical Company in Tamaqua.

Mr. Speaker, we have to do the sensible thing and renew the Export-Import Bank. It is as plain as the nose on your face; it is as true as the law of gravity.

LAMENTING DEATHS IN THE AMERICAN FAMILY

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the wake of last week's devastating shooting in a church in Charleston, South Carolina.

The killing of any human is a real tragedy, but to lose nine innocent people while they were in a Bible study simply because of the color of their skin is heinous beyond words. On behalf of the people of southwest Alabama, I want to share our condolences with the families of those who lost loved ones.

Let me be very clear. In today's society, this kind of hate-based act and particularly hate-based on race or ethnicity is deplorable and unacceptable. We are one Nation, and there is no place in our country for racism.

As a southerner, but more importantly, as an American, I feel as if there has been a death in my own family because these deaths were in my family, the family of all citizens in the United States of America.

MARRIAGE EQUALITY

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, I stood on the steps of the Supreme Court as the discriminatory Defense of Marriage Act was struck down.

On a beautiful day in June, much like today, I stood there with the words ''Equal Justice Under Law'' inscribed on the top of the Court and celebrated a truly historic decision that finally, after decades of injustice, granted LGBT Americans the right to have their marriages recognized by the Federal Government.

That day was even more important to me because I stood on those steps with many of my close friends and many of my staff whom I deeply care about, many of whom for the first time had their basic humanity recognized by the highest court in the land.

I am looking forward again, in the next coming days, to stand on those same steps as the Supreme Court hopefully rules that every American has the constitutional right to marry the person they love.

I am optimistic and hopeful that marriage equality will soon be the law of the land. As a vice chair of the LGBT Equality Caucus, I am committed to continuing to provide Federal policies that recognize the rights of all Americans, regardless of their sexual orientation or gender identity.

□ 1215

IPAB REPEAL VOTE

(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, it is no secret that I am opposed to ObamaCare. I have been since day one. It is a bad law that is hurting Americans. It is hurting Americans with higher costs; it is hurting Americans because they have lost doctors they liked, and it is hurting our seniors because it will ration their health care.

When ObamaCare created the Independent Payment Advisory Board, it put 15 unelected bureaucrats in charge of what payments Medicare seniors could get for their treatments. Many people have referred to this Board as a ''death panel.''

That is wrong. I have been working to repeal this Board, and yesterday, I was proud to stand up for our seniors by voting for the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act, which would do just that.

The Senate needs to pass this commonsense bill now, and we need to keep working to see that ObamaCare is fully and permanently repealed.

IN CELEBRATION OF THE USS GABRIELLE GIFFORDS

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

Mr. SIRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the christening and launch of the USS *Gabrielle Giffords*, the Navy's 10th littoral combat ship.

My former colleague in the House of Representatives, Gabrielle Giffords, could teach us all a thing or two about honor, courage, and commitment.

On January 8, Navy spouse and former Representative Giffords was shot in Tucson, Arizona, while meeting with many of her constituents and has since made an incredible recovery. She still works tirelessly to serve the people of Arizona, as well as citizens all across the country.

I am pleased that the U.S. Navy christened the USS *Gabrielle Giffords* last week in a ceremony led by Dr. Jill Biden, the sponsor of the ship. Dr. Biden aptly noted that former Representative Giffords represents the same qualities that the Navy embodies, and I could not agree more. As this vessel travels the world, I hope it will inspire patriotism and resiliency.

I am proud that the Navy has chosen to honor former Representative Giffords in this prestigious manner, and I am encouraged by the work she is doing as an advocate for safe and responsible gun ownership in order to prevent needless gun violence.

POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize veterans suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder. The month of June is the Veterans Affairs Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Awareness Month.

Unacceptably, we lose 22 heroes a day to mental illness, often connected to PTSD trauma. We must take steps to reduce this horrible statistic. Even one is too many. Mr. Speaker, 22 is a disgrace to everything these heroes fought for.

Post-traumatic stress disorder is widespread, affecting one in five when they return home. Only 40 percent will seek treatment, leaving the remaining three-fifths unaware of their condition, uneducated about the resources available to them, and often fearing that seeking help could hurt their career.

Mr. Speaker, our servicemen and -women deserve the best treatment, and so I pledge to continue supporting initiatives that put our troops and veterans first.

I am honored to stand here today to raise awareness about post-traumatic stress disorder and urge others to fight the fight to combat this terrible disease.

CELEBRATING JUNETEENTH

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Juneteenth, a celebration that commemorates the ultimate implementation of the Emancipation Proclamation.

Mr. Speaker, 150 years ago, on June 19, 1865, Union soldiers marched into Galveston, Texas, with the news that the Civil War had ended and the enslaved were now free. Two and a half years after President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation, its promise was realized at least.

Juneteenth is a celebration of African American freedom, and it also serves as a reminder to constantly strive for the expression and extension of the American idea—one of freedom, independence, and liberty.

This year, I had the honor to join in the 40th annual Buffalo Juneteenth Festival, the third largest in the Nation. People of all backgrounds partake in cultural activities that promote and preserve the African American heritage.

Juneteenth has established its position as an important tradition in western New York and in neighborhoods, towns, and cities throughout America.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Juneteenth to celebrate our Nation's rich African American history.

YWCA BRADFORD

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the YWCA of Bradford, Pennsylvania, on celebrating its 100-year anniversary.

The YWCA of Bradford, which started as the Young Women's Christian League in 1915, seeks to eliminate racism; empower women; and promote peace, justice, freedom, and dignity for all.

In the 1980s, the YWCA was converted from a social organization to one based on service. Since then, it has been the home of McKean County's first program to provide services to victims of domestic and sexual assault.

During its centennial year, the YWCA of Bradford expanded its programs to include services and shelters for the homeless, mentally ill, and intellectually disabled. Meals on Wheels and a food pantry are among the other new amenities offered by the organization.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to honor an organization that has worked so hard to improve its community, and I thank the YWCA of Bradford for its dedicated service to the citizens of McKean County, Pennsylvania.

LET'S ACT TO CUT DOWN GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, last week, we witnessed an act of pure hatred and evil in Charleston, South Carolina.

This is a time to mourn the victims, to pray for their families, for a community to heal, and for Congress to take action against unchecked and widespread gun violence.

Thirty-plus people are killed every day by someone using a gun. Mass shootings are becoming almost commonplace; yet we continue to do nothing. No legislation will stop every tragedy, but passing commonsense gun laws will at least stop some. We need to pass background checks as our first line of defense against criminals and the dangerously mentally ill getting guns.

We don't know what laws could have prevented the shooting in Charleston, but we do know that background checks help keep guns from dangerous people, and that saves lives.

If the Republican leadership has a better idea to cut down on gun violence, let's see it. If not, let's bring commonsense, bipartisan reforms like my bill to expand criminal background checks up for a vote.

BLUE STAR MOTHERS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, it is time we recognize the important role Blue Star Mothers play in supporting our troops by passing my bipartisan resolution which calls for August 2015 to be designated as Blue Star Mothers of America Month.

The Blue Star Mothers have been tireless advocates for our troops and have assisted by providing hundreds of thousands of care packages, sending letters to troops stationed overseas, and hosting thousands of events and ceremonies.

Blue Star Mothers of America is a nonprofit, nonpartisan service organization that was chartered by Congress in 1960 and has currently over 11,000 members in 42 States.

Women who have a son or daughter that is currently serving or previously served in the U.S. Armed Forces are eligible for membership. Many of these Blue Star Mothers have seen their loved ones sent into harm's way.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to stand with the Blue Star Mothers of America and support House Resolution 140.

STEVE WILBURN DOESN'T GET IT

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, there is just one more congressional workday before the charter for the U.S. Export-Import Bank expires. If Republicans allow it to expire, thousands of Americans will lose their jobs and many small-business owners will be hurt, people like Steve Wilburn.

Steve is a pretty amazing guy. He is a former marine who was wounded in Vietnam; he owns a small business, and he is a Republican. Today, Steve runs a biomass-to-energy company, and thanks to the help of our Ex-Im Bank, he had a tentative $300 million deal with the Philippines; but they sent him a letter saying that, if the Ex-Im Bank goes under, so does his deal. Steve won't get the contract, and instead, it will go to a South Korean firm using a South Korean export bank.

Perhaps our ideologically driven friends on the right can explain to Steve and to his employees who are going to lose their jobs why this is a good thing.

We should join together. Let's pass the Ex-Im Bank for American jobs.

NATIONAL DAIRY MONTH

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

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Minnesota's dairy industry and National Dairy Month.

In my home State, dairy is one of our largest agricultural products. We are one of the Nation's top dairy-producing States, and Stearns County, in my district, is the top dairy-producing county in Minnesota.

Dairy farming is more than a profession; it is a way of life for many Minnesota families. I have had the privilege of visiting dairy farms across my district and have seen firsthand the hard work these men and women do day in and day out. From waking up before sunrise to milk their cows, to breeding, to delivering and raising newborn calves, it is just another day at the office for these folks.

I am proud of Minnesota's dairy industry, and I hope that every American will take some time to grab an ice cream cone and appreciate the hard work that goes into making some of our Nation's favorite food.

Happy Dairy Month to all of our hard-working farmers.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

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

Mr. WALZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleagues who have spoken before in support of the Export-Import Bank, which is an absolutely vital tool that helps businesses of all sizes compete in the world market.

It does this not by competing with private sector lenders, but by partnering with them. The Bank fills gaps and provides loans to folks that the private sector is often unwilling or often unable to provide, and it costs the taxpayers nothing. In fact, since 1990, it has generated $7 billion in deficit reduction.

The Export-Import Bank is overwhelmingly supported by Republicans and Democrats; business groups, like the Chamber of Commerce; and labor, like the AFL–CIO. Presidents Eisenhower, Reagan, Bush, Clinton, and Obama have all been on board.

It sure seems like a commonsense measure, right? I think we have all learned in this Congress that a small, vocal extremist minority can derail the most bipartisan measures. Unfortunately, this is exactly what is happening.

I ask you, Speaker BOEHNER, to not allow that small, vocal extreme minority derail a very good program. That is not the way our government is supposed to work.

Southern Minnesota is working, too. Businesses like Davisco, Fastenal, and AGCO all rely on the Bank. The last thing they need is for Congress to get in the way and stop the growth, putting their prosperity at risk.

Speaker BOEHNER, all we are asking for is a simple thing. Bring it to the floor, and let us vote. If it passes, America is better off.

ARKANSAS RAZORBACK BASEBALL

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

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the University of Arkansas Razorback baseball team on their successful 2015 season.

After winning their regional and super regional play, they made it to the College World Series in Omaha, Nebraska. This was the Omahogs' eighth trip to the College World Series and their fourth under the leadership of Coach Dave Van Horn.

While their season may have come to an end last week, they still have many reasons to be proud. On April 4 of this year, the team was idling with a .500 record, and postseason play seemed doubtful. They then embarked on one of the greatest turnarounds in the program's history, winning 25 of their next 35 games to finish the season with an impressive 40–25 record.

With their seemingly limitless enthusiasm and spirit, the Razorbacks represented themselves on the national stage with the determination and dedication that made all Arkansans and Arkansas alumni proud.

Congratulations on a great season, and I look forward to your continued success.

Go Hogs, go.

LET'S DREAM AGAIN

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

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, the other day, I was out in my community and was introduced to a young man, Tyus Ashby, of Boy Scout Troop 447.

Tyus and I got into a conversation, and he discovered I was on the Space Subcommittee. He asked if he could write me a letter. It is one of the requirements to get a Boy Scout merit badge. The other day, my staff passed me Tyus' letter, and I want to read from it.

> Congressman, you told me you are on the committee that looks into why we aren't going to space right now. I hope you can convince them to try again. There is so much more for us to discover. I hope you tell the other people on the committee that kids like me hope they won't let the space program end before we grow up and get to be part of it. We might be missing out on something really fun and important.

Mr. Speaker, let's dream again. Let's explore. Let's invest in the research that is going to take us to the next generation, to Mars, and all the technologies that come with it. Let's not let Tyus' generation down.

□ 1230

ALZHEIMER'S AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize June as Alzheimer's Awareness Month.

In 2014, approximately 270,000 Pennsylvania seniors were diagnosed and living with Alzheimer's disease. Just a little over a decade from now, in 2025, this number is expected to jump by nearly 18 percent to 320,000.

According to the Alzheimer's Association, the disease is the sixth leading cause of death in the United States and is the only cause of death in the top 10 that cannot be prevented, cured, or slowed.

As someone who watched his grandmother suffer and ultimately pass away from this horrible disease, I can say that is a startling trend that needs to be reversed starting now. That is why I am proud to have joined the Congressional Task Force on Alzheimer's Disease and committed to support greater coordination and cooperation among patients, caregivers, and healthcare providers.

Together, we can improve the long-term health of those diagnosed, and increase our efforts on combating Alzheimer's, preventing it, curing it, and slowing the disease.

IMMIGRANT HERITAGE MONTH

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark June as Immigrant Heritage Month. I am also proud to represent and support Representative LINDA SÁNCHEZ' House resolution to recognize June as Hispanic Heritage Month.

In the closing days of Immigrant Heritage Month, we celebrate our country being fueled by immigrants from around the world and how America and her immigrants who have built our country are linked and share in a very productive history.

Members of my own staff, people who serve in the military and our armed services, police forces, and all sorts of jobs around our country help add to the history that makes America great. Each weaves their own family's unique experience into the American fabric and makes our country stronger.

Although June 30 marks the end of Immigrant Heritage Month, the universal American ethos of entrepreneurship, inclusion, strength, and resilience unifies all of us and resonates beyond the end of this month. Today and every day, I remain committed to fighting for immigrant families in my district and nationwide.

PERMANENT REAUTHORIZATION OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

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

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the permanent reauthorization of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, an important program that benefits every American.

LWCF was founded 50 years ago to utilize revenue from energy projects to fund important conservation efforts. In total, it has conserved approximately 7 million acres of land and water resources, including mountains, forest, waterways, nature trails, and other beautiful aspects of our natural environment.

In New York's 19th District, for example, several different projects have benefited, including the Rensselaer Plateau Alliance's Community Forest and, potentially soon, a new improvement to the Appalachian Trail.

Unfortunately, this critical program expires in about 100 days, potentially jeopardizing important funding for many local communities, States, and private organizations. We simply can't let that happen. We must permanently reauthorize this important program.

AFFIRMING MARRIAGE EQUALITY

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of affirming marriage equality and providing equal protection guarantees to LGBT Americans throughout our country. Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming majority of the American public supports marriage equality. They know that same-sex couples should have access to dignity and security that only marriage can provide.

In 37 States in our Nation, this is already a reality. Today, more than 70 percent of our population live in jurisdictions where they are free to marry whom they love. However, at this very moment, marriage discrimination is still openly practiced in 13 States, taking away the securities and protections, financial and otherwise, that many Americans have, but not our LGBT Americans.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker; the failure or prohibition to recognize and allow same-sex couples to marry is discrimination. The fight for marriage equality for our LGBT brothers and sisters is one of the great civil rights battles of our lifetime, and it continues through our tireless efforts to achieve full equality under the law for all.

A positive Supreme Court decision on marriage is an important step towards ending the discrimination that too many American families are suffering because of where they live and whom they love. Mr. Speaker, it is the year 2015. It is well past time we end the discrimination against our LGBT Americans.

THE PROTECT MEDICAL INNOVATION ACT

(Mr. ALLEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, for too long, Americans all across the Nation have felt the devastating effects of the President's healthcare plan, also known as ObamaCare. One of its many harmful provisions is the job-killing medical device tax, a $30 billion tax hike on medical device manufacturers that has crippled growth in this industry to pay for this flawed program.

For this reason, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 160, the Protect Medical Innovation Act, which eliminates the 2.3 percent excise tax imposed on the sale of medical devices by ObamaCare and passed in the House on a bipartisan basis.

As we continue working for full repeal of ObamaCare, this is a step in the right direction to eliminate this job-killing provision in ObamaCare that hinders our economy and hurts patients' access to quality care.

I encourage my colleagues in the Senate to quickly pass this legislation to spur innovation and bring down healthcare costs.

RECOGNIZING THE VICTIMS OF THE CHARLESTON SHOOTING

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the victims of the tragic shooting last week in Charleston: Reverend Clementa Pinckney, Sharonda Coleman-Singleton, Depayne Middleton-Doctor, Tywanza Sanders, Myra Thompson, Daniel Simmons, Susie Jackson, Ethel Lance, and Cynthia Hurd. My thoughts and prayers are with their families.

And I congratulate South Carolina for trying to lower the Confederate flag. It is the right thing to do.

But we don't stop these tragedies by retiring a racist relic. We stop them by fixing our broken gun laws, gun laws that are failing to keep guns out of the hands of those who seek to do us harm.

To fix them, Congress must act. But what has our response been? Silence: silence after Aurora, silence after Tucson, silence after Newtown, silence after daily acts of gun violence.

Mr. Speaker, America should never accept all this mourning, all this heartbreak, and all this gun violence. And shame on this United States Congress if we remain silent after Charleston.

THE RATEPAYER PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, tonight the House will vote on the Ratepayer Protection Act, which is a response to the EPA's proposed 111(d) rule.

The divide between what is right for job creation and the policies coming out of this administration continues to grow deeper. I have heard from countless farmers, manufacturers, businesses, and families who are concerned with the EPA's overreach and what it means for them.

In February, Administrator McCarthy asserted that no EPA rule has ever cost a single job. This is absolutely absurd and demonstrates a myopia that is absolutely stunning.

Outside of the national debt, the EPA, in general—and this proposed rule, specifically—represents one of the greatest threats to the economic prosperity of this Nation.

Our economy is recovering, and many folks are just getting back on their feet. But with this proposed rule and many others, the EPA wants to rip the rug right out from under the American people.

Families and businesses depend on access to affordable and reliable electricity. EPA's proposed 111(d) rule for existing power plants will increase rates by nearly 14 percent.

North Carolina has already reduced CO_2 power plant emissions by 21 percent, without Federal regulations. So for this and many reasons, I urge my colleagues to support the Ratepayer Protection Act.

REAUTHORIZE THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

(Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the things that is actually very difficult to explain to my constituents and to most people who don't follow the ins and outs of Washington.

I was at a plant in my district in northeast Philadelphia just 2 days ago, along with Senator CASEY. This company, Agusta Westland, does excellent work and employs Americans right there in Philadelphia and in Pennsylvania. It benefits from something called the Export-Import Bank, something that has existed for 81 years and has been supported by every single President, both Democrat and Republican.

It is a program that supports 164,000 jobs a year, and just last year, created a $675 million surplus for the taxpayers. So we have a program that helps business, creates jobs, and actually gives to taxpayers rather than taking from them. So, of course, Congress is about to allow this program to expire. It makes absolutely no sense.

It is time for the leadership of this House to listen to the will of the vast majority and not the very vocal extreme minority. Let us reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

AN ANSWERED PRAYER FOR THE PEOPLE OF NEPAL

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a prayer has been answered.

On May 15, I took to this very podium and prayed for the people of Nepal. The prayer was that we would accord them temporary protected status if they were living in the United States. I am proud to say that Homeland Security has now issued a mandate for a 180-day registration period, 18-month temporary protected status.

I am grateful to Congressman CROWLEY and Congresswoman MENG for the letter that they sent to Homeland Security making this request that I was proud to sign on to.

I thank the President of the United States for allowing this to happen.

And, Mr. Speaker, I thank God that the people of Nepal will have an opportunity to stay in this country and not go back to the devastation that they have suffered in Nepal as a result of the earthquakes that took place there.

God bless you, Mr. Speaker, and God bless the United States of America.

WEAR RED WEDNESDAYS TO BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today is Wear Red Wednesday to Bring Back Our Girls.

The news Monday of Boko Haram using two girls as suicide bombers to kill 30 people in northern Nigeria reminds us yet again why we must act now. Please cosponsor House Resolution 147, as amended, to help the Nigerian Government bring back our girls and defeat Boko Haram.

Tomorrow, Congressman SMITH, chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, and I will host a classified briefing from the State Department. I invite you to join in this briefing on the future of Nigeria.

Today, I welcome 38 young girls from Camp Congress for Girls. Please join me on the Capitol steps after the first series of votes to take a group picture with these wonderful little girls. They are from all over the country. They are helping in the fight against Boko Haram, and they are in the gallery today.

Don't forget to tweet, tweet, tweet, #bringbackourgirls. Tweet, tweet, tweet, #joinrepwilson.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2822, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2042, RATEPAYER PROTECTION ACT OF 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JUNE 26, 2015, THROUGH JULY 6, 2015

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 333 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 333

Resolved, That (a) at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2822) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived.

(b) During consideration of the bill for amendment—

(1) each amendment, other than amendments provided for in paragraph (2), shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and shall not be subject to amendment except as provided in paragraph (2);

(2) no pro forma amendment shall be in order except that the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate; and

(3) the chair of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read.

(c) When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2042) to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing carbon dioxide emissions from existing fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units before requiring compliance with such rule, and to allow States to protect households and businesses from significant adverse effects on electricity ratepayers or reliability. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-20. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider concurrent resolutions providing for adjournment during the month of July, 2015.

SEC. 4. On any legislative day during the period from June 26, 2015, through July 6, 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. 5. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 4 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

□ 1245

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 333 provides for a rule to consider important bills that deal with our environment: the first, H.R. 2822, the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2016; and the second, H.R. 2042, the Ratepayer Protection Act of 2015. Each bill will be provided the standard 1 hour of debate, equally divided between the majority and the minority. Further, on each bill, the minority is granted the standard motion to recommit, a chance to amend the legislation one final time prior to its passage.

As with nearly all regular order appropriations bills that have come to the floor under the Republican leadership, the Interior-EPA bill will be considered under a modified open rule, allowing every Member of this body the opportunity to come to the floor and offer amendments to the bill that comply with the House budget rules.

H.R. 2042, the Ratepayer Protection Act, is given a structured rule under the resolution before us today, with the Rules Committee making in order five of the eight amendments offered during consideration of the bill last evening. Of the amendments made in order, one is bipartisan, three were offered by Democrats, and one was offered by a Republican.

H.R. 2822, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2016, provides funding for both the Department of the Interior and the Environmental Protection Agency. This bill provides funding for many of the national parks and recreational facilities throughout the United States. The bill includes over $30 billion in base funding, decreasing the top line level by $246 million below fiscal year 2015 and cutting $3 billion from the President's budget request.

This spending reduction is necessary to rein in an out-of-control Environmental Protection Agency that is moving at breakneck speed to regulate every aspect of our economy. Following the failure of the House and Senate Democrats to get the disastrous Waxman-Markey cap-and-trade legislation to President Obama's desk in 2009, Lisa Jackson and, now, Gina McCarthy, both administrators of the Environmental Protection Agency, have moved forward with regulatory regimes under the guise of the Clean Air Act to go around Congress to regulate carbon after the American people explicitly rose up and said do not do this.

The Energy and Commerce Committee has held countless hearings and markups to address the out-of-control efforts by the Environmental Protection Agency and has taken over the past few years to push President Obama's harmful environmental policies onto a populace that has rejected those same policies at the ballot box. From carbon dioxide to ozone to every stream, puddle, ditch, pond in America, the Environmental Protection Agency

will not rest until it has regulatory control over every aspect of every life in America.

The appropriations bill before us is an important step toward reining in such a power-hungry agency. The bill contains prohibitions on the Department of the Interior's attempts to regulate hydraulic fracturing, a process that President Obama's own Environmental Protection Agency recently stated has not resulted in any significant environmental or health harms. It includes a provision preventing the Environmental Protection Agency from proposing new ozone standards until at least 85 percent of the country is able to meet current standards, which would seem to be a reasonable request. It prohibits the Environmental Protection Agency from moving forward with new greenhouse gas regulations, regulations that the American people have never supported. And it prohibits the Environmental Protection Agency from moving forward with regulating every stream and pond in the country, an issue that the Supreme Court has rejected and that farmers and landowners all across America have risen up to oppose.

Even more than the funding levels in this bill, passing the House Interior Appropriations bill will keep the Environmental Protection Agency from doing further damage to the United States economy than has already been done by this administration. Mr. Speaker, I will just point out, we were greeted with the news that in the first quarter of this year, the economy actually contracted by 0.2 percent. That is not the direction that we need to go.

The second bill contained in today's rule is H.R. 2042, the Ratepayer Protection Act of 2015, which does address the Environmental Protection Agency's job-killing carbon rules on existing power plants. The bill allows for judicial review of any final rule pertaining to greenhouse gas emissions before requiring compliance with such a rule and allows States to protect households and businesses from significant adverse effects on electricity ratepayers or reliability. This seems like a reasonable ask, that the EPA's own rule, which we know will be litigated anyway, not go into effect until the courts have had a final say on whether or not the Environmental Protection Agency actually followed the law.

The Environmental Protection Agency's proposed regulation on greenhouse gases, a regulation that the Democrats couldn't achieve through legislation, places different limits on different States, allowing the Environmental Protection Agency to pick winners and losers in the carbon wars.

If a State does not comply with the strict guidelines that the Environmental Protection Agency sets out for its electricity market, then the EPA will force its own Federal plan on the State, driving up the cost to ratepayers exponentially.

The EPA's own estimates of this rule—just the rule, without any mention of the other disastrously expensive rules that it is currently proposing, such as the ozone regulations—suggest that the carbon rule for existing power plants will impose annual costs of $5.5 billion to $7.5 billion by 2020, and almost $9 billion by 2030. All of those costs will be passed on to every American who pays an electricity bill.

Of course, as we have seen in previous rules, the Environmental Protection Agency consistently underestimates the cost of its rules to hide the ball from the American people about the true damage that is actually being proposed by the Agency. Outside estimates put the cost of this one regulation at upwards of well over $360 billion to almost $500 billion between 2017 and 2031. That level of harm to the United States economy is insane after seeing such a slow recovery under the current President, but it is exactly what Administrator Gina McCarthy is proposing.

State Governors, regulators, and other stakeholders have submitted thousands of comments on this rule, explaining how difficult it will be to implement and prevent rates from increasing, but those pleas appear to have hit a dead end. The Environmental Protection Agency is moving forward with these rules, and this bill before us presents one of the great opportunities to slow them down before irreversible damage is done to the economy.

Mr. Speaker, the House is moving forward with important legislation today to make the government more accountable. I look forward to both bills having a full debate on the House floor after the passage of today's rule.

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

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

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to allow for consideration of legislation that would reauthorize the Export-Import Bank for 7 years. The Export-Import Bank allows American businesses to compete in global markets and supports hundreds of thousands of jobs.

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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

□ 1300

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, we have one legislative day until the expiration of the Export-Import Bank's authorization. We are going to get to talk about this EPA rule in a few minutes, but there are many Members on my side of the aisle who want to bring forward in the form of a previous question, the only procedural way that we can advance this important piece of legislation to the floor before the House goes home in July, to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

Reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank would strengthen our Nation's economy. It would provide stability and certainty for American businesses. The Export-Import Bank assists tens of thousands of small-and medium-sized businesses throughout the country. In fact, nearly 90 percent of Export-Import's transactions are with small businesses, and the Bank directly supports 164,000 private sector jobs at over 3,300 companies.

In August, I was honored to receive a visit from Export-Import Bank President Fred Hochberg, who came to my district to highlight the kinds of jobs and companies that Export-Import really benefits and discuss ways that it can work together with some of our local Colorado small businesses. Together, we visited Boulder-based Droplet Measurement Technologies, which was named the Export-Import Bank's 2015 Small Business Exporter of the Year for its work in cloud and aerosol measurements. Roughly two-thirds of this small company's sales come from exports.

Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of growing business that Export-Import Bank supports—export-related jobs so important in today's global economy—not just the brand names, not big companies, but the types of small-and mid-sized firms that need and deserve our support to compete on the global market.

FiberLok in Fort Collins is a specialty-based printing company in my district that provides heat transfer graphic products like computer mouses and drink coaster rugs. It is family-owned with 70 employees, and about 40 percent of its business is international. They sell worldwide, including Germany, Mexico, and the U.K. In 2008, the company discovered Export-Import Bank through a direct mail campaign that targeted small businesses, and they have been using the small business multibuyer credit insurance since, and through that, with the help of that program, export sales have grown 15 to 20 percent, and the Bank has supported over 2.7 million of FiberLok's exports.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that there are some on the other side of the aisle that have a philosophical problem with the existence of the charter of the authorization for this Bank. If that is the case, surely unilateral disarmament is not the solution. Perhaps instruct our trade negotiators to remove backdoor subsidies at other export-import banks that other nations have, but as long as these types of efforts are permitted under WTO and trade rules, and as long as other nations support the export economy in their countries through programs like the Export-Import Bank, why would we want to unilaterally disarm? It makes no sense and puts American businesses and American exporters at a disadvantage and would lead to the outsourcing of even more jobs overseas.

Financing assistance from this Bank—which, incidentally, costs zero money to taxpayers—helps ensure that U.S. companies are competing on a level playing field. Canada, China, and Japan, over 60 other nations, have similar banks that extend even more export financing to their businesses.

Mr. Speaker, there is strong, bipartisan support for the renewal of the Bank's charter. I urge every Member who supports that to help defeat the previous question so we can offer our amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the great State of California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), to discuss the previous question and the Export-Import Bank.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Colorado, as well as Leader PELOSI and Whip HOYER, for continuing to fight for the survival of the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Speaker, with just 1 day left for Congress to act before the Ex-Im Bank shuts down, I am shocked that my Republican colleagues are planning to leave town without even considering legislation to review its charter. Democrats will not sit idly by. That is why I rise today to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question in order to force a vote on legislation sponsored by myself, Mr. HECK, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HOYER, and nearly every other Democrat in this House to renew and reform the Export-Import Bank's charter for the long term.

Over the past 5 years, the Export-Import Bank has created or sustained an estimated 1.3 million jobs, and it has returned $6.9 billion to the American people over the past two decades. But next Tuesday, that record of success will be stopped in its tracks. The Export-Import Bank will stop creating jobs and supporting our small businesses. It will stop returning profits to the Treasury, and it will stop helping to make our businesses more competitive.

Failure to act hands countries like China, Russia, and countless others that have their own version of the bank a significant victory—at the hands of American workers' products and businesses. But we haven't given up yet. Today we are giving the broad base of Democrats and Republicans who support the Bank an opportunity to cast a vote in favor of keeping this engine of job creation and economic growth alive.

Last week my Republican colleagues who support the Bank failed to stand up for its survival. But with just 1 more day for Congress to save the Bank from shutting down, I am afraid that those who claim to support the Export-Import Bank but refuse to stand up and do so do not truly support the Bank or the jobs it creates.

Mr. Speaker, businesses need to know that our government will stand up for them, not work to undermine them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 20 seconds.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to heed the advice of Ronald Reagan, George W. Bush, and Bill Clinton, all of whom supported the Export-Import Bank.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to myself.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind the Chair that the issue under consideration today before the House of Representatives is H. Res. 333, which provides for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2822, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; and further providing for the consideration of H.R. 2042, to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing carbon dioxide emissions from existing fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units before requiring compliance with such rule, and to allow States to protect households and businesses from significant adverse effects on electricity ratepayers or reliability.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip.

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

Mr. Speaker, my friend, Dr. BURGESS, has just made an observation, that this resolution is about the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee Appropriations bill. I will tell Mr. Speaker, as you know—and the American people, I am sure, know—that that Agency is funded through September 30 of this year, which means we have months to go before it will run out of funds.

The other bill that he mentions, of course, as you know, is about a proposal, not a rule. It may be a rule at some point in time, but it is a proposal which has no absolute definite need to be done today or next week or next month.

However, Mr. Speaker, the Export-Import Bank, if we do not act by tomorrow, loses its authority to loan money or to support—not to loan money, but to support the selling of goods from America by American workers to those abroad.

We just went through a trade debate which was about jobs and whether or not it was going to undermine jobs in America. Now, my previous colleague, Ms. WATERS, mentioned President Reagan, she mentioned President Bush, and she mentioned President Clinton. But the person who says we are going to lose jobs if we don't pass the Export-Import Bank is the Speaker of this House, Mr. Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER of Ohio. He says, if we don't pass this, we are immediately going to start losing jobs—JOHN BOEHNER, Speaker of the House from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 1031—a bill to protect thousands of American jobs by preventing the Export-Import Bank from shutting down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Does the gentleman from Texas yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I do not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, again, I will just remind the House that what is under consideration is a rule resolution, H. Res. 333, for consideration of the appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior and H.R. 2042 to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing carbon dioxide emissions.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), a champion of reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 1031, which is within its power to do—a bill to protect thousands of American jobs by preventing the shutting down of the Export-Import Bank.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Texas yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I would reiterate my earlier announcement that all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only, and I do not yield time for any other purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas does not yield. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 1031—a bill to protect thousands of American jobs by preventing the Export-Import Bank from being shut down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Texas does not yield for that purpose. Therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. ASHFORD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 1031—a bill to protect thousands of American jobs by preventing the Export-Import Bank from shutting down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 1031—a bill to protect thousands of American jobs by preventing the Export-Import Bank from shutting down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 1031—a bill to protect thousands of American jobs by preventing the Export-Import Bank from shutting down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 1031—a bill to protect hundreds of thousands of American jobs by preventing the shutdown of the Ex-Im Bank.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 1031—a bill to protect thousands of American jobs by preventing the Export-Import Bank from shutting down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as you might be able to predict, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 1031—a bill that would protect thousands of American jobs by preventing the shutdown of the Export-Import Bank.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, we were hoping at least Mr. BOYLE's would be accepted. But, Mr. Speaker, I yield to another Member of Congress from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS), a leader in the fight to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 1031—a bill to protect thousands of American jobs by preventing the Export-Import Bank from shutting down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the ranking member of the Committee on Rules, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House bring up H.R. 1031—a bill to protect thousands of American jobs by preventing the Export-Import Bank from shutting down. It is most important in my district.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to myself.

Again, I just want to underscore that the issue under consideration on the House floor today is to consider H. Res. 333, to provide for consideration of the bill, H.R. 2822, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment and related agencies, and to provide for consideration of the bill, H.R. 2042, to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing carbon dioxide emissions.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), a leader in the effort to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am going to get an enormous frustration off my chest today, the obsessive-compulsive focus of this Chamber on the Ts: trade, trade promotion authority, Trans-Pacific Partnership, and trade adjustment authority. This view that we can distill our entire Nation's future trading prospects to one trade agreement or the TPA leading up to it is wrongheaded, it is myopic, and it does not serve our self-interest. The fact of the matter is, in order for us to be successful in a global economy, we must be much more complex and nuanced in our view.

□ 1315

Infrastructure—we don't even spend two-thirds of the money generated by the harbor maintenance tax, which is generated by trade, on improving the ports so that we can have more trade. Where is that issue?

The International Monetary Fund, 5 years hanging loose the reform. We are Nero; Rome is burning. No reforms to the IMF—and what is the consequence? This is real. This isn't abstract. I didn't make this up. China forms the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank; Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa form the BRICS Bank—all of this while we sit and watch Rome burn.

Lastly, the Export-Import Bank is a deficit-cutting, job-creating machine—$6 billion to reduce our deficit, 164,000 thousand jobs in the country just last year. Ninety-five percent, as has so often been said, of the world's population lives outside the borders of the great country of the United States of America.

If we want to keep our middle class, we are going to have to learn how to sell into their middle class and engage in global trade, but it is more complex than just one trade agreement or IMF or what we do with the infrastructure investment. It is all of these things.

Yes, at the top of that list, the Export-Import Bank, a deficit-cutting, job-creating machine, we need to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank—1 day left—because the layoff notices are going out next week.

People will lose that which they value more than anything in life, save their family; and that is the opportunity to be self-sufficient and provide for themselves.

Ladies and gentlemen, I beseech you, vote against the previous question, bring up H.R. 1031, reauthorize the Export-Import Bank in the name of cutting deficits and creating jobs.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, you have heard what we will bring up if we defeat the previous question. You will now hear what this body under this rule has chosen to consider instead—a bill that, as Mr. HOYER said, could be done any time and a bill that is bad.

To explain that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), the distinguished member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I rise in opposition to House Resolution 333.

The Interior Appropriations bill is a disaster, not only because it would continue the pattern of underfunding core Department of Interior programs and ignoring climate change, but also because it is littered with partisan legislative riders that don't belong in an appropriations bill.

This rule does nothing to improve the bill, and even includes waivers to protect these illegitimate riders. Republicans make the rules, but through this appropriations bill, they seek to break their own rules and sneak significant legislative changes into this spending bill.

The riders protected by this rule would make species extinction more likely, close the courthouse door to American citizens, and grease the wheels for Big Business to make private profits from public resources.

These are all terrible ideas, but they are terrible ideas that should be considered in the Natural Resources Committee, not snuck into an Interior spending bill.

I have the honor of serving as the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee, and I would tell my colleagues: we have hearing rooms and a full staff, and if you support delisting endangered species or prohibiting judicial review of resource decisions or giving away public resources to wealthy companies, you should put your name on a bill and come over to 1324 in the Longworth Building for a hearing.

While I cannot speak for the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, as ranking member, I cannot agree to cede jurisdiction over management of our Federal natural resources to appropriators, and I cannot support a rule designed to allow it.

Even though the best available science indicates otherwise, section 121 of the underlying bill would direct the Secretary to reissue two final rules removing wolves in Wyoming and the Great Lakes from the endangered species list.

Another rider would make it more difficult to protect the habitat of the threatened northern long-eared bat. We aren't the experts. We should not interfere with the species listing and recovery processes at all, let alone interfere through an appropriations bill where the merits of such proposals cannot be given any appropriate consideration. This is why the House rules prohibit these riders, and this rule should not protect them.

Another awful rider would block the Fish and Wildlife Service from cracking down on illegal ivory trade within the U.S. Poaching of elephants and trafficking of illegal ivory is currently at an all-time 25-year high here in the U.S., and the U.S. is one of the major markets for the sale of illegal ivory.

Section 120 of the underlying bill would restrict our ability to regulate the trade of elephant ivory in the U.S. and will directly contribute to elephant slaughter. House rules prohibit these kinds of sneaky, partisan riders in spending bills for a good reason, and we should not adopt a rule to protect these provisions.

If these provisions are so toxic that they can only be passed by waiving House rules, they shouldn't be passed at all.

Either way, the question should be considered in the authorizing committee, not in an appropriations bill and not in this rule.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind the gentleman from Arizona that this appropriations bill is coming to the floor, as has been the custom during the Republican majority, under a modified open rule, which means that any Member is able to bring an amendment to the floor of the House and have it heard.

This, of course, includes limitation amendments that would be heard at the end of the reading of the bill that would allow for the striking of any of the provisions that he finds objectionable. Then all that is necessary for the gentleman to do is to convince 218 Members of this body to vote with him on an amendment, and he will be able to accomplish his heart's desire.

A modified open rule is a good process, and it does allow the will of the House to be heard on this bill. I look forward to us affirming the previous question, passing the rule to allow the bill to be heard, and then we can get on to the business at hand.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I think the problem with the idea of the gentleman from Texas is that the base bill is so bad, it could take this body weeks or months to fix it. Meanwhile, we are 1 day away from the Export-Import Bank's reauthorization.

At least let's get that done, and then we are happy to begin the work of trying to fix this terrible bill. Although, again, it might be more productive just to defeat it, send it back to Appropriations, and have them come up with a better base bill.

I am proud to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. As he points out, we are 1 legislative day away from the end of the authorization of the Ex-Im Bank.

American businesses are already losing contracts as foreign companies must decide whether to structure themselves around American equipment or whether to buy equipment from another source. That foreign source offers stable export promotion authority financing provided by the governments of Germany, Japan, China, et cetera; whereas, we dawdle here.

The purpose of a rule is to decide how the House will devote its time here on the floor. The most pressing matter before us is the Export-Import Bank. That is why we should defeat the rule and focus the House on the most pressing matter, and we should allow the House to work its will. A majority of this body wants to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank, but instead, we are being held hostage by a group inside only one of the two caucuses.

I gave 100 speeches for George McGovern. I am proud of that. We were accused of unilateral disarmament being our platform. This is a platform for unilateral disarmament because this is a platform that says Germany, Japan, and China will provide concessionary financing to push their exports, and we will be disarmed in the world of business.

The Export-Import Bank makes money. The CBO concludes that; generally accepted accounting principles conclude that. The enemies of the Bank have concocted a fantasy accounting system, and only under that system, used nowhere else, is there any argument that the Export-Import Bank does not make money.

We have hundreds of thousands of American jobs at stake. They should not be sacrificed on the alter of a new religion. Ayn Rand is not a deity; ''Fountainhead'' is not Holy Scripture, and we need to make practical decisions in the real world where we face real competition from real competitors.

That is why we need to focus the attention of this House on today's most pressing issue, the reauthorization of Ex-Im Bank.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. ASHFORD), a leader in the effort to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I rise today to express my support for the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

The Ex-Im Bank is an independent, self-sustaining executive branch agency with one mission, to foster American job growth by helping American companies with the tools they need to compete in the global marketplace.

In short, the Ex-Im Bank provides the business community the certainty it needs to compete in overseas markets and grow jobs at home.

Why am I so supportive of the Ex-Im Bank and its reauthorization? In my district alone, in the month of May, the Ex-Im Bank provided $3.8 million worth of Nebraska's export goods into the global marketplace, companies as large as Valmont Industries, one of the largest manufacturers of center pivot irrigation systems in the world, and companies as small as Volcanic Peppers, that in a small kitchen produced hot sauce that is exported to Australia.

In fiscal year 2014, the Ex-Im Bank supported approximately $107 million in Nebraska exports, 49 percent of which went to Nebraska small businesses.

Since 2007, the Bank has supported $230 million in exports from 52 Iowa companies and $550 million in exports from 39 Nebraska companies. This translates into American private sector jobs in every district of this country.

In real terms, the Ex-Im Bank helps to level the playing field for both large and small businesses who export products abroad.

Simply put, there is no rational reason, Mr. Speaker, for allowing American products and American goods to have a disadvantage in the global marketplace.

Congress must reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank immediately, and I am committed to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to make this happen.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I think it is clear what we would like to do, what Democrats would like to do, like the probusiness Members of this House would try to do, we want to, with 1 legislative day left, bring forward a reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank for the reasons that have been made abundantly clear by my Democratic colleagues and I know an idea that is shared by many, perhaps less outspoken, Members on your side of the aisle who also support reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank.

Let's have a clean vote. If we defeat the previous question, that is exactly what we will bring forward, a 7-year authorization that I believe will pass this body.

Now, let's talk about what this House is choosing to do instead under these rules—two bills that are not urgent, are not timely, both of which would need Presidential vetoes: the Ratepayer Protection Act of 2015, which I will talk about, which, again, will go nowhere, even if it gets out of both chambers, will get a Presidential veto and won't have two-thirds in this body to override; and Interior Appropriations, which needs to be done, but could be done next week, while we are up against a deadline of the expiration of the Export-Import Bank.

The Ratepayer Protection Act pertains to the recently proposed clean power plan, which establishes emission guidelines for States to follow in developing plans to control carbon pollution from existing coal and natural gas-fired power plants.

Like so many Presidential initiatives, it stems out of the President's legitimate authority to act in areas under his statutory authority when this body fails to act.

I applaud the President for using his existing executive powers on immigration. I applaud the President for using his existing executive powers for a clean power plan to work with the States and the EPA.

□ 1330

What this bill would do, however, is suspend the implementation of the clean power plan and extend all compliance and submission deadlines until a judicial review can be completed, already in process.

On this point, let me make one thing very clear, that there is no existent rule and that the proposed clean power plan is a proposal. Let's give the executive branch the opportunity to at least come forward with a final proposal before this body decides that it somehow wants to invalidate that very proposal.

I have discussed this proposal with many folks in my district, and there are issues that need to be worked out to make this regulation feasible. I have talked to and heard from rural electric utilities and from many others, and we all want to make sure that ratepayers are not detrimentally impacted, but the answer is not to cut the process short.

That is why developers are actually working with the EPA through a public input process, which includes rural electric utilities and others, an unprecedented reach of outreach opportunities that the EPA is doing, including in my district.

They are saying that they want to amend this proposed rule to make it work better. If a majority of this body doesn't like the final result, then it is time to talk about how we want to amend it and how this body would rather deal with emissions and carbon reduction.

There are plenty of other opportunities. Several years ago, this body considered a cap-and-trade program. I am a cosponsor of a bill with Mr. DELANEY that would implement a carbon tax and would use the income from that to reduce the corporate tax rate and reduce the tax burden on American businesses.

There are plenty of good ideas out there, but let's at least see what the administration and the EPA come up with and then respond to its final proposal with meaningful legislation to address our carbon emissions.

Passing this bill now would prematurely undermine the EPA's collaborative effort, instead of encouraging them to involve multiple stakeholders in reducing carbon emissions. Under current law, the EPA is required to develop and implement a Federal plan for any State that fails to submit its own State plan.

This means that the passage of this bill would overturn that existing requirement in the Clean Air Act as it pertains to the clean power plan, which means the State would find itself in a place in which, if it fails to utilize the flexibility this rule provides, it might have a plan that they have not been part of forming.

I urge my colleagues to reflect on a position that not only disregards science but that runs in opposition to business, to the religious community, and to our national and global security. Congress can constructively weigh in on reducing carbon emissions, and I encourage this body to do so.

There are a number of great bills that would provide a statutory mechanism to reduce our carbon emissions. Instead of going that route, this body is saying that we don't even want to see what the President comes up with or what the EPA comes up with. We want to invalidate it before they even finalize it. We want to invalidate the hard work of listening to rural electric utilities; of listening to ratepayer groups; and, instead, throw it all out because, somehow, politicians in Washington know better. That is simply not the right answer, and the American people will not stand for it.

Let's talk about the other bill that the Republicans are bringing forth under this rule instead of reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank—the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations bill.

First of all, I always try to talk about what is good in a bill. I do want to commend the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee for including the Payments in Lieu of Taxes program, or PILT.

As a Representative of a district that is 62 percent owned by the Federal Government and, therefore, untaxable by our local taxing jurisdictions, I know how important it is to ensure the sustainability of our county programs, particularly those that affect our Federal lands; but much of the remainder of the bill and the reasoning for my opposition to it is the drastic approach it takes to nearly every other environmental, energy, and animal welfare issue facing our Nation.

The bill fails to deal with the issue of fire sharing, which is a mechanism utilized that takes money from the Forest Service and gives it to emergency response systems in the wake of wildfires. This limits the Forest Service's resources and capabilities that could be used for the protection of the watershed and for the insurance of access and accountability of maintenance on Forest Service lands, especially those like some in my district that are affected by forest fires.

This bill sets backward priorities for the Bureau of Land Management, funding the continuation and expansion of oil and gas permitting when it doesn't facilitate the zoning of solar or wind projects as my bipartisan bill with Mr. GOSAR would do.

The National Park Service, facing a backlog of over $11 billion, is drastically cut under this bill. The bill also fails to address the fact that offshore oil and gas operations require an inspection fee while onshore wells do not.

This bill fails to address the looming expiration of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which helps American citizens, businesses, homeowners, and communities protect important lands and resources.

It also includes, as Mr. GRIJALVA pointed out, a number of policy riders, any one of which would be grounds for a veto by the President of the United States. It fails to adequately fund the Environmental Protection Agency, and it circumvents its ability to enforce and ensure protections granted to critical species under the Endangered Species Act.

This bill needs a lot of work. I suggest we reject it, send it back to the Appropriations Committee, and let them come up with a more meaningful effort to fund our Department of the Interior, a goal that all of us share.

I also urge my colleagues to reject the Ratepayer Protection Act of 2015, a bill that seeks to proactively invalidate the process of listening, as the Environmental Protection Agency has done, to many stakeholders across my district and across this country.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that, with 1 day remaining, we can move to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, protect over 130,000 American jobs, help American small businesses compete in an increasingly global economy, and grow our export-related economy in Colorado and across the Nation.

I encourage my colleagues to reject the previous question and reject the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

It was 6 years ago this week. I don't know if many people remember the activities on the House floor 6 years ago this week, but in June of 2009, right before we left for the July 4 recess, the then-Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, brought forward to this floor a bill.

The bill was called Waxman-Markey. It was the cap-and-trade bill. The bill had come through our Committee on Energy and Commerce. I thought it was a dead duck when it left there, but that bill was pushed through to the floor at the end of June 2009.

Madam Speaker, I don't know that I need to remind you that, in 2009, right after the 2008 election, the Republicans were deeply in the minority. People talked about the fact that the Republicans were so far in the minority that 40 years in the wilderness actually sounded like the best case scenario for House Republicans; but something happened, and it began in that last week of June 2009.

Now, a lot of people will credit the change in the House majority to the President's healthcare law—and, indeed, it was ill-advised; and, indeed, it did upset a lot of people very quickly—but prior to that, even before we began having the big debates on the Affordable Care Act—the big debates on what became ObamaCare—the then-Speaker of the House brought to the floor of this House Waxman-Markey.

When people started to look at it, Waxman-Markey, we started to get phone calls. People said: ''I can't sell my house unless the Department of Energy certifies it as reaching certain levels of energy efficiency. How am I supposed to be able to do that? That is not a free society. That is not a free country when I am prohibited from selling the one possession that I had used to accumulate dollars in my estate over my entire life, and I can't sell it without permission from the Department of Energy.''

People were legitimately asking questions about what this cap-and-trade bill will do.

Madam Speaker, I have got to tell you that there are times in this body when there is one of those moments when the incandescent lightbulb goes off. One of those was last night. We were sitting in the Rules Committee, and we were hearing testimony from two Members from Kentucky, one in the majority and one in the minority.

The one in the majority is bringing the bill that we have before us, H.R. 2042, the Ratepayer Protection Act. Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky was explaining what the bill would do and the protections the bill would provide. The other Member from Kentucky, a member of the minority, said, because of the failure of the legislative process, the President was required to act, and this is part of the President's Climate Action Plan.

What the H? A failure of the legislative process?

Madam Speaker, I would submit that the legislative process functioned as intended when Speaker PELOSI brought Waxman-Markey to the floor of this House and this House passed that bill. We went back to our districts that weekend, and I will tell you what we caught.

We caught unmitigated holy ''you know what'' because people were so incensed at the freedoms that Waxman-Markey and the cap-and-trade program would take away from them.

When the gentleman last night said it was a failure of the legislative process and that the President had to act, it was exactly the performance of the legislative process that delivered us from a very bad proposition.

What happened after that? Because the country was in such a convulsion about what the House had done, the visceral and immediate reaction of the people of the United States was: ''Hold the phone; we don't want what they are doing.''

The Senate, which was fully invested in passing a cap-and-trade bill—you had Senators who thought cap-and-trade was the be-all and end-all, and that was the reason they were in the United States Senate—didn't bring it up. It never came up for a vote.

Here was a situation in which the Democrats had—I don't remember what—a 55-seat majority on us here in the House of Representatives and a 60-vote—filibuster-proof—majority over in the Senate, and they couldn't get this done. They couldn't get this done because the people said: ''No. No. Don't do this to me.''

The legislative process worked. The Senate said, ''I haven't got the courage to do this right before the 2010 election,'' and the proposition died at the end of the session that concluded on December 31, 2010. I would just submit that that is a good thing.

Here we have before us a bill today to provide, in some measure, some of the protections about things that people were worried about 6 years ago, but it is precisely because we were where we were 6 years ago that we are now considering a bill that will hold back some of the rulemaking authority from the Environmental Protection Agency.

Madam Speaker, under today's rule, we are providing for the consideration of two important bills, bills that prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from doing irreversible damage to our economy through dozens of ill-advised regulations that Administrator McCarthy is looking to push on the American people before President Obama leaves the White House in January 2017.

The bills are thoughtful responses to one of the most egregious agencies in the administration, and I look forward to a full debate for that reason.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 333 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1031) to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, 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 Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1031.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

The Republican majority may say ''the vote on the previous question is simply a

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HARTZLER). 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. POLIS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 181, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 379]

YEAS—243

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
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
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, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
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—181

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
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
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
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
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—9

Clyburn
Courtney
Delaney
Hanna
Hinojosa
Kelly (MS)
Napolitano
Payne
Sarbanes

□ 1408

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

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, on Wednesday, June 24th, 2015, I was absent during rollcall No. 379. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 333—Rule providing for consideration of both H.R. 2042—Ratepayer Protection Act of 2015 and H.R. 2822—Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BARTON was allowed to speak out of order.)

54TH ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL GAME

Mr. BARTON. Madam Speaker, I rise with an extremely heavy heart to, once again, have to congratulate my good friend MIKE DOYLE, the manager of the Democratic baseball team, for another victory. It is sad, but true. Sad, but true.

On June 11, the Republicans and the Democrats played the Annual Congressional Baseball Game. It was a spirited game, but for the seventh year in a row, Mr. DOYLE's team won. I don't know how to say that.

I will say that our team is back. MARK WALKER, our MVP from North Carolina, pitched a good game. He struck out CEDRIC RICHMOND, which I think is probably the first time CEDRIC has not gotten a hit.

We had new blood: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and several others. Of course, we had our stalwarts: JOHN SHIMKUS; KEVIN BRADY; our whip, STEVE SCALISE.

So we played a good game, but the Democrats deserved to win. They beat us, 5–20.

I will say that it was a pretty low blow to have the President of the United States come and interrupt the game, take away our momentum right when we had a big rally.

I am very proud of the Republican team, but I do want to congratulate MIKE DOYLE and the Democrats.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE).

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. First off, I want to thank my good friend, JOE BARTON. JOE, you know, you used the tools that are at your disposal.

This was a great game. It was good. I think all the fans were treated to a very competitive game this year. We had almost 10,000 people attend the game this year.

As we all know, the real winners here are our charities. This game helps raise money for the Washington Boys & Girls Clubs, the Washington Literacy Council, and the Nationals Dream Foundation. I am happy to report, after expenses, we were able to write checks in excess of $100,000 to each of the three charities. So those are the big winners of the game.

This was a hard-fought game. In the last 3 years that we have played this game, our team has made only one error. We made that this game, but I think the difference in the score was that we made the plays in the field.

Both pitchers were outstanding. Your new pitcher, MARK, we weren't used to that knuckle ball and some of those curves. He kept us off balance, and he pitched a brilliant game. I believe you guys actually had one more hit than we did. You had six and we had five.

CEDRIC RICHMOND, coming off of shoulder surgery, pitched a gutsy game for seven innings. And I should also mention that, after striking out, he hit a double over the center fielder's head, just to throw that in.

I want to also note JOE DONNELLY, our first baseman, made some unbelievable plays at first base that, I think, saved the game for us.

And then, as always, anytime I ask LINDA SÁNCHEZ to put a batting helmet on, she gets a hit. So those three individuals share our team MVPs.

Also, there are lots of ways to contribute, and ERIC SWALWELL stole three bases for us and scored. He did it all on the base pads, and he deserves some notice for that, too.

JOE, I just want to say it was a great game. I want to thank you for how hard your team fought, and we look forward to a competitive game next year.

We know some day, you know, the shoe will be on the other foot. But for the past 7 years, we are kind of enjoying this. So God bless.

Mr. BARTON. Madam Speaker, I want to thank leadership on both sides: our Speaker, JOHN BOEHNER; our majority leader, KEVIN MCCARTHY; and our whip, STEVE SCALISE, who played in the game. On their side, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. CLYBURN were all there. So both leadership supported the game.

It was a good game. We did raise a lot of money for charity.

But I will put you on notice, MIKE DOYLE, the shoe is going to be on the other foot next year. Be ready.

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Talk is cheap, JOE. Bring it on.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 244, noes 178, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 380]

AYES—244

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
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
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, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
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

NOES—178

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
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
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
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—11

Capps
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Courtney
Hanna
Hinojosa
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Napolitano
Payne
Sarbanes

□ 1422

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.

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 24th, 2015, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 380. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on H. Res. 333—Rule providing for consideration of both H.R. 2042—Ratepayer Protection Act of 2015 and H.R. 2822—Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016.

RATEPAYER PROTECTION ACT OF 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 2042.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 333 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2042.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1424

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2042) to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing carbon dioxide emissions from existing fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units before requiring compliance with such rule, and to allow States to protect households and businesses from significant adverse effects on electricity ratepayers or reliability, with Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today addresses EPA's proposed clean power plan for existing power plants under section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act.

Unfortunately, the Obama administration has made a decision that they are not going to work with Congress, and in order to accomplish his public policy goals, he has indicated that he is going to use executive orders and regulations.

Now, this proposed regulation focuses on power plants. That is why it is called the existing coal plant rule. But because of this regulation, once it becomes final, it is only the first step in the administration's plan to regulate other areas of our economy, including sources such as refineries, industrial boilers, cement plants, pulp and paper mills, and steel mills.

Since its proposal in June 2014, the Subcommittee on Energy and Power has held five hearings on the proposed rule, where we heard from EPA, FERC, entities within the States, legal experts, and industry stakeholders and manufacturers.

Now, when Mrs. McCarthy comes to Congress, she always says that this proposed rule gives maximum flexibility to the States, but what she does not say is that EPA, and EPA alone, sets the emissions standard for every State, and there is no flexibility in that.

Even Harvard Law School Professor Laurence Tribe, who taught President Obama constitutional law at Harvard, testified at one of the hearings that "EPA's proposal raises grave constitutional questions, exceeds EPA's statutory authority, and violates the Clean Air Act."

The hearings also identified implementation challenges, risks to electric reliability, and significantly higher energy costs under the rule.

For example, economist Eugene Trisko estimated that, for 31 geographically diverse States, electricity rates under the rule could increase by an average of 15 percent, with peak year increases of 22 percent during the period 2017–2031.

State officials also appeared, expressing the same concerns. And I might say, this rule is so complicated that, generally, EPA allows States 3 years to develop their State implementation plans. But under this proposed rule, which we know will be final soon, they are giving States 16 months, which is going to be extremely difficult for them to meet.

So the States are not only filing lawsuits, as are other entities, to try to slow this process down, but they are coming to Congress and saying, you know, Congress didn't pass this regulation, Congress has not asked for this, but the administration, unilaterally, is imposing it upon the American people, and so they are asking us to give them some more time.

So this legislation does specifically that. It does two things: One, it delays the time for the States to submit their implementation plans until after the courts have rendered a decision on whether or not the rule is legal. And then, if it is found to be legal, the State Governors have an option, after consulting with their economic development people, the EPA people, the Attorney General, and other authorities in the States. They have the option, if they find that it significantly and adversely affects their electricity prices and the reliability of electricity, they can opt out of the program.

□ 1430

This bill is simple. It simply gives States more time. We are not repealing this power grab of a regulation, but simply responding to requests from the States and other entities.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of the Ratepayer Protection Act, and I want to commend Representative ED WHITFIELD for his leadership on this important issue.

We all agree that it is vital that we protect our environment today and for future generations. At the same time, though, we must ensure that we are acting within the law, as well as safeguarding American jobs and the economy.

I have serious concerns that the Environmental Protection Agency's proposed clean power rule will be a vast and unprecedented regulatory overreach, resulting in high energy costs; loss of jobs; and a disruption in the states' ability to generate, transmit, distribute, and use electricity.

As the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) noted earlier, no less than the renowned Harvard Law School professor Laurence Tribe has testified that "the EPA lacks the statutory and constitutional authority to adopt its plan." He described the proposed clean power plan as a "power grab" from the three branches of government.

I am especially concerned, Mr. Chairman, about the impact that the EPA's proposed rule will have on Georgia ratepayers. The State of Georgia already has reduced CO_2 emissions by 33 percent between 2005 and 2012 but will have no credit for these reductions. Under the proposed regulation, Georgia would be required to reduce emissions by an additional 44 percent, the sixth largest reduction of any State.

Georgia also will receive no credit towards achieving EPA's mandated State goal for the two nuclear plants that are being constructed.

Ratepayers in Georgia served by Georgia Power, MEAG, and the Electric Membership Corporation would face hundreds of dollars in higher energy bills, which would be especially devastating to rural households in the Second Congressional District, which I represent.

I believe that this legislation takes a commonsense approach that the issue that allows for the completion of judicial review before States are required to comply with the clean power plan.

In addition, the Ratepayer Protection Act provides for a safe harbor if a Governor determines that the proposed rule's implementation will have an adverse impact on ratepayers or on the reliability of this electrical system.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill to ensure that ratepayers as well as our Nation's economy are protected from an overzealous EPA.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise in opposition to this legislation.

The bill before us is dangerous, unnecessary, and premature. It undermines the cornerstone of the administration's plan to tackle unchecked climate change, and the President has made clear that he will veto this legislation.

Yesterday, we passed a bipartisan bill amending the Toxic Substances Control Act. That is the type of legislation that we should be spending our time on, not messaging bills aimed at gutting draft EPA rules.

As we sit here today, climate change continues to reshape our world. According to NOAA, 2014 was the warmest year ever recorded, and 9 of the 10 hottest years have occurred since 2000, and that trend shows no sign of slowing down.

We know this warming is due to carbon pollution from fossil fuels accumulating in the atmosphere, trapping more heat, and changing our climate.

Last week, the Pope highlighted our worldwide moral obligation to address climate change. This week, EPA released a report which confirms what many in the country are already experiencing, that failing to address climate change will have enormous financial costs.

Just look at the skyrocketing costs of fighting wildfires, the mounting costs to farmers of losing their crops and cattle to more frequent and severe droughts, the enormous costs of rebuilding infrastructure swept away by more intense storms or threatened by steadily rising seas.

Ignoring these costs won't make them go away; and the longer we wait to act, the more we allow the risks to compound and accumulate, the more costly it will be to solve the problem.

In fact, the projected costs of climate change impacts dwarf any projected short-term costs associated with transitioning to a clean energy economy, which is happening already.

Mr. Chairman, EPA has proposed a workable plan to reduce emissions of carbon pollution from power plants, which are the largest uncontrolled source of manmade greenhouse gases in the United States.

The clean power plan outlines a path to cleaner air, better health, a safer climate, and a stronger economy. The proposed rule also gives States a lot of flexibility to choose how to achieve their emission reduction goals, which are State specific and cost effective. This is a moderate and reasonable approach and falls well within the legal authority and responsibility of the EPA to address carbon pollution from power plants.

This bill we are considering today would dismiss all of this progress and would cripple the efforts of the EPA to move forward in the fight against climate change. Effectively, this bill would amend the Clean Air Act in a harmful and dangerous fashion.

This bill establishes an unprecedented extension for every clean power plan deadline until all litigation is concluded. This blanket extension would be given to all polluters, incentivizing opponents of the rule to run the clock on frivolous litigation, simply to put off having to reduce their carbon emissions.

The bill also allows a Governor to say: ''The requirements of the clean power plan don't apply to me.'' Under the bill, a Governor can opt out of a Federal plan, giving certain States a free ride to pollute without any consequences. It is one thing to encourage States to just say no, but to let a Governor declare that his State is not subject to the Federal Clean Air Act at all? Mr. Chairman, I think that just goes too far.

As I have said before, EPA's proposed clean power plan is both modest and flexible and will help us tackle our urgent need to reduce our carbon emissions. Just saying no, as this bill would have us do, and condemning future generations is simply not an option. I strongly oppose the bill and urge a ''no'' vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK).

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Ratepayer Protection Act, which is a critical piece of legislation that helps protect our Nation's consumers and businesses from skyrocketing electricity costs.

Last year, the EPA proposed a new set of regulations on existing power plants which will dramatically effect our economy if implemented.

The Obama administration has been doing its best to convince the American people that these new standards would achieve great progress for our Nation, calling the proposal the clean power plan. Despite the illusions of good intentions, the devil is in the details of this proposed rule.

What the administration does not want us to know is that these standards would wreak havoc on our economy and inflict enormous costs on the American consumer. According to the National Economic Research Associates, these regulations would increase electricity prices in my home State of Georgia by 12 percent.

While this would be a problem for any State, it is especially alarming for me, given that Georgia already has the tenth highest average electricity bill in the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, right now, the temperature in my State is 95 degrees. My constituents depend on affordable electricity to stay cool all summer long, and the administration's assault on our Nation's power plants is totally unacceptable.

What is more, the average American household already spends about $15,000 a year to comply with Federal regulations. It has been radical proposals like these which have caused our economy to stagnate throughout this administration.

Even the EPA admits that the rule will cost our economy more than $7 billion a year by the year 2030. Washington bureaucrats may be able to afford this assault on our economy, but my constituents cannot.

The EPA also promotes these regulations with a promise that they would cut 30 percent of carbon pollution by the year 2030. The inconvenient truth is my State has already reduced its carbon emissions by 33 percent from 2005 to 2012.

Why is the administration pursuing these unrealistic regulations when Georgia and other States have already dramatically reduced their pollution levels?

The bill we are considering today, H.R. 2042, would halt the rule's compliance deadlines until litigation on the rule has been completed. This bill would also allow the Governor of any State to opt out of the rule's requirements if their State's electricity rates would increase significantly, as they would in my home State.

This commonsense piece of legislation would help to bring the U.S. environmental policy back into the real world and allow us to remain economically competitive.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), the ranking member of our subcommittee.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the fine ranking member of the full committee, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chair, I applaud the Obama administration for its veto threat of this abhorrent legislation that we are now considering, this just say no bill, which would effectively give Governors the power to sabotage EPA's proposed clean power plan by allowing them to opt out of the Federal requirements of the plan based on arbitrary and ambiguous determinations.

Mr. Chair, when implemented, the clean power plan will allow the EPA to cut common pollution from some of the Nation's oldest, dirtiest, and most inefficient power plants.

We know, Mr. Chair, that these same power plants account for the largest share of greenhouse gases from stationary sources in the country, and they are responsible for about one-third of the total U.S. greenhouse gas emissions.

Currently, Mr. Chair, there are no Federal limits on the amount of carbon pollution that these very same power plants are allowed to emit. The clean power plan would decrease power sector carbon emissions by 30 percent from 2005 levels by the year 2030.

However, Mr. Chair, this bill is an attempt to abort EPA's efforts before

they even have the chance to take hold, despite the fact that the clean power plan gives States great flexibility when implementing the rule, based on their existing utility infrastructure and policies.

Mr. Chair, the proposed clean power plan could not be more timely, as we are experiencing more and more frequent extreme weather events due to climate change, with disastrous effects being felt in our economy and in our communities all across our Nation.

In fact, no region in America has been safe from the impacts of climate change, with nearly annual record wildfires and heat waves in the West and the Southwest, perennial flooding along the coasts, and damaging and costly droughts and crop loss in the Plains and the Midwestern portions of our Nation.

Mr. Chair, when implemented, the clean power plan would help to reduce carbon pollution by hundreds of millions of tons, decreasing particle pollution, such as sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides by hundreds of thousands of tons annually.

Additionally, Mr. Chair, the clean power plan would help protect the health of our most vulnerable citizens, our children, older Americans, and low-income and minority communities.

Mr. Chair, not only do the vast majority of the American people believe that climate change is a serious problem and that the government—our government, this Federal Government, we in this Congress—should take action to address it and take it now, but also, the overwhelming majority of our Nation's doctors believe so, also.

□ 1445

Earlier this year, the American Thoracic Society found that, by a huge margin, most doctors believe that climate change is already negatively impacting their patients' health.

Fully 77 percent of responding doctors reported that increases in air pollution caused by climate change is making their patients' illnesses even more severe, a trend, I might add, Mr. Chairman, that they expect will steadily increase in the future.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, these findings are in line with a similar study conducted by the National Medical Association last year which found that older Americans, low-income communities, and the sick will all be disproportionately impacted by climate change if we fail to act.

Mr. Chairman, this is not just a political issue. This is not just a partisan issue. This is also a moral issue. Just last week, in a landmark encyclical, Pope Francis himself warned of the grave implications of climate change when he stated:

> Climate change is a global problem with grave implications: environmental, social, economic, political, and for the distribution of goods. It represents one of the principal challenges facing humanity in our day.
>
> There is an urgent need to develop policies so that, in the next few years, the emission of carbon dioxide and other highly polluting gases can be drastically reduced.

I urge all of my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, to heed the warning of our scientists, of our doctors, and one of the world's foremost moral authorities, the Pope himself.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that, obviously, you can't have a discussion about this regulation without climate change, and frequently, we hear that climate change is responsible for every extreme weather condition.

I would point out that The Economist magazine, in its May 5 issue, stated that it is impossible to say categorically that climate change has caused any individual storm, flood, drought, heat wave, tornado, or hurricane. Scientists agree that it is impossible to say that.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one other comment. The President of the United States believes that climate change is the number one issue facing mankind.

All of us recognize that the climate has been changing since the beginning of time, but where we fundamentally disagree with the President is we think there are other, more pressing issues dealing with poverty, creating jobs, economic growth, access to clean water, access to health care, and fighting diseases like pancreatic cancer. We think those are more urgent.

But this President has got 61 individual government programs and is spending $23 billion a year on climate change in addition to trying to push regulations like this without any involvement of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the chairman for yielding and for your leadership on this issue. Let me pick up where the gentleman left off relating to the comments made by the opposition to climate change's role in extreme weather conditions.

Mr. Chairman, a couple of years ago, there was a weather condition that many people out here refer to as the polar vortex; in North Dakota, we call that winter, but I think what a lot of people don't know is that, during that cold snap, they don't know how very susceptible and fragile our system of transmitting and distributing electricity was, largely because we don't have the base load generation that we once had largely because of this attack on base load fuels like coal, and that is really what we are talking about.

Mr. Chairman, I spent 10 years prior to coming to Congress as one of those energy regulators, one of those people in the State agency the Governor would consult as per this law, the Governor would consult before determining whether they should opt out of the clean power plan.

It was my responsibility to make sure North Dakotans had reliable electricity, that a grid system and a distribution system was reliable and could deliver on a regular basis, as needed, electricity and that the rates remained as they are still today in North Dakota, among the very lowest in this country.

I also had regulation over the coal industry. I am also very proud of the fact that, while North Dakota is a major coal-producing State that generates over 4,000 megawatts of electricity at the mine mouth and distributes it throughout a robust transmission and distribution system that generates lots of low-cost electricity, it also creates lots and lots of good-paying, important jobs.

The chairman also in response referenced the importance that Republicans are placing on other things besides climate change, things like job creation. Well, the clean power plan is a jobs killer, and it makes us less competitive in the global marketplace.

It is really, in many respects, a unilateral disarmament of the American economy at a time when the only really great thing going on in the American economy is energy development.

A rule like the clean power plan goes exactly against the one robust and positive in the American economy, and that is energy development.

Let's get back to the issue of the constitutionality, the judicial question. Our bill simply provides an opportunity for a judicial review, something that the President and the EPA should have done before doing this rule, finishing this rule, and putting this rule out.

I find, frankly, the Ratepayer Protection Act to be a rather modest response to the overreach and the zeal of the EPA and this administration.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman again for his leadership on this important issue.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2042. The so-called Ratepayer Protection Act does nothing to protect any of us. In fact, it does just the opposite.

This bill would simply continue this majority's policy of sticking their head in the sand and doing nothing to address the serious problems of climate change. The Pope has said that climate change is a reality. It is impacting our lives every day. It is impacting our economy, and it is only going to get worse.

Mr. Chairman, we are confronted almost daily with new evidence that climate change is leading to increased

health risks, threatening our environment, and costing our economy billions of dollars. Studies have shown that climate change can lead and does lead to higher rates of asthma, reduces crop yields, acidifies our oceans, and increases the risk for harmful algal blooms.

More severe droughts are threatening drinking and agriculture water supplies in many locations, while warmer climates are increasing the severity and frequency of storms in others. A recent study also showed that climate change could undo many of the improvements that we have seen in human well-being and life expectancy over the last half century. The power sector is the largest source of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions, accounting for nearly one-third of the U.S. total.

Mr. Chairman, while we will continue to depend on fossil fuels for some time, we can and we must do more to limit their impacts on our climate. The clean power plan does just that by setting carbon reduction goals for each State and allowing States to implement customized plans to meet those goals.

The clean power plan will help maintain an affordable, reliable energy system while cutting pollution and protecting public health and the environment now and for future generations; yet H.R. 2042 would derail the clean power plan and all the health and economic benefits that will come with it. The bill is full of excuses to support inaction, but does nothing to solve the problem.

Mr. Chairman, this inaction on climate change is putting our constituents and our future generations at risk. It is long past time to acknowledge the causes of climate change and to tackle the issue head on. It is time for us to work together to address this problem, not to pass legislation that continues to ignore it.

For these reasons and so many others, I strongly oppose H.R. 2042, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it as well.

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

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2042, the Ratepayer Protection Act of 2015.

The EPA's clean power plan has raised a number of justifiable concerns. However, while I would like to find a solution to the issues raised by today's bill, I don't believe the present bill is the correct solution. For more than a decade, the focus of environmental debate has been on greenhouse gas emissions. In that time, we have passed two comprehensive bills, while the EPA has promulgated dozens of rules.

Now, I am not raising Cain with the EPA. The Agency, backed by the Supreme Court, has the authority to regulate greenhouse gases, including carbon. The Agency, however, has a different approach to regulating than I think many Members of Congress on both sides would prefer.

I acknowledge that global climate change issues are difficult, and the legislation would require a compromise, but this bill doesn't accomplish that. Congress should create a regulatory framework for the 21st century economy and environment. We should recognize that human activity has impacted the climate, but that does not mean regulating sectors of our economy out of existence.

Regardless of the public outreach conducted by the Agency, regulatory overreach can occur. I don't think allowing each successive administration to prescribe policies that affect so much of our way of life is a correct course of action.

We need to recognize our industries, and more importantly, our workers need time to adjust to the new environmental realities and implement changes, both technological and educational.

Mr. Chairman, I know many of our colleagues agree that our job as legislators is to ensure each of our constituencies are equally represented. I prefer we sit down and craft a bill that addresses the many challenges we face not only domestically, but as a world leader.

Unfortunately, the present bill doesn't address those issues I have laid out in a balanced and complete way. Allowing for endless legal challenges or partisan political decisions is not the proper way to handle an issue that affects the entire scope of the environment and the economy.

Today's bill is only a part of the challenge, the part that is directly in front of us, and I don't agree with that approach. I would like the opportunity to sit down with my colleagues to draft a fair and comprehensive legislation that reasonably balances the interests of all parties rather than a sector-by-sector approach that balances none.

I want to make sure that the folks back home get what they need, and I think it is an opportunity to bring all sides together. I have heard certainly from many groups they all want the same thing, but they want certainty.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we want to be certain that their companies will be profitable, that their livelihoods will be protected, and their grandchildren have a clean environment. We can accomplish these goals not with endless delay or agency decree.

I want to thank my colleague, Chairman WHITFIELD, for addressing part of the problem, but let's work together to solve the whole problem.

For this reason, I oppose the bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chair, how many minutes are remaining on both sides?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 15½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey has 15½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH), one of the original cosponsors of this legislation, who is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, earlier, we heard the gentleman from Illinois say that this was a just say no bill. You bet it is. That is exactly what it is.

It is the just say no bill—no to a weaker electric grid; no to fewer jobs, particularly in manufacturing and also in the coal and energy industries; no to regulations that do little to help the environment, but do a lot to raise your electric rates.

When we are talking about protecting the ratepayer—that is who we are talking about, the average man and woman in this country, the families that are out there struggling, trying to make ends meet in an economy that is flat—this bill says no, we are not going to pass a bill on to you for little gain in the environment, but to raise your electric rates tremendously. The American families cannot afford it.

Mr. Chairman, as an example, we heard from a former regulator earlier, but the Virginia State Corporation Commission—and that is the organization in Virginia—appointed judges who make the decisions on what you are going to pay for power in Virginia based on what is an appropriate amount.

They said that customers in Virginia will likely pay significantly more for their electricity.

□ 1500

The incremental cost of compliance for one utility alone—Dominion Virginia Power—would likely be between $5.5 billion and $6 billion on a net present value basis. That is just for one of the companies providing power.

Let me give you an idea, Mr. Chairman, of exactly what that means to the people of Virginia. In my district, I have 29 geopolitical subdivisions, 29 different jurisdictions. Only two of those jurisdictions get their power from Dominion Virginia Power. Now, remember, Dominion Virginia Power is going to cost the ratepayers $5.5 billion to $6 billion, but that doesn't cover the whole State and doesn't cover very much in my district at all.

And, accordingly, again going back to the statements of the Virginia State Corporation Commission, they say that, contrary to the claim that rates will go up but that bills will go down, experience and costs in Virginia make it extremely unlikely that either electric rates or bills in Virginia will go down as a result of the proposed regulations.

So this is a very important measure. One of our prior speakers said that we should take the time to craft some kind of a compromise. This bill puts everything on hold until court cases can be decided and let Governors come in and say: Well, wait a minute. We can't make this happen in our State—or in our Commonwealth, as the case would be with Virginia. That is important.

And maybe if we get this bill passed, we can sit down and find some way to compromise between the regulators at the EPA and the interests of the ratepayers. But because they are going to come out with this rule sometime later this summer, and the States have roughly 13 months thereafter to come up with their plan to meet the regulations, we do not have the ability to give that time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, this is the climate change denial bill. Don't be fooled by its name. Ignoring the impact of climate change will heap huge costs on taxpayers. This bill is a disservice to America. And in addition to being very costly to consumers, it shirks our responsibility for addressing the costly impacts of the changing climate.

The bill we are considering today shows that the Republicans' plan is to just say no and to let our children and grandchildren suffer the consequences of the changing climate without doing anything meaningful to protect them. This position is indefensible, and it will prove very costly, indeed.

Today's bill would essentially amend the Clean Air Act to give a free pass to States that refuse to comply with the requirements of the clean power plan. Unless we work together to meet the modern challenge of the changing climate, this is going to be very expensive for our friends back home, especially in States like mine—Florida.

Here are some of the huge costs we are looking at already: rising property insurance rates and flood insurance rates because of extreme weather events; Federal emergency aid that we have to pay out for things like Superstorm Sandy and other storms, tornadoes, electrical storms, tropical storms, drought, fire, and extreme heat.

In addition to property insurance and flood insurance, property taxes are going to go up because our local communities are going to be saddled with the cost of repairing storm water infrastructure and addressing drinking water. This is going to be very expensive. In Florida, we already see saltwater intrusion into our drinking water aquifers because of rising tides.

There is a terrible drought in California. These are going to require very expensive solutions unless we tackle it on the front end.

And I am fearful that there will be economic harm to coastal communities like mine in the Tampa Bay area where we will have to pay more to renourish our beaches and take care of the lifeblood of our economy, which is tourism, fishing, for a beautiful, healthy economy.

I recommend a ''no'' vote on this bill.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman. I appreciate it very much.

This bill is about commonsense safeguards to ensure my constituents are protected from the EPA's overreach and higher energy prices.

The EPA's proposal under this rule has drawn widespread concern. It places a heavier burden on Florida than other States, despite the fact that Florida has reduced its carbon emissions by 20 percent since 2005.

Congress must act now to protect the everyday American who faces the potential threat of unreliable services and ballooning electricity costs.

With the economy growing at a feeble pace, my constituents cannot afford to have their power bill increase. We should be working to support new technologies to safely harness America's energy boom, not saddle our constituents with regulations that will increase their cost of living.

Let's focus on an all-the-above energy strategy, unleashing America's domestic, renewable, and nonrenewable resources to reduce the costs of groceries and the costs for heating and cooling your home.

This bill will allow each State to have their own opportunity to assess the proposed plan for their State. Thirty-two States have made legal objections to this rule; 34 States have objected to EPA's rushed timeline.

I am glad that we are taking action here today in a bipartisan fashion. I commend Chairman WHITFIELD, Representative GRIFFITH, Representative BISHOP, and Representative PETERSON for their bipartisan work on the Ratepayer Protection Act. Please vote for this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Chairman, this bill represents a misguided attempt to hold back change and progress.

Climate change is a problem. We must deal with it. The clean power plan is an important step in that direction.

It is very disappointing to hear such a ''can't do'' attitude. We have always been a nation that tackles big problems rather than denying them.

Many States have already achieved significant reductions of greenhouse gas emissions through regional carbon trading, renewable portfolio standards, energy efficient programming, and investments in clean energy.

My home State has made great strides. And if there is a flaw in the proposed rule, it is that the proposal asked States that have already done a lot to reduce their emissions and modernize their electric grids to do even more.

By contrast, the requirements on the States that have resisted change and have done far less, are asked only to get started. This bill invites some States to continue to avoid doing their fair share to address the serious environmental and economic threat posed by climate change.

New York State will continue to work on this problem, as will a number of other States that have already taken the steps that I mentioned earlier, but it would be nice if our neighbors also helped to address the problem that we all had a role in creating.

This bill should be defeated. It certainly will not go far in the Senate, and it would not get signed by our President. Its consideration is, indeed, a waste of time. We should be using our time to find real solutions to the problems we all face. This bill offers no solutions, just another way to avoid addressing our problems.

With that, I urge defeat of H.R. 2042.

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

We have heard a lot of discussions today about how important it is with a clean energy plan to address CO_2 emissions in the U.S. You would think that this clean energy plan is going to make a tremendous difference.

I would just like to point out that the Energy Information Administration recently reported that U.S. energy-related CO_2 emissions will remain flat through 2040 and below their 2005 levels without the clean energy plan. So this clean energy plan is being elevated to do some dramatic good. The fact is the U.S. is already doing more than most countries. And I would point out that, in the coming decades, more than two-thirds of the world's energy-related CO_2 emissions will come from the developing countries of the world.

So we are being penalized in America, although we have already made great strides. That is why we are trying to give States more time to address this very complex regulation.

At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), who is a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of Chairman WHITFIELD's legislation, H.R. 2041, the Ratepayer Protection Act.

This rule, the clean power plan, by the EPA is an unprecedented rule, one that has the potential to devastate Ohio's coal industry. That is the very same industry that employs thousands of people throughout eastern and southeastern Ohio and provides homes and businesses with affordable, reliable electricity.

The Ratepayer Protection Act will stop this devastation. Almost 70 percent of Ohio's electricity today—70 percent of Ohio's electricity—is currently

provided by coal. Moreover, coal miners already have a difficult and stressful job as it is. And now, because of the EPA's clean power plan, they will have to worry about whether or not they will even have a job when they show up for work.

The Ratepayer Protection Act is an essential check on the EPA's extreme emission standards. It allows Governors to use common sense to opt their State out of the rule should they determine that it will negatively affect its ratepayers or grid reliability.

The legislation also extends the rule's compliance dates, pending judicial review. That is just common sense, Mr. Chairman, because shouldn't our States have a say in our energy future? Especially when you consider that over 32 States have already raised legal objections to the rule, and 34 have objected to the EPA's rush regulatory timelines.

EPA's carbon emission regulations have already made it economically unfeasible to build a new coal-fired power plant in America. We cannot afford to shut down existing plants and this very important industry as well.

I support the legislation, and I urge my colleagues to.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, first, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

I also rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2042.

No one wants to see new rules and regulations just for the fun of it, and we should not take this EPA rule lightly. But here is why we must let this rule move forward: one, climate change is real; two, it is caused by greenhouse gases that are released from human activities; and three, it has already been changing the world as we know it.

Pope Francis, in his encyclical, ''Laudato Si,'' or, ''Praise Be to You,'' points out that ''reducing greenhouse gases requires honesty, courage, and responsibility, above all on the part of those countries which are more powerful and pollute the most.''

The Pope is right. We need to be honest about climate change, we need to be courageous and face the future, and we need to take responsibility for our carbon pollution.

That is exactly why we need to work with the EPA, with States, with our great research centers, and with our energy sector to increase efficiency and to transition to cleaner fuels and renewable energy sources.

The clean power plan and the authority granted by the Clean Air Act is the vehicle we have right now to cut greenhouse gas emissions and to clean up polluted air. But my colleagues are telling States they should just say no and completely opt out of doing their part and subject this rule, which, by the way, we have not even seen it in its final place, to years and years of delay.

□ 1515

This is not honest. It is not courageous. It is not a responsible way to deal with greenhouse gas pollution.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the irresponsible and shortsighted Ratepayer Protection Act.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire on the remaining time.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 7½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2042, the Ratepayer Protection Act. This bill would protect States and families from EPA regulatory overreach and significant spikes in electricity costs.

Last June, the EPA proposed a rule for existing power plants known as the clean power plan. This rule would mandate new carbon reduction goals for each State, effectively changing the way electricity is generated, distributed, and consumed in the United States.

The economic impact of this rule is very troubling. It could mean increased electricity costs and reduced reliability for consumers. In fact, under the clean power plan, electricity rates would increase by an average of 15 percent in a majority of States.

This bill would protect ratepayers and exempt States from complying with the rule until all judicial reviews are complete. It would also allow Governors to opt out of compliance with the rule if there would be a significant impact on states' ratepayers.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bipartisan, commonsense bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I find this whole conversation somewhat surreal because, in my community in Portland, Oregon, the city is unveiling a new climate action plan to reduce local carbon emissions even more.

We are already below 1999 levels on a per capita basis, but our community has committed, in going forward, to a clean energy future in order to do our part.

It is jarring that, at the same time, we would consider on the floor of the House rolling back the modest, balanced approach that the administration has undertaken with the carbon rule—a carbon rule that is not yet finalized, a carbon rule that is dedicated to working with local States to try and fine-tune it to make sure that it works right and with more public input. Nonetheless, even though it is a little late in coming, the United States must step up.

We have a major responsibility as we are the largest contributor to carbon pollution in the world. We are number two now behind China. We have a responsibility to do our part, but we have a responsibility to do our part not just in terms of global leadership and in trying to change this tremendously destructive trajectory we are on with carbon pollution—as we will, no doubt, hear from the Pope in 3 months in this Chamber—but it is part of what is going to happen with other countries in the world.

If the richest, most powerful nation in the world can't step up to do its part, how can we expect to exert global leadership and prevent catastrophic events elsewhere?

The notion that somehow this is going to be an economic catastrophe is balderdash. The reason the coal industry is in trouble is that coal is dirty, inefficient, and it is more expensive than natural gas. It is not a foundation for our energy future. Being able to move to a low carbon future is a bedrock for economic prosperity in the future.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. We just heard from the gentlewoman from California, a State that has proven to be an international leader. Its economy is going great guns. It is reducing its carbon footprint, its carbon use.

People confuse the price of energy with the cost of energy, and what has happened in States like California, which have been creative in terms of energy conservation and in pricing it properly, is that use goes down.

Some of the people with the lowest rates waste the most energy. They actually spend more. Part of what we did with climate legislation, as the gentleman from New Jersey well knows, actually would have reduced the cost for most people.

We don't want to be on the wrong side of history on this because it will have a devastating effect. The administration's modest proposal ought to be supported. We ought not to pretend that we can shatter it and piecemeal it out for the States to undercut it. We ought not to pretend that this is not a real problem that deserves our attention going forward.

To waste time today with something that would turn the clock back and that won't pass the Senate—if it did, it would be vetoed—is sad. We ought to be working together on a low carbon future to be able to make it work right for each and every community.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. I want to thank my friend from Kentucky, the chairman of the Energy and Power Subcommittee, for yielding and for bringing forward the Ratepayer Protection Act.

Mr. Chairman, this bill goes directly to the heart of these radical regulations, which are coming out of agencies

like the EPA, that are killing jobs in America. When you look at this regulation, this proposal by the EPA that this bill addresses, the EPA is proposing to bring forward more radical regulations that are going to increase the cost of household electricity for every family in this country. The estimates show you will see an over 12 percent increase in household electricity rates if the EPA is allowed to move forward.

When you look at what this legislation does, at least it stands up and protects hard-working taxpayers who are tired of all of these regulations—one after the other—coming forward, not through legislation passed by Congress—in open, public settings like this that you can watch on C–SPAN—but coming forward through unelected bureaucrats at the EPA who want to carry out their own agenda.

They can't pass it through Congress, so they try to just ram it through in regulations that aren't backed up by science but that would, in fact, actually, lead to more jobs being shipped out of this country.

Where would those jobs go, Mr. Chairman? They would go to places like China and India and Brazil and to other countries that don't have the environmental standards that we have. You will actually see more carbon emitted if the EPA is successful in moving forward with regulations like this that this bill is addressing.

I want to commend the chairman for bringing this forward. I think you are going to see a large, bipartisan vote in support of this legislation because people across the country are saying enough is enough.

If the proposal is so good by the EPA, why not move it through Congress? Why not have public hearings on C–SPAN and present the facts and point out and defend the increases that families are going to have in their household electricity rates?

They want to hide, Mr. Chairman. They want to hide and try to just sneak this through with the regulation and not have any public vote on the bill.

Here you have a bill, a bill that says let's slow this process down, that says let's actually give States the ability to opt out if they realize just how devastating it will be not only to the states' economies, but to the taxpayers in each State.

In my State of Louisiana, this proposal by the EPA that we are trying to stop would yield about a 13 percent increase in people's household electricity rates. We are already paying too much. The costs of things are already too high because of regulations coming out of Washington not imposed by Congress, but imposed by unelected bureaucrats.

Enough is enough. Let's rein in these unelected bureaucrats, and let's bring some common sense back to the process of getting our economy back on track. I urge the approval of this legislation, which is so important to getting our economy moving again.

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

It bothers me a great deal when I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle acting as if we don't already have a Clean Air Act in place. The fact of the matter is the Clean Air Act was passed by both Democrats and Republicans back in 1970.

It has been amended and changed several times since then, but the EPA is simply acting on a law that was passed by the Congress. There is no such thing here that the EPA is somehow doing something that they shouldn't be doing, which is what is being suggested by some of my colleagues on the Republican side and, I guess, is the basis for this legislation.

The EPA is regulating based on laws that were passed by Congress—that is what an agency does—but many of my colleagues on the Republican side continue to raise the false specter of job losses and high economic costs in order to try to block the President and the EPA from implementing the clean power plan to curb power plant carbon pollution.

I just want to say again, in going back to the original Clean Air Act, the history of the Clean Air Act shows that they are wrong, that we can have both a clean environment and a strong economy.

This is an argument that industry has used every time the Clean Air Act has been strengthened. Every time new regulations come out that are trying to address the problems with clean air and that are trying to make the air healthier for all Americans, we hear industry argue that somehow there are going to be job losses or that there are going to be huge rate increases.

When Congress debated the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments, the oil industry said that the technology to meet these standards simply does not exist today, and they predicted major supply disruptions, and chemical companies said the law would cause severe economic and social disruption. None of these gloom-and-doom predictions came true. Instead, our air got cleaner, and our economy flourished.

The history of the Clean Air Act shows that the United States can reduce carbon pollution while creating jobs and strengthening the economy. Since its adoption in 1970, the Clean Air Act has reduced key air pollutants by two-thirds while the economy has tripled in size. The Clean Air Act has also made the United States a world leader in pollution control technology, generating hundreds of billions of dollars for U.S. companies and creating millions of jobs.

I want to stress that I think we are at a critical crossroads here. If we continue to ignore the science, we will cause catastrophic climate change and saddle our economy with soaring bills for disaster relief; but, if we invest in the clean energy technologies of the future, we can protect our environment and grow our economy.

This idea of juxtaposing jobs and the economy versus the environment is simply not true. The history of the Clean Air Act shows that it is not true.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, once again, I ask how much time is remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 3½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey has 2½ minutes remaining.

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

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

The other question that I keep hearing from the other side of the aisle is that, somehow, they just ignore the public health aspects of this. Obviously, we are concerned about climate change, but it is also the question of public health.

There are consequences to inaction. In other words, if this bill were to pass and if the clean power plan were not to go into effect, there are consequences.

The EPA estimates that, in 2030, the clean power plan will avoid up to 3,300 heart attacks, prevent 150,000 asthma attacks in children, lead to 2,800 fewer hospital admissions, and avert 490,000 missed work or schooldays each year.

These benefits are worth an estimated $93 billion per year, Mr. Chairman. These are human health benefits that could be delayed or, perhaps, permanently lost if this bill takes effect. The health benefits potentially blocked by the bill are especially important for the most vulnerable among us, our babies, our kids, our seniors, and those with asthma.

The legislation grants a blanket extension for all clean power plan compliant States until all opportunities for legal challenges have been exhausted, and this unprecedented suspension of critical clean air regulations would occur regardless of a lawsuit's merits or its likelihood of success. What the Republicans are doing with this bill is denying the health benefits that come from the clean power plan.

I just want to close, Mr. Chairman, by reminding everyone that the President has said he will veto this legislation, so this effort with the legislation is totally in vain, as it probably won't pass the Senate.

The President would veto it, and there are no votes to override his veto. Let me just read what the President says in his statement when he says he will veto the bill.

□ 1530

He says:

> The bill is premature and unnecessary. It is premature because the clean power plan has yet to be finalized; it is unnecessary because EPA has made clear its commitment to address concerns raised during the public comment period (including concerns related to cost and reliability) when issuing the final clean power plan. The effect of the bill would, therefore, be a wholly unnecessary

postponement of reductions of harmful air pollution.

The bill is unprecedented. The administration is not aware of any instance when Congress has enacted legislation to stay implementation of a clean air standard before judicial review. To do so here, before the rule is even final, would be an unprecedented interference with EPA's efforts to fulfill its duties under the Clean Air Act.

Once again, my colleagues on the Republican side have said that this is only a proposed rule. Why are they passing legislation to deal with a rule that hasn't even been finalized?

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

The reason we are acting is because the 5 years that I have been chairman of this subcommittee, we have had many hearings on proposed rules and regulations coming out of EPA, and only one time did they actually sit down with the affected parties and try to work out a real compromise, and that was on the cement rule.

Other than that, they have made it very clear they intend to move forward with this regulation. Lawsuits have been filed, but the courts have said it is not right yet. So if we don't take action, it is going to become final, and then you go to court, and then it takes years.

So we are simply saying let's pass this legislation to delay the implementation until the court makes a decision on whether or not it is legal. We have real reason to believe that it is not legal because never have they ever attempted to regulate an existing source under section 111(d) except in very minute circumstances.

Now, I agree that since the original Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, our economy has improved. We have had a lot more jobs. But the Global Markets Institute last month issued a report—it is an arm of Goldman Sachs, a respected institution—and they pointed out that in the Obama administration, since 2009, the number of small businesses in America are 600,000 less today than in 2009; 6 million fewer jobs today than in 2009. They also went on to say that the reason for this is the overzealous issue of regulations in this administration.

That is why the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, representing thousands of small-business men and women around the country has endorsed this legislation. That is why the African American Chamber of Commerce has written a letter explaining the detrimental impacts of this regulation. That is why over 30-some States have come to us and asked us to give them more time.

As I said in the beginning, this is a complex rule. It certainly applies to more than just coal, because it is the first time that EPA has ever attempted to go outside the source of the emission to reduce the emission. So we are not talking about only coal-powered electricity plants, but the EPA sets the standard for every State, the emission cap, and then they say you go fix it. So the States are going to be forced to go to other industries, to maybe look at building materials in homes, to adopt renewable mandates to meet these very stringent standards.

So it is a complex rule. EPA usually gives States 3 years to come up with their State implementation plan, but in this instance, they are giving them 13 months, which is unheard of.

This legislation is very simple. Let's delay the State implementation plans until the courts render a decision. I urge our Members to support this commonsense legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chair, today we fight to keep electricity affordable with the Ratepayer Protection Act, a bill that protects folks all across the country from the potential rate increases and reliability risks that experts predict will occur under the EPA's proposed Clean Power Plan. I applaud my colleague ED WHITFIELD for his efforts on this important bill and I urge my colleagues to support it.

In my home state of Michigan, the American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity estimates that the EPA's proposed plan would increase electricity prices by 12%. The last thing families in Michigan and across the country can afford right now are higher bills just as they are finally feeling as if they have turned the corner following the extended economic downturn.

Legal experts, including President Obama's own law professor, Laurence Tribe have testified that the proposal raises grave constitutional questions, exceeds EPA's statutory authority, and violates the Clean Air Act. In fact, Professor Tribe equated the administration's action to "burning the Constitution."

Low-income households and those on fixed incomes get hit the hardest when electric bills go up. In Michigan, there are nearly 2 million lower-income and middle-income families—representing 52% of the state's households. Unfortunately, the costs of this proposed rule would fall disproportionately on the most vulnerable.

Small businesses would also face increased electricity costs that could harm their bottom line. And every extra dollar that goes toward higher energy cost is money that can't be spent on new hiring.

For manufacturers, affordable energy is imperative to stay competitive in a global market. That is why the Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Manufacturers, and many other representatives of job-creating businesses have sounded the alarm on the serious threat posed by the administration's plan.

I would also note that higher costs are not the only menace looming on the horizon—what's worse than expensive electricity is no electricity at all. But that is a real possibility. The North American Electric Reliability Corporation and others have warned that the EPA's proposed plan poses a serious threat to electric reliability as power sources are forced offline.

The Ratepayer Protection Act is a thoughtful and straightforward answer to the potential rate shocks and blackouts. The legislation would allow for the completion of judicial review of any rule before requiring states to implement it, and if a governor of a state finds that the rule poses a significant threat to electricity affordability and reliability they would have the power to suspend compliance with the administration's plan.

The Ratepayer Protection Act does not repeal the Clean Power Plan, it merely adds several reasonable safeguards to it. Regulatory overreach has defined this administration and it is time we all stood up to protect affordable energy. Vote yes in support of every American ratepayer and lower bills.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114–20. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 2042

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 ''Ratepayer Protection Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. EXTENDING COMPLIANCE DATES OF RULES ADDRESSING CARBON DIOXIDE EMISSIONS FROM EXISTING POWER PLANTS PENDING JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) EXTENSION OF COMPLIANCE DATES.—

(1) EXTENSION.—Each compliance date of any final rule described in subsection (b) is deemed to be extended by the time period equal to the time period described in subsection (c).

(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ''compliance date''—

(A) means, with respect to any requirement of a final rule described in subsection (b), the date by which any State, local, or tribal government or other person is first required to comply; and

(B) includes the date by which State plans are required to be submitted to the Environmental Protection Agency under any such final rule.

(b) FINAL RULES DESCRIBED.—A final rule described in this subsection is any final rule to address carbon dioxide emissions from existing sources that are fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units under section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411(d)), including any final rule that succeeds—

(1) the proposed rule entitled ''Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units'' published at 79 Fed. Reg. 34830 (June 18, 2014); or

(2) the supplemental proposed rule entitled ''Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: EGUs in Indian Country and U.S. Territories; Multi-Jurisdictional Partnerships'' published at 79 Fed. Reg. 65482 (November 4, 2014).

(c) PERIOD DESCRIBED.—The time period described in this subsection is the period of days that—

(1) begins on the date that is 60 days after the day on which notice of promulgation of a final rule described in subsection (b) appears in the Federal Register; and

(2) ends on the date on which judgment becomes final, and no longer subject to further appeal or review, in all actions (including actions that are filed pursuant to section 307 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7607))—

(A) that are filed during the 60 days described in paragraph (1); and

(B) that seek review of any aspect of such rule.

SEC. 3. RATEPAYER PROTECTION.

(a) EFFECTS OF PLANS.—No State shall be required to adopt or submit a State plan, and no

State or entity within a State shall become subject to a Federal plan, pursuant to any final rule described in section 2(b), if the Governor of such State makes a determination, and notifies the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, that implementation of the State or Federal plan would—

(1) have a significant adverse effect on the State's residential, commercial, or industrial ratepayers, taking into account—

(A) rate increases that would be necessary to implement, or are associated with, the State or Federal plan; and

(B) other rate increases that have been or are anticipated to be necessary to implement, or are associated with, other Federal or State environmental requirements; or

(2) have a significant adverse effect on the reliability of the State's electricity system, taking into account the effects on the State's—

(A) existing and planned generation and retirements;

(B) existing and planned transmission and distribution infrastructure; and

(C) projected electricity demands.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In making a determination under subsection (a), the Governor of a State shall consult with—

(1) the public utility commission or public service commission of the State;

(2) the environmental protection, public health, and economic development departments or agencies of the State; and

(3) the Electric Reliability Organization (as defined in section 215 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824o)).

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 114–177. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 114–177.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, after line 15, insert the following (and redesignate subsection (b) as subsection (c)):

(b) ADDITIONAL CERTIFICATION REGARDING COSTS OF RESPONDING TO HUMAN-CAUSED CLIMATE CHANGE.—For a Governor's determination to have the effect described in subsection (a), such determination shall include a certification that—

(1) electricity generating units are sources of carbon pollution that contribute to human-induced climate change; and

(2) the State or Federal plan to reduce carbon emissions from electric utility generating units would promote national security, economic growth, and public health by addressing human-induced climate change through the increased use of clean energy, energy efficiency, and reductions in carbon pollution.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume in support of my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment includes language identical to an amendment recently offered by Senator BENNET and approved during the Senate budget process. It is simple enough. In order to opt out, a Governor must certify that the State or Federal plan would ''promote national security, economic growth and public health by addressing human induced climate change through the increased use of clean energy, energy efficiency and reductions in carbon pollution.''

This clear and concise language passed the Senate in the budget bill with the support of seven Republican Senators along with all the Democratic Senators. Republican Senators like DEAN HELLER, MARK KIRK, and ROB PORTMAN voted for this language, as did the chair of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Senator MURKOWSKI, who is from Alaska, where the impacts of climate change are undeniable.

Let me just start by quoting pro-coal Senator MANCHIN from West Virginia: ''There is no question that climate change is real and that billions of people have impacted the world's climate. This amendment supports investment in clean energy technology, including advanced fossil energy, and supports energy efficiency, which reduces carbon while saving customers money. We can protect the environment for future generations while ensuring that we have affordable and reliable energy sources today.''

That is a quote from Senator MANCHIN from West Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should be clear about where Members of this esteemed committee stand on the reality of human-induced climate change and whether or not it needs to be addressed. Senators have had to stand up and be counted, so we here in the House should do the same.

Some on the Republican side of the aisle have said that they are not climate deniers. Well, if that is the case, then this should be a very easy vote for them, in my opinion. But it wouldn't surprise me if some or all on the Republican side oppose this amendment. In the Committee on Energy and Commerce, it was voted down twice: first in the subcommittee, and then in the full committee along party lines.

Let me be clear, Mr. Chairman. This amendment still allows the Governor to opt out of the Federal plan. It doesn't really change the substance of the bill. This amendment is for anyone who believes in human-induced climate change, regardless of their views on various approaches to deal with the problem. You can vote for my amendment and, if you must, still oppose the clean power plan. But if you vote against my amendment, it can only mean, in my opinion, that you are against any solution to climate change.

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

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

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chair, I want to say that I have the utmost respect for my colleague from New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, who is the ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. He is always thoroughly prepared and does a great job, but I respectfully must disagree with him on this amendment.

Just reading the amendment, there doesn't seem to be that much wrong with it, and really there is not that much wrong with it; but I would point out that this amendment suggests that the Federal Government is not taking action about climate change. The fact is, we have 18 Federal agencies administering 61 separate programs on climate change, and since 2008, we have spent over $77 billion addressing it. That is not even including the regulations coming out of EPA. Last year alone, the Federal Government spent $23 billion on climate change.

I would just point out that this bill is about responding to States who are asking us for help. They need more time to address this very complex regulation that will be coming out of EPA very soon. We can't have a debate about it without talking about climate change. But as I said earlier, everyone recognizes the climate has been changing since the beginning of time. I read an article the other day, in the 13th century, they had grape vineyards in northern England. That is not true today.

Where we differ with the President is that the President has made it very clear that he thinks climate change is the number one issue facing mankind. We recognize that it is a problem, but we think there are other more pressing issues out there and that this administration seems to be obsessed with climate change.

We think creating jobs, economic growth, clean water, health care, and trying to solve pancreatic cancer are more important. We have countries in Africa, representatives in Africa and Bangladesh telling us we are more concerned about just having electricity, just having enough food. So that is the big difference between us and the President.

Like I said, we are simply trying to give States more time, giving them the option to opt out if they need to. We want the courts to render a decision that this is legal before they have to start spending the resources and the money to respond to it. For that reason, I would respectfully disagree with this amendment and ask that our Members vote against it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. I yield myself the remainder of my time to close.

Mr. Chairman, I would just say once again that, again, I respect my colleague from Kentucky a great deal, but I don't see how this amendment even says that climate change is a priority. It is simply saying that it should be addressed in the context of any Governor's effort to opt out. Now, I don't think that Governors should be opting out, but at least if they decide to do so, then they should be able to certify the reference to these various issues, including public health and climate change.

Again, we talk about climate change. I understand what the gentleman is saying, but in terms of priorities, keep in mind that public health is a priority. The gentleman mentioned pancreatic cancer. I was thinking that the group that are advocates for trying to cure pancreatic cancer probably came to see him yesterday as they came to see me. We don't even know what the cause of it is. It may very well be that there are environmental causes in the air that lead to pancreatic cancer. So I think that it does need to be a priority. Climate change does need to be a priority.

But again, you can vote for this amendment without saying that climate change is your biggest priority. We are simply saying that when a Governor decides to opt out, which I don't think they should, that they have to say that they certify that they have looked at the public health, that they have looked at climate change, that they have looked at increased use of clean energy and other issues. I see no reason why anyone on either side of the aisle shouldn't support the amendment for that reason.

I yield back the balance of my time and urge passage of the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

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

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

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

□ 1545

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. RUSH

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114–177.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, after line 15, insert the following (and redesignate subsection (b) as subsection (c)):

(b) ADDITIONAL CERTIFICATION REGARDING COSTS OF RESPONDING TO HUMAN-CAUSED CLIMATE CHANGE.—For a Governor's determination to have the effect described in subsection (a), such determination shall include a certification that the inapplicability of a State or Federal plan described in such subsection will not have a significant adverse effect on costs associated with a State's plan to respond to extreme weather events associated with human-caused climate change, taking into account any costs necessary to—

(1) adapt or respond to increased sea level rise or flooding;

(2) prepare for or respond to more frequent and intense storms;

(3) fight or otherwise respond to more frequent and intense wildfires; and

(4) adapt or respond to increased drought.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us, which I prefer to call the ''Just Say No'' bill, would effectively give Governors the power to opt out of the Federal requirements of the EPA's proposed clean power plan if they decide that complying with the plan would have an adverse effect on either rates or reliability.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the language allowing a Governor to opt out is ambiguous and does not take into account other costs that States are already paying due to the impacts of climate change.

So, Mr. Chairman, in order to address this issue, I am offering a straightforward amendment that simply states that a Governor must certify that, within his or her State, any ratepayer increases associated with implementing a State or Federal plan would be greater than any costs associated with responding to extreme weather conditions associated with human-caused climate change.

Mr. Chairman, this would include the costs associated with cleaning up after mass flooding, intense wildfires, more frequent and intense storms, as well as the costs associated with loss of crops and livestock due to increased drought.

Mr. Chairman, as any State that has had to deal with the aftermath of any of these destructive extreme weather events can attest, Americans are already shouldering the costs of climate change—and these costs are getting worse and worse. In fact, according to the National Climate Assessment, if we do not seriously invest in addressing climate change impacts now, we can expect to see more expensive and costly future damages associated with almost every facet of our society, from negative health impacts, to stressing our infrastructure and water system, to harming our national security, up to and including hurting our overall long-term economic growth.

Mr. Chairman, just 2 days ago, on Monday, the EPA, in collaboration with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the Pacific Northwest National Lab, and the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, released a peer-reviewed study detailing the costs if we fail to address climate change. This report stated that failure to act could cost 12,000 lives from extreme temperatures and 57,000 lives from poor air quality in the year 2100, as well as cost the country hundreds of billions of dollars each and every year.

The analysis also looked at the impact of climate change on health, electricity, infrastructure, water resources, agriculture, forestry, and the ecosystem. It found that if we acted to reduce emissions, we could avert loss of life, reduce the number of droughts and floods, and save up to $34 billion in power system costs in the year 2050 alone.

So, Mr. Chairman, with all of these dire warnings coming from both the experts as well as from Mother Nature herself, we cannot allow Governors to ''just say no'' to reducing harmful pollutants from their States and simply put their heads in the sand.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment to ensure that Governors are held accountable for their failure to act to reduce harmful pollutants that impact the overall public good.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

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

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, with great respect to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), whom I have had the privilege of sitting through 5 years, it seems like, of hearings almost every day, while I have the greatest respect for him, I do rise in opposition to this amendment.

His amendment would basically say that State Governors must certify that the cost to the ratepayers under EPA's 111(d) rule would exceed the costs associated with responding to extreme weather events.

I point out once again that in The Economist magazine just this May, a few weeks ago, they were quoting scientists who were saying it is impossible to say categorically that climate change has caused any individual storm, flood, drought, heat wave, tornado, hurricane, or any other adverse weather effect. So that correlation has simply not been established scientifically.

This amendment would require State Governors to make a certification on something that they cannot do, even the EPA itself will not and cannot do, which is to show any direct benefit on climate events from their rule.

EPA has said in their own testimony that this rule, this regulation, will not have a significant impact on climate events in the U.S. As a matter of fact, in April testimony before Congress, Acting Assistant Administrator McCabe indicated that EPA could not predict the impact of the rule on any of its climate indicators. So they are adopting this rule as simply following up on the President's Georgetown speech in which he laid out his climate plan.

But I would like to point out that America is addressing climate change. I would say once again, we have 61 government programs involved. We have 18 Federal agencies involved. We spent a total of $77 billion since 2008. We are doing all sorts of things.

This bill is simply to give States enough time to respond to this very complex regulation until after the courts have rendered a decision.

And so, with that, I would respectfully request Members to oppose the Rush amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA OF MICHIGAN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 114–177.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of section 2 of the bill, add the following:

(d) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—The Congress encourages the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in promulgating, implementing, or enforcing any final rule described in subsection (b), to specifically address how the megawatt hours discharged from a pumped hydroelectric storage system will be incorporated into State and Federal implementation plans adopted pursuant to any such final rule.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky, for bringing this important bill to the floor to empower States to protect consumers from higher electric rates and to ensure grid reliability. In fact, when I was in the State legislature back in Michigan, I served as the vice chair of our Energy and Technology Committee and spent a lot of time and work on grid reliability and cost issues.

Under the clean power plan, the EPA would set mandatory carbon dioxide emission levels for each State and require that they submit State plans to meet their EPA-established ''goals.''

While I have many concerns about the proposed rule, I am offering this amendment to highlight how the EPA's approach to calculating emissions actually discourages the kind of emission reductions that it is intended to promote.

Here is how. The EPA's compliance formula does not include a way to calculate the benefits of clean energy storage. Michigan is a prime example of the importance of energy storage via the Ludington Pumped Storage reservoir in west Michigan, in the Second District.

Ludington Pumped Storage was the largest pumped storage hydroelectric facility in the world when it was constructed. I remember as a young man, my dad was in construction, and we would do Sunday drives an hour and a half north just to see progress on this. It is an 842-acre reservoir that is 2½ miles long and holds 27 billion gallons of water. In the last couple of years, it now includes a wind farm with 56 turbines that are generating an additional 100 megawatts. Ludington can generate up to 1,872 megawatts, which is enough electricity to serve a community of 1.4 million residential customers.

Here is how the pump storage works. At night, when electric rates are low—and oftentimes the wind is blowing in west Michigan, and those turbines are going—Ludington's reversible turbines down at the lake level pump water up the 363-foot hill from Lake Michigan to the reservoir. Then, during the day, when electric demand is high, the reservoir releases water to flow downhill and it turns the turbines to make carbon-free electricity. And that is very, very helpful, obviously especially in the summertime when we have peak times.

In fact, when I was in the State legislature, I was standing next to those turbines and they got the call that they needed peak electricity because a substation had gone down in southeast Michigan. Literally, within 10 minutes, those turbines were spinning and producing electricity and putting it back out on the grid, thereby saving a whole lot of expenses they were going to look at in needing to go out on the MISO system to purchase that electricity.

In addition to it being carbon-free, there are no other emissions being pumped from the storage generation either.

Ironically, the proposed rule would penalize States like Michigan and Virginia that have prudently invested in energy storage technology because the emissions and megawatt hours from plants used to charge the system are included in the EPA's equation. However, the megawatt hours discharged from the storage system are not. Thus, according to the EPA, a State's emissions intensity actually increases if they utilize clean energy storage. That is the exact opposite of what I hope is the EPA's goal of this rule.

This amendment simply encourages the EPA to explicitly authorize States to include clean energy storage in their compliance plans.

I encourage my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment and the underlying bill so that States can best protect their residents from the significant economic and reliability impact the proposed rule could have.

At this time, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), my colleague.

Mr. KILDEE. I thank my friend for yielding.

He has his photo of the hydroelectric pump storage facility. His is from the right. I have a picture from the left. It is a different view, but it is the same facility.

This is really important. I support this amendment. With electricity demands varying, as Mr. HUIZENGA said, throughout peak and nonpeak times, Michigan companies produce and store reserve energy in this facility for future use when demand is high, which provides, as was said, energy literally at a moment's notice, which is critical for grid stability and also critical to keep prices low for our consumers.

This technology allows our companies to respond quickly when demand exceeds base load capacity, especially during extreme weather events such as heat waves and polar vortexes.

The EPA has repeatedly recognized the need for large-scale storage facilities like Ludington's and how pumped hydroelectric storage can fill this role, but the EPA's proposed rule compliance formula does not include a way to calculate the benefits of pumped hydroelectric storage.

□ 1600

With this amendment, we would like to encourage the EPA to address specifically how pumped hydroelectric storage will be counted in Michigan and other States, so the consumers will have access. This is important for Michigan.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am not going to oppose the amendment, but I would like to speak to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITFIELD. First, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I am not going to take the time, maybe give it back to the two gentlemen whom I joined on this amendment as well.

This is one of those things that is common sense—at least, we believe in. Our people back home, they don't understand this in dealing with some regulation on why we are trying to encourage this clean resource and this energy and pumping the hydroelectric and not getting the credit for it.

I have had to deal with this on the core issues on some others where we are actually trying to do what is right for the environment and also trying to

do for sustainable and renewable energy.

So I just wanted to say thanks for this amendment. I think we are working toward the right way, and I think this sense of Congress to say ''study this'' is the positive way we look at this and we work forward toward using all the resources and all the energy sources that we have and using those in a very productive way.

I just wanted to put my support to this and look forward to this amendment being approved. I join with my two other cosponsors on this as well.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for raising the issue and the gentleman from Georgia.

It does illustrate some of the shortcomings of this proposed regulation because, instead of encouraging clean renewable energy, it, in effect, is discouraging it because they are not getting credit for it. That is another problem.

For that reason, we would be happy to accept this amendment and include it as part of this bill. Thank you all very much for bringing it to our attention.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 114–177.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 2.

Redesignate section 3 as section 2 and amend such section (as so redesignated) to read as follows:

SEC. 2. RATEPAYER PROTECTION.

(a) EFFECTS OF PLANS.—In developing a State or Federal plan pursuant to any final rule described in subsection (c), a State or the Administrator shall—

(1) consult with the State's public utility commission or public service commission, and the Electric Reliability Organization; and

(2) to the extent available, consider any independent reliability analysis prepared by such entities during development of such plan.

(b) INDEPENDENT RELIABILITY ANALYSIS.—In preparing an independent reliability analysis for purposes of subsection (a), a State's public utility commission or public service commission, and the Electric Reliability Organization, shall evaluate the anticipated effects of implementation and enforcement of the final rule on—

(1) regional electric reliability and resource adequacy;

(2) operation of wholesale electricity markets within the region involved;

(3) existing and planned transmission and distribution infrastructure; and

(4) projected electricity demands.

(c) FINAL RULES DESCRIBED.—A final rule described in this subsection is any final rule to address carbon dioxide emissions from existing sources that are fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units under section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411(d)), including any final rule that succeeds—

(1) the proposed rule entitled ''Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units'' published at 79 Fed. Reg. 34830 (June 18, 2014); or

(2) the supplemental proposed rule entitled ''Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: EDUs in Indian Country and U.S. Territories; Multi-Jurisdictional Partnerships'' published at 79 Fed. Reg 65482 (November 4, 2014).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the term ''Electric Reliability Organization'' has the meaning given to such term in section 215(a) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824o(a)).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to commend my colleague from Kentucky on his efforts to protect consumers and ratepayers. I share that goal. However, we also need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions; and we can protect customers, consumers, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions simultaneously.

My amendment is intended as a compromise that is practical and would both protect consumers and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

I worked in the energy industry for two decades before coming to Congress. I worked with the utilities sector, with the national laboratories, and with other stakeholders. I know these issues. I have been on the ground. So I can appreciate the need for a secure, reliable electric grid. I clearly understand the need for certainty and flexibility.

That is one of the reasons I cofounded the bipartisan Grid Innovation Caucus, to help address the pressing issues affecting our Nation's electric grid. We are focusing on hardening the grid, protecting against cyber threats, responsiveness to extreme weather events, and ensuring grid reliability and resiliency.

H.R. 2042 will stop the EPA's proposed clean power plan and proposed ozone standard from taking effect. This would sharply limit our Nation's ability to address climate change and the growing negative consequences it has on public health and our economy.

To address this, my amendment will make two changes:

First, it strikes section 2 of the bill, which prevents any rule from taking place until all litigation is complete. That provision would add considerable uncertainty to the entire process and introduce a significant precedent into the Federal rulemaking process. If a delay is appropriate, let's introduce a simple delay.

Second, my amendment replaces the ability of States to opt out of the plan with the requirement that the State public utility commissions or public service commissions, as well as the appropriate electric reliability organization, issue reliability analyses on any State or Federal plan. In this bill's current form, allowing States to opt out of the Federal law would create a significant barrier to Federal authority.

The analysis that my amendment calls for must include effects on regional electric reliability and resource adequacy, operation of wholesale electric markets, transmission and distribution infrastructure, and projected electricity demands.

Federal agencies have varied expertise and missions and not all are equipped to properly assess potential impacts that a rule may have on a particular industry. Consequently, we need collaboration at all levels.

In a letter to the EPA earlier this year, FERC stated that working together with the EPA, ISOs, RTOs, and the States will be essential as plans are developed. FERC wrote that, ''its rate jurisdiction, at times, has effects on reliability issues. But, reliability also depends on factors beyond the Commission's jurisdiction, such as State authority over local distribution and integrated resource planning.''

So I think it is an overstatement to claim that the clean power plan or the ozone standard would be the sole cause of impacts on rates or reliability.

My amendment mirrors FERC's comments and ensures that an independent analysis is conducted by experts who deal with the grid on a daily basis because the EPA is not an expert on grid reliability.

If we want to add safeguards to add transparency and accountability, we need to ensure that States and regions have their voices heard. A practical way to accomplish that is by having the PUC and ISO submit a reliability report to the EPA.

Grid reliability is a bipartisan issue. If my amendment is adopted, it will help move the ball forward on this important issue. If not, H.R. 2042 will just be another messaging bill that the President will almost certainly veto. I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Once again, I would like to thank Mr. MCNERNEY for this amendment. I have certainly enjoyed working with him on our committee. He certainly understands energy.

I must say that I have to respectfully disagree with him on this amendment. His amendment would basically strike the substantive part of our bill. As I have said in the beginning, this proposed regulation is so far outside the bounds of anything EPA has ever attempted before because these plants are already regulated under section 112. It specifically states if they are regulated there, they can't be regulated under 111(d).

So we are trying to respond to the States. EPA, we expect, is going to

give them 13 months to comply. There have been many lawsuits already filed. There are going to be more lawsuits filed.

Because it is so costly, so complex, and they are under such time constraints, we simply want to delay the State implementation plans until after the courts have made a decision.

Also, his amendment would eliminate the Governor's finding of a significantly adverse impact on electricity rates and reliability and simply say that they have got to come up with this State implementation plan by working with utility commissioners and NERC, which they will be doing anyway. So if our bill is vetoed, that is where they are going to be anyway.

So I would respectfully oppose this amendment as certainly defeating what we are trying to do. With great respect to Mr. MCNERNEY, I would oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the chairman's thoughtful remarks and his concern about the effects of the clean power plan.

My recommendation is that, if a delay is required, let's just introduce a specific delay, 1 year or 2 years. Introducing a bill that requires all the judicial matters to be settled before a plan can come into effect is just too vague. It doesn't make sense. I think it will do a lot more damage.

What we are asking for is that the States and the local authorities produce a reliability plan so that they will understand the effects of the clean power plan. It is really a compromise position. If we want to move forward, then, let's adopt a compromise. If we want to make a message bill, let's move forward with the existing plan.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. NEWHOUSE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 114–177.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 4. TREATMENT OF HYDROPOWER AS RENEWABLE ENERGY.

In issuing, implementing, and enforcing any final rule described in section 2(b), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall treat hydropower as renewable energy.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 333, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the good gentleman from Kentucky for his work on this bill.

I rise today in support of my amendment to H.R. 2042, the Ratepayer Protection Act of 2015, and urge my colleagues to support its adoption.

This amendment, which I am proud to introduce with my friend and colleague from the State of Washington, Congresswoman JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER, would very simply direct the Environmental Protection Agency to consider hydropower as a renewable energy source when issuing, implementing, and enforcing any final rule regarding carbon dioxide emissions from existing power plants under the Clean Air Act.

EPA's misguided proposed clean power plan, which the Agency announced in June of 2014, attempts to regulate and reduce the amount of carbon emitted from the power sector by setting emission guidelines for each individual State. Under the proposed rule, my home State of Washington would be responsible for an unattainable 72 percent reduction in its carbon emissions by the year 2030.

To put this into context, the State of Iowa would be required to reduce carbon emissions by 16 percent, the State of Kentucky by 18 percent, and the State of North Dakota by 11 percent. I believe the proposed clean power plan would have devastating consequences for each and every State, as well as for the country at large, which is why I am proud to cosponsor and support H.R. 2042.

Mr. Chairman, the requirements placed on Washington by this misguided rule are simply unachievable. It will hurt our families and our small businesses by raising the cost of electricity, and it will cost our economy billions of dollars just to comply.

My amendment would seek to provide a reality check to EPA and highlight the effect this regulation would have on such States as Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and South Dakota, which are blessed with abundant sources of hydropower, a nonemitting energy source. However, under the EPA's plan, hydropower is not treated as a renewable energy source, despite the fact that the Obama administration has recently been touting the potential of hydropower as part of its all-the-above energy strategy.

In fact, Mr. Chair, last April, Secretary Moniz discussed the importance of hydropower and described it as a renewable in an address to the National Hydropower Association. In his remarks, the Secretary stated: ''We have to pick up the covers off of this hidden renewable that is right in front of our eyes and continues to have significant potential.''

Yet, despite this public praise for hydropower and recognition of it as a renewable, the EPA decided to push a plan that explicitly neglects hydropower as a renewable in favor of other sources, such as wind and solar.

□ 1615

Additionally, the EPA's plan uses the year 2012 as its baseline for each State's carbon reduction goals, and this will also negatively impact my home State and others in the Northwest.

In 2012, Oregon and Washington experienced unusually high levels of rainfall, unfortunately, unlike this year, which led to a sharp increase in hydropower production; and, therefore, we used less energy from fossil fuel sources.

As a result, the proposed rule seriously underestimates the average amount of carbon used by my State in its power production which, in reality, is much higher than the EPA 2012 baseline. Because hydropower is not viewed as a renewable, we will have to utilize impractical amounts of other renewable energy sources, such as wind and solar, to meet the EPA's goals.

Mr. Chair, the effects of this decision in States with large amounts of existing hydroelectric power, such as mine, Oregon, South Dakota, and Idaho, are significantly disadvantaged under the rule and will not get credit for their existing hydroelectric generation and infrastructure.

However, my amendment would address this issue by directing EPA to simply recognize hydropower as a renewable energy source. This would in no way restrict the goals of H.R. 2042, which I fully support, nor would it negatively affect other nonhydropower States. It just highlights the misguided rule put forth by the Agency.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the Newhouse-Herrera Beutler amendment and the underlying bill, and I urge the amendment's adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, the Newhouse amendment seeks to legislatively adjust an element of the EPA's clean power plan, but the amendment does nothing to fix the problems in the rest of the bill, which was actually designed to cripple the EPA's ability to curb emissions from power plants and allows Governors to thumb their noses at the Clean Air Act.

The Newhouse amendment would make more sense if it were a comment submitted to the EPA on the proposed rule, rather than being attached to legislation that would gut the clean power plan altogether.

In fact, the EPA is actively considering this issue already. The proposed clean power plan would have allowed new and incremental hydropower to count towards compliance with the

rule, but it did not consider existing hydropower in either goal setting or for compliance.

EPA received many comments on including hydropower in setting the clean power plan's goals and treating hydropower as an eligible measure to lower CO_2 emissions.

EPA has engaged in outreach to numerous stakeholders about hydropower, renewable energy, and other low- and zero-emitting sources of power to better understand issues raised in their comments; and it is giving careful consideration to all comments received.

There are varying views on this topic, and it should be left, in my opinion, to the rulemaking process to sort out the best approach.

Since EPA is actively considering the comments received on hydropower, the amendment is not necessary, and in fact, it could be counterproductive. Ultimately, approval of the Newhouse amendment would do nothing to change the fundamental flaws of the underlying bill. I urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114–177 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. PALLONE of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. RUSH of Illinois.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. MCNERNEY of California.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 245, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 381]

AYES—181

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
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

NOES—245

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
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
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
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, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
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—7

Clyburn
Hanna
Kelly (MS)
Napolitano
Payne
Pelosi
Sarbanes

□ 1649

Mrs. WALORSKI, Messrs. MULLIN, WALKER, BARLETTA, RYAN of Wisconsin, POE of Texas, CHAFFETZ, HUELSKAMP, Mses. GRANGER and SEWELL of Alabama changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Messrs. CROWLEY, HUFFMAN, Mesdames LAWRENCE and TORRES changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, on Wednesday, June 24th, 2015, I was absent during roll-call vote No. 381. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on agreeing to the Pallone Amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. RUSH

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 243, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 382]

AYES—182

Adams
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
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
King (NY)
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
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
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
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

NOES—243

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
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
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
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)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
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, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
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—8

Clyburn
Hanna
Kelly (MS)
Larson (CT)
Napolitano
Payne
Pelosi
Sarbanes

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1655

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, on Wednesday, June 24th, 2015, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 382. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on agreeing to the Rush of Illinois Amendment #2.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chair, on June 24, 2015—I was not present for rollcall vote 382. If I had been present for this vote, I would have voted: "yay" on rollcall vote 382.

Stated against:

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 382 I inadvertently voted "yes", when I wanted to vote "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 250, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 383]

AYES—177

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
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
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
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

NOES—250

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
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
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)

Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
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, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
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—6

Clyburn
Hanna
Kelly (MS)
Napolitano
Payne
Sarbanes

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1701

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 24th, 2015, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 383. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on agreeing to the McNerney of California Amendment No. 4.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Mr. HOLDING, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2042) to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing carbon dioxide emissions from existing fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units before requiring compliance with such rule, and to allow States to protect households and businesses from significant adverse effects on electricity ratepayers or reliability, and, pursuant to House Resolution 333, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

(By unanimous consent, Mrs. ROBY was allowed to speak out of order.)

SEVENTH ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL WOMEN'S SOFTBALL GAME

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleagues this afternoon to remind all that today is a very special day. Today is the Seventh Annual Congressional Women's Softball Game that we play for the Young Survival Coalition. Each of us is playing either in memory of or in honor of a survivor.

No one in this room is untouched by cancer, so I would just encourage all of my colleagues to join us tonight. The first pitch is at 7 o'clock at the Watkins Recreation Center.

Members can bring all of their staffs and their interns and their friends and their families. It will be a great event.

Beat cancer, and beat the press.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, we are really so gratified to have been able to have spent the last 3 months practicing every morning at 7 a.m.

Our team—I just keep repeating that over and over, and maybe it will come true—is bipartisan. It is an opportunity every year for us to come together and bridge the divide around a cause that is so meaningful and important for so many women all across America.

I thank all of you every year for your support and for the turnout and for the love and affection that we have for one another in that we are able to put aside our differences. As a breast cancer survivor myself—diagnosed at 41—I just can't thank my colleagues enough for their time.

I will close by saying that the Member team is the defending champion; and, tonight, we will keep the trophy. Go, Members. Beat the press. Beat cancer.

Please join us at 420 12th Street Southeast, at the Watkins Recreation Center. The first pitch is at 7 p.m. It is a great game. Come by. Eat hot dogs. Cheer us on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, this will be a 5-minute vote.

There was no objection.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 247, noes 180, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 384]

AYES—247

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
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)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
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, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus

Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
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

NOES—180

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
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
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
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—6

Clyburn
Hanna
Kelly (MS)
Napolitano
Payne
Sarbanes

□ 1719

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 384 on H.R. 2042, I am not recorded because I was absent for personal reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Stated against:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 24th, 2015, I was absent during rollcall vote No. 384. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on passage of H.R. 2042, the Ratepayer Protection Act of 2015.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate concurs in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 2146) ''An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes.''.

The message also announced pursuant to section 4355(a) of title 10, United States Code, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy:

The Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), designee of the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), designee of the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intent to raise a question of the privileges of the House. The form of my resolution is as follows:

Whereas on December 20, 1860, South Carolina became the first State to secede from the Union;

Whereas on January 9, 1861, Mississippi seceded from the Union, stating in its ''Declaration of Immediate Causes'' that ''[olur position is thoroughly identified with the institution of slavery—the greatest material interest of the world.'';

Whereas on February 9, 1861, the Confederate States of America was formed with a group of 11 States as a purported sovereign nation and with Jefferson Davis of Mississippi as its president;

Whereas on March 11, 1861, the Confederate States of America adopted its own constitution;

Whereas on April 12, 1861, the Confederate States of America fired shots upon Fort Sumter in Charleston, South Carolina, effectively beginning the Civil War;

Whereas the United States did not recognize the Confederate States of America as a sovereign nation, but rather as a rebel insurrection, and took to military battle to bring the rogue states back into the Union;

Whereas on April 9, 1865, General Robert E. Lee surrendered to General Ulysses S. Grant at Appomattox Court House in Virginia, effectively, ending the Civil War and preserving the Union;

Whereas during the Civil War, the Confederate States of America used the Navy Jack, Battle Flag, and other imagery as a symbols of the Confederate armed forces;

Whereas since the end of the Civil War, the Navy Jack, Confederate battle flag, and other imagery of the Confederacy have been appropriated by groups as a symbols of hate, terror, intolerance, and as supportive of the institution of slavery;

Whereas groups such as the Ku Klux Klan and other white supremacist groups utilize Confederate imagery to frighten, terrorize, and cause harm to groups of people toward whom they have hateful intent, including African Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Jewish Americans;

Whereas many State and Federal political leaders, including United States Senators Thad Cochran and Roger Wicker, along with Mississippi House Speaker Philip Gunn and other State leaders, have spoken out and advocated for the removal of the imagery of the Confederacy on Mississippi's state flag;

Whereas many Members of Congress, including Speaker John Boehner, support the removal of the Confederate flag from the grounds of South Carolina's capitol;

Whereas Speaker John Boehner released a statement on the issue saying, ''I commend Governor Nikki Haley and other South Carolina leaders in their effort to remove the Confederate flag from Statehouse grounds. In his second inaugural address 150 years ago, and a month before his assassination, President Abraham Lincoln ended his speech with these powerful words, which are as meaningful today as when they were spoken on the East Front of the Capitol on March 4, 1865: 'With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.' '';

Whereas the House of Representatives has several State flags with imagery of the Confederacy throughout its main structures and House office buildings;

Whereas it is an uncontroverted fact that symbols of the Confederacy offend and insult many members of the general public who use the hallways of Congress each day;

Whereas Congress has never permanently recognized in its hallways the symbols of sovereign nations with whom it has gone to war or rogue entities such as the Confederate States of America;

Whereas continuing to display a symbol of hatred, oppression, and insurrection that nearly tore our Union apart and that is known to offend many groups throughout the country would irreparably damage the reputation of this august institution and offend the very dignity of the House of Representatives; and

Whereas this impairment of the dignity of the House and its Members constitutes a violation under rule IX of the Rules of the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall remove any State flag containing any portion of the Confederate battle flag, other than a flag displayed by the office of a Member of the House, from any area within the House wing of the Capitol or any House office building, and shall donate any such flag to the Library of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Mississippi will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

HONORING THE LIFE OF OFFICER SONNY KIM

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, last week, Cincinnati lost a hero in blue. A 27-year veteran of the Cincinnati Police Department, Officer Sonny Kim lived a life of service to his family, his department, and his city.

We mourn for a life cut short while serving in the line of duty. Officer Kim is remembered as a model police officer, husband, and father, an officer with 22 commendations during his decorated career. His lasting memory stands as a testament to the best of our community and society.

Mr. Speaker, police officers deal with people every day, usually people at their very worst, and they do so selflessly and tirelessly, but we must never take that service for granted.

We mourn with Officer Kim's wife, his sons, and his sisters and brothers who served alongside him.

Rest in peace, Officer Kim. Your good deeds will not be forgotten.

□ 1730

REMEMBERING WILLIAM WHITE

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

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, recently, we lost William White to cancer, but his contributions to his community and dedication to his friends and family will not be forgotten. His life is yet another example of the American Dream realized.

Born in 1930, in Brooklyn, Bill started out selling printing presses in New York. Eventually, he would join forces with his brother Tom to build some of New York City's most impressive restaurants.

While he was well known for his success in business, Bill was also an important member of his community in Point Lookout, New York. There, he established the chamber of commerce and was an active member of the Point Lookout Civic Association. He was a true example that we can all find a way to serve and give something back to this great Nation.

He met his wife of almost 60 years, Patricia, at a dance near West Point in 1955. He and Pat traveled the world, always excited to explore culture and cuisine on their next great adventure.

They had one child, Bill, who works in philanthropy and has helped raise hundreds of millions of dollars for our Nation's veterans. I know that Bill was very proud of his son. His legacy of service, carried on by his son, has meant that thousands of veterans—our Nation's heroes—have received help they otherwise would not have received.

While this is a painful time for all who knew Bill, I know his family and friends can be proud of the life he lived and his dedication to his family and his country.

SONORAN CORRIDOR

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

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, the number one priority I hear from my constituents is creating more jobs and economic opportunity in southern Arizona, and this week, I introduced legislation, along with my Arizona colleagues, to do just that.

Southern Arizona already plays a vital role in our Nation's trade partnership with Mexico through its proximity to the border and key interstate systems, but more can be done to take advantage of these invaluable assets.

Right now, trucks driving north on Interstate 19 from the Mariposa Port of Entry at Nogales must travel on congested city routes before meeting Interstate 10 to travel east. This impedes the flow of traffic and wastes valuable time and money.

A connection between the two highways south of Tucson would reduce this congestion, help attract businesses to southern Arizona, and expand trade connectivity for the southwestern United States and Mexico.

My bill, the Sonoran Corridor Interstate Development Act, would designate this proposed connection a high-priority corridor on the National Highway System. It has the support of the entire Arizona delegation.

Its passage is in the best interest of southern Arizona, our State, and our country; and I look forward to working with my colleagues to move this important project forward.

AURORA POLICE OFFICER DAVID BEMER

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

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, in the last year, we have seen far too many examples of conflict and violence in our communities. While we cannot forget or ignore these tragedies, it is important that we recognize the good that is happening throughout our country every day.

I would like to take a moment to share with you one example. While out on patrol, Aurora, Illinois, Police Officer David Bemer stopped when he saw a group of teens in the street. Some of the kids said they were alarmed, not knowing why he was stopping or what might happen next.

They explained that they were all part of a dance group called Simply Destinee and were practicing in the alley because their dance studio had lost electrical power. What happened next was something that we would all love to see much more of.

Officer Bemer got out of his car and danced with the kids. The video from this apparently went viral, highlighting exactly the kind of community engagement that we would love to see more of.

This is what happens when police officers like those in my district get to know their communities and communities get to know their police officers.

It is only when we work together—police officers, side by side with members of the community—that we make real and lasting progress.

Mr. Speaker, that leaves a smile on my face.

CONGRATULATING WAYZATA HIGH SCHOOL BOYS TRACK AND FIELD

(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 to congratulate the Wayzata High School boys track and field team on winning the Minnesota State championship.

After coming up just short the last 2 years, the Trojans were boosted by strong performances from distance runners Jaret Carpenter and Connor Olson. In addition, Wayzata was led by Wesley Jackson's second-place finish in the long jump, Tyler Didier's third-place finish in the 400-meter dash, and a number of strong relay teams. It absolutely was a complete team effort.

These athletes spend practice after practice pushing themselves and each other to reach their personal bests. In addition, every single one of these student athletes still manage to meet and excel at other school, family, and social obligations.

Mr. Speaker, the families, teachers, friends, and entire community are very proud of these high school champs.

Congratulations to Coach Aaron Berndt and the Wayzata High School boys track and field team on a job well done.

ISIS PROMOTES SLAVERY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, according to news reports, ISIS is holding competitions at mosques to celebrate Ramadan. Here is the challenge: memorize the Koran. The prize—get this—is a young female sex slave.

As a father and a grandfather, I am repulsed by the fact that young women—just kids—are being handed out like door prizes in a Koran contest. Second and third place apparently receive the same reward, kidnapped young teenage girls.

This competition is advertised on flyers and marketed to young males. The arrogance, barbarity, and brutality of this terrorist enterprise has no limits. ISIS pillages, rapes, and kills their way across the Middle East. They brazenly broadcast decapitations, slowly drown people in cages, and burn captors alive.

ISIS is an enemy of all states. Its terrorist reign of religious genocide threatens all humanity in a path of murderous anarchy. The world must ban together to destroy these subhuman radical jihadists.

Justice demands these killers be held accountable for their crimes against all peoples of the world, including little girls.

And that is just the way it is.

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY 50TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Florida International University on the celebration of their 50th anniversary earlier this week on June 22.

This great accomplishment gives all Floridians an opportunity to recognize this special institution and all who have contributed to FIU's success throughout the years should be proud.

FIU is located in Florida's 26th Congressional District, where over 17,000 of my constituents are enrolled as students and an additional 2,400 graduated last year. In my time serving south Florida in Congress, I have witnessed this university's passion for helping students seek higher education to better themselves while giving back to our community.

Mr. Speaker, south Florida is a place where people from all over the world come seeking opportunity and success; many find it at FIU.

On the occasion of FIU's 50th anniversary, I salute all those who have dedicated their careers to improving the lives of scholars. I know many proud graduates who today are leaders in our community.

Once again, congratulations. I know that the next 50 years will bring even greater success and achievement.

Go Panthers.

PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS: ADDRESSING GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days 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 New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. As we do almost every week, my colleagues and I are here on the floor this evening to urge the people's House to take up the issues that matter to the people.

This week, we are still reeling from the tragedy in South Carolina. My colleagues and I are urging Members on both sides of the aisle to take a look at an issue we have consistently and painfully avoided for years, what we are doing to prevent gun violence.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Second Amendment and Americans' rights to reasonable, responsible gun ownership; but it is time for us in America to admit we have a problem.

When I see more than two dozen people shot in one weekend in my hometown of Detroit, when I see the face of a deranged and hate-fueled young man—a man who should have never had a gun but was able to destroy the lives of nine amazing people who welcomed him into their church in South Carolina—I know it is time for America to embrace commonsense gun control.

In the span of about 24 hours, 27 people were shot and 3 were killed in Detroit, Michigan. It is a city that I represent, along with my esteemed colleague Congressman JOHN CONYERS. The FBI and the Detroit Police Department confirm that, in the city of Detroit, overall crime is down; yet gun deaths are on the rise.

Ninety percent of Americans who were polled want universal background checks for gun purchases. That is 90 percent. What are we waiting for?

There is not a Member of Congress who has not been touched by gun violence. That includes one of our own, a colleague that was highly respected, Gabby Giffords.

How many more deaths must families and communities endure? How many more funerals must we attend? How many children must be orphaned? How many parents must suffer the unspeakable heartbreak of losing a child?

There is no question that we must act, and we must act now. How many times must we watch on national news what uncontrolled gun violence can do to our country?

That action must focus on three principles: establish universal background checks; eliminate the gun show loopholes that allow a person to walk in, pick up a gun, and walk out the door; and enforce our existing gun control laws.

We have seen countries all over the globe who are not experiencing the gun violence that we have here in America, and their citizens have the right to own guns.

It is time for us to awaken from a sleep of the past and address this issue and address it now.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank the gentlewoman for taking the time to join us and sharing that important message. I join her in her sentiments.

I now yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY).

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding as we continue this important conversation.

Every day in America, we navigate the threat of gun violence. From metal detectors in public buildings to shooting safety drills at schools and movie theaters, guns affect how we live and whether we live at all; yet, when gun violence intruded into the most sacred of places, piercing the peace of prayer at Emanuel AME Church in Charleston, it stirred a sickening sadness within us.

□ 1745

It was a searing reminder that there is no corner of our country that offers a haven for us when guns end up in the wrong hands.

We are here today because of Charleston, to remember the lives of the nine souls who were lost. It is a ritual we have on automatic repeat, again and again, massacre after massacre, as an end run around real gun reform.

We have the conviction covered. What we have lacked in Congress is the courage to do the right thing. The Charleston 9 are victims of this lack of courage, as are the 30,000 Americans who die each year from gun violence.

For the first time in history, this year, gun deaths are on pace to be the leading cause of death of Americans aged 15–24. We are losing a generation of young Americans to guns. The future of our Nation is, quite literally, at stake.

All across America, children are growing up in fear. Kids play tag indoors. Mothers second-guess on letting their children walk to school. Some studies suggest that repeated exposure to shootings in some communities is akin to the trauma suffered by soldiers in war zones.

We as a nation have accepted gun violence as a fact of life. But we are better than this.

In the Kelly Report on Gun Violence in America, I outlined a number of effective strategies to stop the bloodshed, which includes expanding gun background checks.

I implore my colleagues to listen to your conscience and the conscience of the country you represent and work with me to chart a new course for a safer America. There is overwhelming public support for commonsense gun reform. Responsible gun owners support responsible gun laws. We can strike a sensible balance on gun reform that protects our Second Amendment rights while also ensuring the basic human right of all Americans to live free from gun violence.

How many more massacres must we endure? How many more innocent people will we allow to be murdered on our watch?

The time has come for Congress to have the courage of our convictions, to honor through action by expanding background checks to keep these depraved killers from getting their hands on guns, and the other gun safety laws that we have talked about in the past.

We have the power to stop the next Charleston, Newtown, and Aurora so that no other American city becomes synonymous with gun tragedy. We have the moral imperative to stop an epidemic that claims more casualties than war and disease, combined.

Congress must put saving American lives at the top of our agenda. We owe it to the Charleston 9 and to all who have fallen before them, as we owe it to a generation of young people at risk of meeting a similar fate.

I thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks, and I associate myself with the concerns raised through them.

Mr. Speaker, my heart is heavy right now. I never thought that I would be in Washington representing the people of the 12th District in the State of New Jersey, but never in my wildest imagination did I think that I would be on the floor of this body mourning the nine Americans murdered for the color of their skin in the midst of worship, at a church that was part of the fight for our civil rights.

In what has become a disturbingly routine order of events, we watch, horrified, as the helicopter circles a church, a movie theater, a college campus, or a school. A breaking news headline parades across the screen, keeping track of the developing details. The next day, we debate the mental stability or motive of the shooter. We ask where they purchased the weapon. We ponder the merits of changing our Nation's laws to keep more Americans safe. And then, inevitably, we do nothing, and the cycle repeats.

The rate of mass shootings has steadily risen since 2000. President Barack Obama has himself addressed the Nation for at least a dozen of these incidents since the beginning of his first term. We are the only developed nation in the world that has this problem, and we need to wake up and ask ourselves why.

We are told that more guns will keep us safe. We are told that requiring background checks for every purchase, with no exceptions, is too intrusive. We are told that our constitutional right to bear arms should cover every weapon, from a simple handgun to a machine gun, whose only purpose is to cause massive and irreparable harm.

Mr. Speaker, we are here tonight because we know that these statements are, at the very least, misleading and, more likely, outright falsehoods.

We stand together on behalf of the millions of Americans who agree that the shooting in Tucson, Arizona, that wounded one of our own should have been our last; that the lives lost in Aurora, Colorado, should have been the last; that the babies we lost in Newtown, Connecticut, should have moved us to change the ease with which we allow access to firearms.

We are asking our colleagues on both sides of the aisle whether they are willing to make this newest addition to a painful list the very last. I hope when we close our remarks this evening that every one of us will see the need for change.

Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield to a fellow freshman, who has introduced legislation today that would keep firearms out of the hands of criminals, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, every day, 88 Americans are killed by guns. The gun homicide rate in the U.S. is 20 times higher than other developed nations. How long before enough is enough?

Today, I am introducing the Keeping Guns from Criminals Act, commonsense gun violence prevention legislation that will close a loophole in current Federal law, that allows straw purchasers and gun traffickers to funnel firearms to felons, juveniles and other restricted purchasers, with little to no risk of being prosecuted.

While Federal law clearly prohibits the sale of a gun to a felon or other persons deemed not eligible to possess a firearm, the standard required to prosecute violators is so high that law enforcement is rarely able to bring charges. Only if the prosecutor can prove the seller knew the buyer was prohibited from purchasing a gun are they able to successfully prosecute. So unenforceable is the current statute that, on average, only 75 such prosecutions occur every year.

My bill would make it easier to prosecute these bad actors by making the sale of a firearm a strict liability. It is a crime, and the onus is on the seller to know whether the buyer is in the prohibited class of customers. No longer would a gun trafficker or irresponsible gun seller be able to claim they didn't know a purchaser was a criminal or had a restraining order against them or was on a terrorist watch list. No longer would we be tying the hands of law enforcement and preventing them from enforcing laws to protect our children. No longer would a prosecutor have to prove the intention or knowledge of wrongdoing required under current law.

Mr. Speaker, no doubt, one of the arguments against this bill will be a complaint that a background check places an onerous burden upon the seller. But consider this: the seller and prospective buyer need only go to one of the many Federal Firearms Licensees, or FFL, who provide a private property transfer with a background check for only about $30.

And consider that there are 130,000 FFLs in the United States. That is roughly nine times as many McDonald's as there are.

Mr. Speaker, everyone, even the National Rifle Association, agrees that we have a responsibility to keep guns out of the hands of dangerous criminals. This legislation is a step in that direction, and I encourage my colleagues to please support it.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those remarks.

Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, Dylann Roof walked into Emanuel AME and stole the lives of nine innocent Americans. In the days since, somehow we have lost track of the real problems. We keep talking about a flag, a flag that is a symbol of many our Nation's most glaring problems, but it is only a symbol.

I don't want to get too far off track, but I do want to make something perfectly clear. Symbols may matter, but they don't matter as much as the actions of police who consistently treat black men and women with clear and biased disregard. Symbols don't matter

as much as the mandatory sentencing laws that have propped up a prison industry with hundreds of thousands of Black men. Symbols don't matter as much as the predatory loan structures that put Black homeowners underwater and decimated the Black middle class, practices that banks were never truly held accountable for.

So, alongside those calls to take down the flag, I would appreciate calls to acknowledge that persistent racism is not the only problem here. Pervasive and unnecessary gun violence is also one of our Nation's most pronounced flaws.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this: I fully support the permanent removal of the Confederate flag. It represents one the darkest stains on our Nation's history. It represents baseless hate, disrespect for the civil rights and freedoms this Nation was founded upon, and enduring mistreatment in communities of color.

But if we are really about the business of ending discrimination once and for all, we need to enact policies that will counteract everything that that flag represents: job training that ensures all of our communities are qualified for the jobs of the future; education that lets our students succeed, regardless of where they live; and affordable housing that exists outside of the urban centers, in the communities that can offer folks the jobs they need to get on their feet and to climb to the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey for her consistent leadership and, particularly, her friendship, her passion for her district, and her commitment to policies that will lift all of us together as Americans.

This is the first time, Mr. Speaker, that I have had an opportunity to speak on the floor of the House since the moving and horrific tragedy that occurred in Charleston, South Carolina, to be able to first publicly express my deepest sympathy to the families that now mourn.

I think this may be the longest period of time that I have had a chance to speak. My recollection may be that I offered sympathies last week.

But to take a moment to explore the heinousness of the acts of the perpetrator who knocked on a door that was not closed, entered a sanctuary that did not reject him, walked down some stairs to a historic basement that reminds all of us of our church basements across the Nation, being that houses of worship, in particular, African American churches, will have their Sunday or Sabbath school in areas that are basements, particularly along the northern and eastern coasts.

We know that Sunday or Sabbath school is particular to all of our many denominations in the Protestant faith, and every one of us understands that weekly Bible study that, through the traditions of our lives, we have seen our families and grandmothers and grandfathers, aunts and uncles, and those of us who joined in Bible study. In fact, Mr. Speaker, a Bible study is a phenomenon of the American church, the Protestant Church, where people gather to study and to understand the Word.

I said in a memorial service in Houston, it is a time of joy, a time of pain, a time of explaining one's self, and a time of redemption. And you feel good, for you join with your fellow travelers, and in a weary week, midweek, you come and restore yourself.

I can imagine that during the time that this evildoer was there, there was a lot of laughing or asking questions about the Scripture; might have been some joyful, argumentative interpretation, where Bible study participants give their perception or their interpretation. I know this because, if you have gone, you know what Bible study is all about.

In the course of that, the evildoer, filled with the sickness—and I hesitate to say ''cancer.'' Cancer is something that people do not voluntarily seek, but we know that cancer can eat at a body and kill someone.

So the cancerous racism that this individual possessed and internalized and, in fact, duped himself and took the medicine and continued to fill himself with a deadly concoction that was going to do nothing but kill him, but before it killed him, he felt compelled to kill someone else.

The money that he received for the celebrating of his 21st year, very young years—I guess what breaks my heart is how, in those young years, he could become so hateful. For as I said, he came into a place that did not reject him. He went down the stairs in a place where people were rejoicing.

□ 1800

And he, at the conclusion, after sitting next to Reverend Doctor Senator Pinckney, took out a gun and methodically killed those wonderful families—mothers and grandfathers and grandmothers and a son and father—without a pain.

He took a gun that none of us would raise to any Member on this floor or none of us in our houses of worship would raise to any forlorn traveler, any weary person that would come into our place of worship, whether a mosque, a Catholic parish, a synagogue, a Hindu temple, or any form of Protestant church, big or small.

Houston prides itself on having many, many denominations. In fact, we are now in the middle of Ramadan. Houston has many, many places of worship. I wouldn't venture to say I have been to all all over the world, but I have been to all in the city of Houston, my own congressional district, and each place, in their own faith, have welcomed people in.

We only see where there are evildoers that people would blow up temples, mosques, synagogues, and churches. This person didn't blow it up a distance away. He methodically did this. And a mother had to watch a son try to rescue those, protect them.

Heroes shown. The stories have not all been told, but we know that there were heroes in the midst. In fact, they all are heroes.

So I come for two reasons. I come to indicate that much of what we heard here today is true, that for us to do honor to those who died in this disastrous massacre, murderous, blood flowing from the church, that it will have to be our actions. It will have to be what we do about education and criminal justice reform.

I almost want to stop myself for the broken recordness of this because we will only do it in unity. We will only do it after we put aside contentious votes and we begin to say, What will heal America? We will not heal—and we have said this before—on the issue of cancerous racism unless we admit that it exists.

Many of us will present to this Congress a resolution that calls upon the recognition that there are some symbols of hate that we cannot deny. We will frame it in America's unity, as has been noted already earlier today, Governors and State representatives and others of good thought. Mitt Romney, for example, joined with President Obama's tweet that it is the right thing to do, to take down that rebel symbol that has been used to run onto the plantations of yesteryear with individuals clothed in white clothing, providing fear, intimidation, and evildoing.

Certainly we know the threats that Dr. King received during his life, or Medgar Evers during his life, who was murdered on his front porch, were all circling around people not talking about slavery. They were talking about desegregation and their opposition to desegregation and their support of upholding segregation.

This symbol of evil is not far from our life of 2015. Many of us lived through it and saw the disaster of such. Many of us saw the killing of civil rights workers, bound in hatred and not wanting to change what did not unify America but divided America.

So the guns that I have addressed now for the period of time that I have been here—I passed one of the few gun ordinances in a lawmaking body, the city council, which most people don't realize that some city governments give lawmaking legislative authority to their elected representatives. Houston, a noncity manager government, does that.

And I remember that ordinance, amongst the mayor and city council persons, packed the chambers. People with revolutionary outfits, gun enthusiasts, the NRA, all opposing a simple gun ordinance that said that, if a parent allowed a child to get a gun in their hand and a horrific incident happened, a shooting or the child shot themselves, the parent would be held

responsible. It was some semblance of not taking a gun away, but trying to instill responsibility with guns.

When we talk about this on the floor of the House, why all of a sudden, Mr. Speaker, does it become that we are against the Second Amendment and the National Rifle Association, and that this is going to be the undermining of this powerful organization if we even utter the words ''gun responsibility''? Why?

Why in Newtown?

I thought I had seen enough, heard enough when 20 little babies in a corner, no less, 6 adults murdered in a murderous fashion from someone who absolutely did not deserve a gun for whatever the reason, as they took their own life, or someone who now stands on trial in Colorado who decided that a night out with a dad and his daughter in a theater—something that Americans know is part of our American culture. We are just moviegoers. We make the movie industry.

In the old days, in those outdoor drive-ins that many remember were some of the best times with your family—and thank God they didn't cost a lot—or the sophisticated high-tech theaters of today, it is still the same. Dads and little girls are going to theaters together. And this criminally minded person, evildoer, decided to kill 12 or, to our very distinguished colleague, the Congresswoman from Arizona, who was maintaining the dignity of her office, was shot down in the street by a gun, killed a Federal judge and many others, a 9-year-old girl, her staff, whose memory that we continue to mourn.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would offer to say that I joined with Congresswoman WATSON COLEMAN to indicate that the issue of gun responsibility legislation is not even overdue. We are crying out for relief. The violence that is used with handguns and AK–47s and automatic weapons is unspeakable.

We need to close the gun show loophole that allows people to go and get guns at gun shows. The name of my good friend Carolyn McCarthy and John Dingell, they worked together and had compromises. We could not get them on the floor of the House.

We need to go even further. We need to be able to assure that where this evildoer brought the gun, his exposure to the criminal justice system should have disallowed him from purchase until he was completely vetted. Some say that he would have stolen one or gotten one out of the back of a pickup truck, but maybe, Mr. Speaker, he would not have been able to go on that fateful night down those stairs through that open door to kill those blessed souls who were studying the word of the Lord.

So it is a challenge now. I know that those of us in the Congressional Progressive Caucus are Americans. I know that those who adhere to the Tea Party philosophy are Americans. To our various conservative caucuses that are in the Conference, our Republican friends, to the various caucuses that are in the Democratic Caucus, all are Americans. All felt the pain of the murderous act. In fact, it is almost like we are living in a cocoon. It is not over yet, as these families bury their loved ones.

But I think it is upon us—it is an onerous responsibility—to confront this whole question of racism, as the President has charged us to do, and not do it with another round of conversation, but confronting the fact that we can begin by removing symbols and doing something proactively on changing lives.

Then it is upon us to take on this gun responsibility question, to call the NRA to a table of reconciliation, to master a legislative agenda and an omnibus initiative that doesn't have anyone hiding under tables, that there will be no indictment of whether you are for or against. But we hope the majority would move this legislation forward to change the way young people, people who are on the edge, people who shouldn't have guns get guns and kill people. It is time for this Congress to pass the legislation. It is time for the President to be able to sign the legislation.

Let me thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey for her genuine courtesy extended this evening to allow me to both mourn and condemn racism that has been the plight of many of our people in this country and to, as well, remind us that we are derelict in our duty if we do not pass real serious gun responsibility legislation.

Mr. Speaker, last weekend we were faced with another example of what damage results from easy access to guns. The violence that took place in Charleston, South Carolina last week is something that is not new to our nation but is something that we can and must come together to prevent from happening in the future.

As a senior member of the Judiciary Committee and the Ranking Member of its subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, and the author of H.R. 65, "Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention Act, I am in support of our Congress coming together to find solutions to the issue of gun violence, through gun law reform and active engagement of our communities to get to the heart of these problems.

Today, homicide is the second leading cause of death for young people ages 15 to 24 years old.

Even more disturbing is the fact that homicide is the leading cause of death for African Americans between ages io and 24, and the second leading cause of death for Hispanic Americans.

The leading weapon of choice used to kill those victims was a firearm. (82.8% were killed with a firearm.)

Many guns are in the wrong hands, and end up being the highly efficient tools of criminals and mass murderers.

Every 30 minutes, a child or teenager in America is injured by a gun.

Every 3 hours and 15 minutes, a child or teenager loses their life to a firearm.

In 2010, 82 children under 5 years of age lost their lives due to guns.

To put that number in perspective, 58 law enforcement officers died in the line of duty that year.

While preventing the deaths of so many young people should be our highest priority, we also need to address the broader culture of violence that pervades our society.

The Members of the Congressional Progressive Caucus recognize the need for a comprehensive approach to addressing the problem of gun violence in America.

Guns and the harm perpetrated by them impact every American and the events at Sandy Hook and Aurora only underscore how random gun violence events can be; but it is important to appreciate that regular gun violence has a particularly devastating impact on the communities we represent.

We must use the tragedy in Charleston, which took the lives of nine innocent church members, as an opportunity to take action to improve the lives of all Americans.

We need to reform current gun laws and implementing change that will prevent these types of events in the future.

As the Founder and Co-Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus and as a senior Member of the Judiciary Committee, I have listened far too often to the tragic testimony of individuals who have survived or lost loved ones as a result of gun violence.

We respect the Second Amendment, but we understand that supporting universal background checks for all gun sales is not inconsistent with supporting responsible gun ownership. With rights come responsibilities.

And responsible gun ownership requires at a minimum that guns in the home be stored safely out of reach of unsupervised children and making sure that guns are not transferred to non law abiding citizens or the mentally ill.

My bill, H.R. 65 "The Child Gun Safety and Gun Access Prevention Act of 2013", would do just that.

Mr. Speaker, gun violence has reached epidemic proportions.

We must pass responsible gun violence prevention legislation like H.R. 65 and require universal background checks for all gun sales.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas. She has always been a source of information and history. She has always tied our history into our current situation as she has always been someone who has motivated us to think sincerely about the issues of the day and how we can become part of the solution.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I just want to reiterate that I associate myself with every recommendation that this gentlewoman has put forth here. I do indeed believe that we need some sensible gun control legislation. I have even introduced legislation that makes it more difficult to secure ammunition. I do think that that is a very important component of creating a safer environment in this country for all citizens.

I think also that we need to take a serious look at what this type of domestic terrorism is doing and whether or not we are devoting the type of resources that are necessary to ensure that our people are as safe as they can be.

I think that we are very involved and very concerned and very proactive in looking at potential lone wolves, jihadists, ISIS recruitment activities, and things of that ilk, but I question whether or not we are sufficiently engaging in oversight, interventions, and creating tools in order to look at the sites that kind of generate the willingness of people such as Mr. Roof and his desire to do what he did.

So I hope that in consort with what Mr. THOMPSON had earlier released that we are willing to hold hearings on the issue of domestic terrorism. I hope that we are willing to look at policies and procedures that create opportunities and jobs and safer communities and good public education.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your indulgence. I yield the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend from New Jersey, Congresswoman WATSON COLEMAN, for organizing this very important special order.

Mr. Speaker, we have a right to safety and to reasonably expect that we will be free from gun violence in our homes, schools, places of worship, workplaces, and communities. Unfortunately, we are not safe. As I said on the House floor the morning after the devastating murders in Charleston, "there are no more sanctuaries in the United States from gun violence."

There is no question that we are not doing enough. We see the evidence in the news every day. Across the country, guns are the number two killer of children under 19 years of age. After Charleston, Newtown, the DC Navy Yard, Aurora, Fort Hood, Virginia Tech—the list goes on—it is clear that we need a comprehensive approach to preventing gun violence.

Just like my colleagues, I have heard from hundreds of my constituents urging me to support commonsense policies that would help save lives from this senseless violence. I have cosponsored legislation to strengthen background checks, improve mental health services, ensure criminals and dangerous individuals cannot purchase guns or ammunition, ban military-style assault weapons, and prohibit large capacity magazines, and yet, none of these commonsense policies have even received a vote on the House floor.

I refuse to stop fighting for this cause as long as 30,000 Americans needlessly die because of guns every year.

In 2013, West Webster firefighter Ted Scardino came to Washington to give testimony on gun trafficking prevention. On the previous Christmas Eve, when Ted responded to a fire in the early morning hours along the shores of Lake Ontario, he had no way of knowing that a gunman had set the fire as part of a murderous plot that would leave him as well as fellow firefighter Joseph Hofstetter injured, and take the lives of two more firefighters, Mike Chiapperini and Tomasz Kaczowka.

The gunman in this case was already a convicted killer. He was not able to legally purchase a gun himself, but was able to easily obtain one after recruiting a young woman who lived nearby. He took her to a sporting goods store where he picked out a Bushmaster semiautomatic rifle and a shotgun, and just like that a convicted killer had armed himself with military-style guns that he would use to murder two innocent public servants, wound two more, and upend the close-knit community of Webster, NY.

I am deeply embarrassed that this body cannot manage to pass—or even vote on—legislation that would protect our families, friends, and fellow citizens Tragedy after tragedy happens, and yet we do not act. I am terrified at the thought of what it will take to finally bring this body to action.

INNOVATION ACT

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to draw the attention of my colleagues and, yes, the American people to a legislative threat to the safety and well-being of the American people.

We dodged a bullet in the last session of Congress about this very same issue that I will be discussing this evening. But today, again, we are in serious jeopardy of having an important right of the American people neutered from them, taken away from them by a power play here in Washington, D.C., being conducted by multinational corporations who have done everything they can to impact on this system while the American people do not know that there is an attempted move against their constitutional rights.

Alerted by an aggressive yet an unsuccessful attempt to stop this rigorous and rancorous legislation in the House, the Senate was inundated last year about a similar bill that was supposed to be reform, and it was very similar to the one that I will be discussing today.

□ 1815

There was so much opposition to that bill in the Senate that they simply refused to bring it up to the floor for consideration. The bill had already passed the House; and as I say, today, a similar bill now is making its way through the House and will be on the floor, and it is a great threat to the freedom, security, and well-being of the American people.

What was that issue that was rammed through the House and once it was exposed that the Senate turned it back? Well, it has been an ongoing fight over 20 years, a classic case of crony capitalism that plagues our country. The big guys are trying to diminish the rights of the little guys in order to make more money—surprise, surprise.

In this case, however, what we are talking about, they will not only make more money and take that from the little guys, but it will undermine America's prosperity and security in the long run.

Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not opposed to the profit motive, but first and foremost, we need to ensure that powerful forces don't change the economic rules in order to enrich themselves.

Unseen by most Americans who are not paying attention, but are paying attention to the important things in their lives: their children, their families, their jobs, their schools, and their churches; but they have been basically unaware that there is an attempt by mega-multinational corporations to undermine and, yes, destroy a constitutional right of our citizens—this in order to fill their pockets at the expense of the American people who don't really understand and even know this power play is going on.

I am referring to an attack on the fundamental constitutional right of the American people to own what they have created. This is a right that has been written into the law at the Constitutional Convention—it is in our Constitution—that is under attack in a clandestine legal maneuver that would neuter America's inventors the protection that they were granted by the Constitution and permit powerful multinational corporations to steal what rightfully belongs to American inventors as granted to them as a right in the Constitution.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, ordinary Americans, of course, are not as able to get their voices heard at times here in Congress and big corporations are. They have whole stables of lobbyists. Tonight, we need to mobilize the American people and have them make sure that they contact their Member of Congress.

I will alert my fellow colleagues to make sure that they pay attention to what is happening in this piece of legislation that is now being rammed through Congress.

It isn't just about, of course, dispossessing. This issue isn't just dispossessing individual inventors. It is a power grab that, if they are successful in undermining the constitutional rights of inventors to own for a given period of time what they have created, this change in our constitutional law will undermine the prosperity that we have enjoyed as Americans.

The less than forthright attack on our patent system will undermine the economic well-being of our working people who depend on the United States to be technologically superior in order so that they can outcompete other peoples in other countries who come from poor societies who work just as hard, but don't have the technological advantage that we Americans have.

Mr. Speaker, the American working people have always had the advantage that they can be more productive because our country permitted the technological development of the means of production that made our workers the most productive in the world.

People are working hard all over the world, but it was the people of the United States who coupled that with

freedom and coupled that with technology, and it uplifted everyone. Our Founding Fathers believed that technology, freedom, and, yes, the profit motive was the formula that would uplift humankind. They wrote into our Constitution a guarantee of the property rights of inventors and authors.

It is the only place in the body of our Constitution where the word ''right'' is used, in article I, section 8, clause 8 of the Constitution of the United States:

> The Congress shall have power to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries.

This provision has served America well. It has led to a general prosperity and national security, and it has permitted average people in our country to live decent lives and to have good jobs; but instead, now, we are putting all of that at risk because some multinational corporations want to steal the technology that has been developed by our little guys, our small inventors.

Our small and independent inventors are where the new ideas come from. These big meganational corporations have huge bureaucracies that are not the source of the great discoveries that we have had over the last two centuries.

Americans work hard, as I say, but so do all the other people in the world. It is technology that makes the difference. Our technology has multiplied results of that hard work. Yes, that is the secret of our success, technology and freedom.

That was put in place not just because we talk about it, but because we wrote that into our law, our basic fundamental law, the Constitution, and we have developed from that moment the strongest patent system in the world, and that is what has made all the difference.

Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson were men who believed in technology, believed in liberty and freedom, and believed that we could uplift every human being, not just the elite in our society; thus they made sure that, in our Constitution, we had this provision that we set our course toward uplifting all people through technology, hard work, freedom, and the profit motive.

Yet, today, multinational corporations run by Americans—and maybe by some multinational corporations that just have Americans working for them—want to diminish the patent protection our Founding Fathers put in place, want to diminish the patent protection that has served us so well, and over the years, we fought and turned back several efforts to weaken the patent system.

The American people are unaware of this. They are unaware that, for the last 20 years, there has been this attempt—and they call it harmonizing our patent system with the rest of the world, when we have the strongest system, and they were trying to weaken it.

How does the rest of the world respect the rights of the little guy? They don't. In fact, our patent system has said that if a man or a woman—an inventor—applies for a patent overseas that, after 18 months, anybody who applies for a patent over there has a different situation than our patent applicants.

An inventor who applies for a patent in the United States knows that his patent application will be totally confidential until the moment he is issued the patent. When that patent is issued, then it can be published, but he then has the legal power to protect his patent rights for a given period of time. Traditionally, that has been 17 years of guaranteed protection.

Well, that is not the way the rest of the world works. The rest of the world wants 18 months. Eighteen months after you apply for a patent, they publish it for the whole world to see, even if the patent has not been issued; thus any inventor in that case, everything that he or she has invented and all of the research is now made available to one's competitors. That destroys incentive, and in fact, that was the goal 20 years ago that MARCY KAPTUR of Ohio and I were able to stop that provision from being put in the law.

Mr. Speaker, because of what they were trying to do in harmonizing this law, was that every American today—think about it—every American inventor today, anybody who didn't get their patent in 18 months, it would be published to the world, and we would have a massive stealing of our technology and undercutting of our technological superiority.

I might add the other thing they were trying to accomplish was they said—and overseas, they don't have this guarantee—and that is, if you apply for a patent, if it takes you 10 years to get your patent, you still have 17 years of guaranteed patent protection from the time it is issued.

Overseas, they start the clock ticking at 20 years when you file. If you file for a patent and it takes you, let's say, 10 years to get your patent, in the United States, you would have 17 years of protection. Overseas, you end up with 10, sometimes 5 years of protection.

Mr. Speaker, we have the strongest system in the world. It has worked for us. Now, we have people over the last 20 years who have tried everything they could to undermine it. We won those early fights against the two provisions I just described.

Well, after a few years of this, of course, MARCY KAPTUR, a strong coalition, and I managed to thwart those efforts, but today, we see another—another—effort to try to undermine and diminish the patent protection that we have been fighting to preserve for these last 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, 3½ years ago, the House passed the America Invents Act which we warned fundamentally diminished the patent system, weakening its protection for ordinary citizens.

The negative impact of that bill—and that is just 3½ years ago—the negative impact is overwhelming. We changed, for example, the fundamental idea in that bill, one of the ideas that was changed, from our country's founding, it was always the first person to invent something and can prove they invented it, they will get the patent.

Well, they have changed it to the first not to invent, they changed that to the first one to file for a patent is going to get the patent, so that smaller and independent inventors who can't afford to go over and over again and every new twist of their invention get a separate patent for, these small inventors have been facing major corporations that then immediately will go in and file for patent after patent after patent because they can afford it.

Mr. Speaker, what they have done now is these corporations are flooding the Patent Office with applications. Of course, there are not more people working in the Patent Office; thus they are feeling a dramatic reduction in their ability to get the job done because they are being flooded with patent application because we have changed the basic rules of the game, and it has worked against technological development in our country.

The onslaught, as I said, of course, is aimed at neutering the rights of the small inventor. We have barely turned back this latest attempt which, last year, we passed through the House and went to the Senate, but when the Senators, of course, got a message from their own colleges and universities as to what this would do and the damage that it would do to the universities, we were able to stop it and stop the effort in the Senate.

Now, we have the American Innovation Act that has been presented here. This is yet the most recent onslaught. Over a 20-year battle of trying to protect the interests of the little guy, now we have the American Innovation Act.

Let me just suggest that these big megacorporations over the years, who have stepped up with these proposals that would diminish the right of the small inventor, didn't say: We are trying to diminish the rights of the small inventor.

That is not what was being sold to the Members of Congress. Instead, what was sold in the first onslaught 20 years ago was the submarine patent. That is why we have got to eliminate the ability for people to have a patent application that is secret until it is granted. That is why, at 20 years from filing, you don't have any more patent protection.

Well, that was a derogatory term that was used to confuse the public in order to try to secure their goal of diminishing the right of all inventors, especially small inventors. They are insisting, of course, now that there is another threat and that we should pay attention to this other threat that has emerged that should motivate us to, again, diminish the rights of American

inventors to protect their own patent because, supposedly, patent law is being abused by the so-called patent trolls.

□ 1830

Now, what are patent trolls? Let me note that we all understand that there are frivolous lawsuits that take place throughout the American system. We have a system of justice. You can sue someone if that person has damaged you. Yet there are frivolous lawsuits. Lawyers will do that. And we know that that is something we have got to deal with. Judges need to be stronger in that case. But they exist.

And yes, there are frivolous lawsuits that are presented by lawyers over patent right infringement. And sometimes these frivolous lawsuits—and many times—are just based on phony claims that they claim they have the right in the patent to this and they sue some businessman hoping he will just pay off. That is indeed a problem. It is not a major problem in the sense that it is a minor part of all of the litigation that goes on.

Almost all the patent litigation that goes on, and most of the lawyers who are involved in this who are called patent trolls, are involved with legitimate claims against people who have infringed on the patent rights of especially small inventors. They are basically getting involved with the small inventor who does not have the resources to basically defend his patent against some large mega-multinational corporation. But, of course, big corporations would have us believe that what we are really talking about are frivolous lawsuits against them.

No, there are many, many positive lawsuits that are totally justified. The vast majority of all lawsuits that come into play against these major corporations are based on a legitimate claim by someone who owns a legitimate patent who these big companies have just tried to rip off.

And so what they are trying to do now is what? They are trying to make it more difficult for those little guys, even with any type of help from what they call a patent troll, to be able to actually bring their case of infringement against large corporations.

What this basically is saying is we have got to change our justice system. We have got to change the rules of the game for every lawsuit because some people have been manipulating the law and having frivolous lawsuits.

I don't think that that is what we want in America. We don't want to take away the right, the legitimate right, to go and defend yourself in court because some people use the courts in a frivolous or a manipulative manner.

If the small inventor doesn't have the resources, for example, to enforce his or her own patent, and if they have been granted this patent legitimately by the Federal Government that they own this technology that they have developed, then there is nothing wrong with the fact that someone could come along and help them enforce it when a mega-multinational corporation is basically stealing their rights.

I have consulted with a number of outside individual inventors and groups. They have affirmed to me that the legislation now being proposed in H.R. 9, the bill that was already passed through the Judiciary Committee, that that bill disadvantages the little guy against deep-pocketed corporations. And, in fact, every provision in the name of stopping patent trolls is a provision that would undermine the efforts of people who own legitimate patents and have legitimate patent claims, and undermine their ability to enforce those claims.

So, basically, we are saying, and what is being said about patent trolls, yes, there are frivolous lawsuits and trolls sometimes are involved with frivolous lawsuits; but, by and large, that does not mean that the overwhelming number of lawsuits are not legitimate and they should have every right to call on someone to help them in their effort, basically, to defend their patent rights.

Proponents of this legislation are covering the fact that what we really have here is a bill on H.R. 9 that makes it easier for big corporations to steal the technology secrets of the little guys. They would have us believe that all lawsuits are frivolous and the frivolous lawsuits are throughout our system. And instead of focusing just on frivolous lawsuits, they want us to have an overall diminishing of the rights to our inventors to enforce their patents and make it more difficult for them to do so.

So tonight I draw the attention of the American people to H.R. 9. The Innovation Act, as I say, was introduced by Chairman GOODLATTE and was passed through just a week ago or 2 weeks ago in the Judiciary Committee.

In the last Congress, the House Judiciary Committee held hearings on this bill and witnesses at that hearing included Director Kappos and others. That was when we were discussing the America Invents Act. And people said: Let's go slow on this. Why are we trying to push this through in such a hurried manner?

Well, they are trying to push it through in a hurried manner because, once people understand the implications of diminishing the right of people to protect their patents, they are going to find it has dramatic changes to the American way of life.

For example, our universities now have discovered that if, indeed, H.R. 9 passes, that it will have a huge impact on the viability of their own scientific research and their own patents that they own by these various universities. It will diminish the value of patents across the board if we say that it is going to be more difficult to fight infringers and more costly for someone to fight someone who is infringing on that patent.

So, according to sponsors of H.R. 9, this is, as I say, an attempt to control the trolls but, in fact, it is going to control the universities. It is going to control other companies other than these big companies that, as I say, are multinational companies. They are mainly in the electronics industry. Those people may want to take away some of these patent rights and let them sue, but that is not true in many others. You have got pharmaceuticals and biotech and many other industries that will be impacted in a horrible way because of H.R. 9.

Now, what we need to do is make sure that the American people speak to their Member of Congress and talk to them about we do not want to make it more difficult for people who have developed new technologies to defend their technologies against infringers. We don't want to make it more difficult for people who are the innovators to innovate, to come up with the new ideas, to basically make sure that America is on the cutting edge and leading the way.

And if we have harmonized with the rest of the world, as has been their goal for a long time—and, I might add, one of the things that we have to be very concerned about when we look at the trade bill that is being shoved through Congress is whether or not it will contain a provision that I helped defeat 20 years ago, which I just mentioned, that will make sure that our patent applications are published after 18 months.

Now, I have been told that that is in the trade bill, and there have been all sorts of denials and some people are coming to me whispering, yes, it is in there. Well, we know we are operating under secrecy. We have been operating under secrecy here, so it is impossible for me to tell the public I know absolutely because I read it. Because had I read about this in that bill, I wouldn't be permitted to talk about it.

But that is another one of those things that you have got to be very careful. What are you going to pass in this trade bill? It might be exactly what I am talking about, which is a diminishing of the patent rights of the little guy. And who is pushing that? Megacorporations, multinational corporations, the same guys who are pushing this trade bill on us and not letting us even know what is in the trade bill, which we are supposed to give up our right for an up-or-down vote not even knowing what is in that bill.

So what we need to do is make sure we go through all of those items in this bill, H.R. 9. And people have to understand that every one of those provisions in this bill are aimed at making it more difficult for the small inventor to go up against a major corporation who is infringing on that inventor's creation.

So how come we have got bills now that we can be bringing to the floor and that are aimed at helping the big guy steal from the little guy? This is not what America is all about. This

isn't what our Founding Fathers had in mind.

The results of H.R. 9 will be increased patent infringement, meaning the little guys will have more and more of what they are developing stolen from them and, thus, there will be less incentive for the geniuses in our society to use that genius to create the new technologies that keep us safe—safe. It is our technological edge that keeps us safe, that makes us prosperous.

We can't be prosperous unless we are the innovators, unless we are the guys with the new ideas rather than the people who are just copying other people. Our working people will not have a decent standard of living. This will reduce the legal remedies for those who have been infringed upon.

It will reduce investment into small businesses that are aimed at technological development. Why would anybody want to invest with a small inventor or a small company that is developing technology if you are going to make it more and more difficult for that investor to get that money back if someone is stealing that technology?

And, of course, it will do irreparable damage to our research universities, our inventors, our entrepreneurs, our economy, and our Nation.

Every part of the so-called reform is detrimental to the patent owners, and especially individual innovators will be damaged. Every provision bolsters the patent thieves, the infringers, at the expense of the legal owners. All this done, covered by the idea, well, we have got to get at the trolls.

I would like to share with you and with my colleagues just the story of exactly how that word ''troll'' came up.

There is a head of a major corporation who changed his mind on this bill, who years ago was part of the clique pushing this sort of diminishing of patent rights. He told me that he sat in a room with other corporate executives to come up with the strategy: How are we going to get the American people to support legislation that actually hurts the little guy and helps the big guy steal from the little guy? How are we going to do that?

Well, we need a straw man. We need something to get attention that is going to make it look like that is really the goal is to take care of that evil, sinister person over there. They went around the circle trying to come up with a name that was so sinister that would help them accomplish their mission. This is how cynical these people are who are offering this argument about trolls. And finally, the guy who was talking to me said: I suggested ''patent pirate,'' but by the time it got around, ''patent troll'' sounded so much more sinister, they decided they would accept that.

Well, this is absolutely absurd. The fact is that if we are going to beat this onslaught of the big guys against the little guys, we little guys have got to stick together. We have got to make sure that we notify our Members of Congress and talk to other Members. We have got to pay attention because this is just another example of when we are not paying attention, we lose our freedom. We lose our freedom. Our rights are diminished.

You can count on the fact, with the diminished rights of our inventors, wages in this country will go down. Our competitiveness will go down. We will not be secure. We will not be prosperous. This is an important issue, yet they are trying to get this by with as little debate and as little attention as possible.

Now, how important is this? Well, it has always been important to our country. If we didn't have this patent protection that I am talking about, our country would be totally different.

Let me suggest this. If you look back and see what our Founding Fathers had in mind, they wanted the little guys to be protected and have legal rights. This is what our country was all about. And the innovation and the rights of ownership, this was our innovation. This is what Benjamin Franklin talked about and put into our Constitution, and that has worked so well for us.

□ 1845

If we cut off the little guys and if we make sure that they are not going to profit from their hard work and their struggle, we will not have the new technologies. We will not be the leader in technology in the world, and we will fall behind, and every one of us will be hurt by this.

One only needs to see how important technology was to our society. One only needs to take a look here in the Halls of Congress. There is a statue here in the Capitol of Philo Farnsworth.

Now, who the heck knows who Philo Farnsworth was? They have done a special on him on education TV, I understand, on the History Channel. Philo Farnsworth was someone who really was important to our country, and there is a statue to Philo Farnsworth right here in the Capitol.

He was a farmer in Utah, a man who was educated in engineering, but who had very little resources. In fact, he was a farmer. He set out between farming to try to find out and discover a technological secret that had perplexed some of the most powerful and financial interests in our country.

RCA at that time—this was back at the turn of the century in 1910 and 1920—was under a man named David Sarnoff. He was America's premier executive at the premier technology company of the United States, a company that had vast resources and was deeply involved with trying to find out how to invent a picture tube.

They knew what the radio tube was, but they didn't know how to make images on it. How could they make that radio tube show images? This is what they really were looking for, and they had invested so much in it. It was a huge challenge—an historic challenge—that RCA dumped millions of dollars of research into. However, they didn't discover it.

The one who discovered the secret of the picture tube—and it has had so much impact on the American way of life since everything we have—cell phones, computers, you name it—is based on a picture tube—was Philo Farnsworth.

This independent inventor, this farmer from Utah, discovered the secret. He wrote RCA, naively believing that this big corporation would honor his discovery and permit him to at least have the benefit of being recognized as the person who made this discovery.

Then RCA, when they got the letter from Philo Farnsworth, sent a representative to the laboratory there in Utah, which was in his barn, I believe. When he described to these top engineers from RCA what he had found, the scientists from RCA went away, saying: Oh, yes. We will be back in touch with you.

Of course, they never did get back in touch once they learned of his secret, the thing that Philo knew was his. He ends up reading an announcement in a magazine of how RCA had made this major breakthrough, this discovery, except Philo knew. He was the one who had discovered it, and he was the one who had transmitted that information to RCA. This became one of the great jury and great legal battles of the 20th century.

Philo Farnsworth, an individual person—not a wealthy person, the little guy—was up against the most powerful American corporation of the day, RCA, which had one of the strongest and toughest leaders. This corporate leader, David Sarnoff, had a whole stable full of tough, well-paid lawyers, all of whom vowed not to give one penny to Philo Farnsworth and not to recognize him because RCA deserved to get the credit and the money.

Philo Farnsworth was able to mobilize support behind his claim. People invested in Philo Farnsworth's claim, and it went all the way to the Supreme Court. He was able to have people invest in his lawsuit. Slowly but surely, they made their way through the court system—as I say, all the way to the Supreme Court.

God bless the United States of America. A poor, single man—an individual farmer—came up against one of the most powerful corporations in America at the time because he had invented something.

The Supreme Court decided with Philo Farnsworth over this brutally powerful corporation in America. RCA was beaten by an individual farmer, but he had people who had invested in him. Had the same laws they are trying to promote now in H.R. 9 been in place, Philo Farnsworth and the other little guys who have invented things like this throughout our country's history would have been betrayed. There would have been nothing he could have done because H.R. 9 would have prevented

him from having had people invest in his lawsuit.

That is what H.R. 9 does. It says, if a big corporation has stolen from you and if somebody has invested in helping you with your invention, they then become liable if you have to sue to get your money.

If something happens where the big guys win—even if you are right and they win because they have better lawyers—anybody who invests in you has to pay part of the legal fees of these big corporations, which are millions of dollars of legal fees.

No one is going to want to invest in a little guy like that. The Philo Farnsworths would be left out in the cold. The nature of our system would have been totally different than what it is today if we were to have had the provisions of H.R. 9, which they are trying to foist on us now.

Let me give you another example. Black Americans happen to be some of the most inventive people in the United States. A lot of people don't know that. If you look back in the history of the Patent Office, as I have been looking, what you will find is, while Black Americans were being discriminated against in general throughout our whole system, the Patent Office was the one place that they had equal rights to come up with their ideas and to say, ''This is what I have discovered.''

Because of that, we have many great Black inventors. Maybe that is the reason former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, JOHN CONYERS, is taking my side in this debate on H.R. 9. He is opposed to that.

We have a Black inventor, for example, who was the guy who invented the machine that permitted us to mass produce shoes. Before that time, Americans had one pair of shoes. We started to mass produce them because this Black American, struggling on his own because he was discriminated against like all Black Americans were in that day, managed to get his patent accepted, and he changed not only himself, but the whole country had shoes after that. Isn't that wonderful?

That is what happens when you have freedom for the little guy and not just for the big guys. They come up with the new ideas. They can uplift everybody and make sure everybody's feet feel better. We are on the verge of losing that now. We are on the verge of losing that.

When I go out in the hallway of Congress here, I see a statue to Philo Farnsworth. That is where it is. It is the statue of this Utah farmer who invented the picture tube and who had to take on the biggest company and the biggest corporate powers in the world, and he won. I will tell you that there is his statue there and that there is no statue to David Sarnoff, the corporate leader who tried to beat him down and steal his technology.

I do not care how rich and powerful he was; we respect the little guy in this country. We want the little guys to be able to have rights that are protected by our Constitution. That is why our Founding Fathers put it in the Constitution.

Many of these megacorporations, especially electronic corporations, don't care one bit about the well-being of the American people because they are multinational corporations now.

We want to make sure our people maintain their rights, that we keep being the leaders of innovation, and that we are able to outcompete the world and not just take all of our jobs overseas and give them to cheap labor. We want to make sure that Americans benefit because this is what America is all about. It is where the little guy has the same rights legally, and they are protected.

That is what this fight is all about when it comes to H.R. 9. People need to talk to their congressmen, and the congressmen need to talk to each other about what this is really all about. It is easy to yawn when someone says: ''I am going to discuss patent rights.''

''Oh, yeah, patent law. How boring.''

It is not boring. It is going to make all the difference as to whether our country stays safe because we have to have the technological edge to be safe in the world we are getting into now. Our people are not going to have decent housing or a decent standard of living because the wealth that is produced isn't produced just by hard work, it is produced by technological efficiency, and we have to be on the cutting edge, or we will be outcompeted by people overseas. This is going to determine what America is going to be like.

I would ask my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 9. Let's talk to the universities. Let's talk to the other industries that are being hurt dramatically by this. Just talk to the inventors. Let the inventors know.

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

LGBTQ PRIDE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KNIGHT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the leadership for allowing this time on the floor to take up H. Res. 329. H. Res. 329 encourages the celebration of the month of June as LGBTQ Pride Month.

I bring this to the floor, Mr. Speaker, because I have had some experiences in life that have caused me to understand why it is important that we do this. Someone might ask, Mr. Speaker: Why would you, AL GREEN—a person who is not gay, a person who is considered straight—bring a resolution to the floor, a resolution to celebrate and recognize some of the most notable events in the movement of the LGBTQ community?

Let me explain why. I am a son of the South. More specifically, I am a son of the segregated South. I grew up at a time when my friends and neighbors denied me rights that the Constitution of the United States of America accorded me.

I was forced to go through backdoors. I was forced to drink from colored water fountains. I was forced to ride at the back of the bus. I was a son of the segregated South, and as a son of the segregated South, I learned early in life what invidious discrimination was like.

I learned what it smelled like because I had to go to filthy toilet facilities. I learned what it looked like because I saw the Klan burn crosses. I learned what it sounded like because I was called names that we no longer use in polite society. I am a son of the segregated South, and I know what discrimination looks like, feels like, smells like; I know what it hurts like.

I know of the people who lost their lives in the effort to try to bring about justice and equality for all. Medgar Evers lost his life, and Myrlie Evers still suffers to this day because she lost her husband in a worthy cause, in a cause for justice.

I know what it is like, and I know that, notwithstanding my circumstance as a straight guy, I didn't get here by myself. There were people who lived and died so that I could have the blessings that I have. Schwerner, Goodman, and Chaney died. Schwerner and Goodman were not Black. John Shillady died in Austin, Texas, fighting for the rights of Black people. John Shillady was not Black. Of the people who formed the NAACP in an effort to stop lynchings, which were almost commonplace, a good many of them were not Black.

I have been the beneficiary of the efforts of people who do not look like me, of people who had blessings such that they could have gone on with their lives. There was no reason other than they wanted ''justice for all'' for them to take up my cause.

I believe that, when you are blessed, there is a reason for it. You are blessed so that you may be a blessing to others. You have such that you may help those who have less or who have not. Hence, I find myself standing on the floor tonight of the Congress of the United States of America, proud to sponsor a resolution to encourage the celebration of the month of June as LGBTQ Pride Month.

This resolution celebrates and recognizes some of the most notable events of the LGBTQ movement.

□ 1900

What I would like to do is explain what this resolution actually does, H. Res. 329. H. Res. 329 celebrates the accomplishments of Houston mayor Annise Parker, the first lesbian elected as mayor of Houston, Texas.

I am proud that it does because not only was she elected mayor of Houston, Texas, before she was mayor, she served as the city's controller for 6

years; and before serving in this capacity, she served on city council for 6 years. She has earned the right to be recognized, and I am proud to have her recognized in H. Res. 329.

It celebrates the hard work that the transgender community has done to spread awareness about tolerance and inclusion and encouraging the community to keep on working toward broader inclusion. We live in a society that has within its Pledge of Allegiance the words ''liberty and justice for all.''

I salute the flag of the United States of America, and I am proud to do so because I am a proud American. Liberty and justice for all, that means that we have to encourage liberty and justice for those who are in the transgender community and encourage them to keep on fighting for liberty and justice.

This resolution recognizes the protesters who stood for human rights and dignity at Stonewall Inn on June 28, 1968, as some of the pioneers of the movement. It celebrates the gay rights organizations in major cities in the aftermath of the Stonewall uprising.

After Stonewall, there was an uprising in a very positive way that took place. People realized that there was something they could do and should do to make sure that justice and equality were more than words for those who are members of the LGBTQ community.

This resolution highlights the importance of the American Psychiatric Association removing homosexuality from its list of mental illnesses in December of 1973. There is a recognition in the medical community that we should not have and that we must undo what has been done by labeling people as mentally ill because they were being the persons that God created them to be.

We have a saying in my community that God didn't create any junk, and people who are homosexuals are not junk; they are not persons with a mental illness; they are people who deserve the dignity and respect of all human beings and the dignity and respect that we accord other human beings, and I stand here tonight as a friend of the community to make it known that there are people who are willing to stand alone and fight for the rights of others, notwithstanding any consequences that may be put upon them.

This resolution recognizes Elaine Noble as the first LGBT candidate elected to a State legislature in 1974 and Barney Frank as the first Representative to come out as an openly gay Member of Congress in 1987. I had the preeminent privilege of knowing the Honorable Barney Frank.

I served on the Committee on Financial Services when he was the chairperson of that committee. He was a person committed to human rights for all, to human dignity for all. I am proud to stand here tonight and say that he has become an honorary member of the persons who are sponsoring this resolution.

By the way, there are many persons in Congress who are sponsoring this resolution, and I want to thank all of them for signing on to it. The Honorable Barney Frank is no longer in Congress. That is why he is listed as an honorary sponsor or cosponsor of the resolution.

This resolution highlights the importance of the Civil Service Commission eliminating the ban on hiring homosexuals in most Federal jobs in 1975. It seems unimaginable and unthinkable that we had to have a civil rights commission to eliminate the ban on hiring persons because of their sexual preference, because of their sexual orientation. It just seems unimaginable, but it had to happen, and it did.

The resolution celebrates Harvey Milk making national news when he was sworn in as an openly gay member of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors on January 8, 1978. I remember when it happened. It was really big news in this country. Quite frankly, it took courage for him to do this, and the kind of courage that he showed, that he exemplified, has merited his being mentioned in this resolution, H. Res. 329.

It praises the thousands of activists who participated in the National March on Washington for Lesbian and Gay Rights to demand equal civil rights in 1979 and the National March on Washington to demand that President Reagan address the AIDS crisis in 1987.

There were some people who, because they thought that the disease impacted a certain segment of society, did not readily respond with the hand of help that was available. I am grateful that President Reagan did take up this cause to help with the fight against AIDS.

AIDS can impact anyone in our society, and I am proud that our government has spent money on this disease to help eliminate it, but we haven't spent enough, and we haven't done enough. I think we can do more, and we should do more.

The resolution highlights the importance of the 1980 Democratic National Convention, where Democrats took a stance in support of gay rights. I am proud of my party. I happen to be a Democrat, but this is not a partisan effort, and the Democratic Party took that stance at a time when it wasn't popular to take the stance.

It has become popular now, to a certain extent and to a certain degree, to support gay rights and the rights of gay people, but in 1980, it was not nearly as popular as it is today, and the party took the step forward and in so doing brought a lot of others along with us.

The resolution highlights the importance of the Supreme Court ruling in Romer v. Evans in May of 1996, which found a Colorado constitutional amendment preventing the enactment of protection for gays and lesbians unconstitutional.

It is important that we challenge laws that prevent people from having equality of opportunity from receiving the same access to all that society has to offer as other people, and I am honored that the Colorado amendment preventing the enactment of protections for gays and lesbians was found unconstitutional.

It celebrates Vermont becoming the first State to legally recognize civil unions between gay and lesbian couples in 2000; and, my, have we come a long ways since 2000. We have come a long way because a good many people in this country now understand that the laws ought to apply equally to all, that the 14th Amendment is not for some, it is for all.

The judges who interpret these laws, who are indicating that these laws should apply appropriately to the LGBTQ community, these judges are not all gay judges. These are judges who are sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States of America, and they are doing it because they know that it is the right thing to do.

The Supreme Court will be taking up the case of gay marriage—in fact, is taking it up and will make a ruling sometime in the very near future. My hope is that the Supreme Court will honor the 14th Amendment and will allow the Constitution of the United States to apply to the members of the LGBTQ community to the same extent that it applies to people in other communities.

The law should be blind to who you are; it ought to give you justice because you happen to be a person that is a subject of the Constitution. It ought not peek to see if you are of a different hue or of a different sexual orientation. It ought to weigh equally all people and mete out justice to all the same.

This resolution recognizes the importance of the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act, which was signed into law on October 28, 2009, by President Obama, as it expanded the Federal hate crime laws to include crimes motivated by a victim's actual or perceived gender, sexual orientation, or disability. People ought not be assaulted because of who they are.

What this does is it recognizes that, if you assault a police officer because you know that person is a police officer, then the crime that you will be charged with is enhanced, the punishment is enhanced. You will be punished more severely because you have assaulted a peace officer. This is a law in the State of Texas.

Well, if you assault a person because of who that person happens to be and because you don't happen to like that person because of the person's gender, because of the person's ethnicity, color, there ought to be a special punishment for you because you have gone out of your way to hurt somebody that you don't know in a good many circumstances and you want to do it simply because you don't like the way the

person looks or you don't like the person's perceived sexual orientation. The law has been changed, and it punishes you if you decide that you are going to commit this type of crime.

This resolution celebrates 2012 as the first year in which all 50 States had at least one LGBTQ elected official. All 50 States have now at least one person who is a part of the LGBTQ community holding public trust. People have come to understand that it is not the color of skin, it is not sexual orientation; it is the character within a person that determines whether or not a person ought to hold public trust, whether or not a person ought to be respected appropriately. It is the character, not the way the person is perceived in terms of color or sexual orientation.

This resolution celebrates Senator TAMMY BALDWIN being sworn in as the first openly gay United States Senator in January of 2013, and she has served her country well and merits this sort of recognition.

The resolution highlights the importance of the Supreme Court ruling in the United States v. Windsor on June 26, 2013, which found that section 3 of the Defense of Marriage Act, DOMA, found it unconstitutional and determined that the Federal Government cannot discriminate against married lesbian and gay couples for the purpose of determining Federal benefits and protections.

This is the Supreme Court of the United States of America, the same Supreme Court with conservative and liberal Justices on it. We don't have to agree with everything the Supreme Court does, but I thank God I live in a country where we respect the decisions. We can differ with them. Even the Justices themselves differ about various opinions, but they respect the rulings of the Court. This Supreme Court has made such a ruling as it relates to the Defense of Marriage Act.

This resolution celebrates the 37 States and the District of Columbia where it is now legal for same-sex couples to get married. Literally, more than half of the States in the United States of America now permit same-sex couples to get married—more than half of the States.

This means that this country is moving toward, without a ruling from the Supreme Court, the notion that same-sex couples should be allowed to not only love each other, but to marry each other, to have the same benefits that heterosexual couples have when they marry.

□ 1915

Marriage is a great institution. I celebrate the institution of marriage. But the law, under the 14th Amendment, seems to indicate that we cannot prevent people who are of the same sex and who love each other from having the same opportunities that benefit from the institution of marriage that other people who are heterosexual have the opportunity of benefiting from.

So the States that have decided that they would do this should be recognized. By the way, many of these States recognize same-sex marriage because of judges in those States who have made rulings, because of legislatures in those States who have legislated, and because of people in those States who have voted.

There are 37 States. The States include Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut. They are all States that recognize same-sex marriage. Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, and Idaho are States that recognize same-sex marriage. Indiana, Iowa, Illinois, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, and Minnesota all recognize same-sex marriage. Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Ohio all recognize same-sex marriage. Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin are all States in the United States of America that recognize same-sex marriage.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am honored to present the resolution. And I am honored to do so because I know the importance of having people who were not of African ancestry who supported causes that made it possible for me to be here.

I have a debt that I owe. I hope that tonight I have made a down payment on the retirement of that debt. Because somebody suffered so that I could have the opportunity to stand in the Congress of the United States of America and make this floor speech. No one could have—or would have—predicted at my birth that I would have the opportunity to be a Member of the Congress of the United States of America.

For me to be here, somebody had to find out what a 90-pound German Shepherd bites like; somebody had to found out what a high-pressure water hose stings like; somebody had to find out what going to jail feels like; somebody had to find out what losing someone that you love dearly to a cause hurts like.

I am not here because I am so smart. I am here because there are people who were willing to make great sacrifices so that I could have the opportunities that I have. And because I have them, I have a debt that I owe. And I am here tonight to say that I am proud to stand with the LGBTQ community to help bring about the kind of justice for this community that I have enjoyed.

Now let me be perspicuously clear about one thing. I am not saying that we have reached the panacea as it relates to the African American community. There is still great work to be done as evidenced by what happened in Charleston, South Carolina. There is still work to be done and still heavy lifting to do. But I am also very proud of some things that happened there.

I happened to be in a position to be at the bond hearing that took place, and as I listened, I could not believe my ears when I heard a mother say, ''You took my son''—took her hero, ''but I forgive you. I forgive you.'' Time and time again, persons said, ''I forgive you.''

I had tears well in my eyes because it takes a special person to say ''I forgive you'' so close to the event that is being forgiven or that the forgiveness addresses. It takes a special person.

And I want to compliment the families of the persons who lost their lives in church. My God, in church, lost their lives in church. I want to commend those families for having what Dr. Martin Luther King called the strength to love. The strength to love. He wrote the book, ''Strength to Love.'' It is a collection of his sermons. And he makes it known to us in that book that it is not easy to love your enemy. It is not easy to forgive those who would persecute you. But he also makes it known in the book ''Strength to Love'' that that is what love is all about: loving those who would do ugly things to you, who would be spiteful, who would be evil.

I think that the family members in Charleston who have shown the strength to love are a supreme, superb, sterling example to the rest of this country of what we must do if we are to continue to live together such that we will have a future that will be void of the kind of behavior—the ugly, dastardly deed, if you will—that took place in that church.

Dr. King reminded us also that we have a duty—an obligation, if you will—to learn to live together as brothers and sisters. We must learn to live together as brothers and sisters. Because if we don't learn to live together as brothers and sisters, we will perish together as fools.

I thank the people of South Carolina for exhibiting the ultimate in the strength to love, and I thank God that I have been blessed. I pray that God will continue to give me the strength to be a blessing to others.

I yield back the balance of my time.

FAITH THROUGH THE BIBLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I enjoy hearing my friend from Texas, a former judge down in Houston, talk about love. I do love him as a Christian brother. We can disagree and still love each other.

I have been surprised in recent years to find some of those of us who believe in the Book that used to be read here. It was a pretty common practice on the floor of the House on Sundays down in Statuary Hall, and even in this room, back when church services were held in the former House Chamber.

It was attended by the man that first coined the phrase, ''separation of church and State.'' It is not in the Constitution. It was in his letter to the

Danbury Baptists. He came to a nondenominational Christian worship service down the hall. Of course, Thomas Jefferson would even bring the Marine Band and have them play hymns. Because although he made clear he believed in separation of church and State, and used that phrase, he didn't see any problem with singing hymns and having the Marine Band play the hymns to accompany right here in the U.S. Capitol.

I have been surprised in recent years at how prominent the Bible was in our founding, so much so that toward the end of June 1787, the Constitutional Convention was at wits' end, having a great deal of trouble, and Randolph from Virginia made a motion that they all convene together on the Nation's birthday and worship God together in services under the auspices of the Bible. They came back and were able to reach a conclusion that we call the Constitution. People like Alexander Hamilton said that clearly the finger of God was in that, and it all came into place after they worshipped the Lord and used the Bible in worship there in 1787.

But it is amazing now, after the Bible was such a prominent part of our founding throughout our history, now those of us that believe what is in the Bible are the ones who are now discriminated against. I have suffered it right here in this town, not to the extent of being harmed physically, of course. Physical threats are not uncommon, but they were there when I was a judge as well.

So I am just going to read without comment the Book that has been read in this Capitol throughout our history, Romans 1:16:

For I am not ashamed of the Gospel, for it is the power of God for salvation to everyone who believes, to the Jew first and also to the Greek. For in the righteousness of God is revealed from faith for faith, as it is written ''The righteous shall live by faith.''

For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who suppressed the truth and unrighteousness, because that which is known about God is evident within them, for God made it evident to them. For since the creation of the world, His invisible attributes, His eternal power, divine nature, have been clearly seen, being understood through what has been made so that they are without excuse.

For even though they knew God, they did not honor Him as God or give thanks, but they became futile in their speculations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing to be wise, they became fools and exchanged the glory of the incorruptible God for an image in the form of corruptible man and of birds, four-footed animals, crawling creatures.

Therefore, God gave them over in the lust of their hearts to impurity that their bodies might be dishonored among them, for they exchanged the truth of God for a lie and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen.

For this reason, God gave them over to degrading passions. For their women exchanged the natural function for that which is unnatural; and in the same way, also the men abandoned the natural function of the woman and burned in their desire for one another, men with men committing indecent acts.

Because I believe the Scripture—love those who don't, love those because we have all sinned one way or another—there is no room to hate anybody that has sinned, because we all have. We have all fallen short.

But I am sure my office, Mr. Speaker, will be getting nasty, angry, bitter calls, as we often do when we refer to the Bible that helped give us our founding.

□ 1930

But that is what the Bible said, and I am deeply concerned that we have Supreme Court Justices, two of whom who have actually participated in same-sex weddings, thereby showing how biased and partial they are in favor of such things, against the dignity and history of marriage in the country, marriage in the Bible.

It has been said many times here over our history, Moses said it came from God, that Moses, depicted right up above the center door, that a man shall leave his father and mother and a woman leave her home and the two will become one flesh.

When Jesus was asked about marriage, he repeated it: For a man shall leave his father and mother, and a woman leave her home, and the two will become one flesh. And Jesus added: What God has joined together, let no man put asunder.

So we have two Justices that have already indicated they believe otherwise than the law of Moses and Jesus, and they have shown themselves to be anything but impartial.

So, under the law, 28 United States Code 455, it is mandatory, they shall disqualify themselves. And if it turns out that they sit in judgment on a case in which they are clearly disqualified and a part of the majority, that cannot possibly be a legitimate law change, judges substituting their law for the law that this country has utilized throughout its history.

Yes, courts all over the country have substituted their judgment for State constitutions and laws. And for those who don't believe the Bible, you have got nothing to worry about. But the indications are, in Romans 1, God's protective hand will be withdrawn when we continue to abandon the Nation's founding.

Thank God churches fought for, so many were involved in, the movement to make the Constitution mean just what it said. We really shouldn't have had to have a 14th Amendment. Everybody should have been equal under the law. But it took an amendment, took a civil rights movement, to apply it across the board.

Now we have judges that will be oligarchs, as they have been, and they will be making decisions, rather than elected officials, and we will see how much longer the Nation lasts.

There is no hate, just a broken heart in me, but I will be accused of being hatemonger this, hatemonger that. That is not the case.

I would like to congratulate our own leadership, Mr. Speaker. This is The Hill: ''Obama Poised for Huge Win on Trade.''

I would like to congratulate our Speaker, our Republican leadership, for pushing through the trade deal, leader MCCONNELL, down the hall. The President could not have gotten this ability to fast-track, to make deals that we won't know about, without the Republican leadership making that happen for him. Of course, nobody that I know of on the Republican side ran promising that we would get such ability for President Obama, but congratulations go there.

Some people say I am not quick enough to congratulate my own Republican leadership. I mean, I have congratulated our Speaker before when he was chairman of the Education Committee. As President Bush cited in his book, our now-Speaker was very important, very instrumental in getting No Child Left Behind pushed through.

Of course, when we won the majority in November 2010, got it back that December, deals were worked out that cost the country a lot of spending, raised the debt a great deal. Since then, although we continue to promise that we are going to do something about the debt, we continue to give the President almost a blank check.

But congratulations on all these. Congratulations on enabling the President to make these kind of deals. Then we will see if this law, TPA, is finally one the President abides by and gives us notice, timely, as he hasn't done in so many other areas, like Guantanamo and releasing people from Guantanamo.

But we have an article here, I guess, congratulations then would go to the Commander-in-Chief. Because I don't know that this would be the lion lying down with the lamb, if this lamb is the Iranian military-backed forces.

But this article from Bloomberg, June 22, Josh Rogin and Eli Lake, says:

The U.S. military and Iranian-backed Shiite militias are getting closer and closer in Iraq, even sharing a base, while Iran uses those militias to expand its influence in Iraq and fight alongside the Bashar al-Assad regime in neighboring Syria.

Two senior administration officials confirmed to us the U.S. soldiers and Shiite militia groups are both using the Taqaddum military base in Anbar, the same Iraqi base where President Obama is sending an additional 450 U.S. military personnel to help train the local forces fighting against the Islamic State. Some of the Iran-backed Shiite militias at the base have killed American soldiers in the past.

Some inside the Obama administration fear that sharing the base puts U.S. soldiers at risk. The U.S. intelligence community has reported back to Washington that representatives of some of the more extreme militias have been spying on U.S. operations at Taqaddum, one senior administration official told us. That could be calamitous if the fragile relationship between the U.S. military and the Shiite militia comes apart and Iran-backed forces decide to again target U.S. troops.

American critics of this growing cooperation between the U.S. military and the Iranian-backed militias call it a betrayal of the U.S. personnel who fought against the militias during the 10-year U.S. occupation of Iraq.

''It's an insult to the families of the American soldiers that were wounded and killed in battles in which the Shia militias were the enemy,'' Senate Armed Services Chairman JOHN MCCAIN told us. ''Now, providing arms to them and supporting them, it's very hard for those families to understand.''

The U.S. is not directly training Shiite units of what are known as the Popular Mobilization Forces, which include tens of thousands of Iraqis who have volunteered to fight against the Islamic State as well as thousands of hardened militants who ultimately answer to militia leaders loyal to Tehran. But the U.S. is flying close air support missions for those forces.

The U.S. gives weapons directly only to the Iraqi Government and the Iraqi Security Forces, but the lines between them and the militias are blurry. U.S. weapons often fall into the hands of militias, like Iraqi Hezbollah. Sometimes the military cooperation is even more explicit. Commanders of some of the hard-line militias sit in on U.S. military briefings on operations that were meant for the government-controlled Iraqi Security Forces, a senior administration official said.

This collaboration with terrorist groups that have killed Americans was seen as unavoidable as the U.S. marshaled Iraqis against the Islamic State, but could prove counterproductive to U.S. interests in the long term, this official said.

The militias comprise largely Shiite volunteers and are headed by the leader of the Iraqi Hezbollah, Abu Mahdi al-Muhandis. He was sanctioned in 2009 by the Treasury Department for destabilizing Iraq. Al-Muhandis is a close associate of Qasem Suleimani, the Iranian Quds Force commander, who has snapped selfies with the militia leader at key battles.

Other militias that have participated in the fighting against the Islamic State include the League of the Righteous which, in 2007, carried out a brutal roadside execution of five U.S. soldiers near Karbala. The group to this day boasts of its killing of U.S. soldiers. In an interview in February, a spokesman for the militia defended the killings and said his militia had killed many more American soldiers.

Members of these groups have also been deployed by Iran to defend the Assad regime in neighboring Syria. James Clapper, the Director of National Intelligence, confirmed in a June 3 letter to seven Republican Senators, which we obtained, that ''Iran and Hezbollah have also leveraged allied Iraqi Shia militant and terrorist groups, which receive training in Iran, to participate in the pro-Assad operations.''

The militias also stand accused of gross human rights abuses and battlefield atrocities in Sunni areas where they have fought. The State Department heavily criticized Iran's support for the Iraqi militias and those militias' behavior in its annual report on worldwide terrorism, released last week.

Further down:

With the deadline approaching for a nuclear deal that would place up to $150 billion in the hands of Iran, the U.S. is now openly acknowledging in its annual report on international terrorism that Iran is supporting a foreign legion, comprising Afghans, Iraqis, and Lebanese fighters to defend Iranian interests throughout the Middle East.

But the U.S. response to this is inconsistent. In Iraq, America is fighting alongside Iranian-backed militias. In Syria, U.S.-supported forces are fighting against those same militias. The tragedy of this policy is that the Islamic State has been able to hold and expand its territory in Iraq and Syria, while Iran has been able to tighten its grip on Baghdad.

Then another article from Daniel Horowitz, Conservative Review:

Anyone who visits Walter Reed Hospital will immediately see the irrevocable destruction of Hezbollah. Thousands of our troops have been incapacitated and mangled by IEDs from Hezbollah and other Shiite groups in Iraq, all funded by Obama's ally, Iran. Anyone who was around in 1983 will remember the 241 American servicemen who were killed in the Hezbollah terror attack in Beirut.

Guess what Obama is doing with them?

Eli Lake reports at Bloomberg News that our troops are sharing a base with Hezbollah-controlled Shiite forces, and we are bailing them out of their humiliating loss to the Islamic State.

□ 1945

The article goes on, but it is just exceedingly tragic; but it explains why the President has been unable to state that we have a clear strategy in the Middle East because, on the one hand, we have had the United States military give their lives fighting against the tyranny and the atrocities of Hezbollah.

On the other hand, we now have the President, the Commander in Chief, who commands over our forces that he has put in the same camp with Hezbollah. The hope, apparently, of the administration is, even though they are still bragging in Hezbollah about killing American soldiers, that maybe by having them camp in the same camp, they won't be killing them now. You have got to love that optimism.

As we see the Commander in Chief's troops being forced to come together with people like Hezbollah—that want to kill them, have killed them, have maimed them, Hezbollah is clearly supported by Iran—then we get this, ''AP Exclusive: Document outlines big-power nuke help to Iran,'' George Jahn, dated today, from Vienna.

The United States and other nations negotiating a nuclear deal with Iran are ready to offer high-tech reactors and other state-of-the-art equipment to Tehran if it agrees to crimp programs that can make atomic bombs, according to a confidential document obtained Tuesday by the Associated Press.

The draft document—one of several technical appendixes meant to accompany the main text of any deal—has dozens of bracketed texts where disagreements remain. Technical cooperation is the least controversial issue at the talks, and the number of brackets suggest the sides have a ways to go not only on the topic but also more contentious disputes with little more than a week until the June 30 deadline for a deal.

With that deadline looming, Iran's top leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, on Tuesday rejected a long-term freeze on nuclear research and supported banning international inspectors from accessing military sites. Khamenei, in comments broadcast on Iranian state television, also said Iran will sign a final deal provided all economic sanctions now in Iran are first lifted—in a sign the Islamic Republic may be toughening its stance ahead of the deadline.

In any event, that is great news.

Of course, the Senate and House passed a bill that turned requirements for authorization of treaties upside down. Instead of having two-thirds of the Senate required to approve a deal, we have flipped it. Now, it will take two-thirds of a vote in the House and Senate to disapprove a deal. That makes it easier for the President to give Iran the nuclear reactors they are hoping.

Mr. Speaker, I brought this up in past years; but here, in negotiating with Iran, one of our lead negotiators was the same person who was involved in the Clinton administration negotiations with North Korea, where they cut this wonderful deal basically saying, in essence, we will give you nuclear reactors for power if you will just promise that you won't use them to make nuclear weapons.

This dishonest, evil leader said: All you want is a promise from a dishonest leader that I won't use them to make nukes? Sure, I will promise you that. Bring on the nuclear power plants.

Those came, and they were converted. Now, North Korea is helping with parts of the evil empire to develop nuclear weapons of their own.

When you have somebody involved in that kind of deal with North Korea sent to negotiate with Iran, we should have known that this would be coming: Hey, we will give you nuclear reactors. We will help you make it happen. We just don't want you to use them to make nuclear weapons.

Since Iran has been—at least the leaders have been so evil in the way they have pursued Israel, in the way they have pursued Americans, continuing to brag about killing Americans, I don't think anybody should really be surprised if this deal gets cut and then Iran goes ahead and uses what we provide them or the P5+1 provides them in order to make nuclear weapons more quickly than they could have without this kind of deal.

But ''congratulations'' again go to the Republican leaders in the House and Senate for pushing through the authority for the President to have the ability to make these kinds of deals. Who says I can't be magnanimous and thank Republican leaders?

I hope the American public will wake up and understand, the deal that has been negotiated is deadly to our ally Israel; it is deadly to the United States. Make it clear that any party that hopes to have any chance of having a President elected from their party better not be part of the deal with Iran because it is going to get more Americans and Israelis killed.

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

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed

without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 533. An act to revoke the charter of incorporation of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma at the request of that tribe, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate concurs in the House amendment to the Senate amendment with an amendment to the bill (H.R. 1295) ''An Act to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes.''.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and an adjournment of the House of Representatives.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 644) ''An Act to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities, and for other purposes.'', and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HATCH, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mrs. STABENOW to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2032

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX) at 8 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO THE HOUSE AMENDMENT TO THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1295, TRADE PREFERENCES EXTENSION ACT OF 2015

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–179) on the resolution (H. Res. 338) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1295) to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PAYNE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of a medical procedure.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 615. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to take administrative action to achieve and maintain interoperable communications capabilities among the components of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2146. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 25, 2015, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1901. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Salable Quantities and Allotment Percentages for the 2015-2016 Marketing Year [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0096; FV15-985-1 FR] received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1902. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Biorefinery, Renewable Chemical, and Biobased Product Manufacturing Assistance Program (RIN: 0570-AA73) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1903. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Report to Congress on the Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) for Fiscal Years 2012 and 2013'', pursuant to Pub. L. 113-186, Sec. 658L; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1904. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Additives Permitted in Feed and Drinking Water of Animals; Gamma-Linolenic Acid Safflower Meal [Docket No.: FDA-2010-F-0537] received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1905. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Additives Permitted for Direct Addition to Food for Human Consumption; TBHQ [Docket No.: FDA-2014-F-0364] received June 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1906. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the ''2012-2013 Report to Congress on Organ Donation and the Recovery, Preservation, and Transportation of Organs'', pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 274f-4, added by Pub. L. 108-216, the Organ Donation and Recovery Improvement Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1907. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the report to Congress on the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program Parts A and B Supplemental Funds for FY 2011 through 2014, pursuant to Secs. 2603(e) and 2620(d) of Title XXVI of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1908. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Food and Drug Administration's FY 2014 annual Performance Report to Congress, pursuant to the Generic Drug User Fee Amendments of 2012; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1909. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance to Australia, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Pub. L. 94-329, Transmittal No.: 15-41; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1910. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's ''Country Reports on Terrorism 2014'', pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2656f; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1911. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Pub. L. 107-243) and the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Pub. L. 102-1), for the February 14, 2015, to April 15, 2015 reporting period.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1912. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the ''Report on External Quality Control Review'' for the year ending on September 30, 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1913. A letter from the Chief Privacy and Civil Liberties Officer, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Privacy Act of 1974; Implementation [CPCLO Order No.: 008-2015] received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1914. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of The President, transmitting the ''2014 Report to Congress on the Benefits and Costs of Federal Regulations and Unfunded Mandates on State, Local, and Tribal Entities'', as required by 31 U.S.C. 1105 note and 2 U.S.C. 1531-1538; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1915. A letter from the Senior Vice President and Chief Accounting Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Des Moines, transmitting the Federal Home Loan Bank of Des

Moines 2014 management report and financial statements, pursuant to the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1916. A letter from the Officer, Equal Employment Opportunity, International Boundary and Water Commission, U.S. Section, transmitting the Commission's FY 2014 annual report, pursuant to Sec. 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1917. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled ''District of Columbia Agencies' Compliance with Fiscal Year 2015 Small Business Enterprise Expenditure Goals through the 2nd Quarter of Fiscal Year 2015''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1918. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1919. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the semiannual report to Congress from the Social Security Administration Office of Inspector General during the period from October 1, 2014, through March 31, 2015, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1920. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a notification that the Department, through the Bureau of Land Management, intends to accept a gift of land in Tulare County, California, from the Mojave Desert Land Trust, pursuant to Sec. 6 of the Wilderness Act of 1964, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1135); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1921. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's interim rule — International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Fishing Effort Limits in Purse Seine Fisheries for 2015 [Docket No.: 150406346-5346-01] (RIN: 0648-BF03) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1922. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Edits [NPS-WASO-18005; PPWOVPADU0, PPMPSPD1Y.YM0000] (RIN: 1024-AE25) received June 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1923. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Special Management Zones for Delaware Artificial Reefs [Docket No.: 130702585-5454-02] (RIN: 0648-BD42) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1924. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Small-Mesh Multispecies Specifications [Docket No.: 150205118-5443-02] (RIN: 0648-BE87) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1925. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a report on compliance within the time limitations established for deciding habeas corpus death penalty petitions under Title I of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. 2266 subsections (b)(5) and (c)(5); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1926. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the 2014 Report to Congress on the STOP (Services, Training, Officers, Prosecutors) Violence Against Women Formula Grants Program (STOP Program), as required by the Violence Against Women Act, codified as amended at 42 U.S.C. 3796gg-3, and the 2014 Report to Congress on the Sexual Assault Services Formula Grants Program, as required by Sec. 1003(b) of the Violence Against Women Act of 2000, codified at 42 U.S.C. 3789p; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1927. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment to the Titles of Restricted Areas R-5301, R-5302A, R-5302B, and R-5302C; North Carolina [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1862; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ASO-6] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1928. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0485; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-093-AD; Amendment 39-18176; AD 2015-12-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1929. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Tribune, KS [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0744; Airspace Docket No.: 14-ACE-5] received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1930. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Learjet Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0249; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-211-AD; Amendment 39-18180; AD 2015-12-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1931. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0585; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-248-AD; Amendment 39-18182; AD 2015-12-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1932. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0618; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-171-AD; Amendment 39-18178; AD 2015-12-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1933. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Avidyne Corporation Integrated Flight Displays [Docket No.: FAA-2015-2191; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-019-AD; Amendment 39-18183; AD 2015-10-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1934. A letter from the FMCSA Division Chief, Regulatory Development, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medical Examiner's Certification Integration [Docket No.: FMCSA-2012-0178] (RIN: 2126-AB40) received June 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1935. A letter from the Regulations Officer, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Procurement, Management, and Administration of Engineering and Design Related Services [FHWA Docket No.: FHWA-2012-0043] (RIN: 2125-AF44) received June 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1936. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's temporary regulations — Suspension of Benefits under the Multiemployer Pension Reform Act of 2014 [TD 9723] (RIN: 1545-BM73) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1937. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations and removal of temporary regulations — Portability of a Deceased Spousal Unused Exclusion Amount [TD 9725] (RIN: 1545-BK74) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1938. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final and temporary regulations — Partnership Transactions Involving Equity Interests of a Partner [TD 9722] (RIN: 1545-BM35) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1939. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Credit for Carbon Dioxide Sequestration: 2015 Section 45Q Inflation Adjustment Factor [Notice 2015-44] received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1940. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — 2014 Section 45K(d)(2)(C) Reference Price [Notice 2015-45] received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1941. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rules — Summary of Benefits and Coverage and Uniform Glossary [TD 9724] (RIN: 1545-BM53) received June 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on Ways and Means. S. 984. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare beneficiary access to eye tracking accessories for speech generating devices and to remove the rental cap for durable medical equipment under the Medicare Program with respect to speech generating devices (Rept. 114–178 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 338. A resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1295) to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–179). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama (for herself, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 2867. 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. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2868. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to improve access and choice for entrepreneurs with small businesses with respect to medical care for their employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MARCHANT (for himself, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 2869. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to permit cooperative governing of public entity health benefits through local governments in secondary States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 2870. A bill to amend the Torture Victims Relief Act of 1998 to authorize appropriations to provide assistance for domestic and foreign programs and centers for the treatment of victims of torture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 2871. A bill to provide an incentive for firearm owners to sell their firearms safely and responsibly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCSHON (for himself and Mr. WOMACK):

H.R. 2872. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to modernize the treatment of opioid addiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 2873. A bill to prohibit employers from requiring low-wage employees to enter into covenants not to compete, to require employers to notify potential employees of any requirement to enter into a covenant not to compete, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DESJARLAIS (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. FINCHER, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. MASSIE):

H.R. 2874. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income any discharge of indebtedness income on education loans of deceased veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. BASS, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. LEE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. MOORE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Ms. PLASKETT):

H.R. 2875. A bill to encourage greater community accountability of law enforcement agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. VELA):

H.R. 2876. A bill to promote the recycling of vessels in the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself and Mr. DELANEY):

H.R. 2877. A bill to designate an existing Federal officer to coordinate efforts to secure the release of United States persons who are hostages of hostile groups or state sponsors of terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas (for herself and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 2878. A bill to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2015; 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. KINZINGER of Illinois (for himself, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. BOST):

H.R. 2879. A bill to include Livingston County, the city of Jonesboro in Union County, and the city of Freeport in Stephenson County, Illinois, to the Lincoln National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 2880. A bill to redesignate the Martin Luther King, Junior, National Historic Site in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MESSER (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 2881. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of applicable large employer for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. LEE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 2882. A bill to support Promise Neighborhoods; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 2883. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the publicly traded partnership ownership structure to energy power generation projects and transportation fuels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 2884. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to eliminate the firewalls between defense and nondefense discretionary spending limits; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Ms. TSONGAS (for herself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 2885. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from income and employment taxes real property tax abatements for seniors and disabled individuals in exchange for services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HIMES, Ms. LEE, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. KEATING):

H.J. Res. 58. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the authority of Congress and the States to regulate contributions and expenditures in political campaigns and to enact public financing systems for such campaigns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H. Res. 336. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the need to create a small donor and public finance system for Congressional elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. SALMON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PITTS, Mr.

McGOVERN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BEYER, Ms. McCOLLUM, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. BERA):

H. Res. 337. A resolution calling for substantive dialogue, without preconditions, in order to address Tibetan grievances and secure a negotiated agreement for the Tibetan people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself and Mr. McDERMOTT):

H. Res. 339. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the 25th anniversary of democracy in Mongolia; to the Committee on Foreign 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 Ms. SEWELL of Alabama:

H.R. 2867.

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. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 2868.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States), Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes), and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 2869.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

1. regulate commerce . . . among the several states . . . as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, and

2. provide for the general welfare of the United States as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause I of the Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2870.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 10

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 2871.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 or Article I fo the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 2872.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8 of the Constittuion of the United States

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 2873.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: ''The Congress shall have Power [...] To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States...''

By Mr. DESJARLAIS:

H.R. 2874.

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 Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 2875.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

1) Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. This provision grants Congress the authority to enact appropriate laws protecting the civil rights of all Americans; and

2) The Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution. This provision prohibits unreasonable searches and seizures.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:

H.R. 2876.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 2877.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause XVIII

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:

H.R. 2878.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:

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.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois:

H.R. 2879.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 providing for the general welfare of the United States

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 2880.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 2881.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 2882.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 14—Congress has the ability to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 2883.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 2884.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section, 9, Clause 7

By Ms. TSONGAS:

H.R. 2885.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment XVI to the Constitution.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.J. Res. 58.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article V of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. PAULSEN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. COOK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. HAHN, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 20: Ms. BASS and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 21: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 167: Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 213: Mr. VARGAS and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 223: Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 224: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 282: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 379: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. WHITFIELD, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 403: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 430: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 465: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 539: Mr. COHEN, Mr. POSEY, Ms. LEE, Ms. McCOLLUM, Mr. McGOVERN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 540: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 564: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 611: Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 634: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 635: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 680: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 686: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 692: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. PITTS, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BABIN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. POMPEO.

H.R. 700: Mr. McGOVERN.

H.R. 702: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 707: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 716: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 759: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 771: Ms. McCOLLUM.

H.R. 775: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MULLIN, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 789: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 790: Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 824: Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 840: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 842: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 845: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 879: Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 885: Mr. SARBANES and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 915: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 918: Mr. ISSA, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 920: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 930: Mr. McGOVERN.

H.R. 969: Mr. SCHRADER and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 980: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 985: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 986: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 1019: Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. OLSON, Ms. LEE, Mr. BERA, and Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.
H.R. 1062: Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 1078: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1086: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. BRAT.
H.R. 1089: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 1091: Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 1095: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1120: Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 1132: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. DENHAM, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. NUNES, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. BASS, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.
H.R. 1141: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1194: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1218: Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 1233: Mr. KLINE and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1258: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 1299: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 1300: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 1301: Ms. HAHN and Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 1309: Mr. WOMACK, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
H.R. 1321: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 1328: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 1342: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 1384: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 1434: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 1439: Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 1453: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 1462: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 1475: Mr. TROTT.
H.R. 1502: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1516: Ms. TITUS, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1559: Mr. FOSTER
H.R. 1566: Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 1567: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 1594: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 1598: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1600: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1603: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 1604: Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 1610: Mr. ASHFORD.
H.R. 1624: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 1653: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1654: Mr. PITTENGER and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1655: Ms. NORTON, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 1680: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 1684: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 1686: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 1722: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1725: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 1728: Mr. DESAULNIER and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 1743: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 1752: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 1769: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1774: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1801: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LEE, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1818: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1832: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 1853: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 1859: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 1861: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 1882: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 1893: Mr. BUCK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. HARPER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. OLSON, Mr. POMPEO and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 1901: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 1937: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 1950: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BLUM, Mrs. BLACK and Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 1994: Mr. GUINTA, Mr. PITTENGER and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 2013: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2016: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 2023: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2037: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 2043: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 2061: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2123: Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 2125: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 2134: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 2140: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. RUSSELL
H.R. 2148: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 2169: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. POCAN and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 2191: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 2216: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2233: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 2280: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 2285: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 2290: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
H.R. 2304: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2315: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2355: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PETERS and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2362: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 2371: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2380: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2400: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2403: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 2404: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 2406: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 2407: Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 2466: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 2524: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 2530: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2560: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 2595: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 2602: Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 2612: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2615: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2636: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2646: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 2650: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 2652: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 2653: Mr. FLEISCHMANN and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 2660: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2662: Mr. COOPER and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 2691: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 2710: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 2726: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 2742: Mr. WALZ, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 2762: Ms. ESHOO and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 2763: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2775: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. DENT.
H.R. 2802: Mr. BUCK, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. ZINKE, and Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 2805: Mr. GUINTA.
H.R. 2809: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 2825: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas
H.R. 2826: Mr. WELCH, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ASHFORD, and Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2835: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 2838: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 2850: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2856: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 2866: Mr. FATTAH.
H.J. Res. 47: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.J. Res. 51: Mr. MOULTON.
H.J. Res. 54: Mr. BRAT.
H. Con. Res. 17: Ms. MCSALLY.
H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. GALLEGO and Mr. WALZ.
H. Res. 54: Mr. FOSTER.
H. Res. 82: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H. Res. 112: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. LOFGREN.
H. Res. 209: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H. Res. 227: Mr. PASCRELL.
H. Res. 291: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Ms. MENG.
H. Res. 294: Mr. UPTON, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
H. Res. 310: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H. Res. 318: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H. Res. 324: Ms. LEE, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. HONDA.
H. Res. 329: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LEWIS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. POLIQUIN

AMENDMENT NO. 4: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce section 63.7570(b)(2) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act).

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MRS. BLACKBURN

AMENDMENT NO. 5: Page 70, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced to $0)''.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MRS. BLACKBURN

AMENDMENT NO. 6: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

ACROSS-THE-BOARD REDUCTION

SEC. ____. Each amount made available by this Act is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. WEBER OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 7: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of Section 321(a) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7621(a)).

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. WEBER OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 8: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to issue any final

rule pursuant to the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.) until the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency complies with Section 321(a) of the such Act (42 U.S.C. 7621(a)).

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. WALBERG

AMENDMENT NO. 9: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON FUNDS

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to lobby in contravention of section 1913 of title 18, United States Code, on behalf of the proposed rule entitled ''Definition of 'Waters of the United States' Under the Clean Water Act'' (79 Fed. Reg. 22188; April 21, 2014).

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. KILDEE

AMENDMENT NO. 10: Page 68, strike lines 1 and 2 and insert the following: '': *Provided further*, That an entity shall not be an eligible recipient for a grant under this paragraph unless the entity has experienced at least 15 percent population loss since 1970, as measured by data from the 2010 decennial census and has experienced prolonged population, income, and employment loss resulting in substantial levels of housing vacancy and abandonment and such housing vacancies and abandonments are concentrated in more than one neighborhood or geographic area within a jurisdiction or jurisdictions.''.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MRS. LAWRENCE

AMENDMENT NO. 11: Strike section 418.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MRS. LAWRENCE

AMENDMENT NO. 12: Strike section 422.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MRS. LAWRENCE

AMENDMENT NO. 13: Strike section 439.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MRS. LAWRENCE

AMENDMENT NO. 14: Strike section 417.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MRS. LAWRENCE

AMENDMENT NO. 15: Strike section 434.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. AMODEI

AMENDMENT NO. 16: At the end of the bill, before the short title, add the following new section:

SAGE-GROUSE

SEC. ____. (a) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Interior to develop, propose, finalize, implement, enforce, or administer any action to withdraw lands pursuant to section 204 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1714) for the purpose of managing the greater sage-grouse or greater sage-grouse habitat.

(b) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture to finalize, approve, or implement the Great Basin Region Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments for the Sub-Regions of Idaho and Southwestern Montana, Nevada and Northeastern California, Oregon and Utah; the Rocky Mountain Region Greater Sage-Grouse Proposed Land Use Plan Amendments for the Wyoming, Northwest Colorado, Lewistown, and North Dakota Sub-Regions; the Proposed Resource Management Plan for the Billings and Pompeys Pillar National Monument Resource Management Plan Revision; the HiLine District Proposed Resource Management Plan; the Miles City Field Office Proposed Resource Management Plan; Proposed Resource Management Plan for the Bighorn Basin Resource Management Plan Revision; the Proposed Resource Management Plan for the Buffalo, Wyoming Resource Management Plan Revision; and the South Dakota Field Office Proposed Resource Management Plan developed pursuant to section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712) or section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604).

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. DUNCAN OF SOUTH CAROLINA

AMENDMENT NO. 17: Page 14, line 3, before the period insert the following: '': *Provided further*, That none of such funds and appropriations may be used to enforce any prohibition under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.) or the Act of June 8, 1940 (chapter 278; 16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.; popularly known as the Bald Eagle Protection Act) on the accidental taking of birds, before the date of the issuance of a rule that exempts such takings from such prohibitions''.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. HUDSON

AMENDMENT NO. 18: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO REMOVE OIL AND GAS LEASE SALE 260 FROM LEASING PROGRAM

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to remove oil and gas lease sale 260 from the Draft Proposed Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Oil and Gas Leasing Program for 2017-2022 (DPP), or from any subsequent proposed or final iteration of such Program.

H.R. 2822

OFFERED BY: MR. NEWHOUSE

AMENDMENT NO. 19: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO TREAT GRAY WOLVES IN WASHINGTON, OREGON, AND UTAH AS ENDANGERED SPECIES OR THREATENED SPECIES

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to used to treat any gray wolf (*Canis lupus*) in Washington, Oregon, or Utah as an endangered species or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).