United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 28, 2015 No. 120

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 28, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID G. VALADAO 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.

AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, on July 22, The New York Times published an article titled ''Afghan Security Forces Struggle Just to Maintain Stalemate,'' by Joseph Goldstein.

Mr. Goldstein writes that, because of extremely high casualty rates in the Afghan security forces, there is also a high desertion rate. As a result, the Afghans are struggling to maintain adequate numbers in their security forces, meaning, it is becoming extremely difficult for them to keep the Taliban at bay.

The article is of great concern for those of us who have watched the fight against the Taliban since 2001. We have lost over 2,355 men and women in Afghanistan, with 20,000 wounded, and spent over $685 billion.

The history of Afghanistan has shown that no outside military force has ever changed it, from Alexander the Great, to the British, to the Russians. Yet, last year the Obama administration signed a 9-year agreement, committing American money and manpower in Afghanistan that was not voted on by the Congress.

That is so ironic. We are talking about voting on this agreement with Iran, but we did not vote to commit our troops and our money to Afghanistan for 9 more years.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I am concerned by Mr. Goldstein's report. Let me give two quotes from his article about the ability of the Afghan security forces to keep the Taliban at bay that I found very, very concerning.

First: ''A spokesman for the Afghan Defense Ministry . . . insisted that desertions remained rare and that there had been no effort to ban leaves or to stop rotations away from the front to cut down on the number of people going absent without leave.''

The second quote: ''But interviews with soldiers and police officers repeatedly countered the government's claims. One Army major said . . . 'Once the soldiers are taken for their breaks, they are unwilling to come back and join their duty.' ''

Once again, Mr. Speaker, the Afghan Government is untruthful and corrupt. Yet, we continue to spend billions of dollars at this losing cause.

It is not fair to the taxpayers of eastern North Carolina, the taxpayers of America, or anybody in this country that pays taxes that we will continue to send money there to build their infrastructure and rebuild their roads and then to have the Taliban blow them up. It makes no sense.

I can assure President Ghani, the President of Afghanistan, that the United States House continues to spend billions of dollars on Afghan reconstruction so the Taliban can continue to destroy what we send over there with the taxpayers' money to be built.

We in Congress should stop funding this rathole of a policy in Afghanistan, which has basically given the Afghan Government a blank check every year and will for the next 9 years.

History has proven that we will never change this tribal nation, and we should stop trying. Instead, let's focus on fixing our economy here in America.

God bless our troops, and God bless America.

RAISE THE GAS TAX ALREADY

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, for the last 3 years, I have been coming to the floor, arguing against the folly of our attempting to pay for 2015 infrastructure with 1993 dollars.

We haven't adjusted the gas tax since 1993, and that is why we haven't given the American people a 6-year, robust reauthorization of the surface transportation system since 1998.

I find myself today in complete agreement with a column by James Surowiecki in the current issue of The New Yorker. It is entitled ''Raise the Gas Tax Already.''

He talks about how what is going on in the other body might be perceived as progress, might be a good thing, '' 'real progress,' except for one thing: their complicated, jury-rigged plan is only

Printed on recycled paper.

necessary because of the continued refusal by Congress to embrace the obvious, economically sensible solution to highway funding, namely raising the gas tax. The federal gas tax is, as it should be, a key source of funding for highway spending.'' Locked currently at 18.4 cents:

''The problem is that the funding mechanisms the plan relies on are as gimmicky and haphazard as ever. The bill would raise money by, among other things, lowering the dividend rate paid to banks in the Federal Reserve system, raising certain customs fees, increasing collection rates on unpaid taxes, and selling off a hundred and one million barrels of oil from the country's Strategic Petroleum Reserve.''

''If you're going to have a Strategic Petroleum Reserve, you should probably only sell oil from it for strategic reasons, not just because you want to raise some cash.''

''And, from an economic perspective, paying for operating expenses by selling off assets is not a good way to manage your money.''

''What's especially infuriating about the bill is that we already have, in the gas tax, an ideal tool for raising money to pay for highway repairs. It's a user tax: if you don't drive, you don't pay it, and if you drive less it costs you less.''

''That's why even conservative economists, like Gregory Mankiw . . . have been ardent advocates of gasoline taxes.''

''Indeed, the refusal of Congress to raise the gas tax is the ultimate expression of how reflexive and irrational the resistance to taxes has become. Opposition to higher income taxes has some theoretical justification: higher marginal rates discourage people from working more and investing. Seen in one light, they're a penalty for success. But no such argument exists against the gas tax: all it does, in essence, is ask drivers to pay for the roads they use. It's not even fair to say that keeping this tax at its current level is a check on big government, since most federal highway spending now goes toward rebuilding and repairing roads—maintenance that even conservatives recognize we must do.

''Highway revenue has to be raised somehow. Congress should show some political spine, discard the Rube Goldberg funding schemes, and stop treating all taxes as bad ones.''

I couldn't agree more with that sentiment. Indeed, we have seen six Republican States already this year show some political spine. They have raised the gas tax in Idaho, Utah, Iowa, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Georgia.

It is time for us to assume our responsibilities, to rebuild and renew America, that used to have the finest infrastructure in the world, but now is locked into a downward spiral.

Renewing and rebuilding America, giving a 6-year, robust reauthorization bill will put hundreds of thousands of Americans to work in a matter of months all across the country, and it will make all our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

DRUG FREE AMERICA FOUNDATION CHAIR BETTY SEMBLER

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

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize someone who has been described as a pioneer in national substance abuse policy and prevention and a woman whose dedication, drive, and compassion have made the world simply a better place.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Betty Sembler of St. Petersburg, Florida, as she retires as chair of the Drug Free America Foundation after nearly 15 years of dedicated leadership.

Mrs. Sembler has actually dedicated the past three decades of her life to fighting the war on drugs. In 1976, she was 1 of 10 founding members of Straight, Inc., a nonprofit drug treatment program that successfully treated more than 12,000 young people with drug addiction in eight cities nationally, from Dallas to Boston.

Mrs. Sembler then turned her sights to establishing a national drug policy to reinforce the four critical fronts to combat drug abuse: education, treatment, interdiction, and law enforcement.

Mrs. Sembler helped form public policy in the United States' campaign against drugs through her participation in the White House Conference for a Drug Free America, as a member of the Florida Governor's Drug Policy Task Force, and as a board member of DARE Florida, a national organization that provides drug resistance education for elementary and middle school students.

Mrs. Sembler has continued her campaign against weakening drug policies and against legalization of drugs on an international basis. She serves on the board of DARE International as vice chairperson.

She accompanied her husband, Mel Sembler, on both of his missions as United States ambassador, first to Australia and then to Italy.

Mrs. Sembler is the founder and board chair of Save Our Society from Drugs and the Drug Free America Foundation.

Both organizations work to educate people about the effects on individuals, families, and communities, from legalizing and loosening restrictions on drugs while also fighting to reduce drug use, drug addiction, and drug-related illnesses and death.

Mrs. Sembler serves on the boards of the Republican Jewish Coalition, Operation PAR in Pinellas County, the Florida Holocaust Museum, the Florida Governor's Mansion Foundation, the Florida National Guard Multijurisdictional Counterdrug Training Advisory Board, the Jewish Policy Center, and St. Petersburg's Menorah Manor.

Mr. Speaker, in 2008, the DEA Museum Foundation presented its Lifetime Achievement Award to Mrs. Sembler for her 30 years of leadership and commitment to fighting drugs.

The Lifetime Achievement Award is the highest honor bestowed by the foundation and recognizes long and sustained commitments to supporting law enforcement, drug abuse treatment, and drug abuse education.

Mrs. Sembler was awarded honorary agent status by the DEA, only the second such designation to ever be given.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is Mrs. Betty Sembler and her work with the Drug Free America Foundation has positively impacted lives and families around the world and has, no doubt, saved lives around the world.

Mrs. Sembler, with her grace, friendship, and charm, has impacted each and every individual that she has touched throughout her life, including this Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in thanking Mrs. Betty Sembler for her selfless years of service and for her work leading the charge, pushing back against dangerous drug policies, and promoting public health and public safety.

PUERTO RICO'S DEBT

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to make an introduction. This is the beautiful island of Puerto Rico. We own it. It is ours. We are responsible for it.

The Congress of the United States governs this island. It is our colony, and we rule over it. It is $73 billion in debt.

The Supreme Court said: Puerto Rico is a territory . . . belonging to the United States, but not a part of the United States.

And, apparently, the responsibility to govern Puerto Rico falls to the Congress and not to the executive branch, because, for the last 6 months or more, I have talked with Obama administration officials at every level about Puerto Rico, and their response has been that they cannot or will not do anything. The message I received loud and clear was anything to help Puerto Rico had better happen in Congress.

But there is no sense of urgency in Congress or anywhere else in Washington for real solutions. Puerto Rico's problems are complicated.

I am here to say that the Puerto Rican people must begin putting direct pressure on this Congress for action because Puerto Rico's problems are mostly the creation of—you guessed it—Congress.

The Jones Act of 1917 made all Puerto Ricans citizens of the United States, just in time for World War I, when 18,000 new draftees were needed.

The Jones Act also says that Puerto Rico, unlike any State, can issue triple-exempt bonds, bonds that are free

of Federal, State, and local taxes. Illinois can't do that. Neither can your State.

□ 1015

But Puerto Rico was specifically written out of U.S. bankruptcy laws by Congress. They cannot declare Chapter 9 or anything else because a special exemption was made. So Congress creates a tax-free bond haven and Wall Street jumps in to buy Puerto Rican debt decade after decade.

Puerto Rico has more than 15 times the median bond debt of all 50 States, and bankruptcy is not an option without an act of Congress. And get this: the Puerto Rican Constitution says bondholders must be paid before anything else.

Right now, Wall Street is circling the wounded animal like vultures waiting to get their piece; and they are fighting against a bill that would allow Puerto Rico, like any other jurisdiction, to declare bankruptcy because that could move decisions about who gets paid and in what order they get paid into a U.S. Federal court of law.

You see, the current situation favors the billionaires and hedge funds because they will get paid before the cops on the beat, the doctors in the hospitals, and the teachers in the schools. Oh, we can't investigate that crime or take down that drug dealer because we have to pay the bondholders on Wall Street first.

Now, the same people who cash in on debt in places like Greece and Argentina are lining up to cash in in the Caribbean by stepping up their demands for austerity measures, privatization of utilities, and restructuring on their terms that will make them very, very rich at the expense of the Puerto Rican people.

Tomorrow, I will discuss how the Puerto Rican people are being distracted by the promises of statehood by every politician who travels to San Juan or needs the votes of Puerto Ricans in Orlando, Florida.

But today, I want to make clear that the sooner the people here realize that the people in this Chamber are the ones who need to take action, the sooner we can make real progress and not get distracted by politics and the pipe dreams of statehood.

So for my remaining minute, I want to address the people of Puerto Rico directly in the language they speak at home around the dinner table.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

It is time for everyone to put political divisions aside.

I have talked to the Obama Administration and they will do nothing to help Puerto Rico.

The bond-holders are lining up to get paid even if the rest of Puerto Rico collapses.

Wall Street is buying up Puerto Rican debt so that they can demand austerity measures, tax-breaks, and privatization of industries that will fill their pockets with even more money.

Whatever plan is invented in Washington or on Wall Street will not put the needs of the Puerto Rican people first—we all know that.

So what is a unified Puerto Rico's plan to move forward?

Boricuas must step up right now so that Puerto Rico has a plan for the economy that will create jobs and not just drive young people off of the island to the U.S. on Jet Blue.

The only place we can seek help is right here in Congress; we need to make this Congress act.

I will talk more about this and the Island's the distraction of the status question tomorrow.

But right now I want Puerto Ricans to put their ideas together.

Go to my Facebook page—''Rep. Gutierrez on Facebook''—and let's begin working on a plan to get Congress to act.

Ya es hora de que todos pongan a un lado divisiones políticas.

He hablado con la Administración de Obama y ellos no van a ayudar a Puerto Rico.

Los dueños de bonos están haciendo fila para recibir sus pagos aun cuando el resto de Puerto Rico se derrumba.

Wall Street está comprando la deuda de Puerto Rico para poder exigir medidas de austeridad, rebajes de impuestos, y la privatización de las industrias que llenarán sus bolsillos con más dinero.

Cualquiera que sea el plan de Washington o de Wall Street no pondrá las necesidades de la gente de Puerto Rico primero—todos sabemos eso.

Entonces, ¿Cuál es el plan de Puerto Rico unido para seguir adelante?

Los Boricuas deben involucrarse en este momento para que Puerto Rico tenga un plan de economía que pueda crear empleos y no seguir empujando a los jóvenes fuera de la isla para los Estados Unidos en Jet Blue.

El único lugar donde podemos buscar ayuda es aquí en el Congreso, tenemos que hacer que este Congreso cumpla.

Voy a hablar más sobre esto y de la distracción de la cuestión del estatus de la Isla mañana.

Pero por ahora quiero que los puertorriqueños pongan sus ideas en conjunto.

Vayan a mi página de Facebook—''Rep. Gutiérrez en Facebook''—y empecemos a organizar un plan para hacer que este Congreso cumpla.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois will provide a translation for the RECORD.

CONGRESS-BUNDESTAG YOUTH EXCHANGE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, since 1983, tens of thousands of students have participated in the Congress-Bundestag Youth Exchange, or CBYX, program with Germany. This program allows young professionals from both the United States and Germany to spend a year abroad to intern and study a different culture while living with a host family.

During their experience, students from both countries develop a better understanding of foreign cultures and expand their knowledge and leadership potential exponentially. This fellowship provides extensive language training, strong courses of study at foreign universities, and the opportunity to be fully immersed in another culture, thereby culminating in a very unique experience.

Members of the German-Bundestag hold this program in especially high esteem as they hand select their nominees and build very strong personal relationships with them. While Members of the United States Congress are not as involved in the selection process of American participants, the American equivalent would include the prestige that congressional nominations for military academies carry.

Over the years, this program has shown tremendous success in fostering a stronger relationship between the United States and Germany, which is why I was particularly disappointed to see the Department of State cut its funding by half in 2015. These reductions of CBYX came despite Congress' continued bipartisan support over this program for decades.

To prevent the collapse of this program altogether, Germany graciously closed the gap in 2015 by authorizing additional funds to negate the funding cuts that the U.S. had implemented. However, they maintained this was not something that they would be able to continue, and without the U.S. restoring funding, the continuation of this program was in jeopardy.

To further emphasize the significance of CBYX, German Chancellor Angela Merkel highlighted her disappointment in the funding cuts to President Obama during her visit to the United States in 2015. During those deliberations, she said:

> We were not pleased . . . because we very much value this partnership program. And I believe that all of those who participated as young people have also had unforgettable experiences. Especially now, 25 years after German unification, we want to continue this program. Given the fact that there are no longer as many American soldiers experiencing Germany as in the past, it is even more important that young people learn as much as possible from one another.

In fact, the State Department's own U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy countered the cutbacks during its 2014 annual report. In it, the Commission is quoted as saying:

> We believe that it is against our interest to invest less in our relations with the German public at a critical time when facing dual threats from Russia and countering violent extremism in Europe, while also trying to secure the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership agreement with the European Union . . . the cutback of U.S. investment in the Congress-Bundestag exchange also sends a strong message to the German public and

government that the U.S. does not value the relationship with a critical ally whose public is increasingly skeptical of the United States.

In response, the House German-American Caucus and those concerned about the prospect of the CBYX program being placed at a disadvantage, voiced our frustrations with both Secretary Kerry and our House colleagues to raise awareness and demand the restoration of full funding for CBYX. I was pleased that this effort amassed bipartisan support throughout the House.

Further, the House Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Agencies conveyed their concern in June 2015 by adding the following language:

This program is integral for the continuation of a strong relationship between the United States and Germany . . . the committee does not support the proposed program reduction.

Ultimately, the committee included language to restore funding for fiscal year 2016. While this was good news, the root of the problem still fell within the State Department's lack of support.

On July 17, 2015, the U.S. Ambassador to Germany, John Emerson, contacted the German Bundestag to emphasize the vital importance of this program and relayed the State Department's reversal on this issue and their decision to restore full funding for CBYX.

As co-chairman of the Congressional German-American Caucus, I was ecstatic to hear this news, and I am pleased that the United States is holding up our end in strengthening ties with our great European ally. Many thanks to the nonprofit exchange organizations here in the U.S. who administer CBYX, such as Cultural Vistas, AFS, Youth for Understanding, CIEE, ASSE, FLAG, and Nacel Open Door. They are important partners in the success of the CBYX program.

I would also like to thank my co-chair from across the aisle, Congressman KEATING, for the great efforts he showed throughout this process as well. This is a great step forward towards continuing our participation in this program and educating our future leaders through such an important fellowship.

SUMMER FOOD ROCKS TOUR

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on July 17, I hosted my second annual Summer Food Rocks Tour in my district to bring attention to the importance of summer meals and USDA's Summer Food Service Program, which ensures that low-income children continue to receive nutritious meals when school is not in session.

I was honored to be joined on the tour by USDA Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services Kevin Concannon, as well as many local, State, Federal, and nonprofit partners.

Mr. Speaker, for millions of low-income students, summer break isn't as carefree as it should be. For these children, summer is a time of great uncertainty. During the school year, they have access to reliable, healthy school breakfasts and school lunches, but when school is out, these children and their families are often left scrambling to find enough to eat.

According to Share Our Strength, a leading national partner on summer meals, 43 percent of low-income families say it is harder to make ends meet during the summer, and they must budget an extra $300 a month for groceries when kids are home from school in the summer. For families already struggling to put food on the table, these can be daunting challenges.

Summer should not be a time of increased hunger among our children. That is where USDA's Summer Food Service Program comes in. It is a federally funded, State-administered program that reimburses providers who serve healthy meals to children and teens in low-income areas at no charge during the summer. Local sponsors serve meals at community sites on set days and times. Sites may be located in a variety of settings, such as schools, recreation centers, parks, community centers, day camps, housing projects, and Indian reservations.

My Summer Food Rocks Tour began at Koziol Elementary School in Ware, Massachusetts. We had the opportunity to serve breakfast and speak with kids and their families about the importance of summer meals, and Share Our Strength was there to distribute sunglasses to the children, which they all loved.

Our next stop was Fisher Hill Elementary School in Orange, Massachusetts. There, we met with children attending day camp at a school who receive breakfast through the summer meals program. We got a chance to play basketball with the kids. The kids were definitely better than us.

Then we were off to the Spanish American Center in Leominster, Massachusetts, where we were hosted by the center's executive director, Neddy Latimer. We participated in a roundtable discussion on the successes and challenges of the summer meals program. We then had the opportunity to tour the center's newly constructed kitchen and serve lunch to an enthusiastic group of children.

Our day ended at the Goddard School in my hometown of Worcester. Under Secretary Concannon led a roundtable discussion on national standards for the school lunch program. During the discussion, we were treated to a delicious lunch prepared by the Worcester Public Schools Nutrition Department.

We wrapped up our visit by touring two Worcester Public Schools food trucks and learning more about this innovative mobile meals program that runs throughout the city.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank everyone who joined me and my Summer Food Rocks Tour, especially Under Secretary Concannon, the site sponsors and volunteers, and the children and families who reminded me of why summer meals are so really important.

A child's need for healthy, nutritious food doesn't just end when the school year does. We know that providing children access to healthy meals in the summer months has clear health, education, and economic benefits; and since summer meals must be served in a community setting, children have another incentive to participate in summer enrichment and recreation programs that, in turn, help them return to school ready to learn in the fall.

This summer, USDA plans to serve more than 200 million free meals to children 18 years and under at approved summer meals sites. I have no doubt that they will achieve this ambitious goal.

But there is still a lot of work to be done. USDA estimates that only one out of six students that gets a free or reduced price school meal during the school year receives a summer meal. As we consider the next Child Nutrition Reauthorization bill, we need to make sure that all students who are eligible for school meals have access to free summer meals and that States and local communities have the funding and resources they need to reach all eligible children.

An easy way to find a summer meals site near you is to text FOOD to 877–877, or visit USDA's Summer Food Rocks page online.

Over August recess, I encourage all of my colleagues to visit a summer meals site in your district. I know that you will be just as impressed as I was at the incredible work being done right in your own community to ensure that no child goes hungry in the summer.

Mr. Speaker, we can and we should do more to end hunger now.

□ 1030

OUT-OF-CONTROL SPENDING

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to talk about one of the biggest problems facing our Nation, out-of-control spending.

At this very moment, the national debt sits at over $18 trillion. We have not arrived at this point because of the actions of one party or of one administration. Over the years, both parties have enacted programs that have increased our debt.

That said, we have reached a point at which we must get serious about reining in our out-of-control spending, or we may fall victim to a similar fate that many nations throughout history have experienced.

Here in the U.S., our spending problems are reaching a crisis level, and we are effectively leaving behind a catastrophe for the next generation. The basis of the American Dream is that, if you work hard, you can leave behind a better future for your children and grandchildren. That fundamentally American vision is in jeopardy due, in part, to our irresponsible spending.

I am a new and very proud grandfather. My grandson, MacGuire, is about to turn 1, and already, his share of the national debt before his first birthday is over $40,000. We cannot turn a blind eye to this problem and pretend that it will just get better. Let me explain why.

There are two basic forms of Federal spending, mandatory spending and discretionary spending.

Mr. Speaker, when most people think of the Federal Government, they are probably thinking about discretionary programs, which is money that goes to things like our military, highways, national parks, agriculture, and medical research.

The good thing about discretionary spending is that, each year, Congress has the ability to control these spending levels through the appropriations process. Since Republicans took control of the House in 2010, we have had some success in cutting funding to various Federal agencies. For example, agencies like the IRS and the EPA have seen their budgets cut in response to egregious executive overreach.

While it may seem like it covers the majority of government operations, discretionary spending actually only makes up about one-third of all Federal spending.

The other portion of spending is what we call mandatory spending. This, along with the interest on the national debt, makes up almost two-thirds of all Federal spending.

Now, here is the really bad part about mandatory spending: it is on autopilot. Unlike discretionary spending, mandatory spending does not require annual appropriations from Congress. Instead, as long as someone meets the requirements, these programs dole out money without any action from Congress. Within these mandatory spending programs are what we call ''means-based entitlement programs,'' including things like Medicaid, ObamaCare, food stamps, welfare, and the like.

For example, in fiscal year 2012, the Federal Government spent almost $800 billion on over 92 programs that were aimed at lifting Americans out of poverty. Despite that record spending, too many Americans simply stopped looking for work. The system is failing the very people it was designed to help.

While many of these means-based entitlement programs have good intentions, they aren't supposed to be permanent. These programs were created to help lift people out of poverty, not to keep them there. That is why it shouldn't be a surprise that, during the recent economic downturn, spending on these means-based entitlement programs ballooned.

What is surprising, however, is that, as the economy has improved, the spending on these programs has not gone down. In fact, the spending on some of these programs remains at all-time highs.

Now, Republicans and Democrats both agree that Americans shouldn't be stuck in poverty, and that is why we should put party politics aside and come together to address this dangerous cycle of government dependence.

We need to reform these means-based programs to put a real focus on workforce training to help connect Americans with the skills they need to get good-paying jobs that meet workforce demands.

We could block grant, through the appropriations process, money to State governments and allow them to craft poverty fighting programs based on each State's specific societal programs and economic needs.

I know that reforming these mandatory spending programs won't be easy, but I didn't run for Congress to come here and make easy decisions. I doubt my colleagues did either.

Before I leave this body, I want to be able to look at my grandson, MacGuire, and know that I have been part of a real effort to rein in spending and put our Nation on a fiscally stable path for the next generation.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to join me in addressing our Nation's spending crisis. Let's come together and make the tough choices. Let's get our spending under control, and let's leave behind a better America for the next generation.

POSTPARTUM DEPRESSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) for 5 minutes.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a common medical condition that is too often masked by silence and stigma. It affects more women than diabetes or stroke or breast cancer. It is postpartum depression.

Here are some words from women who have suffered from postpartum depression.

From Maria: I was experiencing anger and rage, and I had suicidal thoughts. ''I don't know what's wrong, but I can't take care of the baby, and I'm miserable all of the time.''

From Jodi: My son was sick again, and I was crying so hard I could barely text my mom to have her come over immediately. I waited anxiously at the door, with a screaming, ill child, and greeted her by handing over my son, saying, ''I can't do this anymore.''

From Heather: Soon after the birth of my son, I knew something was wrong with me. I couldn't fall asleep, or if I did, I couldn't sleep for long. I also couldn't eat. I forced down every bite of food, and I spent most of my time crying.

These women are not alone. In 2013, there were more than 3.9 million live births in the United States, and of these births, one out of every seven mothers was affected by postpartum depression.

Women suffering from maternal depression often report overwhelming and isolating feelings of sadness, anxiety, fear, and guilt. This can include strong feelings of anger, thoughts of death or suicide, and even negative feelings towards their babies.

The children of mothers with postpartum depression can become withdrawn, have behavioral problems, and have a higher risk of anxiety disorders, depression, and toxic stress.

Even though this condition affects hundreds of thousands a year, many do not seek medical help. Many moms report that they are too embarrassed to admit their feelings or are worried they might be seen as failing or as being bad moms. It doesn't have to be this way. The good news is that treatment works. Ninety percent of women who are going through postpartum depression can be treated effectively.

That is why I am introducing a bill with Representative COSTELLO to make sure new moms are not on their own when it comes to dealing with postpartum depression. The Bringing Postpartum Depression Out of the Shadows Act will offer grants to States to screen and treat new and expecting moms for maternal depression.

States and professional groups have made great progress, and we need to support them as they move to increase awareness and consolidate resources. We need to help doctors recognize the signs of postpartum depression and provide access to appropriate treatment.

This is commonsense legislation to help the over 400,000 women annually who suffer from maternal depression. We need to stand up and tell moms they are not alone. Needing help does not make them bad mothers, and help is out there, but we need to make sure those who need it can get it.

I ask my colleagues to cosponsor our legislation and take this concrete step towards supporting healthy moms and healthy babies.

FAILING VA MEDICAL CENTER RECOVERY ACT

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

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, it has been almost a year since the director of the Central Alabama Veterans Health Care System was fired after numerous reports of mismanagement and malfeasance surfaced—the missing patient x rays, the falsified records, the employee who took a veteran to a crackhouse, and the utter lack of discipline and order.

The removal was possible under new authority granted under the VA reform law that we passed last year, and I was hopeful that this action was indicative of a new VA leadership that finally got it, that was willing to cut through the bureaucracy and make the decisions necessary to turn around failing medical centers.

I did hear a lot of nice promises—commitments to work through the system to make sure that the problems were fixed—but, Mr. Speaker, the problems were not fixed.

Communication and coordination between various levels of management are still badly out of sync at a time when we can least afford it. It seems like, every time I think we are in a position to make real progress in central Alabama, something falls through the cracks, the ball gets dropped, an opportunity is missed. Every time, the VA leadership can point to the various layers of bureaucracy for why these problems exist—promises, excuses—but not action.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the problem is that we have been depending on a broken bureaucracy to fix itself. I believe the problem is that we have been asking the VA leaders to intervene in this troubled system rather than requiring them to. I believe it is time to change that by breaking through the bureaucracy to get results on behalf of our precious veterans.

What happens when a public school continues to fail to meet basic standards? The State Department of Education steps in to take over, and it takes charge of turning the place around.

It is a process that isn't pleasant, but everyone from principals and teachers to students and parents understand the consequences of the failure to improve. I believe we need a similar mechanism at the VA when medical centers continuously fail our veterans.

Today, I am filing legislation to compel the Department of Veterans Affairs officials to intervene and take over failing VA medical centers. It is called the Failing VA Medical Center Recovery Act.

It offers the VA new tools to turn around the worst of our healthcare centers, and it puts the responsibility for doing so squarely on the Secretary of the VA. The VA needs a team of leaders who is equipped with the expertise to identify solutions and the authority to execute them.

Under my bill, the VA will recruit teams of the best managers and medical professionals who can rapidly deploy to failing medical centers to take over and take charge. These takeover teams would be managed through the newly authorized office of failing medical centers and would have the new legal tools needed to make a difference at each location.

This is an antibureaucracy bill. This is the team that no complacent VA employees want to see coming because they know that the status quo is about to get shaken up.

Just like a failing school, this can serve as a motivation to keep performance from dropping off. Also very important is that the determination of a failing medical center will be based on data, not on the Secretary's whim or what media attention it is garnering. My bill sets up an automatic trigger that compels the VA to act under the law.

I am glad the Secretary used his authority to take control of the situation in Phoenix—but why not Montgomery? Why not Tuskegee? Why not come and take control of the worst and the second worst situations in our country, especially after we have repeatedly asked and have pleaded for him to do so? I am tired of asking, and that is why my bill requires the VA to step in and take charge.

Mr. Speaker, some might misperceive this as an attack on the VA, and it is not. It is actually a gift. Entrenched bureaucrats might hate this plan, but reform-minded leaders at the VA should welcome new tools and new resources to fix medical centers and help veterans access care.

I have spoken to many of my colleagues about this bill, and I am pleased as to how well it is being received. I look forward to working with Chairman MILLER and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to move this legislation forward.

Let's have a real conversation about getting results on behalf of our veterans.

TRIBUTE TO THE PASSING OF MAJOR GENERAL ANDREW COOLEY

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

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I stand in recognition of the late Major General Andrew Cooley, a dear friend and a tremendous patriot who dedicated his life to serving our great Nation.

A true leader and a combat veteran, he faithfully served for 38 years, leading from the front and accomplishing much along the way. His career was marked by several tours of duty at home and abroad, including the command of an Army division, and he participated in combat operations in Korea, Vietnam, Lebanon, Somalia, Bosnia, Kosovo, and Angola.

In 1951, General Cooley enlisted in the United States Army at the age of 17, and he went on to receive his commission after having successfully completed Officer Candidate School at Fort Benning, Georgia, in 1955, as a second lieutenant.

Over the course of his career, he served in various staff and command positions, including as the principal representative of the Department of Defense to the Lebanese-Israeli negotiations and as commanding general of the 24th Infantry Division.

Upon retirement from the Army, General Cooley was instrumental in instituting a forward-focused, logistical infrastructure that remains instrumental to our Nation's defense.

□ 1045

Without a doubt, General Cooley's many accomplishments deserve to be honored. However, his accomplishments could only be realized with the support and commitment of his wife of 57 years, Joan, and their two children, Cathleen and Caroline.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today humbled by the many accomplishments of a true patriot. It is my great honor to recognize the late Major General Andrew Cooley for his friendship and his service to our great Nation.

UNRESTRICTED ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, just this past week a Federal district court in California found that facilities built to hold illegal immigrants while immigration officials determine whether their asylum claims are valid or not were not properly operated and ordered the release of thousands of illegal immigrants within 90 days.

The lawsuit alleged that, despite the fact that detention centers provide schooling for underage detainees, they still believe the facilities are insufficiently hospitable.

Despite brand-new facilities built to address the present surge in illegal immigration last year, advocates of illegal immigration will use any avenue to expand and promote policies that entice immigrants to make dangerous journeys and put themselves under the influence of smugglers and human traffickers.

The ruling gave the government until August 3 to submit a plan for releasing the illegal immigrants within 90 days.

Of course, the Department of Justice's own data tells us that what will happen when these illegal immigrants are released is fully 85 percent will never show up for their immigration court hearings.

The end result of this lawsuit will simply be the release of thousands of illegal immigrants who have not been vetted for criminal backgrounds, outstanding warrants, or any other characteristics that should prevent the release into our society.

The situation raises a number of questions: Why did illegal immigration advocates file a lawsuit in California rather than in Texas, where these detention facilities are located? We know why.

California is the lawsuit capital of the world and the home of courts like the Ninth Circuit, which most times is overturned, many times overturned at higher levels of court. They figure they could get a loose deal in California on immigration.

Why did these illegal immigration advocates file a lawsuit knowing full well that the administration intends to release any detainees who provide a credible asylum request?

Is even the most cursory review of illegal immigrants to determine whether they are dangerous to Americans too much for these attorneys?

Will this administration appeal or does this ruling simply support their goal of unrestricted immigration and policies which ensure that the vast majority of illegal immigrants who are detained are released into our country almost immediately?

Mr. Speaker, I believe we already know the answer to these questions. Both the Obama administration and the lawyers who file these frivolous suits have but one interest: continued unrestricted illegal immigration that places both Americans and immigrants in danger and makes a farce of our rule of law.

JUDY WATERS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I come often to this floor to talk about community and service and the notion that, if we work to put a little less emphasis on figuring out how to control people from Washington, D.C., and a little more emphasis on trying to serve one another back home in our communities, that America will be moved in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, I come today to have that same discussion and to put a face on that conversation. For me, in north Georgia, Mr. Speaker, that face is Judy Waters.

Mr. Speaker, in 1979, Judy Waters was known as the best hairdresser in all of Snellville. By the end of 1979, she was known as the first female ever elected to the Snellville City Council, and her path of service continued from there.

Mr. Speaker, for more than a decade, as Snellville grew into the first suburban-from-rural community in Gwinnett County, Judy helped to navigate those challenges. Her fingerprints are on absolutely everything that you see in the foundation that has allowed Snellville to become what it is today.

Mr. Speaker, after serving the City of Snellville, seeing that our county was going through some of those same challenges, in 1992, Judy answered the call to serve Gwinnett County.

She ran for the District 3 county commissioner seat and was sworn in in 1993 to that post. Over the 8 years that she served, Gwinnett County's population almost doubled to 600,000 people and her hand helped to guide that development.

Mr. Speaker, our motto in Gwinnett County is ''Gwinnett is great,'' and Judy's emphasis on ensuring that that was true absolutely every single day earned her the love and devotion of an entire community.

But her service does not either begin or end with these kinds of public roles, Mr. Speaker.

In 1992, she ran for that post. But, in 2004, she answered the call to serve the Community Foundation for Northeast Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the motto of the Community Foundation of Northeast Georgia is ''Connecting people who care with causes that matter.''

Mr. Speaker, this foundation, under Judy's leadership, grew its assets by more than $20 million. It has plowed back into service projects in our community more than $52 million since 1985.

Thousands upon thousands of lives in Gwinnett County have been impacted in no small part due to the love, devotion, and commitment of Judy Waters.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that all of the individual deeds we see in our lives are woven together to make us more than who we are.

Judy set out early in her life to make sure that no one would be giving back more than she did, and she exemplifies exactly the kind of person that I am surrounded by in my community absolutely every single day.

People ask, Mr. Speaker: How can you give away Washington's power and influence and return that to the community? My answer is Judy Waters.

Mr. Speaker, no matter how well-intentioned the folks in this building are, they will never care more about my community than folks like Judy Waters do, and Judy lived that commitment every single day.

Mr. Speaker, Judy retires from her service at the Community Foundation. Her official retirement is August 22. I want to add my heartfelt thanks to her for her decade upon decade upon decade of service.

Judy, we are all better off and grateful for all that you have done for our community.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are all better off and grateful just for the opportunity to have known her.

Mr. Speaker, there is no measurement of how many Judy Waters there are out there across the country, but there is a measure of what Judy Waters has done for our community.

You see it in the faces of the elderly and you see it in young families and you see it in the children in our community systems.

Thank you to Judy Waters for all that she has done for Gwinnett County.

PRATT & WHITNEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, next week marks the 90th birthday of a great American business, Pratt & Whitney.

It all started with just 26 employees and 12 machines in an old car plant in Hartford, Connecticut. Nine decades later, Pratt & Whitney employs more than 9,000 people in Connecticut and ranks among my State's biggest employers.

Planes with Pratt & Whitney engines carried Charles Lindbergh across America, Amelia Earhart over the Atlantic, and Wiley Post around the world.

During World War II, the company powered half the U.S. aerial fleet. Later, Pratt & Whitney led the world in developing jet engines for iconic aircraft like the B–52, the Blackbird, and the Boeing 747. Its technology even helped power the Apollo 11 Moon lander.

This tradition of excellence continues today. Pratt & Whitney engines built in my district provide the beating heart of the F–35 Lightning II. The company remains a key player in an industry that helps to safeguard our national security.

It is my honor to congratulate Pratt & Whitney on 90 years of achievement. We thank you. To the men and women who work at Pratt & Whitney, we say again thank you for your service to our great country.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 55 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Lord our God, thank You for giving us another day.

Be with the Members of this people's House in all their undertakings today. You know them through and through. You know how they relate with one another and know them as the American people do, as the 114th Congress of the United States of America.

Lord, help them to know You. As ultimate truth, send Your spirit upon them, that You might find a dwelling place among them, so that all Your people will place trust in them as leaders, as well as their Representatives.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. WOMACK led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

STOP FUNDING PLANNED PARENTHOOD

(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, earlier today, a third Planned Parenthood video surfaced, with a small warning of graphic content, the content being video of a freshly aborted fetus being dissected on a dish while, once again, senior staff uses casual rhetoric to describe how they obtain and sell baby parts, stating:

> I think a per-item thing works a little better, just because we can see how much we can get out of it.

Americans are horrified by this and other videos, which already prompted House and Senate committees, as well as eight States, to launch investigations into Planned Parenthood.

Faithful protestors nationwide are speaking out against this absolutely disgusting practice, including a rally occurring today in Sacramento; yet in that State, we have an attorney general actually, instead, leading a review of the group who filmed the videos.

Using unborn babies as human capital? That is totally fine. Journalists exercising their First Amendment rights to expose illegal and gruesome activities? The government must intervene.

Under Federal law and California State law, the sale or purchase of human fetal tissue is a Federal felony that carries a fine of up to $500,000, a number still less than the annual salary of Planned Parenthood's president.

Mr. Speaker, these are unborn babies we are talking about. At the very least, we need to put a stop to this organization until we can investigate fully.

CONGRATULATING PRATT & WHITNEY

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize one of the great companies in my district, Pratt & Whitney, who this week is celebrating their 90th anniversary.

Pratt & Whitney has a plant in North Berwick, Maine, and nearly 1,000 of the most skilled and dedicated workers in the aerospace industry work there to build and develop high-quality jet engines.

Pratt & Whitney has been a critical part in the history of aviation in this country, and even today, Pratt & Whitney is still at the forefront of shaping advances in aviation.

Their continued work on new technologies, like the geared turbofan engine, is advancing commercial aviation by reducing noise, fuel burn, and emissions like never before. I am very proud of the great work that has been done by those at Pratt & Whitney in my district for so many years.

Please join me in congratulating this great company and its employees for 90 years of impressive accomplishments and to thank them for their significant efforts and contributions.

PROTECTING LIFE AND TAXPAYERS ACT

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, last week, I joined 64 of my House colleagues in cosponsoring legislation that would permanently cut off taxpayer funding for abortion providers.

H.R. 3197, the Protecting Life and Taxpayers Act, would prohibit Federal funding to any entity unless it certifies that it will not perform abortions during the period for which funding is provided, and it will not provide any funds to entities that do perform abortions.

There are currently restrictions that prohibit the use of taxpayer dollars to fund elective abortion directly, but we all understand that money is fungible. It is clear that Federal funds are supporting organizations' entire operations and that those operations include performing elective abortions.

This legislation reflects the will of the American people and would prevent taxpayers from being forced to finance thousands of elective abortions.

Few things demean the sanctity of human life more than elective abortion, and we, as a Nation and as a Congress, must continue to confront the systematic extermination of an entire generation of the most vulnerable among us.

Mr. Speaker, I will enter into the RECORD a recent article by Charles Krauthammer: ''The Price of Fetal Parts.''

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF VOTING RIGHTS ACT

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, August 6 marks the 50th anniversary of the signing of the Voting Rights Act, which is a landmark piece of legislation that expanded civil rights and protected one of our most fundamental democratic rights, and that is the right of every person to have the right to vote.

Unfortunately, though, 2 years ago, the Supreme Court gutted many of the Voting Rights Act's most important protections. Since then, despite some commitments right at that moment, since then, Republican leadership has refused to allow a strengthened Voting Rights Act to come to the floor.

Instead of working to ensure that every American has the right to vote, we have seen more efforts to suppress votes, disenfranchising hard-working Americans; yet on the floor, we have had, at the same time, our entire appropriations process held up because of the fear of the Republicans that they may have to cast a vote on whether or not we should display the Confederate battle flag in the year 2015.

We can't get a Voting Rights Act bill to the floor, but our entire appropriations process is held up over the Confederate battle flag—seriously? It is 2015. Let's bring the Voting Rights Act to the floor now.

FFA NORTH MIAMI

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the North Miami Future Farmers of America members for their dedication to aiding their fellow classmate, Evan Exmeyer.

As a student at North Miami High School, Evan was born with cerebral palsy. He lives on a hog and grain farm and relies on a wheelchair accessible van to transport him around his family's land. Unfortunately, the van can't travel to every corner of the farm, making parts of his own land inaccessible.

These outstanding FFA students, with the help of our generous Hoosier community, raised $20,000 in donations to purchase and modify a UTV Gator. Thanks to their hard work, Evan has the freedom to explore all that his farm has to offer.

The commitment to bettering the lives of others demonstrated by the North Miami FFA members makes me so proud to represent Indiana's Second District. Their dedication to public service is something to be admired by Hoosiers everywhere.

Today, I thank the North Miami FFA members for serving as role models for our entire Hoosier community statewide.

MEDICARE-MEDICAID 50TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 50th anniversary of Medicare and Medicaid.

For half a century, these critical programs have provided irreplaceable

health and economic lifelines for countless Americans.

In my congressional district alone, over 250,000 Arizonans rely on Medicaid for access to quality, affordable health care, while nearly 60,000 seniors depend on Medicare to cover their healthcare costs. However, this anniversary isn't just a time for celebration; it is also an opportunity to recommit ourselves to strengthening America's social safety net.

Instead of dangerous cuts, we should be considering meaningful solutions to the serious problems that Americans of all ages are currently facing, from the rising costs of prescription drugs to the unmet needs of our caregivers.

Unfortunately, some prominent Republicans, including leading Presidential candidates, would have you believe that we need to phase out these important programs. That is nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, I can't imagine telling Latinos who rely on Medicare—half of them have incomes below $14,000—that we need to phase out their health care.

I am extremely proud to have fought for the Medicaid expansion in my home State of Arizona, and I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues here in Congress to protect and improve Medicaid and Medicare for future generations.

PRATT & WHITNEY 90TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, like many of my colleagues, in celebration of the 90th birthday of Pratt & Whitney.

Since its humble beginnings in 1925 as an employer of 26, Pratt & Whitney has grown to employ more than 31,500 people worldwide, including some in my district, the Third District of Arkansas, at its PSD facility in Springdale.

Today, Pratt & Whitney is at the forefront of shaping aviation. They are not only developing breakthrough technologies, like the geared turbofan; but they are also producing critical technologies, like the F–35 engine, for our warfighters.

Mr. Speaker, aerospace is Arkansas' number one export. That industry employees over 10,000 Arkansans, and I can say, without hesitation, that the continued economic growth of our State depends on the work and innovation of companies like Pratt & Whitney.

Thank you, Pratt & Whitney, for the vitally important work you do in the Third District and worldwide; and happy 90th birthday.

TPP

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, this week, trade ministers from 12 TPP countries are gathering on Maui in my district in what is expected to be the final negotiations of a massive trade agreement impacting 40 percent of the world's economy.

Not only were the American people shut out of this trade deal when Congress passed fast-track authority legislation, these negotiations continue, as we speak, in a shroud of secrecy, with the American people reliant on sites like WikiLeaks as they seek information about how this agreement will impact us.

The people of Hawaii and all Americans are rightfully concerned about how this trade deal will impact our jobs, our families, our economy, our environment, and our Nation's sovereignty.

We, the American people, deserve to know what is in this deal and to have a say in what happens. How can a genuine public debate occur on a deal as monumental as this when no one knows what is in it? It is hard to imagine a deal more demanding of transparency.

People from Hawaii and around the world are gathering tomorrow on Maui to protest this secret deal. They are sick and tired of multinational corporations benefiting on the broken backs of working class Americans, and they will not stop until their voices are heard.

RECOGNIZING JULIA LAKE

(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 a very valued member of my staff and the staff of my predecessor, Congressman Jim Gerlach, as she embarks on a new adventure in the private sector.

Since 2010, Julia Lake has served the constituents of Pennsylvania's Sixth Congressional District. By the time I was elected to serve in January, I knew well of her reputation as a tireless, impactful, and caring worker; and I was very grateful when she decided to continue her role in my office.

It is very common for me to meet constituents across my district and hear high praise for her work. Just recently, I received an email from Sandra in Glenmoore, who had this to say:

> Julia was very diligent in responding to me. I believe she went above and beyond normal responsibilities to resolve this issue for our family. Thanks to her and your office.

My predecessor, Congressman Gerlach, had this to say:

> Julia was an extremely hard-working staff member who worked diligently every day to solve constituents' difficult problems with the Federal bureaucracy. Her high level of skill, combined with her warm and cheerful personality, made her an indispensable part of our team.

Julz, while we are saddened in one respect by your departure, given your exemplary and effective constituent service, we deeply appreciate your service and are excited that an opportunity arose that will benefit you and your two children.

Best wishes to you.

□ 1215

NEVER-NEVER LAND

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about an imaginary world that many of my Republicans, I believe, are living in.

Peter Pan's Neverland is a place many of us think of with fond thoughts of our childhoods. It is an imaginary place where anything is possible and innocence lasts forever.

Mr. Speaker, sadly, I think the House is operating under some sort of a never-never land that neither reflects our best nor our brightest. It is a Neverland in which House leaders think we can build and reconstruct bridges, roads, and highways without the funding to do so. How do you do that? It sounds like never-never land to me.

How else do you explain 32 or—I forget—34 patches—short-term extensions—since the Federal authorization ran out 7 years ago, thus continuing to kick the can down the road? How is it possible to keep hard working individuals employed or to maintain the safety of our roads and transit systems if we are not providing the long-term funding to do so to match both State and local funding? It is not possible. Once again, we are going to see another patch for 2 months—kicking this can down the road.

This is a never-never land that the American public is frustrated with. This is America's Congress. We can, we must, and we should do better.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN K. COUTANT

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

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor John K. Coutant, who passed away on June 19, 2015, at the young age of 69.

John was the quintessential community servant. Born in Kingston in 1945, he graduated from Kingston High School and Dutchess Community College. He worked in the automobile industry for several decades, including founding Kingston Auto Supply and being recognized twice for having the top sales in the country. Very active in the community, John also served in several organizations and on the town board.

It was as town supervisor that John left his greatest mark. His vision for a better town led to many accomplishments, including solar energy projects at the town hall and the landfill.

John's outstanding reputation and popularity was a direct result of always being there for any constituent in need and of his inclusive style of governance of giving every citizen a voice.

I am proud to have had the opportunity to know and work with John. He leaves behind an impressive legacy of service that has made his community a better place to live. May God bless John Coutant and his entire family.

CAMERON TORNADO

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

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the first responders and volunteers who worked tirelessly in a town called Cameron, Illinois—population, 600.

On July 16, a tornado devastated this small town that measures only six blocks by seven blocks. While the storm caused widespread property damage, good people from across the region rushed in to help Cameron recover.

I was able to thank many of them last week when I toured the damage. Their generosity, bravery, and willingness to help their neighbors gives me hope that this community will rebuild again and be stronger than ever. I spoke with one family whose home was damaged. There was a little child there whose bike had been swept away in the storm. A first responder, in seeing this small child crying, bought a bicycle to replace it for him.

My heart goes out to all of these families who were impacted by this terrible tornado; and I want to thank our brave and generous first responders and volunteers who have poured their time, energy, and love into this town called Cameron, Illinois.

DEFUND PLANNED PARENTHOOD

(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, Planned Parenthood must be defunded. Taxpayers should no longer fund inhumane actions.

Between sips of red wine, a top official with the organization shares the dark nature of their work of altering abortion procedures to better harvest body parts. In another, after talking about the price for body parts, an official muses of buying a Lamborghini. In yet another, human dissection, geared toward harvesting body parts, is exposed.

Such callousness.

Planned Parenthood resists the use of ultrasound during pregnancy when a mother considers abortion, yet uses ultrasound to guide the harvesting of body parts.

Such disregard for life.

I am not only disgusted but am very saddened, and so are millions of Americans. Is nothing off limits? Is nothing sacred? This is why I have long cosponsored legislation to defund Planned Parenthood, but we must do more. This body is obligated to investigate wrongdoings.

VOTER EMPOWERMENT ACT

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, the right to vote is the bedrock principle of our democracy. It is something to be cherished and held sacred.

Although it did not come without struggle or without sacrifice, the Voting Rights Act moved us step by step beyond the disenfranchisement that held entire segments of our population voiceless for far too long. But today, as we approach its 50th anniversary, the strides we have made through that historic legislation are at risk.

Two years ago, when the Supreme Court overturned a critical safeguard enacted in the VRA, many of our most vulnerable citizens—some who were on the front lines of this fight for decades—were again pushed to the sidelines of our democracy.

With each passing day of inaction in this Congress by House Republican leadership, we are not just standing passively by as the voices of voters go unheard; we are actively walking backwards along the march towards civil rights—step by step, day by day.

It is time to pass the Voter Empowerment Act and make good on our promise, one that has made us a model for young democracies around the world—that every vote counts, that every voice matters, and that all of our citizens have a right to vote.

PROTECTING CONSUMERS FROM THE CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU

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

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I am outraged that government agencies like the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau have denied public participation to allow consumers and businessowners to comment on regulations that directly impact them.

In 2013, the CFPB implemented guidance that would prevent families and individuals from obtaining auto financing discounts. This guidance not only affects the American auto industry and the hundreds of hard working auto dealers in the Granite State, but it also affects Granite State families and individuals—for example, the young couple in Manchester who is struggling to afford a new minivan to accommodate a growing family or, for example, the startup logistics company in Conway that is wishing to add another truck to its fleet to grow its business.

Congress created the CFPB to protect consumers, not to hurt them. If the CFPB really cares about developing policies that are truly in the best interests of consumers, it should amend its guidance and be more transparent.

That is why I introduced H.R. 1737, a bipartisan bill to rein in the CFPB's overreach and to merely bring more transparency, accountability, and clarity to the formal rulemaking process. H.R. 1737 will reverse this misguided CFPB indirect auto financing guidance and will allow the public's voice to be heard.

THE EX-IM SAGA CONTINUES

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the charter for the U.S. Export-Import Bank has been expired now for almost a month because Congress did not act.

Because of that, thousands of American small businesses have been unilaterally disarmed in the battle for export financed business. Meanwhile, 85 foreign export credit agencies continue to help companies from their countries finance their exports. They are helping their small businesses while ours are disadvantaged.

This body has also failed to act to increase the lending limits for the Small Business Administration. Without an increase, the 7(a) Loan Program will be suspended until the beginning of the next fiscal year, October 1; and the highway trust fund is set to expire, bringing vital construction work and jobs to a halt.

Mr. Speaker, if this body doesn't get to work, then we are going to needlessly hurt hundreds of thousands of American jobs. It is time to stop the political bickering and to pass these important bills.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

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

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to any nuclear deal with Iran.

Iran has proven time and again it is a state that cannot be trusted. The current deal rewards its bad behavior while compromising our national and global security.

As a result of this deal, Iran will receive billions of dollars in sanctions relief that will, undoubtedly, be used to wreak havoc on its region of the world. This economic boost will make it much more likely that Iran will actually try and carry out its often repeated threat to wipe Israel off the map.

As a staunch supporter of Israel, I cannot support any deal that threatens its security. Just last weekend, Iranian Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei gave a speech that Iranians responded to with chants of ''death to America'' and

''death to Israel.'' How could anyone believe that Iran could be trusted to play by any agreed upon rules?

I stand by Israel. I am completely opposed to this deal, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it as well.

RAECHEL AND JACQUELINE HOUCK SAFE RENTAL CAR ACT

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, in 2004, Raechel and Jacqueline Houck were tragically killed in California when their rented Chrysler PT Cruiser crashed and caught fire due to a safety defect that was under recall.

A glaring safety gap in current law allows recalled cars to be rented without being repaired, which is why I have introduced H.R. 2198, the Raechel and Jacqueline Houck Safe Rental Car Act, so as to close this gap and prohibit the renting of vehicles that are subject to safety recalls.

The bill is supported by all major car rental companies and consumer safety groups as well as by General Motors and Honda, yet Chrysler and Ford continue to oppose this bill for unclear reasons. Chrysler's opposition is particularly troubling considering this week's announcement that NHTSA is imposing a record $105 million fine and vehicle buyback requirement on Chrysler for its failure to adequately fix recalled vehicles or to notify vehicle owners in a timely manner.

While H.R. 2198 wouldn't solve all of Chrysler's recall problems, it would at least ensure that American families who rent Chryslers this summer will know they are safe. This is a commonsense idea. I hope Chrysler voices its support for the bill and helps me bring it to the House floor soon for a vote.

PASS THE REINS ACT

(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, when I talk to small businesses in Minnesota about what their biggest challenges are, one of the top concerns they mention is of the regulations coming from Washington. For these small employers, unnecessary regulations and bureaucratic red tape make it difficult to expand and create jobs.

That is why I support the REINS Act, which the House will be voting on this afternoon. The concept is simple: If a government agency proposes a regulation that will have a significant economic impact, Congress should have to sign off on it. With an average of 10 new regulations a day, small-business owners are spending more time on paperwork and less time on their businesses.

Mr. Speaker, with our sluggish economic recovery and anemic growth, there is no doubt that we have to get the engine of our economy going and small businesses moving again. That means passing the REINS Act today.

PRATT AND WHITNEY'S 90TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Pratt & Whitney on its recent milestone of having been incorporated for over 90 years. This is truly a remarkable achievement.

I am proud to represent the employees of Pratt & Whitney's Dallas Airfoil Repair Operations facility in the city of Grand Prairie, and I am very proud to have those manufacturing jobs there. I am very proud that aviation has come a long way since Pratt & Whitney's development of the air-cooled Wasp engine in 1925. Its passion for excellence continues today as it produces the engine for the revolutionary F–35 Joint Strike Fighter.

The technological advancements in aviation that Pratt & Whitney have developed over the last 90 years have helped make our Nation stronger, and they have kept our men and women in uniform safer.

Congratulations on 90 years of service.

□ 1230

HELPING FAMILIES IN MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS ACT

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today mourning Mayci Breaux and Jillian Johnson, buried yesterday by their families following the horrific killings in Louisiana. Yesterday we had a moment of silence to convey our respect and our prayers.

But, as a House, we must break the silence because once again we have failed the American people with our broken mental health system. How many more people have to die before we take action?

A person with severe mental illness is 15 times less likely to be violent when receiving proper treatment. Over the last 10 years, we have more suicides, more drug overdose deaths.

We have replaced the hospital bed with a jail cell, the homeless shelter, and the cemetery. We cannot be silent anymore.

The Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, H.R. 2646, provides treatment before tragedy through comprehensive reforms.

Let not our offer of comfort be mere silence, but let it move us to comprehensive action. Otherwise, our passivity makes us partners to these tragedies.

I urge our Nation to not be silent, but to speak up. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 2646.

PRATT & WHITNEY

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

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I join my other colleagues from Arkansas, Maine, and Texas, who have stood here today in recognition of Pratt & Whitney aircraft.

I am proud to say, however, that the headquarters for Pratt & Whitney aircraft is in East Hartford, Connecticut, where we keep the eagle flying.

My father, my mother, during the Second World War, my brother, all worked at Pratt & Whitney aircraft. It continues to be not only the arsenal for democracy for this great Nation of ours, but a center of innovation and technology where we not only keep the eagle flying, but we also provide opportunities for jobs well beyond these 90 years.

Pratt & Whitney alone, as a corporation, provides an education for every single one of its employees and not only pays for that education, it buys them the books and provides the time off to study so they can continue to do what they have always done, build dependable engines and be an excellent model of corporate behavior and continue to keep the eagle flying both in this country and around the globe.

BOB BREWSAUGH

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of one of the best men I have ever known, Bob Brewsaugh, who passed away over the weekend at the age of 76.

The Good Book says, in 2 Corinthians 9:6: He who sows sparingly will also reap sparingly, but he who sows bountifully will also reap bountifully.

Bob Brewsaugh lived this Scripture. He was a lifelong farmer and a loving father and grandfather. Most importantly, Bob Brewsaugh was a man of God.

He worked hard. He treated everyone with kindness and respect, whether as a Sunday School teacher at Sandusky United Methodist Church or as a county councilman or in his daily work on the farm.

Bob tilled the land. He sowed bountifully. As a consequence, he reaped a blessed and bountiful life.

My thoughts and prayers are with Bob's wife, Carolyn; his two kids, Scott and Mandy; my brother, Richie; all Bob's grandkids; and the entire extended Brewsaugh family.

SPECIAL OLYMPIC WORLD GAMES IN LOS ANGELES

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of the 2015 Special Olympic World Games and to pay tribute to all who are participating in this wonderful event happening right now in my hometown of Los Angeles.

The opening ceremonies were held Saturday in the Memorial Coliseum. I was honored to attend as a member of the Presidential Delegation, led by our First Lady Michelle Obama.

Over the next week, 6,500 athletes representing 165 countries will compete in 254 competitions, supported by 30,000 volunteers and an anticipated 500,000 spectators, making this the largest sports and humanitarian event anywhere in the world this year and the single biggest event in Los Angeles since we hosted the 1984 Olympic Games.

This is much more than a sporting event. For almost 50 years, the Special Olympics has showcased the skills and accomplishments of people with intellectual disability and helped foster the acceptance and inclusion of all people.

I congratulate and wish good luck to all of the participants in this 2015 World Games.

JACK CHALMERS

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

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember a man who was a veteran, a volunteer, a devoted Christian, and a man who was dedicated to helping others. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember John Milton Chalmers, or ''Jack'' Chalmers, of Pinellas County, Florida.

Mr. Chalmers passed away quietly in his sleep on July 20 at the C.W. Bill Young VA Medical Center at the age of 81.

Born in Scotland, Mr. Chalmers came to the United States when he was 15 years old. He later graduated college with a degree in engineering and served in the U.S. Army.

An avid sailor, cyclist, and animal lover, Mr. Chalmers' life was marked by helping others. As a member of Northside Baptist Church, Mr. Chalmers volunteered in the food pantry and worked as a veterinarian assistant after retiring.

He was an active volunteer in the Central Pinellas Republican Club and a member of the Pinellas County Republican Executive Committee. With a brilliant mind and as someone who was always striving to give back, Mr. Chalmers was a man who led by example.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in remembering and honoring Jack Chalmers, a very dear and gentle soul, a dear friend of mine, and a man who will be missed by so many. May God forever bless Jack, and may God bless those who loved him dearly.

VOTER EMPOWERMENT ACT AND THE VOTING RIGHTS ADVANCEMENT ACT

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, August 6 will mark the 50th anniversary of the Voting Rights Act. It has stood for a half a century as the great guardian of America's right to vote.

However, 2 years ago the Supreme Court dismantled key protections within the act. Making matters worse since, Republicans in Congress have refused to restore the protections and bring up a renewed and strengthened Voting Rights Act.

Today the right to vote is under coordinated attack around the country. States and localities are passing laws that restrict the right to vote, making it harder for young people, disabled Americans, and people of color to participate in our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Voter Empowerment Act and the Voting Rights Advancement Act. I call on my Republican colleagues to join Democrats and pass a renewed, strengthened VRA and ensure the ballot box belongs to every American.

GEORGIA MILITARY COLLEGE

(Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud the outstanding accomplishments of Georgia Military College, an outstanding academic institution in Milledgeville, Georgia, that recently achieved a 100 percent graduation rate and exceeded the State and national averages for the SAT and ACT.

Today I commend them for their commitment to deliver a high-quality education and for their support of all students to reach their true academic potential. They have an unprecedented 97 percent graduating class enrolled in post-secondary institutions.

Georgia Military College has also distinguished itself by improving its students' individual well-being and putting character above all.

GMC's impact extends far beyond higher test scores and academic performance. Students are more equipped to enter the workforce and are better prepared to contribute to society.

They have also excelled athletically, winning two State championships in varsity softball and varsity girls track this past year.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Georgia Military College students, their faculty, staff, and president, Lieutenant General William B. Caldwell, for their remarkable scholastic and athletic achievements.

By instilling the values of duty, honor, and country, they empower students to reach new heights. I am deeply honored to have Georgia Military College in Georgia's 10th District.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The Chair would remind Members to refrain from trafficking the well while another Member is under recognition.

DEPLOY AN EARLY WARNING SYSTEM FOR EARTHQUAKES

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to fund the purchase, installation, and activation of an early warning system on the Cascadia subduction zone off the Pacific Northwest.

The Cascadia fault has the prospect of unleashing a quake at any point that actually could exceed that off of Japan. As we know, in Japan, 15,000 people died, $300 billion in damages. In Oregon, our State expects thousands of deaths, $32 billion in infrastructure.

If the United States of America would deploy, like Japan and other countries are doing, an early warning system, thousands of lives could be saved.

Inland we could evacuate schools that are going to collapse. Up in Portland they could suspend the MAX service and get people off the bridges that are going to collapse. Manufacturing operations that are critical could be suspended.

We have the potential to save thousands of lives, tens of millions, billions, of dollars in excess damages, and it would just require the United States of America to do what other countries are doing: deploy an early warning system off the Pacific coast.

The technology is known. We just lack the will to fund it. So I am directing the Federal Emergency Management Agency to deploy such a system in the near future.

PRATT & WHITNEY

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I come before you today to congratulate Pratt & Whitney for their 90 years of excellence in aviation.

Because of those determined and innovative founders, Pratt & Whitney has become a leader in aviation innovation, such as their groundbreaking development of the air-cooled Wasp engine.

Their engines have produced the power for some of the most formidable

military aircraft in American history. Even today the power behind Lockheed Martin's F–35 Lightning II aircraft comes from a Pratt & Whitney engine.

I am proud that Pratt & Whitney's engine center calls Columbus, Georgia, home, but more proud of the investment they have made in the community. The Columbus plant employs 1,026 highly skilled employees to refurbish jet engines and brings in over $750 million a year.

I have no doubt that Pratt & Whitney's impressive accomplishments and milestones will continue on for another 90 years. Their commitment to producing high-quality and dependable engines help keep our servicemen and -women in the air safe.

We are fortunate to have their support for our local economy and look forward to many more years of their business in our great State.

THREE WORTHWHILE OBJECTIVES

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, we have an opportunity in the next 48 hours to do three good things:

One, keep the highway system going. It is irresponsible, but we have not already done so.

Two, make sure that the Veterans Administration has sufficient funds to keep our VA hospitals serving our veterans.

Three, make sure that we are competitive with the rest of the world by adopting the Fincher amendment and providing for Ex-Im Bank's ability to create jobs and to make us competitive worldwide.

We ought to do all three of those things.

Mr. Speaker, you have said that you wanted to allow this House to work its will. Sixty-five Members of the United States Senate voted to keep the Ex-Im Bank in business for America and for American jobs.

There are, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, at least 240 votes on this floor to pass the Fincher amendment, which is the Kirk-Heitkamp amendment in the Senate.

Let's do it. Let this House work its will. Let's keep America competitive with the rest of the world. Let's adopt the Export-Import Bank, send it to the Senate, have them send it to the President, and help save American jobs.

Who says it will save American jobs? Speaker BOEHNER, the Speaker of this House.

Let us do all three of those worthwhile objectives that the American people support.

□ 1245

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 427, REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JULY 30, 2015, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 7, 2015; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 380 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 380

Resolved, That 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. 427) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law. 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 the Judiciary. 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 the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. 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. 2. On any legislative day during the period from July 30, 2015, through September 7, 2015—

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

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

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

SEC. 4. Each day during the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546).

SEC. 5. Each day during the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution shall not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XIII.

SEC. 6. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of July 30, 2015, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

SEC. 7. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported through the legislative day of July 30, 2015.

SEC. 8. For purposes of the joint meeting to receive Pope Francis on September 24, 2015, only the following persons shall be admitted to the Hall of the House or rooms leading thereto:

(a) Members of Congress and Members-elect.

(b) The Delegates and the Resident Commissioner.

(c) The President and Vice President of the United States.

(d) Justices of the Supreme Court.

(e) Elected officers of the House.

(f) The Parliamentarian.

(g) The Architect of the Capitol.

(h) The Librarian of Congress.

(i) The Secretary and Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate.

(j) Heads of departments.

(k) Other persons as designated by the Speaker.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on House Resolution 380, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring this rule forward on behalf of the Committee on Rules. This rule provides for a robust amendment debate on an issue of critical national importance. This rule provides for the consideration of H.R.

427, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2015.

The Committee on Rules met on this measure yesterday evening and heard testimony from both the chairman and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial, and Antitrust Law of the Committee on the Judiciary, in addition to receiving amendment testimony.

This rule brought forward by the committee is a structured rule. There were 18 amendments total submitted to the Committee on Rules. Of those submitted, I am pleased to say that the full House will debate and vote on 10 of those amendments.

This legislation also went through regular order in the committee. During the committee markup, eight amendments were debated and voted on, including one I offered and that the committee had actually agreed to.

This rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary. I appreciate the hard work of the Committee on the Judiciary Chairman, BOB GOODLATTE, and his full committee and subcommittee staff in bringing forward H.R. 427.

I strongly support this rule and the underlying legislation because, when we reform our Nation's regulatory system, we will jump-start the engine of our economy; and when our economy gets up and going, our families flourish.

What does this administration produce more than 60 of every day? Here is a hint: It is not jobs. The answer lies in the heart of many woes facing small businesses and established industries.

What they produce every day is regulations. The goal of any regulation should be to achieve a benefit that would not be possible without it, designed in such a fashion that the achieved benefit far outweighs the cost, but our administration has lost sight of this goal, and America's economic engine is paying the price.

Our current Federal Government designs regulations that are often unnecessary and achieve little to no benefit, but at very high cost. The rules have become so skewed that this administration's regulators are at war with American businesses.

Industries such as manufacturing and technology are fighting to compete in a global market, but first, they must survive the regulatory beast that is strangling innovation and growth.

This administration is legislating through regulation yet decries the REINS Act and calls it an unprecedented requirement. When you circumvent Congress and exploit the rulemaking process in order to, one, make law and, two, make law in contradiction to the wishes and needs of the American people, you should expect unprecedented responses.

In just the first 7 days of 2015—just the first 7 days of 2015—the administration unveiled 300 new rules. Over the Memorial Day weekend, the administration quietly published the spring 2015 Unified Agenda of Federal Regulations. What it contained was so disheartening to the American people and so destructive to small business that it didn't go unnoticed.

The agenda showed that the Federal departments and agencies have 3,260 rules in the midst right now of the rulemaking process. Unfortunately, it is not just the sheer number of regulations that is astounding; it is also the oppressive cost.

One of these 3,260 rules I mentioned is predicted to be one of the costliest regulations ever put forward, the EPA's national ozone standard. A recent analysis found the cost of this one regulation to be upwards of $140 billion. It will cost my home State of Georgia over 11,000 jobs.

To add insult to injury, the first line of H.R. 427 Statement of Administration Policy states:

> The administration is committed to ensuring that regulations are smart and effective and tailored to further the statutory goals in the most cost-effective and efficient manner.

This is the statement from the administration on why they oppose H.R. 427.

I cannot believe that a single regulation promulgated by this administration with $140 billion of cost was put forward in the most cost-effective manner, and a regulation costing 11,000 jobs in Georgia alone is hardly smart. The Statement of Administration Policy also claims that the underlying legislation would create business uncertainty.

I encourage this administration to use the infamous pen and phone to actually ask businesses what creates uncertainty for them because, when small businesses across the country came to Congress last week as part of National Federation of Independent Business lobbying day, their top legislative priority was regulatory relief. These are small-business owners who sat with us and said: Here is what we are facing in trying to get people jobs.

The 3,000-plus regulations in the works by this administration create the uncertainty, not this body's effort to require agencies to submit the most costly regulations to Congress for approval. The underlying bill applies only to regulations with a $100 million impact or greater.

The American people do not elect this administration's regulators—or any administration's regulators for that matter. They elect us in this body to represent them. This bill allows us to do so properly.

The system is broken. The system has failed the American people. The REINS Act is the first step toward restoring proper order and even sanity toward our regulatory framework.

The administration states that Executive Order No. 13563 requires careful cost-benefit analysis, but they don't explain why only 7 rules out of the thousands had cost-benefit analysis in 2013 and only 14 rules had that in 2012.

This administration's regulators have stated publicly that they are not going to sit around and wait for Congress—so much for respecting the powers enshrined in our Constitution and, thus, the reason that we need this legislation and why this rule should be approved.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, 2 legislative days—really a day-and-a-half now—remain before Congress recesses for 5 weeks. Here we are, yet again, considering a piece of partisan legislation designed to fill up floor time, which has little to no chance at all of becoming law.

It is unconscionable that the majority continues to waste legislators' and the American people's time with bills such as the Regulation from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act—they really do name things nice around here, the REINS Act—when critically important work is left to be done.

Just a few moments ago, the minority whip spoke to three issues; I include them in my commentary, but largely, one that all of us ought be interested in is the highway trust fund, which will become insolvent on August 1 if those of us sent here to Washington to govern do not come up with a solution.

Instead of focusing on priorities like eliminating corporate tax loopholes to ensure that we have the money to fund projects to repair our Nation's deteriorating roads and bridges, House Republicans passed yet another short-term patch that the Senate has refused to take up. The majority's dysfunction and inability to govern is having a real impact on hard-working Americans.

Today marks the 204th day of the Republican-led 114th Congress. In the nearly 6 months that have passed, the majority has compromised the financial security of American companies by failing to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank's charter; avoided passing a long-term transportation and infrastructure bill; passed pointless legislation designed to cut critical funding from local police departments and communities in lieu of taking up comprehensive immigration reform; refused, they did, to bring up the student loan refinancing bill; and perhaps most abhorrent to some of us, voted four times in support of the Confederate battle flag, a symbol of hate and intolerance that has no place on any of our public lands.

□ 1300

The days leading up to a month-long congressional recess should be spent debating and voting on the important issues that our constituents sent us here to address—as an example, restoring the Voting Rights Act, bolstering our economy through a long-term highway bill, and guaranteeing that jobs are created and sustained.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 427 is yet another partisan measure that Republican leadership has selected for consideration, despite its clear constitutional violations and with the knowledge that it stands an almost certain Presidential veto.

It is, therefore, unclear to me why we are spending precious time on this bill. We already have the power to disapprove proposed rules; we have the power to limit delegations of authorities to agencies; we have the power to control the appropriations; and we have the power to stay the effect of specific rules and hold oversight hearings. It seems to me that, in addition to these tools being quite powerful, they also comply with the doctrine of separation of powers and, therefore, have the added benefit of being constitutional.

The REINS Act would require both Houses of Congress to approve every major rule, many of which are highly technical ones authored by experts such as scientists, physicians, engineers, and economists.

There simply isn't enough time for Congress to hold the hearings and conduct the research necessary to weigh in on these complicated matters. The individuals tasked with making these difficult regulatory decisions are certainly more qualified than most, if not all of us here in this room, and it is for this precise reason that Congress wisely delegated this regulatory authority to such experts.

Politicizing this process will not only permit industry representatives with deep pockets to have an overwhelming influence on whether major rules go into effect, it will make it nearly impossible for agencies to implement rules regulating consumer health and product safety, environmental protections, workplace safety, and financial services industry misconduct. The enactment of this legislation would, in my opinion, do immeasurable disservice to the American people.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the good gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, my friend from Florida asked a rhetorical question. He said: Why spend precious time on this? And here is the reply: Because our constituents' time is precious. Our constituents' time in trying to comply with regulations is precious.

Before I get there, let me just give you a little bit of a history, Mr. Speaker, about my understanding of the genesis of the REINS Act. It is interesting from a process point of view and a substance point of view.

From a process point of view, my understanding is that this came out of a townhall meeting that was hosted and sponsored by our former colleague, Congressman Geoff Davis from Kentucky. He gathered a group of people together and, as I understand the story, one of the constituents raised his hand and he posed this question. He said: Congressman, how is it possible that the Environmental Protection Agency is contemplating a rule that is so controversial it couldn't pass Congress? How is that even conceivable under our governance structure that unelected bureaucrats are able to accomplish something that the elected Representatives of the people have said ''no'' to?

Congressman Davis in a very thoughtful way began to take that in. Out of it, he began to work with other people and put together the REINS Act, Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny, that says this. It says that over the years, one of the weaknesses of Congress is that this institution has delegated too much responsibility to executive agencies. That is at the base of what we are talking about. This is an issue of delegated authority. And since it was Congress' mistake in terms of atrophying its authority over a period of time, the remedy then falls on Congress to reclaim that authority.

So the gentleman from Georgia is proposing that we support this rule around H.R. 427, and it says this: If there is a regulation that has more than a $100 million impact on the economy, then that regulation ought not be foisted on the economy without discussion and approval by elected Representatives in Congress.

Now, there is a straw man argument that is out there as it relates to this. I haven't heard it on the floor today, but I might hear it if we continue to listen to the debate, particularly during the amendment process and so forth.

Here is the straw man argument. The straw man argument is: If you are in favor of the REINS Act, then you don't want any regulations whatsoever. You want the Wild West, where only the strong survive. That is a straw man. That is ridiculous.

What the REINS Act says is, if you are going to have a regulation, it ought to be thoughtful, it ought to be well structured, it ought to be well debated, and it ought not be a bureaucrat sitting on the seventh floor of a gray building on Independence Avenue that is pursuing an agenda—and haven't we seen plenty of that, by the way—pursuing an agenda, an agenda that couldn't pass this place, an agenda that 218 Members of the House of Representatives and a majority of the Senate are not going to support, but an agenda that a bureaucrat with a political agenda and so forth is trying to move forward.

Now, these numbers are staggering. According to the Competitive Enterprise Institute, the annual cost of complying with government regulations is $1.8 trillion. Think about the downward pressure of that.

What the gentleman from Georgia is saying—and other supporters of this—is let's take President Obama's admonition to the Congress and his admonition to the public, and let's take those words at face value.

This is what the President said in an op-ed in The Wall Street Journal. He said that overregulation ''stifles innovation'' and has a ''chilling effect on growth and jobs.'' Absolutely, that is true. That statement is true.

President Obama said in his State of the Union address that same week that the op-ed was published in The Wall Street Journal, January 2011, ''To reduce barriers to growth and investment . . . when we find rules that put an unnecessary burden on business, we will fix them.''

Okay. Great news. We have got the remedy. We have got the way to fix that.

I will tell you, I represent a constituency, Mr. Speaker, in suburban Chicago, as you know, and so, with frequency, I am out talking to businesses, getting in there. I represent a lot of manufacturers. I represent a lot of financial services companies. I represent a lot of food production, transportation, insurance, and other things.

When you talk to folks and ask them what the nature of the challenge is, they will tell you. But what is interesting is the consistency of the feeling of pressure that they feel as it relates to a regulatory burden.

So the good news is we can do something about that, and the good news is we can vote ''aye'' on the rule and we can vote ''aye'' on H.R. 427, the REINS Act.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), a very good friend of mine and the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule on H.R. 427, and I thank my friend for yielding.

This bill is the very definition of political legislation and serves absolutely no purpose in ensuring better rules. This legislation accomplishes nothing, aside from slowing down the administrative rulemaking process and giving Congress the power to shoot down any action that this majority doesn't like.

By requiring a joint resolution of congressional approval prior to enactment, the only surefire achievement of this legislation is a longer rulemaking process, not a better one.

Let me humor my Republican colleagues and try to give them the benefit of the doubt. They claim that this bill is about requiring Federal agencies to be more transparent in their actions. They want reports on how rules impact the Federal budget. But why should transparency only be limited to the budget? If transparency is the gold standard, why aren't we demanding reports on how these rules impact our most vulnerable and at-risk citizens? If we are striving for transparency, let's be transparent about all things.

Yesterday, I submitted an amendment to address this point. But unsurprisingly, this rule does not allow my amendment to be considered. This proves yet again that this Republican majority cares more about protecting industry than protecting our people or our planet.

My amendment was simple. It would have required the administration to report to Congress on the greenhouse gas emission impacts associated with any proposed rule and what any proposed rule's impacts are on low-income communities in this country.

The overwhelming scientific consensus is that climate change is real. No matter how often industry and many of my Republican colleagues try convince us that we have nothing to worry about, no matter how much manufactured science they gin up to create doubt, climate change is real.

If the administration is going to be forced to justify their rulemaking to Congress, let's make sure they include climate impacts in their justifications. The same goes for how the rules impact our poor communities. Why are people less important than Big Business?

My amendment aimed to remedy the negative impacts felt by these populations by changing the definition of what constitutes a major rule to include any rule that increases the health risks among low-income communities, period. But apparently those concerns don't warrant a vote on the House floor.

The majority's decision to block my amendment on climate change and environmental justice says more about the underlying legislation than any speech you will hear today.

This is not about good government. This is about House Republicans wanting to put their finger on the scale to benefit corporations at the expense of the health and safety of the American people and, yes, our planet.

This is a bad rule and it is protecting a bad bill, and both should be defeated.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3064, a comprehensive, 6-year surface transportation bill that is partially paid for by restricting U.S. companies from using so-called inversion to shrink their tax obligations.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I won't belabor things by talking about that, but I have to say the previous question makes an awful lot of sense for us to do a 6-year plan. People in our States and in our localities are looking to us to give them some certainty. I hear this all the time from colleagues on both sides of the aisle. For us not to do that, to me, is extremely troubling; and, I believe, in the long haul, it is harmful to the economy of this country.

We need to pass a long-term surface transportation bill, and I genuinely believe most Members in the House of Representatives, Republican and Democrat, feel the same way.

The name of this bill at least flirts with being clever, I will give the majority that. But let me tell you that we really need to rein in around here. We need to rein in a Republican-led Congress that will no longer bring the remaining appropriations bills to the floor because it is more dedicated to seeing the Confederate flag fly high. I really don't understand that.

What happened here a few days ago, we had the Interior measure going forward. Someone complained, rightly, about the Confederate flag in public places.

□ 1315

All of a sudden, the Interior Appropriations and any other appropriations went away. I predict that we will probably wind up with a continuing resolution, rather than doing the work that the American people sent us here to do, and that is to complete the appropriations or remaining bills.

We need to be about the business of reining in a Republican-led Congress that says it wants to help small businesses and then makes sure to let the Export-Import Bank charter expire.

In the congressional district that I am privileged to serve, alone, $964,000 in lost business and lost jobs will occur with three companies that depend on the Export-Import Bank.

We need to rein in a Republican Congress that constantly attempts to undermine a healthcare law. I have forgotten now; most of us can't even remember how many times we have voted to repeal portions of or all of the Affordable Care provision which is in effect now—5 years—and we are still having these sideline votes that are going nowhere.

We undermine it, and it has provided millions of American citizens the opportunity to access affordable health care—and somebody please tell me what is wrong with that.

We are 50 years now into Medicare, and I remember, as if it were yesterday, that then President Ronald Reagan said that it would have a severe impact on the American economy—in other words, to paraphrase, that the sky was going to fall.

Well, 50 years out now with Medicare, we have seen the benefits to literally hundreds of millions of Americans who rely upon Medicare, and we demonstrably have seen its positive.

Yes, we are learning, even with the Affordable Care Act, that what is happening is Medicare is now having diminution of its costs, which is necessary to rein in the cost of health care in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' and to defeat the previous question. Vote ''no'' on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it has been said—and we have moved beyond the old adage many times—if it moves, regulate it; or, if it exists, to regulate it.

It is an interesting paradigm today because it is time for Washington to focus on creating a regulatory system that is flexible, allowing the market to decide the optimal path to implementation.

Regulations should be expedient and unambiguous, seeking to minimize the uncertainty facing industries and small businesses, and we must encourage innovation and bringing new products and processes not only to market, but to office places everywhere. Outdated regulations should be cleared off of the books, especially those created by those unelected.

As we have been here today—and I have, listening to the arguments—what is amazingly—from our side, I have wanted to talk about regulation and the overreach of many of our branches; the gentleman from Illinois brought it up tremendously, and I have talked about this in the Ninth District of Georgia, where I am from—is that, for many years, I believe Congress decided, for whatever reason, it was much easier to give to agencies to promulgate rules and regulations. They said it is much easier.

In fact, I have even heard from the floor today that we don't have the expertise, and it is much better to do it offsite. I just tend to find that is wrong.

I think it is that Congress has the ability to listen to those experts, to listen to those opinions, and then provide something that unelected bureaucrats do not, and that is have the people who elect us, whom we face every time we go home—when I go to the grocery store, when I go to the ball games, when I go to my church, when I go to the places that I go to and they ask me questions, then they are holding their elected official accountable—then we take that, and we balance that to make good decisions for all, in our districts and in our country.

What is amazing to me today is many of the arguments made today have nothing to do—there are many things we could debate here today, but we are here to debate—by the way, I will just remind everybody—the rule for the REINS Act, not the plethora of other things that would be want to, could have done, should have done—we are here on the issue of regulatory reform. We are here on the REINS Act.

Frankly, if I was part of this administration who wants to create this sort of entrenched Federal bureaucracy, I wouldn't want to talk about regulatory reform either. I would want to talk about anything else. I would want to

talk about anything else besides the burden that keeps crushing down from Washington on small-business owners.

Then, of course, as well, there is the argument that did come up, that if you really, really, really want this, undoubtedly, you are really, really, really just wanting to protect big businesses and make dirty—from our perspective, I have heard it before, decrease regulations so that people are put in harm's way or that the environment is worse off.

The reality is that is an old argument and really just needs to go away. I come from the Ninth District of Georgia, in my humble opinion, one of the prettiest places in all the world. Our farmers, our residents all enjoy the clean air. They enjoy the greatness of what we have and the businesses that are a part there and the regulations that, when rightly controlled, help us achieve that American Dream.

There is no one who, voting for this, or even talking against it, would want to actually say: I am voting for this because I want to actually pick up a glass of water that is tainted and drink it, or I want to make it worse for somebody else.

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple rule. It says let's bring forward some fiscal sanity and regulatory sanity. Let's put it back in perspective.

I believe the circle of government, when the Founders put it out there, was based on the fact of having the Executive to carry out the laws, the Congress to make those laws, and the judicial branch to interpret those laws. Our country works best when that is in alignment.

What we are asking for is let's bring it back into alignment. Let's take the REINS Act, let's take this step toward bringing some certainty for our businesses because, at the end of the day, when our businesses have certainty, it does affect the people.

It is not a nameless, faceless place on a brick wall somewhere, those business names that we want to talk about business. It is about those people who get in their cars in their neighborhoods and their apartments and their townhomes, and they drive to a place of work, or they walk to their place of work, and they make a paycheck; they earn a living so that they can do the things that I believe that they have wanted to prosper in and to take care of their families and to move that American Dream forward in their life.

It is up to this building to look after them. It is up to what the Republican majority is putting forward to say: We care about all Americans; we care about their ability to earn a living; we care about their growth, and we care about their safety.

Proper regulation done in the proper way is the way to do that. I will always stand on that side.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 380 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 9. 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. 3064) to authorize highway infrastructure and safety, transit, motor carrier, rail, and other surface transportation programs, 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 among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. 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. 10. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3064.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 380, if ordered; and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 675.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 167, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 470]

YEAS—240

Abraham	Bucshon	Diaz-Balart
Aderholt	Burgess	Dold
Allen	Byrne	Donovan
Amash	Calvert	Duffy
Amodei	Carter (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Babin	Chabot	Duncan (TN)
Barletta	Chaffetz	Ellmers (NC)
Barr	Coffman	Emmer (MN)
Barton	Cole	Farenthold
Benishek	Collins (GA)	Fincher
Bilirakis	Collins (NY)	Fitzpatrick
Bishop (MI)	Comstock	Fleischmann
Bishop (UT)	Conaway	Fleming
Black	Cook	Flores
Blackburn	Costello (PA)	Forbes
Blum	Cramer	Fortenberry
Bost	Crawford	Foxx
Boustany	Crenshaw	Franks (AZ)
Brady (TX)	Culberson	Frelinghuysen
Brat	Curbelo (FL)	Garrett
Bridenstine	Davis, Rodney	Gibbs
Brooks (AL)	Denham	Gibson
Brooks (IN)	Dent	Gohmert
Buchanan	DeSantis	Goodlatte
Buck	DesJarlais	Gosar

Gowdy
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
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 (MS)
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
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
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—167

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
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)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—26

Bass
Butterfield
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Conyers
Fudge
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Lee
Lieu, Ted
Lujan Grisham (NM)
McNerney
Meeks
Moore
Rangel
Ribble
Richmond
Royce
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Thompson (MS)
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1353

Messrs. AGUILAR, FATTAH, and WELCH changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mrs. BLACK changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our Nation in Iraq and Afghanistan and their families, and of all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

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 ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 167, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 471]

AYES—240

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)
Chabot
Chaffetz
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 (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
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 (MS)
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
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)
Zinke

NOES—167

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
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)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind

Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—26

Bass
Butterfield
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Conyers
Fudge
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Lee
Lieu, Ted
Lujan Grisham (NM)
McNerney
Meeks
Moore
Rangel
Richmond
Royce
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Thompson (MS)
Wasserman Schultz
Zeldin

□ 1403

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.

VETERANS' COMPENSATION COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 675) to increase, effective as of December 1, 2015, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 0, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 472]

YEAS—409

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Massie
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—24

Bass
Butterfield
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Conyers
Fudge
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Lee
Lieu, Ted
Lujan Grisham (NM)
McNerney
Meeks
Moore
Rangel
Richmond
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Thompson (MS)
Wasserman Schultz

□ 1409

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to increase, effective as of December 1, 2015, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, to improve the processing of claims by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 427.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 380 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. 427.

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

□ 1412

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. 427) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, with Mr. MARCHANT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

Regulatory reform plays a critical role in ensuring that our Nation finally achieves a full economic recovery and retains its competitive edge in the global marketplace. Congress must advance progrowth policies that create jobs and restore economic prosperity for families and businesses across the Nation, and it must make sure that the administration and its regulatory apparatus are held accountable to the American people.

America's small-business owners are suffering under mountains of endlessly growing, bureaucratic red tape; and the uncertainty about the cost of upcoming regulations discourages employers from hiring new employees and expanding their businesses. Excessive regulation means higher prices, lower wages, fewer jobs, less economic growth, and a less competitive America.

Today, Americans face a burden of over $3 trillion from Federal taxation and regulation. In fact, our Federal regulatory burden is larger than the 2014 gross domestic product of all but the top nine countries in the world. That burden adds up to $15,000 per American household, nearly 30 percent of the average household income in 2014.

□ 1415

Everyone knows it has been this way for far too long. But the Obama administration, instead of fixing the problem, knows only one response: increase taxes, increase spending, and increase regulation.

The results have painfully demonstrated a simple truth: America cannot tax, spend, and regulate its way to economic recovery, economic growth, and durable prosperity for the American people.

Consider just a few facts that reveal the economic weakness the Obama administration has produced. In the June 2015 jobs report, the number of unemployed workers, workers who can only find part-time jobs and workers who are now only marginally attached to the labor force, stood at 10.8 percent. They number over 16 million Americans.

America's labor force participation rate remains at lows not seen since the Carter administration, and the median household income still is below the level achieved before the financial crisis.

The contrast between America's current condition and the recovery Ronald Reagan achieved is particularly stark.

Four-and-a-half years after the recession began in 1981 the Reagan administration, through policies opposite to the Obama administration's, had achieved a recovery that created 7.8 million more jobs than when the recession began. Real per capita gross domestic product rose by $3,091. Real median household income rose by 7.7 percent.

To truly fix America's problems, the REINS Act is one of the simplest, clearest, and most powerful measures we can adopt. The level of new major regulation the Obama administration has issued and plans to issue is without modern precedent.

Testimony before the Judiciary Committee during recent Congresses has plainly shown the connection between skyrocketing levels of regulation and declining levels of jobs and growth.

The REINS Act responds by requiring an up-or-down vote by the people's representatives in Congress before any new major regulation—defined in the bill generally as a rule that has an effect on the economy of at least $100 million—can be imposed on our economy.

It does not prohibit new major regulation. It simply establishes the principle "No major regulation without representation."

By requiring Congress, which is more directly accountable to the American people, to approve or deny major regulations proposed by the administration, the REINS Act provides Congress and, ultimately, the people with a much-needed tool to check the one-way cost ratchet that Washington's regulatory bureaucrats too often turn.

During the 113th and 112th Congresses, the REINS Act was passed by the full House of Representatives multiple times, each time on a bipartisan vote.

I thank Mr. YOUNG of Indiana for introducing this legislation. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for the REINS Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 20, 2015.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On April 15, 2015, the Committee on the Judiciary ordered H.R. 427, the "Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2015," reported to the House. As you know, the Committee on Rules was granted an additional referral upon the bill's introduction pursuant to the Committee's jurisdiction under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives over the rules of the House and special orders of business.

Because of your willingness to consult with my committee regarding this matter, I will waive consideration of the bill by the Rules Committee. By agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, the Rules Committee does not waive its jurisdiction over H.R. 427. In addition, the Committee reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provisions of the bill that are within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation. I ask your commitment to support any request by the Rules Committee for conferees on H.R. 427 or related legislation.

I also request that you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the committee report to accompany H.R. 427 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this legislation on the House floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

PETE SESSIONS.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 20, 2015.

Hon. PETE SESSIONS,
Chairman, Committee on the Rules, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SESSIONS, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 427, the "Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2015," which the Judiciary Committee ordered reported favorably, as amended, to the House on April 15, 2015.

As you noted, the Committee on Rules was granted an additional referral of the bill. I am most appreciative of your decision to forego further consideration of H.R. 427 so that it may proceed to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you are waiving formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on the Rules is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in those provisions of the bill that fall within your Rule X jurisdiction. In addition, if a conference is necessary on this legislation, I will support any request that your committee be represented therein.

Finally, I am pleased to include this letter and your letter in our committee's report as well as the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 427.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 21, 2015.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE, I am writing concerning H.R. 427, the Regulations From the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2015, which the Committee on the Judiciary ordered reported on April 15, 2015.

The bill amends section 257(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 by providing that any rules which affect budget authority, outlays, or receipts that are subject to the congressional approval procedure outlined in section 802 of chapter 8 of title 5, U.S.C., are effective unless it is disapproved in accordance with such section. In order to expedite House consideration of H.R. 427, the Committee will forgo action on the bill. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 427 and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration.

Sincerely,

TOM PRICE, M.D.,
Chairman,
Committee on the Budget.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 22, 2015.

Hon. TOM PRICE,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PRICE, Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 427, the ''Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2015,'' which the Judiciary Committee ordered reported favorably, as amended, to the House on April 15, 2015.

As you noted, the Committee on the Budget was granted an additional referral of the bill. I am most appreciative of your decision to forego further consideration of H.R. 427 so that it may proceed to the House floor. I acknowledge that although you are waiving formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on the Budget is in no way waiving its jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in those provisions of the bill that fall within your Rule X jurisdiction. In addition, if a conference is necessary on this legislation, I will support any request that your committee be represented therein.

Finally, I am pleased to include this letter and your letter in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 427.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume and rise in opposition to H.R. 427.

Mr. Chair, H.R. 427, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2015, otherwise known as the REINS Act, would amend the Congressional Review Act to require that both Houses of Congress pass and the President sign a joint resolution of approval within 70 legislative days before any major rule issued by an agency can take effect.

Additionally, H.R. 427 imposes deadlines for the enactment of a joint resolution approving a major rule that could charitably be referred to as Byzantine.

Under new section 802, the House may only consider a major rule on the second and fourth Thursday of each month. Last year there were only 13 such days on the legislative calendar compared to the 80 major rules adopted in 2014.

Furthermore, under new section 801, Congress may only consider such resolutions within 70 legislative days of receiving a major rule. This process would constructively end rulemaking as we know it.

Now, Mr. Chair, the reason why my friends on the other side of the aisle contend that we need this kind of gumming-the-works legislation, which would result in the passage of no new regulations, is because these new regulations are stifling economic growth.

They point to the Obama administration and say that it is because of regulations enacted or promulgated and placed into operation under the Obama administration that has caused our economy to be at a point where they are saying we are not as economically vital as it should be.

What they are failing to tell the American people is that it was the George Bush Republican economic policies of the first part of this century that led to the Great Recession, the economic meltdown, the fact that there were not regulations that prohibited predatory lending, and other economic policies which contributed to the economic meltdown. They won't tell you it was because of the lack of regulation that caused that.

But, indeed, if you go back and talk to Alan Greenspan, who chaired the Federal Reserve and was a big antiregulatory capitalist, he had to come back after the Great Recession and admit that he was wrong.

His policies were those that contributed to the economic meltdown, which, despite horrendous opposition from the opposite side of the aisle against the policies of Democrats and President Obama, they tried to obstruct those changes. But they were enacted and, as a result, America's economic recovery has been quite notable.

Corporate profits are up. Even though productivity is up and wages are steady, workers have not participated in the upswing in this election, even though jobs have been created for the last 65 straight months under the Obama administration.

But the wage growth has been stagnant, and it is because of the trickle-down Republican policies that have caused this. Now they want to blame the lack of monies in the pocketbooks and pockets of Americans, working people, on regulations.

Even if agencies reduce the number of major rules in contemplation of the bill's onerous requirements, Congress would still lack the expertise and policy justifications for refusing to adopt a major rule.

As over 80 of the Nation's leading professors on environmental and administrative law have noted in a letter to the Judiciary Committee earlier this year, without this expertise, any disapproval is, therefore, more likely to reflect the political power of special interests, a potential that would be magnified in light of the fast-track process.

Lastly, by upending the process for agency rulemaking so that Congress can simply void major rules through inaction, the REINS Act likely violates the presentment and bicameralism requirements of article I of the Constitution.

As Professor Ron Levin, a leading expert on administrative law, noted during the hearing on the REINS Act last Congress:

''The reality is that the act is intended to enable a single House of Congress to control the implementation of the laws through the rulemaking process. Such a scheme transgresses the very idea of separation of powers, under which the Constitution entrusts the writing of the laws to the legislative branch and the implementation of the laws to the executive branch.''

Indeed, as the Supreme Court noted in the landmark case INS v. Chada: ''The Constitution does not contemplate an active role for Congress in the supervision of officers charged with the execution of laws it enacts.''

The court also clarified that it was profound conviction of the Framers that the powers conferred on Congress were the powers to be most carefully circumscribed. By providing that no law could take effect without the concurrence of the prescribed majority of both Houses, the Framers reemphasized their belief that legislation should not be enacted unless it has been carefully and fully considered by the Nation's elected officials.

It defies credulity that so many of my Republican colleagues who so strongly oppose crony capitalism and hold the Framers' intent so dearly would support H.R. 427, which is a bald attempt by corporations and special interests to shield themselves from any oversight and, in the process, shred article I of the Constitution.

Furthermore, Speaker BOEHNER has also said that the Republican-led, do-nothing Congress, the most ineffective in modern history—and I will note that we are getting ready to adjourn tomorrow, a day early, for a 6-week adjournment with all of the work that remains for Congress to do.

Speaker BOEHNER also said that the Republican-led, do-nothing Congress, the most ineffective in modern history, should be judged by the number of laws it repeals, not the number of laws that it passes.

It therefore follows that this obstruct-at-any-cost approach would carry over to blocking the most critical agency rulemaking, thereby threatening agencies' ability to protect Americans' health, safety, well-being, and economic growth.

Who stands to gain from Republican obstructionism? Corporate giants that are holding our country hostage through a deregulatory agenda and political influence that would rival the industrial monopolies from the past century.

Unsurprisingly, it is many of the same corporations that are continuing to show record profit margins that are also pushing deregulation and fewer taxes because they have an ''obsession with short-term profits at the expense of long-term value creation,'' according to Henry Blodget, the CEO of Business Insider.

Unquestionably, H.R. 427 would be nothing short of a catastrophic event for the everyday Americans who stand to lose the most from the majority's myopic and reckless treatment of our Nation's regulatory system.

Mr. Chair, we need real solutions to help real people, not yet another thinly

veiled handout to large corporations, not another messaging bill to take back to the district over the August recess.

We need legislation that creates middle class security and opportunity, and we need sensible regulations that protect American families from financial ruin, that encourage competition, that bring predatory financial practices to an end, legislation that brings the United States into conformity with the rest of the developed world's employment policies by guaranteeing paid sick and parental leave, legislation that increases our global competitiveness by creating an affordable higher education, and legislation that increases the minimum wage from a paltry $7.25 an hour.

I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to oppose H.R. 427, yet another deregulatory bill in the majority's business-focused, crony capitalist agenda.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I have to agree with my friend from Georgia. I agree with him on his statement that this administration's recovery has been amazing. It has been amazingly bad.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the majority whip.

□ 1430

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, if you look at what is happening in our economy right now, why the economy is struggling so badly through this Obama economy, it is because of radical regulations coming out of Washington.

Every time I go home and meet with small businesses in my district in southeast Louisiana, the common thread is that it is not the local business down the street that is the main threat to their business.

The main threat to small businesses throughout my district—and I hear it from my colleagues as well across the country—are the thousands and thousands of pages of these radical regulations that come out of these Federal agencies, unelected bureaucrats that are imposing, in essence, new law that is making it harder to create jobs in this country.

Hard-working taxpayers deserve a Federal Government that is more efficient, more effective, and more accountable; and that is what the REINS Act does, Mr. Chairman. The REINS Act forces real accountability in regulations that are coming out of Washington.

Whether it is the IRS or the EPA or the NLRB or HHS or CMS, the alphabet soup of Federal agencies that is crippling our economy with all of these regulations is what is holding our economy back.

Why not have a mechanism that says, if a rule is being proposed by a Federal agency by an unelected bureaucrat that is so important that it is going to have a major impact on our economy, shouldn't it at least go through the transparency of coming before the elected representatives of the people, Mr. Chairman?

Why not have these conversations on C–SPAN, not in the dark annals of some Federal bureaucratic agency in Washington, some unelected bureaucrat that is going to wake up one morning and say they are going to create a new law that is going to devastate our economy?

Shouldn't that at least go through public hearings? Shouldn't it have to be passed by the elected people in Congress who will be held accountable every 2 years for the consequences of those regulations?

Let's stop crippling our economy. Let's stop holding our economy back with these radical regulations, Mr. Chairman. Let's pass the REINS Act and bring real accountability into the process of creating regulations in Washington.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill. The REINS Act would create new obstacles to the promulgation of regulations designed to protect American workers' health and safety and to protect the environment.

It would jeopardize the economy by impeding regulations for financial services and throw sand in the gears of government efforts to address growing inequality and prevent discrimination.

Congress already has the right to disapprove any rule through the Congressional Review Act or through appropriations bills or other legislation. This bill would essentially impose a procedural chokehold by requiring that any major rule receive affirmative House and Senate approval within 70 legislative days.

As an example of the effect of this bill, we note that the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, OSHA, is in the process of updating a nearly 70-year-old standard to keep workers from contracting a progressive and frequently fatal lung disease called chronic beryllium disease.

In the 1940s, workers at the Atomic Energy Commission plants were contracting acute beryllium poisoning. To deal with the problem, two of their scientists sitting in the back of a taxicab on the way to a meeting agreed to set the beryllium exposure limit at 2 micrograms per cubic meter of air. Established back in 1948, that standard is still in place today and is often called ''the taxicab standard'' because there was no data supporting that number.

In 1975, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health advised OSHA to issue a new, more stringent protective standard. That effort faltered. Now, one cost of inaction is an estimated loss of 100 lives per year each year this new standard is delayed.

Another is the fact that we have to pay over $300 million in Federal compensation to workers and their survivors who have contracted chronic beryllium disease and who are employed by the Energy Department's contractors and vendors.

Today, over 100,000 workers are exposed to beryllium, and workers in my district are not alone in asking the government to be on their side. There is substantial stakeholder support from beryllium producers and labor representatives to cut the standard exposure limit by 90 percent.

Over the last 17 years, OSHA has worked to update that standard, based on numerous scientific studies and expert recommendations, and now, the new standard is working its way slowly through the regulatory process; and under the present laws and procedures, it still might be another year or two before the final rule is promulgated.

Despite overwhelming scientific evidence that this nearly 70-year-old standard fails to protect workers, there are still a few who object. By requiring a bicameral resolution of approval prior to the rule ever taking effect, this legislation will make it easier for a well-funded special interest group to block needed workplace protections.

The underlying bill does nothing but prioritize special interests above the protection of lives and limbs of American workers. I, therefore, urge a ''no'' vote on this bill.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), the author of this piece of legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the leader and Chairman GOODLATTE for bringing H.R. 427 to the floor today.

I introduced the REINS Act because people in my home State of Indiana want to hold someone—someone—accountable for the job-killing rules and regulations coming out of Washington, D.C.

Each day, government agencies impose an average of 10 new regulations on America's businesses, both big and small. It is no surprise to discover that the costly, confusing government regulations that come out of this body—ObamaCare mandates, EPA regulations, or IRS tax penalties—are exciting some feedback from my constituents.

In fact, the collateral damage wrought by Federal Government regulations is consistently cited as one of the biggest barriers to business creation and expansion and growth in household income in this country.

One Indiana businessowner, who employs 16 family men and women in Floyd County, recently called my office. He wanted to know who had voted in support of a peculiar new IRS rule that is going to penalize him if he helps his employees pay for health insurance.

Now, this IRS rule can cost employers more than $36,000 per employee per year if they continue to offend the sensibilities of Washington's regulating

class by reimbursing workers for healthcare coverage.

As the son of a small-business owner and someone who hears a lot from local businesses back in Indiana about their challenges, about their opportunities, I know how costly regulations impact the small company's bottom line.

While this broad, new IRS rule will undoubtedly have a major impact on smaller enterprises across the Nation, it was written by unelected, unaccountable regulators here in Washington, D.C. It never came before Congress for an up-or-down vote.

That is what the REINS Act is all about. It is about holding officials at Federal agencies and the Congress of the United States accountable for the harmful regulations drummed up each year, regulations which are laws in everything but name. They hurt American jobs and wages when they are implemented, and they need an additional filter of accountability here in the people's House.

Who should be held responsible, I would ask opponents of this legislation, for these rules that have a $100 million-plus impact on our economy if not the people's elected representatives in Congress? For too long, Congress has delegated much of its constitutional authority to executive agencies here in Washington, D.C. This has empowered unelected Federal officials to implement sweeping rules and regulations that are often ineffective, redundant, counterproductive, and costly.

Consider the impact of such rules on another business in my home district in Indiana. It is a local farming operation. When we add up the impact of county, State, and Federal regulations, these Hoosier farmers must meet hundreds of reporting requirements dictated by an alphabet soup of different government agencies—EPA, USDA, HHS, IRS, NLRB. It goes on and on and on. It is mind numbing, really.

The burden on their operation and its ability to grow and compete has been punishing. For example, one regulation alone requires them to treat water left over from cracking eggs like industrial waste. It costs hundreds of thousands of dollars each year for this business in consulting and equipment fees just in compliance costs.

Now, with the EPA assuming broad new authority over bodies of water in the United States, these farmers are taking more time and resources away from their farm to track these ill-defined WOTUS regulations coming down the pike.

Now, America's job creators will tell you the future is uncertain. Our rulemaking process is out of the people's control. It needs to be reined in. Wouldn't it make sense for small-business owners and farmers to have a larger voice, to be given a bigger say in the rulemaking process, especially when regulations can dictate whether their business succeeds or fails?

That is exactly what my legislation, the REINS Act, provides. It gives the job creators and the American people a voice. It injects a measure of accountability back into the democratic process. The REINS Act requires that Congress must approve any new major rule proposed by the executive branch before it can be enforced on the American people.

Remember, our small businesses are our Nation's economic engine. They represent 99.7 percent of all national employers, 56.1 million of our Nation's private workforce. Small and family-owned businesses, new startups, and entrepreneurs create two-thirds of all job growth in the United States.

Meanwhile, small businesses spend an estimated $10,500 per employee to comply with Federal regulations. It is no wonder that, for the first time in 35 years, more American companies are being destroyed than they are being created each year.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Compliance with costly Federal regulations leads to higher consumer costs, lower take-home pay, and even reduced hiring.

A businessowner who owns a parts manufacturing company in Wabash, Indiana, summed it up best. From his standpoint, when it comes to the vast array of rules and regulations his company must follow, they are not only onerous; they add zero value to his business, and they put him at a competitive disadvantage to foreign competition.

We could, frankly, spend a lot more time than today here on the floor going through each of the different challenges with our Federal regulation system, but in the end, Congress needs to be forced to account for the regulations resulting from our sweeping legislation like ObamaCare and Dodd-Frank.

The REINS Act accomplishes this objective. The REINS Act, like the Hoosiers I represent, demands accountability. I commend it to the consideration of all my colleagues.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I often hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle repeat false information, and it is unfortunate that it would be perpetrated that economic growth has been hurt because of an explosion of regulations during the Obama administration.

I will be the first to admit that, with the historic passage of the Affordable Care Act, which has enabled 16 million Americans to now have access to the healthcare system—16 million people—it could have been more if the policies had not been obstructed so much; if we hadn't had 50-plus votes to do away with the Affordable Care Act, we would have more people having access to the healthcare system in this country, but bringing that many people into the healthcare system and actually changing the healthcare system required new regulations, and so people have been trying, for 75 to 100 years, to establish health care for everyone in this country.

The Affordable Care Act was the closest that we could come to that ideal, but it was a transformational bill, and it did require new regulations to nurture it and to get it to this point, which has been a complete success, despite all opposition.

□ 1445

And then we had the Dodd-Frank legislation that was passed as a result of the Great Recession, which was caused by a lack of regulation.

So we had regulations that had to come forth as a result of the passage of that legislation to protect the health, safety, and financial well-being of everyday Americans. And so with that act having passed and controls put on excessive speculation in the financial services industry, we have seen economic growth. That is the bottom line. We had 64 straight months of private sector job growth. That is 12.8 million private sector jobs created amidst a regulatory system that is proworker, proenvironment, prohealth and prosafety, and proinnovation. That is a significant accomplishment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the chairman of the Small Business Committee and a fighter for small businesses and the families that they represent.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Before I get into my prepared remarks, I have to respond to my good friend from Georgia's comments about the Affordable Care Act, which many have come to start referring to as the ''Unaffordable Care Act'' or ''ObamaCare,'' as most people refer to it.

There certainly was a need to help some of those folks who didn't have insurance, and there were ways of doing that. By passage of this legislation, we have adversely, negatively impacted, I think, far more Americans than we have helped. We have seen Americans' rates go up, deductibles go up, premiums go up, and they are getting less quality health care for that. So it has been a disaster for many Americans, and a lot of it is still unfolding.

And then, on Dodd-Frank, which the gentleman also mentioned, what we have seen as a result of that—and I happen to be the chair of the Small Business Committee, as was mentioned—one of small businesses' greatest challenges is access to capital, getting money so that they can grow or start a business or grow an existing business and create more jobs.

Because of Dodd-Frank, we got a whole new army of bureaucrats looking over the shoulders of banks—and the smaller banks, too, like community banks, who had nothing to do with this

so-called economic meltdown. Bureaucrats are looking over the shoulders of credit unions, making it tougher for them to make loans to small businesses.

So those two pieces of legislation, which many of my friends on the other side of the aisle are proud of, I think have been disastrous for this country.

Getting to this particular piece of legislation, half of America is employed by small businesses. In fact, 70 percent of the new jobs created in this economy are created by small businesses. Families rely on small businesses to put food on the table and a roof over their heads. They are very critical to the American community and to our American economy.

There is not a small-business owner I know who thinks that the government creates job, but they do know that government can keep them from creating jobs. It does it with one-size-fits-all regulations. It does it by perpetuating uncertainty and increasing barriers to success.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

The REINS Act forces government to think before it acts. It protects the American people by ensuring that those that they elected get a say in major regulations—not all regulations, just regulations that would have a significant impact on the economy.

Some may falsely claim that this bill is about deregulation. It is not. It is about accountability. It is about making government think before it acts. And if it chooses to act, the American people can hold their elected representatives—us—accountable for making that decision, not some nameless, faceless bureaucracy, but their elected representatives. That is what this is all about. It is commonsense legislation.

I commend the gentleman from Indiana for offering this. I also want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for handling this on the floor today.

The REINS Act is a good piece of legislation. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I would inquire as to how much time remains on both sides.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) has 13 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), another fighter for his district and those who are affected by regulation.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Chairman, the Constitution vests all legislative powers in Congress. Unfortunately, past Members of this institution have given away a lot of that power to government agencies like the EPA, the Department of Health and Human Services, and an alphabet soup of agencies. President Obama is using his pen and telephone to talk to the ideologues who work in and run these agencies to change laws, to make laws without coming to Congress. Unelected, faceless Federal bureaucrats are making regulations that have the force of law, not elected representatives of the people.

There are reams of rules. There are so many rules out there, I bet the average person can't go a couple of hours without violating a rule or regulation they probably don't even know about.

The REINS Act is a great first step in reining in these job-killing regulations. The legislation before us is important to America. The REINS Act brings accountability back to the system.

When a regulation with an economic impact of more than $100 million comes out of one of these agencies, it has got to be approved by Congress. That is our job; the Constitution says so, the people who elected us to make laws. And the people will hold us accountable for those laws if they are bad laws.

How do you hold a faceless Federal bureaucrat accountable? We have seen through the VA that it is practically impossible to fire one of these bureaucrats. But every 2 years you have got the opportunity to fire somebody in this House, and every 6 years you have the opportunity to fire somebody on the other side.

Let Congress do the job the Founding Fathers intended. Put the people's representatives back in charge. Follow the Constitution.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) made a great point when he was reading through the Supreme Court decision talking about the constitutional responsibility of this branch of government to make the laws. That is what the REINS Act does. It gives us back the power.

Another gentleman on the other side spoke about the taxicab standard, how it came up in a taxicab and how this random regulation has been law for years. If the REINS Act had been in effect, that would have come before Congress, and we could have asked the question: Where is the science behind that?

It would have worked then, and it will work when we pass it now.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the REINS Act.

For far too long, Congress has allowed unelected Federal bureaucrats to take responsibility for the policymaking in this town. Too often, these unaccountable individuals in Washington make decisions that affect the daily lives of western Pennsylvanians with little regard for how they impact one's livelihood and family.

For instance, we learned a month ago in a Supreme Court decision that one agency, the EPA, failed to appropriately consider the costs and benefits of its MATS proposal, which is estimated to cost $9 billion, with a benefit of only $4 million to $6 million.

Solid, middle class jobs like those in some parts of the energy industry and in my district are being regulated right out of existence. More broadly, consider that in 2015, thus far, more than 150 regulations have been finalized, with total costs exceeding $60 billion and more than 10 million hours of paperwork.

It is this unaccountable culture that hinders the very job creation and economic growth we need in cities and towns across America that will provide opportunities for Americans to get back in the game and to get this country back on track.

There is a bigger issue here, Mr. Chairman, and that is what is represented in this bill. It goes to the constitutional structure of our government, where we are supposed to have an executive branch that is supposed to enforce the law, a legislative branch that makes the law, and a judicial branch that adjudicates the law.

For close to 100 years, this body has ceded responsibility for making laws to the executive branch. This bill is a start towards restoring the proper structure of government and accountability.

When regulations are passed that people don't agree with, there is no way to hold those regulators accountable; but if Congress had a say, you could hold Congress accountable. This is what self-government is all about.

I reflect on 34 years ago, when a certain gentleman spoke on the west front of this Capitol and had these words to say: ''From time to time we've been tempted to believe that society has become too complex to be managed by self-rule, that government by an elite group is superior to government for, by, and of the people. Well, if no one among us is capable of governing himself, then who among us has the capacity to govern someone else?''

I thank Mr. YOUNG and the committee for its work on the REINS Act.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill as a means to restoring the original, proper constitutional structure of who is responsible for the laws that come out of this town. You would think that Members of Congress would want to take credit for good regulations and protect people from bad regulations. Again, that is what this legislation does.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The economic elites who are the patrons of many of my friends across the aisle believe in trickle-down economics, which George Herbert Walker Bush termed to be ''voodoo economics.''

My friends believe that when you put a quarter in the pocket of a rich man, there is a hole in that pocket and the quarter trickles down and falls out into nickles and dimes and is distributed to the waiting working class people of the country. They believe that is how the economy works: give the rich the money, let them operate in an unregulated environment, and then somehow, magically, the economy trickles down to those waiting at the bottom of the scale waiting for some kind of a handout.

That is not how our economy works. It works from the ground up. It works with people going to work, making a decent wage, delivering services for a period of time—8 hours a day, that is a regulation; 40 hours a week, that is a regulation. We didn't used to have those during times when people were predominantly poor, and the Nation was poor as a result; but due to these regulations like the minimum wage, the 40-hour workweek, the health and safety regulations on the job, we were able to build a middle class in this country that sustained us up until the time when Ronald Reagan won the Presidency and established the current climate of trickle-down economics.

We have seen during that time what has happened is the rich have gotten richer and the poor have gotten poorer. The working poor have had less to work with and the middle class has been squeezed so that there are not as many working middle class people as there were once before.

So the REINS Act is a gift to the economic elites who have had their way with the economy for the last 40 years. They want to stab the heart of the American economy now by passing this act, the REINS Act, which would not deregulate, but it would stop all future regulations from coming to the fore. That is something that America does not need.

So I am going to urge my colleagues at the appropriate time to oppose this legislation and oppose voodoo economics, oppose trickle-down economics.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to just say that the fact of the matter is we are not talking about voodoo economics here. We are talking about representative democracy.

The American people elect their Representatives from 435 congressional districts; 50 States elect their Senators, and they send us to Washington, D.C., to write the laws of the land.

The laws that the gentleman referred to were all written by the United States Congress, signed into law by various Presidents. Then those laws are turned into regulations, and that is where there is no more representative democracy.

The bureaucracy that writes the regulations has no accountability. They write regulations that cost too much, that strangle the job creation that we both—the gentleman from Georgia and I would like to see greater job creation and more jobs for the middle class in this country.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 15 seconds.

This bill is about restoring representative democracy to the American people and fairness to the American people and protecting their economy and protecting their jobs by making sure that bureaucrats are held accountable and send those regulations back to the Congress for an up-or-down vote that, yes, those regulations comport with what the Congress intended when they wrote the law—or don't comport.

If they comport, they take effect; if they don't, they don't take effect.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I stand today in strong support of the REINS Act of 2015.

The gentleman from Georgia said, in opposition to this bill just a few moments ago, that we should be opposed to it, because ''it would end rulemaking as we know it.''

What a great statement on why we should vote for the REINS Act because that is exactly what we are trying to do. We must end rulemaking as we know it.

I am proud to cosponsor this bill because I know, firsthand, how this administration's overbearing regulatory policies have devastated my State, West Virginia; its businesses; its workers; its fundamental way of life. The people of West Virginia's Third District deserve better. All West Virginians deserve better. All Americans deserve better.

The Economist recently estimated that Federal regulations cost our Nation more than $1.8 trillion per year. In West Virginia, for example, the EPA has implemented sweeping rules and regulations that have driven out thousands of good-paying jobs, reduced demand for West Virginia coal, and raised energy prices for all Americans.

This administration is out of touch with our Nation's hard-working families. This bill, the REINS Act, will protect our communities, small businesses, and workers from the administration's crushing regulatory onslaught.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in support.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My colleagues have repeatedly argued to the fact that—or to the allegation that the rate of Federal regulations is growing, but a recent report by the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service reported that the length of the Code of Federal Regulations has no bearing on the scope or impact of Federal regulation.

In other words, just because the volume of paper is growing, they want to argue that this means that there is an onslaught, an explosion of Federal regulations.

As I pointed out earlier, yes, there have been new regulations having to do with Dodd-Frank, which protects us from another economic meltdown that we suffered under the Bush administration, and also the Affordable Care Act, which has enabled 16 million Americans to have access to the healthcare system who did not have it prior to the passage of the Affordable Care Act.

This argument that regulations are killing us is nonfactual.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I have only one speaker remaining, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will close and just say that this debate has been about whether or not we need a law that would stop Federal rulemaking in its tracks.

This debate has been about whether or not, as we move forward into the future, as society advances, as technology takes us to places where we have never been before, as medical care and breakthroughs in the ability to keep people alive, as that explodes, as things change, as they do in the annals of human history, the question is whether or not we are going to have a Federal bureaucracy that keeps up with the change and keeps up with the need for an implementation regimen to enact or see that the laws that are enacted by Congress can, in fact, be accomplished.

With no regulations to support the measures that Congress passes—but I will note that this Congress doesn't pass much, but that is what we are here for, to keep up with change and to legislate, so that change is good for Americans, their health, safety, and well-being.

When we do that, if we have a regulatory regime that is gummed up and inoperable, then it hurts America's ability to compete in this global marketplace. It hurts America's economy to be an economy where all people can share in the prosperity of it.

This is what this debate has been about. Are we going to change America? Are we going to throw out the Administrative Procedure Act, which has been an orderly way and predictable way for regulations to be promulgated and placed into effect?

Are we going to do away with that and then subject that rulemaking process to a dysfunctional process like we have here in Congress today, where we can't even pass the Export-Import Bank legislation—which, by the way, you say, government does not create jobs, but there will be government jobs lost as a result of us going home early without having passed the Export-Import Bank reauthorization.

Government does create jobs, and we are going to lose tens of thousands of

jobs because of our inability or our refusal to bring a measure to the floor which has the votes—bipartisan votes—to pass this Chamber and which has already passed the Senate in a transportation bill.

We are going to go home without having done that, and I will tell you we will go home without having—if this legislation passes, we will go home without passing a single regulation, and government will be gummed up. Who will prosper? It is the economic elites who make money, regardless.

I will call on my colleagues to oppose this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

During this debate, my friends on the other side of the aisle have raised quite a few false alarms.

If this bill passes, why, all important regulations will stop, they say; but that is not true. All regulation that is worthy of Congress' approval will continue.

If this bill passes, why, expert decisionmaking will stop because Congress will have the final say on new major regulations, not Washington bureaucrats; but that is not true. Congress will have the benefit of the best evidence and arguments expert agencies can offer in support of their new regulations.

Congress is capable of determining whether that evidence and those arguments are good or not and deciding what finally will become law. That is the job our Founding Fathers entrusted to us in the Constitution. We should not shirk from it.

I will tell you, though, what will stop if this bill becomes law is the endless avalanche of new, major regulations that do not deserve Congress' approval because they impose massive, unjustified costs that crush jobs, crush wages, and crush the spirits of America's families and small-business owners.

Think about what that will mean to real Americans suffering the real burdens of the Obama administration's overreaching regulations. Let me tell you about some of them who have testified before the Judiciary Committee.

Think of Rob James, a city councilman from Avon Lake, Ohio, a small town that has faced devastation by ideologically driven, anti-fossil fuel power plant regulations.

These regulations were expected to destroy jobs in Avon Lake, harm Avon Lake's families, and make it even harder for Avon Lake to find the resources to provide emergency services, quality schools, and help for its neediest citizens—all while doing comparatively little to control mercury emissions that were the stated target of the regulations.

The Supreme Court just invalidated those regulations, but not before multiple years of job-crushing compliance costs had to be borne by those who challenged the rules.

Think of Bob Sells, from my district. He runs a Virginia-based division of a heavy construction materials producer. His company and its workers were harmed by EPA cement kiln emission regulations that were technically unattainable and vastly changed from what the EPA proposed for public comment, other EPA emission regulations that were stricter than needed to protect health, gerrymandered to impose expensive controls on other types of emissions, and that prohibited commonsense uses of cheap and safe fuel that could eventually help the environment and the Department of Transportation regulations that, without increasing safety, vastly increased recordkeeping for ready-mix concrete drivers, unnecessarily limited their hours, and suppressed their wages.

This is what the REINS Act will stop: overreaching, unjustified, immensely costly regulation that, unless Congress stands up to protect the American people, this administration will continue to load on to the backs of struggling American families and small-business owners.

Support the American people. Support the REINS Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Chair, as a cosponsor of H.R. 427 I rise in strong support of the REINS Act.

Our bill is imperative to ensuring that federal agencies, and those in the White House, are held accountable for the expensive and intrusive regulations they are imposing on the American people.

The REINS Act simply requires an up or down vote by Congress on any costly regulation proposed by a federal agency before it is allowed to take effect.

This is a common sense check on regulators who too often ignore the impact of their job-killing regulations.

The United States was founded on the principle of separation of powers, a system that exists to protect the people from the unchecked, unilateral actions of a faceless bureaucracy.

Unfortunately, the current Administration has issued regulations at record levels and ventured into new regulatory areas that go far beyond the originally authorized regulatory authority.

The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office estimates that over the last five years, the Obama Administration has issued 82 "major rules"—or rules with more than $100 million in economic impact—each year.

Bureaucratic red tape and costly mandates have forced small businesses to close up shop, have resulted in other businesses laying off workers and have made U.S. businesses less competitive.

America's job-creators and small businesses are the lifeblood of our communities, and our economy, and we cannot stand by and let them be overrun by rules and regulations. It's time to rein in the regulators and bring some accountability to their unchecked power.

The American people deserve a government that is both accountable for their actions and one that operates under a structure meant to protect their freedoms.

I believe it's time that we stand up and put a stop to this abuse of power, and the REINS Act is a critical step towards the achievement of that goal.

I'm standing with hard-working Americans, the nation's small businesses and America's job-creators. Let's pass H.R. 427 and restore common sense in our government.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise today support of H.R. 427, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny (REINS) Act of 2015.

In the two terms of the Obama Administration thus far, the Executive Branch has issued increasingly costly regulations on a variety of issues, without much thought to the devastating effects on the economy.

The REINS Act would give Congress, and therefore the people, the power to determine whether all major regulations that have an estimated economic impact of over $100 million, significant adverse effects on employment, or a major increase in costs for consumers take effect. This would return Congress to a proper role of oversight.

As a small businessman, I know firsthand the crippling impact of an overzealous federal government. The REINS Act would finally empower members of Congress to engage in the rulemaking process and return our regulatory scheme to a common sense one that promotes economic growth, creates jobs, and increases wages for working families in the First District of Iowa while protecting our natural resources, environment, and health.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate to enact this pro-growth legislation that assists job creators across my district and across America.

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 the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 114–230. 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. 427

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 ''Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to increase accountability for and transparency in the Federal regulatory process. Section 1 of article I of the United States Constitution grants all legislative powers to Congress. Over time, Congress has excessively delegated its constitutional charge while failing to conduct appropriate oversight and retain accountability for the content of the laws it passes. By requiring a vote in Congress, the REINS Act will result in more carefully drafted and detailed legislation, an improved regulatory process, and a legislative branch that is truly accountable to the American people for the laws imposed upon them.

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING.

Chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 8—CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING

''Sec.
''801. Congressional review.
''802. Congressional approval procedure for major rules.
''803. Congressional disapproval procedure for nonmajor rules.
''804. Definitions.
''805. Judicial review.
''806. Exemption for monetary policy.
''807. Effective date of certain rules.

"§ 801. Congressional review

''(a)(1)(A) Before a rule may take effect, the Federal agency promulgating such rule shall submit to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General a report containing—

''(i) a copy of the rule;

''(ii) a concise general statement relating to the rule;

''(iii) a classification of the rule as a major or nonmajor rule, including an explanation of the classification specifically addressing each criteria for a major rule contained within sections 804(2)(A), 804(2)(B), and 804(2)(C);

''(iv) a list of any other related regulatory actions intended to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective as well as the individual and aggregate economic effects of those actions; and

''(v) the proposed effective date of the rule.

''(B) On the date of the submission of the report under subparagraph (A), the Federal agency promulgating the rule shall submit to the Comptroller General and make available to each House of Congress—

''(i) a complete copy of the cost-benefit analysis of the rule, if any;

''(ii) the agency's actions pursuant to sections 603, 604, 605, 607, and 609 of this title;

''(iii) the agency's actions pursuant to sections 202, 203, 204, and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995; and

''(iv) any other relevant information or requirements under any other Act and any relevant Executive orders.

''(C) Upon receipt of a report submitted under subparagraph (A), each House shall provide copies of the report to the chairman and ranking member of each standing committee with jurisdiction under the rules of the House of Representatives or the Senate to report a bill to amend the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

''(2)(A) The Comptroller General shall provide a report on each major rule to the committees of jurisdiction by the end of 15 calendar days after the submission or publication date. The report of the Comptroller General shall include an assessment of the agency's compliance with procedural steps required by paragraph (1)(B) and an assessment of whether the major rule imposes any new limits or mandates on private-sector activity.

''(B) Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Comptroller General by providing information relevant to the Comptroller General's report under subparagraph (A).

''(3) A major rule relating to a report submitted under paragraph (1) shall take effect upon enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802 or as provided for in the rule following enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802, whichever is later.

''(4) A nonmajor rule shall take effect as provided by section 803 after submission to Congress under paragraph (1).

''(5) If a joint resolution of approval relating to a major rule is not enacted within the period provided in subsection (b)(2), then a joint resolution of approval relating to the same rule may not be considered under this chapter in the same Congress by either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

''(b)(1) A major rule shall not take effect unless the Congress enacts a joint resolution of approval described under section 802.

''(2) If a joint resolution described in subsection (a) is not enacted into law by the end of 70 session days or legislative days, as applicable, beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), then the rule described in that resolution shall be deemed not to be approved and such rule shall not take effect.

''(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section (except subject to paragraph (3)), a major rule may take effect for one 90-calendar-day period if the President makes a determination under paragraph (2) and submits written notice of such determination to the Congress.

''(2) Paragraph (1) applies to a determination made by the President by Executive order that the major rule should take effect because such rule is—

''(A) necessary because of an imminent threat to health or safety or other emergency;

''(B) necessary for the enforcement of criminal laws;

''(C) necessary for national security; or

''(D) issued pursuant to any statute implementing an international trade agreement.

''(3) An exercise by the President of the authority under this subsection shall have no effect on the procedures under section 802.

''(d)(1) In addition to the opportunity for review otherwise provided under this chapter, in the case of any rule for which a report was submitted in accordance with subsection (a)(1)(A) during the period beginning on the date occurring—

''(A) in the case of the Senate, 60 session days, or

''(B) in the case of the House of Representatives, 60 legislative days,

before the date the Congress is scheduled to adjourn a session of Congress through the date on which the same or succeeding Congress first convenes its next session, sections 802 and 803 shall apply to such rule in the succeeding session of Congress.

''(2)(A) In applying sections 802 and 803 for purposes of such additional review, a rule described under paragraph (1) shall be treated as though—

''(i) such rule were published in the Federal Register on—

''(I) in the case of the Senate, the 15th session day, or

''(II) in the case of the House of Representatives, the 15th legislative day,

after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes; and

''(ii) a report on such rule were submitted to Congress under subsection (a)(1) on such date.

''(B) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to affect the requirement under subsection (a)(1) that a report shall be submitted to Congress before a rule can take effect.

''(3) A rule described under paragraph (1) shall take effect as otherwise provided by law (including other subsections of this section).

"§ 802. Congressional approval procedure for major rules

''(a)(1) For purposes of this section, the term 'joint resolution' means only a joint resolution addressing a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 801(a)(1)(A)(iii) that—

''(A) bears no preamble;

''(B) bears the following title (with blanks filled as appropriate): 'Approving the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____.';

''(C) includes after its resolving clause only the following (with blanks filled as appropriate): 'That Congress approves the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____.'; and

''(D) is introduced pursuant to paragraph (2).

''(2) After a House of Congress receives a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 801(a)(1)(A)(iii), the majority leader of that House (or his or her respective designee) shall introduce (by request, if appropriate) a joint resolution described in paragraph (1)—

''(A) in the case of the House of Representatives, within three legislative days; and

''(B) in the case of the Senate, within three session days.

''(3) A joint resolution described in paragraph (1) shall not be subject to amendment at any stage of proceeding.

''(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred in each House of Congress to the committees having jurisdiction over the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

''(c) In the Senate, if the committee or committees to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred have not reported it at the end of 15 session days after its introduction, such committee or committees shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the resolution and it shall be placed on the calendar. A vote on final passage of the resolution shall be taken on or before the close of the 15th session day after the resolution is reported by the committee or committees to which it was referred, or after such committee or committees have been discharged from further consideration of the resolution.

''(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee or committees to which a joint resolution is referred have reported, or when a committee or committees are discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

''(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 2 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

''(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

''(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

''(e) In the House of Representatives, if any committee to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred

has not reported it to the House at the end of 15 legislative days after its introduction, such committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution, and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar. On the second and fourth Thursdays of each month it shall be in order at any time for the Speaker to recognize a Member who favors passage of a joint resolution that has appeared on the calendar for at least 5 legislative days to call up that joint resolution for immediate consideration in the House without intervention of any point of order. When so called up a joint resolution shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered to its passage without intervening motion. It shall not be in order to reconsider the vote on passage. If a vote on final passage of the joint resolution has not been taken by the third Thursday on which the Speaker may recognize a Member under this subsection, such vote shall be taken on that day.

''(f)(1) If, before passing a joint resolution described in subsection (a), one House receives from the other a joint resolution having the same text, then—

''(A) the joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

''(B) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House until the vote on passage, when the joint resolution received from the other House shall supplant the joint resolution of the receiving House.

''(2) This subsection shall not apply to the House of Representatives if the joint resolution received from the Senate is a revenue measure.

''(g) If either House has not taken a vote on final passage of the joint resolution by the last day of the period described in section 801(b)(2), then such vote shall be taken on that day.

''(h) This section and section 803 are enacted by Congress—

''(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed to be part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution described in subsection (a) and superseding other rules only where explicitly so; and

''(2) with full recognition of the Constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as they relate to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

''§ 803. Congressional disapproval procedure for nonmajor rules

''(a) For purposes of this section, the term 'joint resolution' means only a joint resolution introduced in the period beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress and ending 60 days thereafter (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That Congress disapproves the nonmajor rule submitted by the _____ relating to _____, and such rule shall have no force or effect.' (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).

''(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred to the committees in each House of Congress with jurisdiction.

''(c) In the Senate, if the committee to which is referred a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has not reported such joint resolution (or an identical joint resolution) at the end of 15 session days after the date of introduction of the joint resolution, such committee may be discharged from further consideration of such joint resolution upon a petition supported in writing by 30 Members of the Senate, and such joint resolution shall be placed on the calendar.

''(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee to which a joint resolution is referred has reported, or when a committee is discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

''(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

''(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

''(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

''(e) In the Senate the procedure specified in subsection (c) or (d) shall not apply to the consideration of a joint resolution respecting a nonmajor rule—

''(1) after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning with the applicable submission or publication date, or

''(2) if the report under section 801(a)(1)(A) was submitted during the period referred to in section 801(d)(1), after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning on the 15th session day after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes.

''(f) If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of that House described in subsection (a), that House receives from the other House a joint resolution described in subsection (a), then the following procedures shall apply:

''(1) The joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

''(2) With respect to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) of the House receiving the joint resolution—

''(A) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; but

''(B) the vote on final passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

''§ 804. Definitions

''For purposes of this chapter—

''(1) The term 'Federal agency' means any agency as that term is defined in section 551(1).

''(2) The term 'major rule' means any rule, including an interim final rule, that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget finds has resulted in or is likely to result in—

''(A) an annual effect on the economy of $100,000,000 or more;

''(B) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; or

''(C) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets.

''(3) The term 'nonmajor rule' means any rule that is not a major rule.

''(4) The term 'rule' has the meaning given such term in section 551, except that such term does not include—

''(A) any rule of particular applicability, including a rule that approves or prescribes for the future rates, wages, prices, services, or allowances therefore, corporate or financial structures, reorganizations, mergers, or acquisitions thereof, or accounting practices or disclosures bearing on any of the foregoing;

''(B) any rule relating to agency management or personnel; or

''(C) any rule of agency organization, procedure, or practice that does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of nonagency parties.

''(5) The term 'submission date or publication date', except as otherwise provided in this chapter, means—

''(A) in the case of a major rule, the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 801(a)(1); and

''(B) in the case of a nonmajor rule, the later of—

''(i) the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 801(a)(1); and

''(ii) the date on which the nonmajor rule is published in the Federal Register, if so published.

''§ 805. Judicial review

''(a) No determination, finding, action, or omission under this chapter shall be subject to judicial review.

''(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), a court may determine whether a Federal agency has completed the necessary requirements under this chapter for a rule to take effect.

''(c) The enactment of a joint resolution of approval under section 802 shall not be interpreted to serve as a grant or modification of statutory authority by Congress for the promulgation of a rule, shall not extinguish or affect any claim, whether substantive or procedural, against any alleged defect in a rule, and shall not form part of the record before the court in any judicial proceeding concerning a rule except for purposes of determining whether or not the rule is in effect.

''§ 806. Exemption for monetary policy

''Nothing in this chapter shall apply to rules that concern monetary policy proposed or implemented by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee.

''§ 807. Effective date of certain rules

''Notwithstanding section 801—

''(1) any rule that establishes, modifies, opens, closes, or conducts a regulatory program for a commercial, recreational, or subsistence activity related to hunting, fishing, or camping; or

''(2) any rule other than a major rule which an agency for good cause finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of

reasons therefore in the rule issued) that notice and public procedure thereon are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest,

shall take effect at such time as the Federal agency promulgating the rule determines.''.

SEC. 4. BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 802 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.

Section 257(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 802 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.—Any rules subject to the congressional approval procedure set forth in section 802 of chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, affecting budget authority, outlays, or receipts shall be assumed to be effective unless it is not approved in accordance with such section.''.

SEC. 5. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STUDY OF RULES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine, as of the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) how many rules (as such term is defined in section 804 of title 5, United States Code) were in effect;

(2) how many major rules (as such term is defined in section 804 of title 5, United States Code) were in effect; and

(3) the total estimated economic cost imposed by all such rules.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress that contains the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a).

The CHAIR. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 114–230. 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. YOUNG OF IOWA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 114–230.

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. 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, line 3, insert after ''shall'' the following: ''publish in the Federal Register a list of information on which the rule is based, including data, scientific and economic studies, and cost-benefit analyses, and identify how the public can access such information online, and shall''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

□ 1515

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Chairman GOODLATTE, for his kindness in allowing me to come forward with an amendment here.

My amendment is quite simple, and I believe it should be bipartisan. My amendment, quite simply, requires agencies to make available on the Internet the data, the science, studies, and analyses that a major rule is based on.

This transparency allows everyone access to the source information and the same information so we can all be on the same page when we talk about these things. No one is left in the dark.

You know, Iowans ask me—and I am sure the same questions are asked to other Members when they are home—How do regulations come to these conclusions? How do these regulators get to where they get to when they do these regulations? What science or data do they use? Is it sound science?

They want to see the same data and science. They ask me: Well, can we see it, too? And I don't have a good answer for them at the time. But I want to make sure that they do.

So this amendment allows Americans to see that science that the regulators use. My amendment helps answer these questions by simply making this information available.

Federal regulations affect every aspect of a hard-working American's day, from the moment they wake up until they go to bed at night.

They affect America's job creators, big and small, with sometimes exorbitant costs in order to comply, but also devastating costs of lost opportunities to grow their businesses and create more jobs.

Federal regulations have an enormous, a giant, impact on the health of our national economy to the tune of $1.88 trillion in 2014. Federal regulation is a constantly growing entity.

The Code of Federal Regulations, as we know, is monstrous in size, cost and effect on our economy, and our job creators and on the bank accounts of hard-working Americans.

I have a real dedicated interest in tackling this issue of regulations because they affect our rights and the economy, and I am willing to work with anyone on these issues.

I have other ideas. I think we should know who these regulators are, who is writing these rules and regs, what is their background.

We, as Members, put our names on amendments and bills, but we don't know the names of the people who are writing these regulations. Those are ideas that I have, also.

We do financial disclosure reports here in Congress. Members do as well as our senior staff. I think we should consider the impact that this would have on those who do these regulations, making them do a financial disclosure report. These are just some of the ideas.

But today my amendment is about making sure the science and data that these regulators, what they come to a conclusion on, are made available to the public so we can all be on the same page and there is transparency and we are not left in the dark.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, this Young amendment looks eerily familiar to the so-called Secret Science Reform Act, H.R. 1030, that the House passed in a partisan vote back in March, except the problem is that this bill is actually even worse.

H.R. 1030 would have applied these harmful restrictions to the EPA, but this amendment that we are looking at today would affect every single Federal agency.

Let's look. The amendment would require an agency, as part of its rulemaking process, to make all information used in the creation of a rule publicly accessible, including all of the data.

That would mean that any data that is considered confidential, such as health information or business records, would most likely become off limits.

So, for example, an agency trying to create labeling requirements for toxic chemicals wouldn't be able to use a study that uses personal health data as long as that data is deemed confidential.

New scientific methods and data could be restricted because the information includes data protected by intellectual property laws.

When we passed the Secret Science Act on a partisan vote last March, I mentioned in my opposition that it would force the EPA to choose between protecting our health and environment and maintaining the privacy of patient medical records and the confidentiality of business records. And if that argument isn't enough, let's consider the costs.

When the House Science Committee was considering the bill that I mentioned previously, the Secret Science Act that does exactly the same thing that the Young amendment does, except to all Federal agencies, Democrats on the committee pointed out that the Congressional Budget Office estimated just for that one bill that it would cost the EPA $250 million to comply with the new regulations.

If that is how much it is going to cost the EPA for one regulatory requirement, imagine what the cost would be if you expand this mandate across every single Federal agency. The cost would be astronomical.

Between the cost and the harmful restrictions that this imposes on our Federal agencies, the amendment sets up an impossible hurdle for those agencies to overcome.

We are asking them to decide between compromising institutional review board ethics and doing their job to protect the American people.

It is very clear that the Young amendment and provisions like it are not, in fact, about transparency. It really is to block Federal agencies from doing their jobs, their jobs of protecting our air, giving us clean water, making sure that our food supply is safe, checking on medical devices so that they don't harm us, our prescription drugs so that they don't make us sick, our privacy safeguards for our workplace information, our workplace safety standards, protections against Wall Street and its predatory lending practices.

I would ask my colleagues to oppose this harmful and antiscience amendment, oppose the final bill, and oppose this amendment because of the restrictions that it would place on the American people.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, how much time is left?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Maryland has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, this amendment I oppose. It would require agencies to publish in the Federal Register a list of information on which a rule is based, including data, scientific and economic studies, cost-benefit analyses, and where the public can access this information online.

While this amendment purports to make scientific information available that is used in developing a rule, the amendment does not define or limit what would actually constitute the term ''data.''

As a result, the term could include sensitive health data, classified data, confidential business information, and all other forms of information subject to a rulemaking by any Federal agency.

Especially in light of the recent disclosure that the personal and sensitive information of millions of Federal employees maintained by the Office of Personnel Management was hacked, Congress should be working to prevent Federal data breaches by reducing the accumulation and potential loss of sensitive data rather than requiring that the publication of such vast amounts of sensitive data be the rule of law.

We just simply cannot afford that in this day and time. In sum, this amendment would exacerbate the risk of identity theft and data breaches.

For those reasons, I must oppose this amendment. I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

Ms. EDWARDS. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left?

The CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I support his amendment.

Mr. Chair, the REINS Act restores to Congress the accountability for regulatory decisions that impose major burdens on our economy. By doing that, it ultimately strengthens the ability of the people to hold Washington accountable.

There could hardly be a better way to ensure that Congress will exercise its authority under the bill soundly and that the people can hold Congress and Washington accountable than through the gentleman's amendment.

This amendment guarantees that, when agencies publish new regulations, they will let Congress and the people know immediately how to access online the key scientific, economic, and cost-benefit information on which the agencies base the regulations.

With this real-time access to information in hand, Congress will be better positioned to scrutinize the agencies' decisions, and the public will be better positioned to hold Congress accountable if Congress approves regulations that it shouldn't.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, Americans deserve to know how they are being regulated and the science that is being used to affect our daily lives.

Right now we are left in the dark, Mr. Chairman. We need sunlight. Sunlight is the best disinfectant here. We are unable right now to challenge what we can't see, and that is a hard fight for the American people to put up against.

I am urging favorability for this amendment. I ask my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG).

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

Ms. EDWARDS. 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 Iowa will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 114–230.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. 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, beginning on line 12, strike ''sections 804(2)(A), 804(2)(B), and 804(2)(C)'' and insert ''clauses (i) through (iii) of section 804(2)(A) or within section 804(2)(B)''.

Page 18, beginning on line 11, strike ''the Administrator'', and insert ''—''

''(A) the Administrator''.

Page 18, line 15, by redesignating subparagraph (A) as clause (i).

Page 18, line 17, by redesignating subparagraph (B) as clause (ii).

Page 18, line 21, by redesignating subparagraph (C) as clause (iii).

Page 18, line 25, strike the period at the end and insert ''; or''.

Page 18, insert after line 25 the following:

''(B) is made under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Pub. Law 111-148).''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, as I have traveled across the Eighth District of Missouri, one of the largest concerns I hear from my constituents is the uncertainty surrounding the Affordable Care Act.

Individuals are concerned about how the relationship with their doctor will change and how their healthcare costs are rising. Businesses are left with uncertainty as well.

They are afraid to hire folks because of the healthcare costs, which leaves them understaffed. Hospitals are consolidating, and insurers are merging as a result of the law.

The simple truth is that my constituents have fewer options. The Affordable Care Act is hurting health care and hurting jobs in Missouri and across the country.

That is why I am offering an amendment to protect families and job creators from the mounting uncertainty of the Affordable Care Act.

My amendment revises the definition of a major regulation to specifically include any regulation made under the Affordable Care Act. With over 3,000 pages of Federal regulations already issued and many more to follow, Congress must protect folks from this troublesome law and keep it from causing further damage to our healthcare system.

Mr. Chairman, there is a broad bipartisan concern to the Affordable Care Act. This administration has demonstrated its own uncertainty through the delays to several key provisions of the bill.

Congress must stand up for the folks back home and give the American people a voice. My amendment does just that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment because it would make the REINS Act thoroughly problematic insofar as the Affordable Care Act is concerned.

One of my principal concerns about the REINS Act is it would jeopardize the health and safety of Americans by substantially delaying and possibly derailing critical regulations from ever going into effect.

As currently drafted, the REINS Act only applies to major regulations, that is, regulations having an annual effect of $100 million or more on the economy; regulations causing a major increase in prices or costs for consumers,

individual industries, governmental agencies, or geographic regions; and regulations having a significant adverse impact on competition, employment, investment, and productivity.

This amendment, however, would subject all regulations, not just major regulations issued under the Affordable Care Act, to the REINS Act's burdensome requirements.

It is obvious that this amendment has a different purpose. It is yet another attempt by the majority to undermine the implementation of the comprehensive healthcare reform legislation that was enacted in 2010, the Affordable Care Act, which, I might remind my colleagues, has been upheld not once, but twice, by the United States Supreme Court.

We cannot allow the majority to do through this antiregulatory bill what it has repeatedly failed to do during the last 4 years, namely, to defeat healthcare reform. The REINS Act is a hopelessly flawed bill, and this amendment would only make it worse.

Accordingly, I must strenuously object to the amendment and oppose the amendment. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against it.

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

□ 1530

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I support his amendment.

The REINS Act restores to Congress the accountability for regulatory decisions that impose major burdens on our economy. This amendment strengthens congressional accountability for regulations under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, otherwise known as ObamaCare.

The PPACA was imposed over the will of the American people. Implementation of ObamaCare has demonstrated that the act imposes a detrimental and unworkable reform of the Nation's healthcare system; and one after the other, promises made to the American people by the act's supporters when the law was passed have been broken.

Moreover, the Obama administration's own actions to waive or suspend ObamaCare requirements have made clear that regulatory actions to implement the act form a ''seamless web.'' Too often, actions to avoid one adverse effect of the act's implementation send ripple effects of unfairness or other harmful consequences throughout the ObamaCare web, requiring adjustments of other aspects of implementation. This, too, justifies the amendment's requirement that Congress approve any new regulations promulgated under the act.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this amendment protects the folks back home. It stops the Obama administration and unelected bureaucrats from issuing major new healthcare regulations, and it improves the role of congressional oversight.

I urge the adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH).

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. 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 Missouri will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. RODNEY DAVIS OF ILLINOIS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 114–230.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), 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, line 24, insert before the semicolon the following: '', including an analysis of any jobs added or lost, differentiating between public and private sector jobs''.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Excessive government regulations are a significant barrier to private sector job creation. This Congress has made job creation a priority and, therefore, we believe it is important to have a role in reviewing these regulations to ensure that their proposed benefits outweigh any potential economic harm.

The Sessions-Davis-Wenstrup-Barr amendment would require an agency's report to Congress to include an assessment of estimated jobs gained or lost as a result of the implementation of a rule. These agencies would also be required to specify whether those jobs will come from the public or private sector. This assessment will be part of the cost-benefit analysis required to be submitted to the Comptroller General and made available to each House of Congress prior to consideration of a rule.

Over the past 6 years, our Nation's cumulative regulatory burden has increased exponentially; and, unfortunately, this out-of-control administration has shown no signs of slowing down. The addition of 27 major new rules last year brought the administration's 6-year total to an astounding 184 new regulations. This has cost the country thousands of jobs and an estimated $80 billion annually.

When regulations are considered for approval under the REINS Act, it is imperative that Congress have a clear picture of their effect on jobs. This amendment will help us guard against job-killing regulations and will give Congress important oversight over the executive branch's regulatory agenda.

At this time, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. YODER). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would mandate that the cost-benefit analysis for a proposed rule required by the REINS Act that is submitted to Congress include an analysis of any jobs added or lost as a result of the proposed rule, differentiating between public and private sector jobs.

I should be clear that there is absolutely no credible evidence proving that regulations depress job creation. In fact, one of the majority's own witnesses at a hearing held in a prior Congress before the House Judiciary Committee clearly debunked the myth that regulations stymie job growth and job creation. Christopher DeMuth of the American Enterprise Institute, a conservative think tank, stated in his prepared testimony that the ''focus on jobs . . . can lead to confusion in regulatory debates'' and that ''the employment effects of regulation, while important, are indeterminate.''

Even Bruce Bartlett, a senior policy analyst in the Reagan and George Herbert Walker Bush administrations, has refuted the claim that regulations undermine the economy or job growth. He explains that ''no hard evidence is offered for this claim; it is simply asserted as self-evident and repeated endlessly throughout the conservative echo chamber.''

While I appreciate the sensitivity that the author of this amendment has for employment and job development, I would encourage him to support my amendment, which would except from the REINS Act's onerous requirements all regulations that the Office of Management and Budget determines would result in net job development.

My amendment would ensure that job creating rules are not delayed or derailed as a result of the REINS Act's nearly impossible procedural hurdles.

Unfortunately, this amendment could add even more analytical burdens on agencies by forcing them to make a speculative assessment of whether a regulation will facilitate job creation or have a depressive effect.

Instead of trying to turn Congress into a superadministrative agency, which is what the REINS Act would do, we should be considering legislation that would actually create jobs, stimulate our Nation's economy, and help

millions of struggling Americans regain their financial footing with meaningful ways to encourage full employment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, at this point, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), my friend, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I support his amendment.

The bill restores to Congress the accountability for regulatory decisions that impose major burdens on our economy. As Congress makes those decisions, one of the most important factors to consider is whether new regulations produce jobs or destroy them.

The bill requires that when agencies submit new regulations to Congress, they will also submit their cost-benefit analyses of the regulations. The amendment guarantees that each of those analyses will include a specific assessment of the jobs the regulations create and the jobs the regulations destroy, distinguishing between private sector and public sector jobs.

With that information, Congress will be in a better position to determine whether to approve the rules, and the American people will be in a better position to hold Congress accountable for its decisions.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this commonsense amendment. I think it is only right to require very costly and burdensome regulations being created by this administration's regulatory environment to actually show the taxpayers the cost benefit of what the executive branch's decision is going to be on the taxpayers of this country.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 114–230.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 18, line 10, insert after ''means any rule'' the following: ''(other than a special rule)''.

Page 19, line 2, insert before the period at the end the following: '', and includes any special rule''.

Page 20, after line 8, insert the following:

''(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget determines would result in net job growth.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would except from H.R. 427 all rules that the Office of Management and Budget determines would result in net job creation.

As with many other deregulatory bills we have considered this Congress, the proponents of H.R. 427 argue that it will grow the economy, create jobs, and increase America's competitiveness internationally.

But we cannot pretend that this politicized legislation is about economic growth or American prosperity.

As I have noted during the consideration of each of the antiregulatory bills that we have considered in the 114th Congress, there is simply no credible evidence in support of the majority's reiteration of ''job-killing'' regulations undermining economic growth—zero.

The tired rhetoric that my Republican colleagues have repeated again and again since the passage of the REINS Act in 2011 has not changed in light of the changing facts on the ground.

The latest report from the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that unemployment has fallen to 5.3 percent. While there is more work to do to grow the economy and help our Nation's middle class, there have been 64 straight months of private sector job growth. That is 12.8 million private sector jobs created amidst a regulatory environment that is proworker, proenvironment, propublic health and prosafety, and proinnovation.

And to those who would brush aside these strong employment figures, the Department of Labor also reported last week that claims for unemployment benefits have dropped to the lowest levels in over 40 years, the lowest level since November of 1973.

Do these numbers mean that the major rules adopted during the Obama administration have decreased employment, grown the economy, or contributed to the drop in unemployment benefit claims?

While I would submit that regulations have a positive effect on sustainable economic growth, the reality is that there is little correlation between regulations and the economy.

Don't just take my word for it; take the word of the San Francisco and New York Federal Reserve Banks, which found zero correlation between employment and regulation.

Take the word of Bruce Bartlett, a senior policy analyst in the Reagan and George Herbert Walker Bush administrations, who strongly refuted the claim that regulations undermine the economy or job growth, explaining that Republicans ''assert that Barack Obama has unleashed a tidal wave of new regulations, which has created uncertainty among businesses and prevents them from investing and hiring. No hard evidence is offered for this claim; it is simply asserted as self-evident and repeated endlessly throughout the conservative echo chamber.''

Take the word of the Washington Post, which gave ''two Pinnochios'' to industry estimates of the costs of regulations earlier this year.

Take the word of the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service, which debunked claims that regulations have a trillion dollar cost to the economy.

Mr. Chairman, we need real solutions to help real people, not yet another thinly veiled handout to large corporations and the economic elite.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and to oppose H.R. 427.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1545

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

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment carves out of the REINS Act's congressional approval procedures regulations that the Office of Management and Budget determines will lead to net job creation.

The danger in the amendment is the strong incentive it gives the OMB to manipulate its analysis of a major regulation's jobs impacts. Far too often, the OMB will be tempted to shade the analysis to skirt the bill's congressional approval requirement.

In addition, regulations alleged to create net new jobs often do so by destroying real, existing jobs and creating new, hoped-for jobs associated with regulatory compliance.

For example, some Environmental Protection Agency Clean Air Act rules will shut down existing power plants. The EPA and the OMB may attempt to justify that with claims that more new ''green'' jobs will be created as a result.

In the end, that is just another way in which government picks the jobs winners and the jobs losers, and there is no guarantee that all of the new ''green'' jobs will ever actually exist.

The REINS Act is not intended to force any particular outcome. It does not choose between clean air and dirty air. It does not choose between new jobs and old jobs. Instead, the REINS Act chooses between two ways of making laws. It chooses the way the Framers intended, in which accountability for laws with major economic impacts rests with the Congress—the elected Representatives of the people.

It rejects the way Washington has operated for too long, where there is no accountability because decisions are made by unelected agency officials.

The amendment would undermine that fundamental accountability, so I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, to the extent that a regulation would or would not present a choice between clean air and dirty air, I think we can all, in unison, conclude that we would come down in favor of clean air.

If the choice became whether or not a regulation would promote clean water or dirty water, then I am sure that most Americans would agree with me that we would want a regulation that would ensure clean drinking water.

Unfortunately, if the REINS Act passes, the jobs that will be created by the regulations which would enforce the requirement that air and water be clean will not come to pass. We would do without the jobs, and we would have dirty water and dirty air.

I would submit that my colleagues on the other side run to the support of my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the underlying bill, which would be badly undermined by this amendment, which would remove from Congress the ability to determine which regulations make sense and which don't, which regulations comport with the underlying law that the Congress passed and which do not.

That is the key to this legislation, and it is the key to why Members should oppose this amendment. I urge them to do so.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 114–230.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 18, line 10, insert after ''any rule'' the following: ''(other than a special rule)''.

Page 19, line 2, insert before the period at the end the following: '', and includes a special rule''.

Page 20, insert after line 8 the following:

''(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule intended to ensure the safety of natural gas or hazardous material pipelines or prevent, mitigate, or reduce the impact of spills from such pipelines.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple and straightforward. It would ensure that oil and gas pipeline safety rules and pipeline spill prevention or mitigation rules are not considered ''major rules'' under this bill.

By design, the REINS Act would likely delay or stop virtually all future Federal rulemaking. We could spend hours listening to some of the countless health and safety problems that this bill would cause. I commend my colleagues for raising some of these issues in the other amendments that are being offered today and debated.

My amendment focuses on protecting oil and gas pipeline safety and spill mitigation rules from the needless and costly delays imposed by this bill. These rules are particularly important to me and to my constituents in the wake of the recent oil spill in my district.

On May 19, line 901 of the Plains All American pipeline ruptured just north of Santa Barbara, California; and it spewed over 100,000 gallons of crude oil onto Refugio State Beach and the surrounding areas. At least 20,000 gallons of the oil spilled into the Pacific Ocean and spread along nearly 100 miles of pristine California coastline, devastating local wildlife, covering our beaches in thick tar, and closing valuable fisheries.

One of the other tragedies of this spill is that it likely could have been prevented—or at least minimized—if the pipeline had been using state-of-the-art automatic shutoff and leak detection technologies.

These systems are available and are already in use in other pipelines in the area, but this pipeline does not have these technologies because its Federal regulator—the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, or PHMSA—currently does not require the use of these safety systems.

Like many communities across the country, the central coast of California, which I represent, has called for action. The good news is that Congress, on a bipartisan basis, has listened and has demanded action to improve pipeline safety rules.

In 2011, we came together and unanimously passed the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act, which required PHMSA to issue 42 new pipeline safety standards; yet, 4 years later, PHMSA has yet to complete 16 of these requirements, including the rules to strengthen standards on automatic shutoff and leak detection systems.

This unacceptable delay has not been lost on this Congress. Just 2 weeks ago, we held a bipartisan hearing in the Energy and Commerce Committee on the long overdue implementation of these pipeline safety standards.

Both Republicans and Democrats chided PHMSA for dragging its feet because we all agree that these rules are long overdue and must be completed as soon as possible. It is baffling now that, just 2 weeks after this bipartisan hearing, we find ourselves considering a bill that would delay these pipeline rules even further.

Let's be clear. That is exactly what the REINS Act would do. My amendment would protect these important safety standards from the added layers of bureaucracy that the REINS Act would impose.

I hope that my colleagues will join me again today, as they did 2 weeks ago, in working to ensure that PHMSA is not further delayed in fulfilling its obligations. They can do this by voting for this amendment, which would simply ensure oil and gas pipeline safety rules are not considered ''major rules'' under the REINS Act. It would not exempt these rules from the main reporting requirements, but it would minimize the additional delays created by the bill.

If this bill were to become law as written, PHMSA's pipeline safety rules would not take effect until both the House and the Senate affirmatively voted to approve them, but both the House and the Senate already voted unanimously in 2011 to require PHMSA to write these rules. Going around and around in circles makes no sense.

Mr. Chairman, supporters of this bill claim that the REINS Act is all about more efficient and effective government. How is it more efficient or effective to require Congress to reconsider and reapprove rules that it has already voted unanimously to establish?

The simple truth is that the REINS Act is not about efficient or effective government. It is a partisan gimmick that will do nothing but gum up the works and needlessly delay important health and safety rules that our constituents depend on.

My amendment won't make this a good bill—and I intend to oppose its final passage—but my amendment would at least help to ensure that the REINS Act does not delay oil and gas pipeline safety standards any more than they already have been. This is something which, I hope, we can all agree on; so I urge my colleagues to stop the delays and support my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment seeks to carve out from the REINS Act's reforms regulations that concern natural gas or hazardous materials pipeline safety or the prevention of oil spills and their adverse impacts.

We all support pipeline safety and the prevention of harm from pipeline spills, but there is no assurance that the amendment would guarantee the achievement of those goals.

On the contrary, the amendment would shield from congressional accountability procedures regulations that actually threaten to decrease safety. They also would shield from the bill's congressional approval requirements new, ideologically driven regulations intended to impede Americans' access to new sources of inexpensive, clean, and plentiful natural gas.

This amendment clearly says that the Congress can and has voted to have pipeline accountability and safety measures regulated but that the Congress doesn't care what those regulations are.

The Congress does care what the regulations are, and that is why they should come back here so that the Congress can confirm that the regulations written comport with the legislation already passed. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, as I stated earlier, this amendment is straightforward and common sense.

There is broad, bipartisan agreement that stronger oil and gas pipeline safety standards are long overdue. I hope there is similar agreement that further delaying these safety rules puts communities like mine in California and hundreds of communities across the country at risk.

My amendment would simply ensure that these safety rules are not subject to the needless, burdensome delays created by the REINS Act. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The REINS Act is intended to make sure that Federal Government regulations get it right—solve the problem intended to be solved by the Congress in the manner intended by the Congress. Supporting this amendment would defeat that purpose; so I oppose the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do so.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 114–230.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 18, line 10, insert after ''means any rule'' the following: ''(other than a special rule)''.

Page 19, line 2, insert before the period at the end the following: '', and includes any special rule''.

Page 20, after line 8, insert the following:

''(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule relating to protection of the public health or safety.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment to H.R. 427 would exempt rules concerning public health or safety from the onerous requirements of this legislation.

It is simply an acknowledgment that, when a rule is necessary to protect public health and when it is beneficial and in the public interest, the rule be put into effect without unnecessary delay.

If this legislation is enacted without this amendment, it will create a regulatory environment that will make it nearly impossible for agencies to safeguard the public well-being.

For instance, the Department of Transportation implemented an economically significant rule for the implementation of positive train control systems on January 15, 2010. This safety feature is designed to correct operator errors and to slow or to stop a train in order to prevent train-to-train collisions and overspeed derailments.

Investigators from the National Transportation Safety Board have said that this technology is necessary to prevent accidents like the derailment of an Amtrak commuter train in Philadelphia on May 12 of 2015, which killed 7 people and injured 200 more; yet, under the REINS Act, this vital technology would require a joint congressional resolution, with an unrealistic timeline for implementation, before being mandated, needlessly putting the lives of millions of Americans at risk who ride Amtrak every year.

Proponents of this legislation may argue that H.R. 427 contains an emergency exemption which allows a major rule to temporarily take effect following an executive order stating that there is an imminent threat to public health and safety.

However, as the positive train control system rule illustrates, not every threat to the public welfare will manifest itself overnight, and not every agency's rule is implemented as a reaction to a product recall or to a sudden tragedy.

Even when a threat is not imminent, the fundamental responsibility to protect the public health and well-being remains. This legislation would substantially hinder the ability of agencies to fulfill this obligation, placing Americans at greater risk for the benefit of corporate interests.

In its present form, the Coalition for Sensible Safeguards—an alliance of more than 150 consumer, labor, faith, and other public interest groups—has characterized the REINS Act as ''the most radical threat in generations to our government's ability to protect the public from harm.''

□ 1600

Echoing this analysis, 83 of our Nation's top administrative and environmental law professors describe this legislation as ''unnecessary to establish agency accountability and unwise as a matter of public policy because it undercuts the implementation of laws intended to protect people and the environment.''

While my amendment will not cure all the flaws in this legislation, it will address one of the most glaring problems and preserve the ability of agencies to protect public health and safety.

I ask my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment exempts from the bill any rule pertaining to health or public safety.

Health and public safety regulation, done properly, serves important goals, and the bill does nothing to frustrate the effective achievement of those goals.

But Federal health and public safety regulation constitutes an immense part of total Federal regulation and has been the source of many of the most abusive, unnecessarily expensive, and job- and wage-destroying regulations.

To remove these areas of regulation from the bill would be to severely weaken the bill's important reforms to lower the crushing cumulative cost of Federal regulation and increase the accountability of our regulatory system to the people.

These include regulations such as the Environmental Protection Agency's multi-billion-dollar Utility MACT regulations. The Supreme Court recently invalidated those regulations, but not before the targets of the regulations had to spend multiple years' worth of compliance costs.

Had the REINS Act been in place, Congress could have refused to approve those regulations to begin with, saving billions of dollars in unnecessary cost.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, I just would say, in conclusion, that the

amendment will, in fact, strengthen the ability of Federal agencies to protect the public health and well-being, and there are instances, as the example I just gave, where the failure to act will endanger the lives of Americans.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment to improve a badly flawed piece of legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, I oppose the amendment, and I urge support for the legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part B of House Report 114–230.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer an amendment as the designee of my colleague, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, who regrettably is unable to be with us today.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 18, line 10, insert after ''any rule'' the following: ''(other than a special rule)''.

Page 19, line 2, insert before the period at the end the following: '', and includes a special rule''.

Page 20, insert after line 8 the following:

''(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule that pertains to the safety of any products specifically designed to be used or consumed by a child under the age of 2 years (including cribs, car seats, and infant formula).''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, this amendment improves H.R. 427 by exempting those regulations that are critical to protecting the health and safety of infants.

More specifically, the Jackson Lee amendment provides a special rule pertaining to the safety of any product specifically designed to be used or consumed by a child under the age of 2 years, which includes cribs, car seats, and infant formula.

As a member of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law, I am very concerned about the REINS Act and the complications and delays to the rulemaking process it would create regarding regulations that would protect the health and safety of children.

This legislation would amend the Congressional Review Act to prohibit a major rule from going into effect unless Congress enacts a joint resolution of approval within 70 legislative days. Otherwise, the rule does not go into effect.

Effectively, no regulations will ever be enacted because it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to move any proposed legislation through Congress within 70 days.

Moreover, subjecting agencies to additional reporting requirements and congressional review, as mandated by H.R. 427, would not only be wasteful, it could be damaging or even deadly, especially when it comes to regulations designed to protect children and infants.

For example, much like the version of the bill that we debated in previous sessions, the REINS Act would delay product safety rules affecting family products like toys, cribs, and children's clothing.

In particular, restrictions put forth in H.R. 427 could result in further delay to agencies attempting to take action to protect children as it relates to harmful and deadly products, such as safety caps on medicine, flammable clothing, and tipping furniture, just to name a few.

Notably, the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission reports that a child dies every 2 weeks from furniture or TVs tipping over, and injuries from falling furniture occur every 24 minutes.

We cannot afford to put the lives and safety of infants, toddlers, and children at risk while Congress entangles any real possibility for immediate and preventive action.

The REINS Act is strongly opposed by many individuals and organizations all across the country, including opposition by more than 450,000 members and supporters of the Center for Science and Democracy at the Union of Concerned Scientist, as well as 83 academics in the field of administrative and environmental law, and an alliance of more than 150 consumer, labor, research, faith, and other public interest groups representing the Coalition for Sensible Safeguards.

We should not hinder the democratic process and stymie regulatory agencies' ability to protect the safety and security of the American people, especially infants.

At a minimum, regulations promulgated to protect the safety of infants and children should not be subjected to the strictures of H.R. 47.

The Jackson Lee amendment protects children and infants. I urge all Members to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment seeks to carve out from the REINS Act's reforms regulations intended to protect young children and infants from harm.

Child safety is a goal all Members share, but to shield bureaucrats who write child safety regulations from accountability to Congress is no way to guarantee child safety.

The only thing that that would guarantee is less careful decisionmaking and more insulation of faceless bureaucrats from the public.

Congress needs a better mechanism to make sure that Washington bureaucrats make the right decision to protect child safety when we delegate legislative authority to regulatory agencies.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bad amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, no one is attempting to shield bureaucrats from anything. This amendment is designed to shield infants, to protect children.

I urge my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, the elected Representatives of the people are the best ones to be held accountable for the laws and regulations passed and adopted in this country, including those that protect children.

This would turn back to a situation where unelected bureaucrats can take whatever time they want to, write whatever regulation they want to, and then that would take effect without the Congress having to have the ability to say, yes, that truly will protect children or, no, that will not protect children.

We should have that responsibility. That is something that the American people expect from their elected representatives. For that reason, I oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Chair understands that amendment No. 8 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part B of House Report 114–230.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 18, line 10, insert after ''any rule'' the following: ''(other than a special rule)''.

Page 19, line 2, insert before the period at the end the following: '', and includes a special rule''.

Page 20, insert after line 8 the following:

''(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule pertaining to nuclear reactor safety standards.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

This amendment would exempt any rule pertaining to nuclear reactor safety standards from the new onerous approval process created by the bill.

In other words, my amendment would allow the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the NRC, to continue to issue rules under the current system, thereby making it easier to protect Americans from nuclear disaster.

Today's bill, in the name of so-called reform, adds new procedural hoops that agencies and departments must go through before regulation can be issued, including requiring a joint resolution of approval for every major rule.

The result is simply to impede, obstruct, and delay the attempt of government to accomplish one of its most basic functions: to protect the health and welfare of its citizens.

Not surprisingly, groups who care about protecting public health, safety, and environment, such as the Natural Resources Defense Council, Public Citizen, and the Union of Concerned Scientists, oppose this bill.

According to the Coalition for Sensible Safeguards, which represents a coalition of many such groups, this bill ''is nothing more than a back-door way to gut enforcement of existing legislation and future safeguards that big-money interests do not want. It would force Congress to refight its previous debates, wasting time and money, and paralyzing vital agency work.''

Americans should rightfully be scared that this bill will put their health and safety at risk. One example that highlights this fact is the subject of this amendment: nuclear power.

The risks and dangers of nuclear power were made all the more real by the nuclear disaster in Japan at Fukushima 4 years ago. We all watched in horror when that country was devastated by the earthquake and resulting tsunami.

That disaster then caused its own disaster: the meltdown of three reactors at the Fukushima nuclear power plant.

That led to the release of radioactive isotopes, the creation of a 20-kilometer exclusion zone around the power plant, and the displacement of 156,000 people. Inside the evacuation zone all farming has been abandoned.

In 2011, Virginia was struck by a relatively rare, but strong, earthquake, felt up and down the eastern seaboard. It caused a nuclear power plant near the epicenter to have to go offline.

For me, this concern hits close to home. A nuclear power plant, Indian Point, about which many people have had concerns for years, lies just less than 40 miles away from my New York City district.

There are 20 million people living within a 50-mile radius around the plant, the same radius used by the NRC as the basis for the evacuation zone recommended after the Fukushima disaster.

Indian Point also sits near two earthquake fault lines and, according to the NRC, is the most likely nuclear power plant in the country to experience core damage because of an earthquake.

To keep my constituents and, indeed, all Americans safe, I am offering this amendment today.

Because of the catastrophes that can result from disasters, be they natural or manmade, at nuclear power plants, prevention of meltdowns is the key.

Since Fukushima, the NRC has issued new rules designed to upgrade power plants to withstand severe events like earthquakes and to have enough backup power so as to avoid a meltdown for a significant length of time.

The NRC must have the ability and flexibility to issue new regulations to safeguard the health and well-being of all Americans.

However, H.R. 427 is intentionally designed so new and vital regulations will likely never be put in place. We cannot permit the NRC to never be able to create new regulations.

Therefore, I urge you to support the Nadler amendment to exempt the Nuclear Regulatory Commission from the onerous new requirements for rulemaking imposed by this bill. In that way, the NRC would have the ability to safeguard public health and safety, as it should.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment carves out of the REINS Act congressional approval procedures all regulations that pertain to nuclear reactor safety standards.

REINS Act supporters believe in nuclear safety. We want to guarantee that regulatory decisions that pertain to nuclear reactor safety are the best decisions that can be made, but that is precisely why I oppose the amendment.

By its terms, the amendment shields from the REINS Act congressional approval procedures not only major regulations that would raise nuclear reactor safety standards, but, also, regulations that would lower them.

All major regulations pertaining to nuclear reactor safety standards, whether they raise or lower standards, should fall within the REINS Act.

That way, agencies with authority over nuclear reactor safety will know that Congress must approve their major regulations before they go into effect.

That provides a powerful incentive for the agencies to write the best possible regulations, ones that Congress can easily approve.

It is a solution that everyone should support because it makes Congress more accountable and ensures agencies will write better rules. All Americans will be safer for it.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, this bill prohibits any major regulation from going into effect unless both the House and Senate pass and the President signs a joint resolution of approval within 70 legislative days.

If the President and the Congress fail to approve the regulation within the timeframe, it cannot take effect and a subsequent joint resolution for the same regulation cannot be considered for the remainder of the Congress.

Because of the unrealistic approval deadlines and the requirement that both Houses approve each and every major rule, as well as the President, this bill would effectively prevent the promulgation of many critical protections that ensure Americans' health, safety, and economic well-being.

The proponents say they support regulation when it makes sense. But this is a vast government. It is a vast economy. It is a vast socioeconomic system.

To demand that Congress pass in both Houses within 70 days and the President sign a resolution of approval for every one of the thousands of regulations means most will never be considered.

□ 1615

That is why this amendment, to say that at least where people's lives are at stake in large numbers, where safety regulations to prevent nuclear disasters or to mitigate their effects are in question, that it not be subject to the same restrictive requirements that this rule would put into place, which would say that most regulations would never get adequately considered.

In closing, I want to say that this amendment is absolutely necessary if we want to make sure that the next time there is an earthquake, God forbid, or some other disaster, or even just a power failure, that a nuclear reactor doesn't have a terrible situation, that we don't get a nuclear meltdown, and that if we do, regulations are in place to safeguard people's lives and health.

I think if we are going to pass this terrible bill, the least we can do is exempt nuclear safety from it. I urge all Members to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, in closing, the facts speak for themselves. During the course of the Obama administration, which I think most people would agree has been very aggressive at imposing new regulations upon our economy and on our society—it has averaged 81 a year, not thousands, but 81 per year.

I think many of us would agree that some of those regulations impose burdens that were not intended by the underlying legislation upon which those regulations are based, and therefore this is a very manageable way to make sure that regulations don't kill jobs and crush our economy. For that reason, I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. POCAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 10 printed in part B of House Report 114–230.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 18, line 10, insert after ''any rule'' the following: ''(other than a special rule)''.

Page 19, line 2, insert before the period at the end the following: '', and includes a special rule''.

Page 20, insert after line 8 the following:

''(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule that ensures the availability of affordable medication and effective healthcare management for veterans.''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 380, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of myself and the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), my colleague, I rise today to offer an amendment to prevent a spike in the copays that veterans pay for prescription drugs as a result of this misguided bill.

Every year, the Department of Veterans Affairs publishes a rule to ensure that veterans enrolled in the VA health program don't see as much as a 37.5 percent increase in their prescription drug copays. In this bill, the REINS Act, if it were signed into law, it would be very difficult, and perhaps impossible, for the VA to publish this rulemaking before January 1, 2016.

Let's face it, Congress doesn't exactly have a great track record on acting fast. I used to say, when I was in the Wisconsin Legislature, sometimes things move like a tortoise. In Congress, I explain they move more like an upside-down tortoise.

Under this bill, copayments for approximately 2.4 million veterans would increase significantly, causing economic hardship and health risks for many veterans struggling to make ends meet.

If this bill were to become law, veterans with a service-connected disability rating greater than 50 percent would see their prescription drug copays increase more than 11 times what they were paying last year. Veterans who are former prisoners of war or awarded a Purple Heart would see their copays go up nearly 38 percent. Veterans, who have been hit hardest economically after serving their country, would see their rates spike 22 percent.

We must ensure that those who bravely have served our country don't see Congress take money out of their pockets just to score political points. At this time, when we still have many veterans struggling to find a job, it is irresponsible for Congress to make it more difficult for the men and women who have served our country to pay more for the health care they deserve.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment carves out of the REINS Act's congressional approval procedures all regulations from the Department of Veterans Affairs that concern the availability of affordable medication and effective healthcare management for veterans.

Affordable medication and effective healthcare management for veterans are goals every Member of Congress can support, but every Member of Congress also knows the Department of Veterans Affairs' appalling recent incompetence and negligence in administering its programs. Rather than diminish the Department's accountability to Congress for regulatory decisions concerning veterans' health care, we should increase the Department's accountability. That is precisely what the REINS Act does.

Under the legislation, the Department will know that Congress must approve its major regulations concerning affordable medication and effective healthcare management before they go into effect. That provides a powerful incentive for the Department to write the best possible regulations, ones that Congress can easily approve.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with much of what the gentleman has said. The only problem is, as much as we have had some problems in the VA—and we need to take actions, and we are, including in Wisconsin where we have had an action that, in a bipartisan way, we have been working together on—the only thing worse could be the performance of Congress.

There is a reason why the public currently rates cockroaches, head lice, traffic jams, zombies, and even the band Nickelback higher than Congress. Clearly, we do not have a performance record that shows if we pass this bill we can absolutely guarantee that a veteran won't be paying more, a spike as much as 38 percent, or 11 times what they are currently paying.

I am not going to bet on Congress, and I am guessing the American public won't bet on Congress, but we have the ability with this amendment to at least say we are going to make sure those who have served our country won't pay more for their prescription drugs if we don't get our work done, because they have seen that all too often.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment says is, because the Department of Veterans Affairs is doing a remarkably bad job of providing timely health care to citizens, we should carve out that Department's responsibility for providing medications and timely health care and exempt it from the accountability that Congress, the elected representatives of the people, who are very responsive to the needs of veterans, would impose.

With the REINS Act, Congress could instruct, with the passage of legislation to help veterans, and say, ''You must report back regulations within a certain time period,'' which the Congress could then act upon in a timely fashion, assuring themselves that not only have the regulations been done quickly, but also that they are going to address the problems in an effective way that we have all identified with what is going on in the Department of Veterans Affairs.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment which will simply preserve the bad system we have now for helping our veterans through a Department of Veterans Affairs that is unaccountable. We should, instead, make them more accountable by passing the REINS Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE) having assumed the chair, Mr. YODER, 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. 427) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, had come to no resolution thereon.

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 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1655

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.

REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 380 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 427.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND) kindly take the chair.

□ 1656

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 427) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, with Mr. WESTMORELAND (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 10 printed in part B of House Report 114–230 offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting Chair. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 114–230 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

Amendment No. 5 by Mrs. CAPPS of California.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment No. 10 by Mr. POCAN of Wisconsin.

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. YOUNG OF IOWA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 250, noes 159, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 473]

AYES—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)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
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 (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
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 (MS)
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
Peters
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
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—159

Adams
Aguilar
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
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)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz

Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—24

Bass
Butterfield
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Conyers
Fudge
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Meeks
Moore
Rangel
Richmond
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Thompson (MS)

□ 1727

Messrs. CICILLINE, CARSON of Indiana, COURTNEY, COSTA, and Ms. KAPTUR changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. BRADY of Texas and MESSER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

14TH ANNUAL FIRST TEE CONGRESSIONAL CHALLENGE

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to update my colleagues on a competition that takes place each year between House Democrats and House Republicans. It is called The First Tee Congressional Challenge.

It is a golf match that is patterned after the Ryder Cup golf matches that you watch on television from time to time. It is sponsored by Roll Call. The winner of the event each year is entitled to keep for a year what has been known as the coveted Roll Call Cup. I want to announce to the Members that, this year, the Republican team won the competition, so we will keep the cup. This is the fourth year in a row that the Republicans have won the coveted cup.

Let me just say ''thank you'' to all of my teammates. I would like to congratulate my teammates for their fine work and fine play. I would like to congratulate the Democrats for their sportsmanship. We had a couple of rookies who played well. It is a spirited competition, Mr. Chairman. It is a chance for individuals to meet some folks across the aisle and to build friendships.

It is made more meaningful by the fact that the money that is raised each year goes to an organization called The First Tee. It is a group that is active in all 50 of our States, and it has touched the lives of over 10,000 young people. It uses the game of golf to teach values such as hard work, honesty, and integrity. It is a wonderful organization. Over the years, we have raised over $2 million for The First Tee, so that makes it even more meaningful.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), my counterpart and the captain of the Democratic team.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my friend, and I congratulate him and the Republican team on a well-earned victory.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said many times in the last few years, elections have consequences. After we lost the majority, we also lost some of our advantage in terms of talented golfers. We need to do a better job of either electing good golfers or of recruiting some of the better ones we have.

The Republicans have a terrific team that is made up of truly honorable and wonderful people; and I think we all, on both sides of the aisle, get a great deal of enjoyment from this competition. We have made friends; and as Mr. CRENSHAW said, we have succeeded in raising an awful lot of money for a very, very good cause.

I thank the Republicans for a great competition, and I thank my teammates for their efforts, but they need to be practicing for the next year a little more. I also want to thank the sponsors who actually contributed to this event and made the fundraising possible.

We won 6 years in a row, and the Republicans have now won 4 years in a row. It is interesting how the streaks come along with the majority, so we will give it another try next year.

Once again, congratulations to the Republicans. Even more importantly, congratulations to The First Tee for the work that they do.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes 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 242, noes 167, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 474]

AYES—242

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
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
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
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 (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lipinski
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
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

NOES—167

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
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)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lewis
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng

Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—24

Bass
Butterfield
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Conyers
Cramer
Fudge
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Meeks
Moore
Rangel
Richmond
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Thompson (MS)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1736

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 246, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 475]

AYES—163

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

NOES—246

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)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
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 (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
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 (MS)
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)
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
Ruppersberger
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—24

Bass
Butterfield
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Conyers
Fudge
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Meeks
Moore
Mullin
Rangel
Richmond
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Thompson (MS)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1740

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote No. 475 on H.R. 427, I mistakenly recorded my vote as "no" when I should have voted "yes."

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) 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 166, noes 244, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 476]

AYES—166

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Courtney
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)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi

Graham
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—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)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
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 (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
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 (MS)
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
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—23

Bass
Butterfield
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Conyers
Fudge
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Meeks
Moore
Rangel
Richmond
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Thompson (MS)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1744

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes 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 166, noes 242, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 477]

AYES—166

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Courtney
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)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—242

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
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 (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
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 (MS)
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
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—25

Bass
Blackburn
Butterfield
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Cole
Conyers
Fudge
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Meeks
Moore
Rangel
Richmond
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Thompson (MS)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1748

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) 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 167, noes 243, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 478]

AYES—167

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
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)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
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
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)
Chabot
Chaffetz
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 (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
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 (MS)
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
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—23

Bass
Butterfield
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Conyers
Fudge
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Meeks
Moore
Rangel
Richmond
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Thompson (MS)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1752

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 241, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 479]

AYES—167

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Courtney
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)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch

Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—241

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
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 (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
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
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
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—25

Bass
Butterfield
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Conyers
Fudge
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Gutiérrez
Huelskamp
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Meeks
Moore
Rangel
Richmond
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Thompson (MS)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1755

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. POCAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) 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 167, noes 239, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 480]

AYES—167

Adams
Aguilar
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
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)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—239

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
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 (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
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
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
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
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
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder

Yoho	Young (IA)	Zeldin
Young (AK)	Young (IN)	Zinke

NOT VOTING—27

Ashford	Green, Al	Meeks
Bass	Jackson Lee	Moore
Bridenstine	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Butterfield	Jordan	Richmond
Carter (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Clawson (FL)	Lee	Sewell (AL)
Cleaver	Levin	Thompson (MS)
Conyers	Lieu, Ted	Westmoreland
Fudge	Lujan Grisham (NM)	
Graves (GA)		

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1759

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, 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. WOMACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, 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. 427) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law, and, pursuant to House Resolution 380, 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.

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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Nolan moves to recommit the bill H.R. 427 to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendments:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

SEC. 6. PROTECTING GUARANTEED SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE.

The exemption from treatment as major rules for certain classes of such rules (known as ''special rules'', as such term is defined under section 804(6) of title 5, United States Code) is intended to protect rules that protect Social Security and Medicare benefits for seniors.

Page 18, line 10, insert after ''means any rule'' the following: ''(other than a special rule)''.

Page 19, line 2, insert before the period at the end the following: '', and includes any special rule''.

Page 20, insert after line 8 the following:

''(6) The term 'special rule' means any rule that would—

''(A) protect Social Security's earned benefits, and prevent cuts, including those caused by an increase in the retirement age; or

''(B) protect Medicare's guaranteed benefits, and prevent cuts, including those caused by a voucher system that forces beneficiaries to purchase health care in the private sector.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, my amendment would see to it that nothing in this legislation does any harm to Social Security or Medicare. Why? It is because, first of all, they are not entitlements; they are earned benefits that people started paying for the first day, the first hour that they ever went to work.

Our seniors rely on their Social Security and Medicare. Nothing has done more to lift more people out of poverty and give them health and life expectancy than Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying legislation that we are looking at here proposes to provide relief, but in fact, it proposes to emasculate and do away with the regulatory process and, in the process, do great harm and great damage to the things, the many things that have made this country the great Nation that it is.

I have got to tell you, as I look around this room here and the age of this Congress, make no mistake about it; many of you were there when I was there, when our rivers were running sewers, when our lakes were catching on fire, when our coal miners and boat workers were dying young in life from fiberglass lungs and coal dust in their lungs.

I spent time in the sawmills; I owned one. You couldn't find anyone that could count to 5 on their hands because they were either missing fingers, hands, arms, or legs or had lost their lives for want of a little ventilation, for want of a safety switch or a guard of some sort.

The simple truth is that these laws, these regulations turned all that around. That is right; they turned all that around. Guess what. They doubled our life expectancy—maybe one of the greatest accomplishments of all time. We went from our grandparents, where life expectancy was 47, to darn near 80—what an incredible accomplishment.

Now, the question is: Do we want to protect that progress? I hope so. Do we? Do we want to pay it forward? Or do we want to turn it back? I should hope not.

Do we really want to paralyze these laws and do away with the rules and regulations that gave us clean water that we can drink and clean air that we can breathe without getting sick? I should hope not. Is that really what we want to do?

Do we want to do away with the healthy, safe working conditions that extended life for people who worked hard to build a life for themselves and their families? Is that what we really want to do? Do we want to do away with food safety that protected us from the drugs and the chemicals that ended our lives prematurely? Is that what we want to do? I should hope not. No. No.

Do we want to do away with the Wall Street regulations, the billionaires who play so fast and loose with other people's money? Well, we sure as heck don't want to turn Social Security and Medicare over to them, do we? Imagine what they would do with Social Security and Medicare. It is devastating, and it is frightening.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment protects both. That is the least we can do. My amendment protects Social Security; it protects Medicare, and that is the least that we can do for a generation that gave us so much.

Last, but not least, had it not been for these regulations, had it not been for Social Security and Medicare, half of us wouldn't be here—that is right—because we increased the life expectancy from 47 to 80, so show some gratitude. Show some being grateful. Let's protect Social Security and Medicare.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, on the floor of this House in 2011, the President of the United States promised the American people to reduce barriers to growth and investment: ''When we find rules that put an unnecessary burden on businesses, we will fix them.''

Mr. Speaker, those were just the President's words. His actions have been starkly different. Throughout the entire 6-plus years of the President's administration, a flood of new major regulations has been burying America's job creators and households at record levels.

To make matters worse, when Congress declines to legislate the President's misguided policies for him, he takes his pen and his cell phone, and he increasingly resorts to unilateral regulatory actions to legislate by executive fiat.

The REINS Act, in one fell swoop, puts a stop to that and ensures that Congress, the body which the Constitution assigns the power to legislate, will possess an additional check on the most significant legislative decisions

imposed on the American people through regulation.

The motion to recommit seeks only to distract from the urgent needs to reform our regulatory system and reduce unnecessary burdens on the public. I think Americans are tired of the other party telling them that their bureaucrats know better than their own elected officials.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, reject this motion to recommit, and show America that Congress can act for the good of American job creators and Americans who desperately want and need jobs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 241, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 481]

AYES—167

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
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)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—241

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
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 (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
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
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
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

NOT VOTING—25

Bass
Butterfield
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Conyers
Engel
Fudge
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Hoyer
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Meeks
Moore
Rangel
Richmond
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Thompson (MS)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1817

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 165, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 482]

AYES—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)
Chabot
Chaffetz
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)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
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 (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
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
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

NOES—165

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
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)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—25

Bass
Butterfield
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Conyers
Fudge
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kelly (IL)
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lucas
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lynch
Meeks
Moore
Rangel
Richmond
Sanchez, Loretta
Sewell (AL)
Thompson (MS)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1824

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, during the vote on H.R. 427 I was inescapably detained and away handling important matters related to my District and the State of Alabama. If I had been present, I would have voted "no" on final passage.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I missed the following votes: Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this motion. H. Res. 380, Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 427. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this resolution. H.R. 675, the Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2015. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this bill. Young (IA) Amendment to H.R. 427. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this amendment. Smith (MO) Amendment to H.R. 427. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this amendment. Johnson (GA) Amendment to H.R. 427. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this amendment. Capps Amendment to H.R. 427. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this amendment. Cicilline Amendment #1 to H.R. 427. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this amendment. Cicilline/Jackson Lee Amendment #2 to H.R. 427. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this amendment. Nadler Amendment to H.R. 427. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this amendment. Pocan/Moore Amendment to H.R. 427. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this amendment. Motion to Recommit H.R. 427. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on the motion. H.R 427, the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2015. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I was absent today to attend the funeral services for U.S. Navy Petty Officer Second Class Randall Smith. Had I been present, on rollcall No. 470, I would have voted "yes," on rollcall No. 471, I would have voted "yes," on rollcall No. 472, I would have voted "yes," on rollcall No. 473, I would have voted "yes," on rollcall No. 474, I would have voted "yes," on rollcall No. 475, I would have voted "no," on rollcall No. 476, I would have voted "no," on rollcall No. 477, I would have voted "no," on rollcall No. 478, I would have voted "no," on rollcall No. 479, I would have voted "no," on rollcall No. 480, I would have voted "no," on rollcall No. 481, I would have voted "no," and on rollcall No. 482 (Passage of the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act), I would have voted "yes."

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 387

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—Mr. Clay.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF OFFICIAL OBJECTORS FOR PRIVATE CALENDAR FOR 114TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On behalf of the majority and minority leaderships, the Chair announces that the official objectors for the Private Calendar for the 114th Congress are as follows:

For the majority:
Mr. GOODLATTE, Virginia
Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Wisconsin
Mr. GOWDY, South Carolina
For the minority:
Mr. SERRANO, New York
Mr. NADLER, New York
Ms. BASS, California

RECOGNIZING THE HUNTINGDON COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA, FAIR

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in 1831, a tradition was started in Huntingdon County, Pennsylvania, which would go on to become a staple of the summertime agriculture expos.

This August 9, the Huntingdon County Fair is celebrating its 125th fair, located at their 69-acre site, which has evolved over the decades to boast hundreds of agricultural exhibits. Ranging from equine shows to wine tasting, the Huntingdon County Fair provides areas of interest for almost everyone.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I am proud to rise today to congratulate the people of Huntingdon County and those countless volunteers and community members who have made this time-honored event a Pennsylvania tradition, including the parents and friends of 4–H, FAA youth members, and the Huntingdon County Agricultural Association.

Here's to wishing them 125 more successful fairs for the next generation and generations to come.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEDICARE AND MEDICAID PROGRAMS

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the 50th anniversary of the Medicare and Medicaid programs. Since 1965, these landmark programs have provided affordable health insurance coverage and access to care for our Nation's seniors and most vulnerable populations. Few programs have improved the lives of Americans as significantly as Medicaid and Medicare.

Fifty years ago, almost half of elderly Americans lacked health insurance. Today, Medicare provides lifesaving insurance to nearly 100 percent of adults over 65.

Medicaid continues to be a lifeline for millions of children, pregnant women, people with disabilities, seniors, and low-income families. Over 70 million Americans currently rely on Medicaid for affordable health insurance. Medicaid covers more than one in three children, pays for nearly half of all births, and accounts for more than 40 percent of all long-term care.

On the anniversary of this historic law, we celebrate the successes of Medicaid and Medicare. We must renew our commitment to further strengthening them so they remain available in perpetuity for generations to come.

□ 1830

RECOGNIZING JEWISH COMMUNITY SERVICES OF SOUTH FLORIDA

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jewish Community Services of South Florida and its upcoming annual Milk & Honey event, which will take place on August 30 and starts at the Greater Miami Jewish Federation.

This tremendous, faith-based, nonprofit organization has worked to improve the lives of South Florida residents since 1920. It is one of our State's largest and most reliable social service organizations.

Among the many important services that the JCS of South Florida provides are those focused on supporting our elderly. This year's Milk & Honey event will, again, bring together hundreds of volunteers to assemble food baskets and hurricane preparedness kits for vulnerable South Florida seniors.

My community liaison, Harriet Carter, and I have participated in many events of the JCS of South Florida, and I thank all the volunteers who will make this year's Milk & Honey event a smashing success.

SUPPORTING DRAFT LEGISLATION CONCERNING THE VA BUDGET AND CHOICE FUNDING

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I participated in laying a wreath at the Arlington Cemetery to honor our fallen veterans and military members.

Today, we need to do more than a ceremony. We need to honor our veterans now by passing the VA budget legislation.

I support this draft legislation because it addresses the $3 billion shortfall for fiscal year 2015 that veterans had, and it keeps hospital and medical facilities open for our veterans through the end of the fiscal year.

This legislation allows the VA to use the dollars for health care provided to veterans and family members under the program provided by the non-VA provision. This bill allows VA to access this money. In addition, $500 million may be used for pharmaceutical expenses related to the treatment of hepatitis C at the VA.

This is a cure many of the veterans need, especially those who served in Vietnam; and I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation before we go home.

As the Army says, this is one team, one fight; and we need to look out for the VA and veterans.

SUPPORT MONTANA JOBS

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

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Montana jobs and to rally against this administration's war on American coal.

In Montana, coal means good-paying jobs. Those are blue collar, union jobs. Coal means economic opportunity. Coal means affordable utilities for families and manufacturers, and coal means Montana.

In the words of Crow Chairman Old Coyote:

> For the Crow people, there are no jobs that compare to the coal job. The wages and benefits exceed anything else that is available. A war on coal is a war on the Crow people.

Montana could lead the Nation in coal production; but, unfortunately, President Obama and his EPA are waging a more aggressive war on coal than they are against ISIS.

Montana alone, and our coal, produces $1.7 billion in royalty payments; and that pays for schools, bridges, and our infrastructure.

The EPA's Clean Power Plan will kill Montana jobs. Those are real jobs, like in the Rosebud mine in Colstrip, and across our State.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support Montana and support our Nation's energy independence through coal.

RENEW VOTING RIGHTS ACT

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, nearly 50 years after the Voting Rights Act was signed into law, we still see efforts to weaken voter protections and suppress votes.

Discriminatory voting laws, such as strict photo ID requirements and reduced early voting, disproportionately impact minority voters in the name of preventing widespread voter fraud, a problem that simply does not exist.

Clearly, since the Supreme Court's decision 2 years ago to erode some of the VRA's most critical protections, including preclearance requirements that protect against disenfranchising laws, the Voting Rights Act is still needed more now than ever before; yet Republicans have refused to allow a renewed and strengthened Voting Rights Act to come to the floor.

This should concern everyone who believes the right to vote is one of the most fundamental to our democracy. It is time we renew and strengthen the Voting Rights Act.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING IS MODERN-DAY SLAVERY

(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 because it is past time we call human trafficking what it really is: modern-day slavery.

Every year, up to 300,000 children are at risk of being sex-trafficked here in our country. On average, these children are first sold into sex slavery before their 13th birthday. As a father, I can't fathom anything more disgusting.

Earlier this year, I supported legislation that we successfully passed aimed at stopping sex trafficking, but the fight is far from over. Human trafficking generates $9.5 billion worldwide each and every year, and the criminals that profit off of sex trafficking aren't going to give in that easily.

For example, right now in my district, backpage.com, a disgusting Web site that facilitates online sex trafficking, is suing Cook County Sheriff Tom Dart because he stood up to the evil and corrupt people who profit off of the exploitation of minors.

It is our collective obligation to do everything that we can to put a definitive end to this atrocity. I commend Sheriff Dart for standing up for what is right, and I pledge to work with my colleagues here in this House, on both sides of the aisle, to stop this abhorrent crime.

A SURVIVOR'S STORY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Amanda Jones was kidnapped in Dallas, Texas. She was 15 years of age, and then she was sold for sex at the hands of human traffickers.

Children right here in the United States are bought and sold for sexual

exploitation in urban, suburban, and rural areas. Their souls are stolen from them, and no community is immune.

Amanda was in slavery for 9 years. She eventually escaped with her daughter and, thankfully, found services through a new wonderful organization in Dallas, New Friends New Life. New Friends New Life is primarily funded by Dallas donors, and it provides services to victims to address their unique needs. It helps them rebuild their lives.

Amanda now helps other trafficked victims become survivors instead of victims. We need more programs like this one, where survivors help each other.

Now, through funding in the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, more services will be available to victims like Amanda. We can stop traffickers in their tracks because our children are not for sale, in our town, in our State, or in our country.

And that is just the way it is.

THANK YOU AND BEST WISHES TO MARK WELLMAN

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment this evening to offer my appreciation and sincere best wishes to Mark Wellman, my chief of staff for the last 4 years, who is leaving us at the end of this week to accept an appointment as a professor of constitutional law at the United States Military Academy at West Point.

Mark has superbly served as a congressional staffer for more than two decades—first, with our late colleague, Congressman Paul Gillmor of Ohio; and then, following an earlier tour at West Point, in my office.

During all of those years, he has served with distinction in the National Guard, including a tour in Iraq, and has risen to the rank of colonel.

He is an outstanding individual, a gentleman of the first order, the world's most loyal Chicago Cubs fan, and a great American. He will be truly missed.

Good luck, Mark, and God bless you.

RECOGNIZING SEVERAL UNSUNG HEROES IN THE FOURTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TEXAS

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

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to recognize several unsung heroes in the Fourth Congressional District of Texas.

Several counties in my district are just now beginning to recover from recent flooding at historic levels, so I appreciate the opportunity to thank all the sheriff and fire departments in communities across our district in Grayson, Fannin, Lamar, Red River, Bowie, Hopkins, Delta, and Cass Counties.

Emergency coordinators like C.J. Durbin-Higgins, Joyce and Steven Molder, and Robert Flowers in Grayson County; and Jim Roberts, Deborah Lann, and James Carlow in Bowie County, as well as so many others, are deserving of our gratitude.

While our first responders' efforts have been vital and, in some cases, heroic, many folks back home are still suffering. Mr. Speaker, I want my constituents to know that they can still reach out to my office if they need any assistance or help with any issues related to flooding.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE TOM MCCLINTOCK, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable TOM MCCLINTOCK, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 28, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a non-party subpoena, issued by the Madera County Superior Court, Madera County, California, for documents in a civil case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

TOM MCCLINTOCK.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

JULY 28, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 202(a) of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–146) I am pleased to appoint the following individual to the Commission on Care:

Mr. Michael Blecker of San Francisco, California

Thank you for your consideration of this appointment.

Best regards,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

THE IMPACTS OF COAL

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topics of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, tonight, we want to talk about these three subjects as it relates to coal. You have already heard recent remarks made a few minutes ago about the war on coal, but we want to talk about the impacts of coal, the regulations, and the Clean Power Plan. That is what we are going to be talking about tonight are these three primary subjects.

I want to put things in perspective. We want to talk about how does this coal industry—you hear us, many of us that come from coal country, we have been fighting about coal, fighting for coal—why do we do that?

Look at the impact. For those of you that aren't coming from a coal community, now, we mine coal in 27 States, but just look at this, the impact, what it has—between coal mining at $58 billion a year and then the generation of power from coal totals $142 billion.

Now, maybe that doesn't mean a lot to a lot, but $142 billion, put that in context with the automobile industry. All of us are familiar with cars. We all hear the commercials on television. We know about the discussion about how you have got to have the latest car.

This is bigger than the car industry. The automobile industry is $130 billion. That is why many of us, all across this country, are concerned about this future of the coal industry. It is larger than the automobile industry. I want you to understand that. Everyone should make sure they grasp the impact of that.

This war on coal that many of us have been talking about for some time, I want to make sure that people understand how it affects us individually and affects a State like West Virginia.

□ 1845

Just 7 years ago the unemployment rate in West Virginia was the seventh best in the country. But after 7 years of a war on coal, after regulation after regulation after regulation, West Virginia's unemployment rate now has dropped and we are in the last place in the Nation.

Think about that impact for all of us. You go from number 7 to 50th in just 7 years. Combine that with the families of our coal miners. Just in the past 3 years, 45 percent of the coal miners in West Virginia have lost their jobs, 45 percent. These are people. These are real people. They are not statistics.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) uses this chart. He has shown us over the years—my 5 years in Congress—he showed us that these are the people we are talking about all over this country who are losing their jobs.

But in West Virginia, 45 percent of them have lost—in the coalfields of

West Virginia, the unemployment rate is staggering, and that hasn't stopped the administration.

We are talking about unemployment rates in counties two and three times the rate of the national figures: 13.5 percent, 13 percent, 12 percent, 10 percent. That is tough for a family, a community, a State, all to be able to survive.

We keep talking about mines shutting down. I want people to understand, when you shut down coal mines, you really affect a community. These people all have families. When these men lose their jobs, it affects other people.

The administration and the EPA can shut down our coal mining industry. Yes, they can. They are doing a pretty good job of it, if that was their intent, was to shut down and for people to lose their jobs.

But think about it. When these men lose their jobs, it is not just the coal miners who are losing their jobs. It is the other individuals in the community.

We are talking about the railroad workers, the barge operators, the trucking industry, all that come to pick up the coal at the mine to take it to the power plant.

The machinists, the concrete suppliers, the people that put the conveyor belts in, and the building that we have to do with it, all of them lose their jobs. The timber industry.

Then go outside and talk to the school board when the school boards are struggling to make ends meet because so many of their employers are gone and their tax base is eroded with it. But, also, go to the grocery store and find out that is the impact. Grocery stores, pharmacies, restaurants, apartment buildings.

We have got a map that shows, again, the impact of this as we get into this. We have got several speakers here tonight to talk more about it.

This is a location of all the power plants across America. There are over 500 coal-fired plants operating today around this country.

But just in the last month the Sierra Club, Bloomberg, Earthjustice, and all have been touting the fact that they want by the year 2017 to take one-third of those red dots off the map.

Almost a third of our capacity to generate electricity can be gone because of the rules and the way some of the environmental groups are pursuing this. One-third of them.

Now, in terms of grid reliability with this, you have to deal with what they have talked about. If we continue to shut down coal-fired power plants and don't replace them, whether that is with wind, solar, or gas, our grid reliability is going to be in question.

How many times are we going to lose our power? FERC has already said that, if we don't do something by 2017, they are saying the Midwest is going to start experiencing rolling blackouts. So let's be careful with this.

I am going to stop now. We have tried to frame some of the argument about this history of how we got to this point that you are seeing the frustration in Congress. But I wanted to put that again in context.

This industry is bigger than the automobile industry, but we don't have the big communities. We don't have the Detroits and the Grand Rapids. We just have Farmington, Lumberport, small towns that make up the backbone of rural America. That is what we are trying to fight for.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) for his comments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Thank you to my colleague for yielding.

You made a comment just a minute about, you know, we don't have the Detroits, we don't have the New Yorks, we don't have the big cities in coal country.

We may not have those big cities in coal country, but I guarantee you those big cities get some of their electricity from the coal that is produced by the coal miners that live in our region.

Over the past 5 years, the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation has spent more than $10 million of its budget to pursue a wholesale rewrite of one of the agency's regulatory programs.

Dubbed the ''stream protection rule'' by the agency, this massive regulatory undertaking has little to do with protecting streams and much more to do with riding roughshod over State regulatory programs.

This rule rewrite means more Americans will be out of work and that electricity bills of hard-working families could increase.

As OSM's related draft environmental impact statement indicates, the Appalachian Basin, home to thousands of Ohioans who depend on the coal industry for their livelihood, to put food on their table, to put clothes on their children, to send their children to school, could see as many as 450 production-related jobs lost per year, with potential adverse impacts of $37 million annually.

This appears to be of little concern to the administration, as Interior Secretary Sally Jewell was recently quoted as characterizing the job loss in coal country associated with this rule rewrite as ''minor.''

I invite Secretary Jewell to join me on a trip to any coal mine in Ohio and directly tell the hard-working miners—look them in the eye and tell them that this new rule has only minor impacts.

I will clear my schedule, and I will be available any day, anytime, to go with her if she wants to come there.

Furthermore, this regulation omits and ignores the relevant input from those stakeholders with the most expertise in regulating mining, the States who have been doing it for years.

In fact, 9 of the 10 States originally involved in the rules development have withdrawn their support due to OSM's exclusionary tactics.

This is unacceptable, and it is why I urge the House to consider H.R. 1644, the STREAM Act, as soon as possible.

Introduced by my colleague from West Virginia, ALEX MOONEY, the STREAM Act would direct the administration to conduct a comprehensive study of the effectiveness of the Stream Buffer Zone Rule that has been in place since 1983. We have been doing this for a long time and protecting streams in the process.

While this study occurs, a prohibition on the promulgation of new rules addressing the stream protection or stream buffers will be implemented to ensure that the Secretary incorporates the findings of the study into any future rulemaking.

This is just one example, Mr. MCKINLEY, of the regulatory overreach of this administration and its devastating impacts on coal miners, on families that depend on the coal industry for their livelihoods, and the businesses that depend on cost-affordable, reliable electricity across our country.

I appreciate you giving me the time to share that.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Thank you. You have been one of our stalwarts in pushing this legislation for all 5 years you have been here on this.

So I know people across this country recognize the work that you are doing on behalf of the coal miners and this whole industry.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. I am proud to be on your team.

Mr. MCKINLEY. We have a host of other folks here to address the issue. We have got this chart up. Eventually, we are going to get to that in the next part of it.

But what we are talking about here is here are all the regulations. These are all the regulations that are affecting the coal industry, the manufacturing industry, all promulgated from the Clean Air Act. We will get to that in a minute. But, in the meantime, let's hear from some more individuals.

I yield to the gentleman from the Third District of West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Congressman MCKINLEY, thank you for your leadership as chair of the Coal Caucus. It does great work. I am honored to be a part of it, and I am honored to work with you.

Mr. Speaker, as you well know and as the people of America need to know, we are at a critical point in this war on coal, and it truly is a war on coal.

Coal is vital to the people of West Virginia and to West Virginia's economy and to this country. Coal supports many crucial investments in southern West Virginia, in my congressional district.

Its revenues help support tourism, roads, and infrastructure. It will make King Coal Highway a reality and make sure we do not have a bridge to nowhere, like we already have in southern West Virginia.

Coal puts food on the table. Coal pays the bills. Coal supports families. Coal generates the revenue that provides for our roads, our schools, our police, and our fire departments. Coal keeps the lights on.

But, sadly, this administration doesn't recognize the value of coal or of the people who work to mine it. They are proposing regulation after regulation to make it harder to mine coal, harder to burn coal, and harder to produce affordable energy from coal.

We have lost an estimated 43 percent of our coal jobs in just the last 6 years. While that is a sobering number, it is more than a statistic.

Each one of those employees has responsibilities. They have bills. They have families. They have rent or house payments. How will they provide for themselves and others without their coal jobs?

We must stand up for West Virginia jobs, West Virginia energy, and West Virginia coal. That is exactly what I am doing in Congress as a member of the House Appropriations Committee.

At one hearing, I did ask EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy to come to West Virginia and listen to us. She declined. So I brought Logan County coal miners to Washington to testify before Congress.

They shared how coal provides good paychecks to support their families and how they are worried overregulation will put them out of work.

I am working in Congress to ensure our miners will be able to provide for their families and that our State still has access to affordable domestic energy. I will continue to fight each and every day.

Thank you for your leadership.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Thank you for your comments.

Before we go to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman KELLY, I just wanted to add, because you talked about education, that the Duke Energy plant over in New Richmond, Ohio—the closure of that cost them $1.5 million out of their school system, out of their property taxes, with that.

You are absolutely right when we talk about the impact it is going to have on schools when we start depriving that.

But then you have FirstEnergy's Albright plant. They lost $380,000. The AEP plant over in Lockbourne, Ohio, is $406,000.

This is real money that is hurting the communities. It is depriving our school systems of money, all pushing an ideology. So thank you for joining this fight.

I yield now to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is about time. Time is running out. I think right now we look at what is happening in coal country and nothing could be more alarming than what is happening.

This is one promise the President kept. When he ran as a candidate, he said: You can continue to generate electric power by burning coal. But if you decide to go that way, we will bankrupt you. That is one promise he has kept.

Now, in Pennsylvania alone, coal is responsible for over 40,000 jobs and 40 percent of our electric power. The Associated Press calls it the workhorse of America's power system.

But the extreme overreach by the EPA is threatening jobs and forcing energy costs for families and manufacturers to skyrocket, which hurts every single American. That is something I think the general public has to understand.

While maybe they don't go down in those mines and while maybe they don't bring that precious product out from underneath the ground and while maybe they don't work in a coal-fired power plant, one thing they do know is, when they hit that switch to turn on the power, it is reliable because of coal.

Coal has always been the standard. Coal has always driven the fact that we not only have coal that is abundant, we have coal that is accessible and we have coal that is very affordable.

□ 1900

Why in the world would we go away from this workhorse of America's power system? That is one of the reasons we reintroduced the Coal Country Protection Act; that is H.R. 2637.

It is just a commonsense bill that would stop any EPA regulations from affecting America's power plants until four outcomes are achieved: number one, no job losses; number two, no loss in GDP or economic growth; number three, no higher electric rates; and, number four, no interruption in the reliable delivery of electrical energy. These are pretty commonsense goals.

Now, who would be able to verify that or who would certify? Well, the Secretary of Labor could do it; the Congressional Budget Office could do it; the Energy Information Administration could do it; the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission could do it, and the North American Electric Reliability Corporation could do it.

You said about time. It is about time, but it is time not just for the coal country people to stand up and fight for coal; it is time for the whole country to stand up and fight for coal. It is well past the midnight hour.

As we continue to shut down mines and lose jobs and shut down communities and raise people's electric rates and then people at home sit back and wonder: What are they doing in Washington? Why do they continue to hurt us at every turn?

The answer is the people making some of this policy have never done what you have done; they have never walked in your shoes; they have never had to do what we have done in coal country to protect electric power.

Why in the world would we do this now at a time when the country is looking for jobs, at a time when the country is looking for less dependence on foreign nations for energy? Why now? Why, Mr. President? Why continue to push in the direction you have been pushing?

The bottom line is this is just not about coal country; this is about our whole country.

Mr. MCKINLEY, I would like to thank you for fighting this fight. The 5 years we have been here together, this has been something we fought to go every day in every way and will continue to do.

It is time now for the people in America to also be heard. Please do not sit in silence and suffer in silence when your voices need to be heard. We need to have everybody standing up for coal, standing up for the production of electricity that is affordable and reliable, and we just need to look at where we are going and say: My goodness, the people we sent to represent us, the people we sent to protect us, it is time for them to stand up and do exactly what they took a pledge to do.

I thank you for all your efforts. I thank my colleagues for being here tonight. This is something we will never give up on, we will never walk away from. It has come to our shoulders. We can't ever walk away from it because it is not an option.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think one of the biggest shortcomings here is I don't think other Members of Congress and I don't think the American public understand the magnitude of this industry. That is why I started off with that chart, to show you that between the coal and the coal-fired electrical plants, it is larger than the automobile industry.

Now, just walk with me, just imagine that if we told the automobile industry that they had to cut back one-third of their capacity of cars, but that is okay, they are going to say, because what we do is people will ride bikes or they will take the train or the bus. That is not our culture in America. They would fight back, too.

You and I are fighting—and the rest of these people that represent our coal fields. We have enjoyed the cost of electricity coming from low cost because of coal. In America, all across, we showed 49 of the 50 States burn coal—49—and this administration wants to stop that, wants to cut back.

I would say, if you are going to cut back the coal industry, then look at the automobile industry as well; if you are going to go after one huge component of our economy, go after the automobile industry as well with it.

Thank you very much for what you said.

We talked about a lot. Now, let's continue on.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS).

I think Congressman GIBBS from Ohio, I think you had some remarks you wanted to make.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for holding this Special Order on this very important topic.

In the very near future, this affects every Ohioan across the country, but very soon, the EPA is expected to release its Clean Power Plan. This is just another burdensome regulatory scheme that will increase energy costs.

The Energy Information Administration—that is the government agency dedicated to the impartial analysis of data—reported it will cause the price of electricity rates to rise for consumers.

Ohio families are already stretching their budgets as much as they can, struggling to make ends meet. Raising their monthly electric bills is just going to make their struggle worse.

Earlier this month, the House passed the Ratepayer Protection Act, as you know, to stop the implementation of a clean power plan while the courts address the legal challenges to the plan and give Ohioans a break from the EPA's heavy-handed regulations.

Sadly, the EPA's refusal to listen to the public and industry input is not without precedent. When considering the redefinition of waters of the United States rule, the agencies did not take into account the opinions of their State partners. Within hours, 27 States and countless organizations filed lawsuits challenging the rule.

Additionally, at the end of June, the Supreme Court found that the EPA failed to consider compliance costs when proposing new rules for power plants.

If the EPA continues to push forward with this plan, it will only hurt those who want reliable, affordable energy. It is time to set aside partisan agendas.

I encourage the EPA to start from scratch and work with the stakeholders and industry partners to create a commonsense plan that strengthens our energy infrastructure and safeguards our environment.

Again, Congressman MCKINLEY, I thank you for holding this Special Order today—and Mr. Speaker—because this affects a large region of our country. I know you talked about, what, 400 coal-fired plants across the country.

This is important to our economy, and you have to have reliable and affordable energy for businesses to grow and create jobs. This Clean Power Plan is going to lay around and strangle our businesses and put people out of work across the Midwest and across my State in Ohio.

I thank you for doing this tonight.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Thank you very much. Thank you for bringing up the Ratepayer Protection Act because, as you know, after we followed the MATS rule, after the Supreme Court ruled that unconstitutional, you didn't hear the President complain because they had effectively accomplished everything they wanted before that rule.

I am afraid that is why the importance of this Ratepayer Protection Act is because, if we continue to shut down our coal power plants and deprive our communities of taxpayer moneys to run our schools, then that winds up—if it is ruled unconstitutional later on, then how do we recover the moneys that we have lost? Can we reopen a school that was closed because a community lost its operation? Do we recover? How do we recover that? That is why it is important.

I am really glad you brought up the Ratepayer Protection Act because we need to make sure that the courts have ruled before the action is taken. You and I are going to be paying more for our utility bills as a result of that if and until it is ruled unconstitutional. We know it is coming; they know it is coming. Thank you for bringing that up.

Our next remarks we have are from one of our—I can't say one of our newest Members, but he is a Member from Kentucky that has been very outspoken. I appreciate very much Congressman BARR from Kentucky.

Can you share some thoughts tonight?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman, my colleague and friend, from West Virginia for his leadership in the Congressional Coal Caucus, to my colleagues from Pennsylvania and Ohio, and all over the country representing coal-producing States where good people—men and women—working in the coal mines literally power America.

They come from an industry—they work in the coal mines; they support the coal miners—an industry that provides affordable and reliable energy that powers the American economy and has been the backbone of the American economy.

Instead of celebrating that industry, instead of applauding the heroic work that these men and women do, day in and day out, underground and above ground, what is the response of the Federal Government over the last 6 years? It has been to singularly punish this industry.

I can't think of an administration from either party in the history of the United States that has singled out a single industry with the level of vindictiveness, frankly, and targeted a single industry and literally bankrupted many of these companies.

I don't understand it for a variety of reasons, but let me just share with you a little bit about the coal industry in Kentucky. We could very well be the poster child for demonstrating the tremendous negative impact and the consequences of this heartless, aggressive, anticoal policy from the EPA and from this administration's regulatory policy.

Since 2009, the Commonwealth of Kentucky has lost more than 8,000 coal mining jobs throughout our State. For every one coal mining job, three additional jobs are directly tied to every coal mining job. This is a direct result of the administration's war on coal.

Sure, there are competitive pressures from natural gas, and we celebrate the fracking boom and the result of discoveries in natural gas, but I can tell you what the coal industry says. It is not cheap natural gas that is the cause of these lost jobs; it is the fact that the Federal Government has put its heavy hand of regulatory power on the scales to make this industry noncompetitive.

Just to give you a sample of the problem, in the first quarter of 2015 alone, Kentucky's coal employment numbers dropped another 10½ percent.

What does that mean in total? Coal production in Kentucky has decreased to its lowest level since 1963. In 2015, production levels are currently half of what they were just two decades ago; yet demand for energy in the United States has suddenly increased.

There are more than just statistics, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to talking about the face of the war on coal. Many of my colleagues have shared these stories about what this really means, what all of these regulations really mean in the real world. It is not statistics on a page; it is not about coal production percentages on decline.

What it is really about, it is about Sally, the young woman in Wolfe County, Kentucky, that I met with tears in her eyes at the end of a townhall meeting.

She came to me as her Congressman and she said: Do they know what they are doing to our family? My husband lost his job because the coal mining employer that he works for didn't get a permit, and so now, he is out of work. Don't those people in Washington understand that I have got kids? We are going back to school; it is August, and I can't afford shoes for my kids. I had to go to Walmart and buy them flip-flops, just so they wouldn't be embarrassed to go back to school.

Now, I want the regulators in Washington, D.C., to come back to Kentucky, to eastern Kentucky, and meet Sally and look Sally in the eye and ask her to describe to them what the impact of this war on coal is for her.

What about Robert? Robert the coal miner from Wolfe County, Kentucky, in my district, he gets up at 3 a.m. every morning to commute an hour to go to work in the coal mines just to put food on the table.

Or what about James, who looks at me with an incredible expression and says: ANDY, don't they understand what they are doing? They are putting people out of work. They are making life harder on the American people. Surely, these are the people who say they are fighting for the working man. I am the working man. Congressman, what are they thinking?

Then you talk about Chris, Chris who says: Congressman, I don't know much about politics; I don't really care much about politics, but if you can go save my job, I am for you. Can't the politicians in Washington fight for people just to go to work and provide for their families? These are paychecks that these people depend on.

Finally, it is Curtis, Curtis who said to me that his father crawled on his

belly for decades to take care of his family, and because of his father's hard work, he had opportunities.

This is more than statistics. This is about real people who have been victimized by bureaucrats in Washington who are out of touch—if the bureaucrats in Washington would at least just go to these places—West Virginia, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Kentucky—and look these people in the eye and ask them what they think about their policies.

Worst of all, it is all done in the name of the environment. We all love the environment. These coal miners love the environment. They come from a beautiful part of the country, in Appalachia.

It is not about not wanting to help the environment or environmental stewardship, but what is so sad is that these regulations aren't going to do a darn thing about global carbon emissions.

The Clean Power Plan rule that this administration has proposed would reduce global carbon emissions by less than 1 percent—for what, $8 billion in additional annual cost to our economy and thousands of American families without paychecks.

This is wrong. The Congress of the United States is right to stand up for these families. The Congress of the United States is right to stand up for jobs.

That is why I support all of the legislative work done by this House by these good Members—the STREAM Act from my colleague and friend from West Virginia; the coal residuals bill that the gentleman, the chairman, has championed and done a great job in supporting, my colleague, ED WHITFIELD, the chairman of the Energy Subcommittee on the Ratepayer Protection Act; the REINS Act, which we just voted for and passed out of this House, which would stop all of these costly regulations.

□ 1915

Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to stand up for American jobs, for American energy, and for American-produced coal power. I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman touched on something that I don't know that our listeners or even the other Members of Congress quite grasp, but the gentleman touched on it in one statement he made. It is the claim that CO_2 emissions of the world are the target of our global warming issue.

I will just accept, for discussion purposes, that that is the basis of their war on coal, this ideological fight that we are involved in. I will use the United Nations' statistics—not the Republican caucus', not the coal country's numbers, but the United Nations'.

They say: Congressman BARR, if you were to stop all coal-fired capacity in every school, church, hospital, power station—if we were to stop all burning of coal in America in total so that there became no coal being consumed in America—you would reduce the CO_2 emissions of the world by two-tenths of 1 percent.

Mr. BARR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCKINLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I would also make this point that this is the United States of America.

In the United States of America, we solve problems through entrepreneurship, free enterprise, and innovation. We put a man on the Moon because we are Americans. We believe in freedom, and we believe in innovation.

If there is a problem with carbon emissions and climate change, then we should solve the problem the American way, through fossil energy research. What we should not do is supply a Soviet-style, command-and-control solution from Washington, which will not solve the problem.

What we need to be doing is exporting American technology to China and India and other countries that have inferior electricity-generating capabilities.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to touch base again before we go to our last speaker.

Again, these are all of the rules. This is the overwhelming number of rules that we are trying to deal with in America in dealing with fossil fuels, from ozone to new source performance standards. I could go on.

There is the regional haze and the greenhouse gas tailoring rule. We have to deal with those. Let me show the impact as already predicted is going to happen. It is that we are going to see higher utility bills. If we want to see that, just keep doing it because that is exactly what is going to happen.

This chart has been produced that shows, just in West Virginia 7 years ago—let's just say for discussion—you had a $100 bill for your monthly electric. Now, because of all of the rules, we are at $160. That is a 60 percent increase in the cost of utilities. Some might argue it is because of the cost of coal. No. The cost of coal has dropped.

The point here is that the power plants—the utilities—are having to put excessive money into the production of electricity to meet some of those rules that we talked about over there. It is coming out of our pockets. Someone is paying for that. You and I are paying for that.

In addition, we are already 60 percent up. Look at Arizona. They are suggesting that the increased cost in Arizona is going to go up 40 percent; in the State of Washington, 37 percent; in California, 24 percent. All we have to ask is: Is this what the consumers want?

Let me show you another chart here.

This talks about where coal is being used. Now, this administration has been very effective in shutting it off. You have heard the horror stories of what has happened in Kentucky. I have heard of some of it in West Virginia. In Ohio, it is the same story—in Indiana, in Illinois. The impact it is having on our industry is destructive. They are destroying the industry. The industry is on its knees now.

But what about overseas?

The International Energy Agency has already indicated that they have a voracious appetite for coal elsewhere outside of America. No one else is following the administration's lead on this idea of this war on coal.

They are still burning coal. They are burning coal every which way they can. Whether it is in China or in India—wherever they are—they are using coal. As a matter of fact, from the year 2000 to 2013, they increased their appetite for coal by 70 percent; but in America, we dropped. It is important to understand where this fight is and what we have to do to fight for the individuals.

Mr. Speaker, as we start to wrap up our discussion tonight about coal and its impact, about the Clean Power Plan and the effective regulations, I yield to the gentleman from the Second District of West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY), one of our newest Congressmen.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman MCKINLEY for his leadership on this issue and in our great State of West Virginia. I thank Congressman BARR for his great comments and for his telling some personal stories about how this affects real Americans from different States.

Mr. Speaker, our great country is blessed with abundant natural resources. Unfortunately, President Obama has made a campaign commitment to destroy coal as a domestic energy source, and he is intent on fulfilling that promise.

Just 2 weeks ago, the Office of Surface Mining, under the Department of the Interior, released its latest set of rules and regulations that will cripple the coal industry not only in West Virginia, but across the country. These new rules and regulations are over 2,500 pages in length.

If you do not know exactly what that looks like, here it is, ladies and gentlemen. It is six folders full of new regulations—2,500 pages. This is what it looks like, okay? The Department of the Interior has given us 60 days to go through this. It is a lot of work. At the very least, a 120-day extension is needed beyond the current 60-day comment period.

I have already joined Chairman BISHOP of the Natural Resources Committee, on which I serve, and 43 Members of Congress in sending a letter to the Obama administration, requesting a 120-day extension of the comment period for the recently announced job-killing stream buffer zone regulation right here.

My hard-working staff and I of the Second District of West Virginia have been going through this very hard over the last several days since it came out. We have been trying to look at all of

the ridiculous regulations in this bill, and we have come across a couple of things that, I think, are worth pointing out so far.

For instance, on page 1201 of the proposed regulation, it reads:

> Ensure that electric power transmission lines and other transmission facilities that are used for or are incidental to surface mining activities on the permit area are designed and constructed to minimize electrocution hazards to raptors and other alien species with large wingspans.

The Office of Surface Mining is worried about protecting raptors and other birds from electrocution, so they have created a special regulation just to prevent that from happening. That is right. Here it is—required. We found on page 1201, buried within thousands of pages of regulations, that coal companies are to build special power lines to prevent ''raptors from getting zapped.''

I wonder if the environmentalists have the same concerns for their own projects. According to the Smithsonian, somewhere between 140,000 and 328,000 birds die each year from flying into wind turbines.

On page 1100 exactly, we have even more new rules here. It reads:

> You may not conduct any surface mining activity that is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of threatened or endangered species listed by the Secretary or proposed for listing by the Secretary or that is likely to result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat in violation of the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

That is a long sentence with a lot of ''ors.'' This absurd regulation would prohibit mining near animals that the Director of the Interior has simply proposed for listing as endangered or as threatened.

It would be one thing to prevent mining operations around animals that are actually endangered, but this regulation goes far, far beyond protecting endangered species. This is a stunning regulatory power grab that an environmental extremist Secretary will use to put miners out of business.

Even more ridiculous is just the heart of this rulemaking, which is to fundamentally change the definition of a ''stream'' to include temporary streams. Temporary streams are, essentially, ditches that fill up with water when it rains, and the water goes away quickly. They are calling them ''streams'' now.

A recent study from the National Center for Mining estimates that these rules will destroy as many as 80,000 coal jobs across the country. My colleague Congressman ANDY BARR put some names to those stories of individuals who are losing their jobs. He just referred to them in his remarks, and I appreciate that.

These are hard-working American taxpayers who are simply trying to provide for their families; and these idealistic, extremist regulations are putting them out of work. It is harming families not only in our States of West Virginia and Kentucky, but across the country. These new regulations would be catastrophic to the coal industry and to all of the hard-working American families who depend on coal to keep their energy costs low.

The economy of the Appalachian Region and West Virginia, in particular, are uniquely threatened by these regulations because of our mountainous topography and abundance of small streams.

Industry estimates say this administrative action could mean 45 to 79 percent of the coal reserves in the Appalachia would no longer be usable. The damage from such a critical blow to the industry would create a ripple of hardship in our State.

I think my colleague Congressman MCKINLEY mentioned this already, but over 90 percent of the energy consumed in West Virginia is produced by coal power, and distress in the coal industry will raise home energy prices and business energy costs for everybody. Low-income folks are going to struggle with this.

Furthermore, approximately 60 percent of West Virginia State business tax revenue is derived from coal revenues. A significant decrease in these revenues would put a severe financial strain on the State budget, and it could potentially hurt crucial services in our State, like public schools, State-funded health clinics, and the funding of our law enforcement agencies.

I want to continue to work with my colleagues on the Natural Resources Committee, and I thank my colleague from West Virginia and my colleague from Kentucky for cosponsoring my bill, H.R. 1644. It is also known as the STREAM Act.

I want to first move it swiftly through committee before any real damage can be done by this harmful new rule. It is time that the administration wakes up and realizes that their regulations are hurting hard-working American taxpayers for no good reason.

□ 1930

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments on that and for bringing up also the Clean Power Plan as we were wrapping up with that.

Because I am intrigued—and maybe the rest of the Members should be as well—with the idea that is being promoted by the senior Senator from Kentucky, which is maybe we should not be so quick to jump on the Clean Power Plan.

The President may very well be overturned on this constitutionally. But if the States implement this voluntarily and impact our schools, our communities, our environment, our health care, our hospitals, by shutting down, we won't be able to recover from that.

So the Senator has come up with an intriguing concept, and that is just say no. It kind of reminds me of Barbara Bush a few years ago.

As a result of that, we already have several States that are either saying no or are deeply and seriously considering saying no.

States like Oklahoma, Indiana, Wisconsin, Texas, Louisiana, Alabama, and Mississippi are not going to jump on this legislation just yet.

The rule, they are coming from the administration because they have seen the strategy here, which is just to use a bullying tactic, push it through, knowing full well 5 or 6 years from now it is going to be overturned in the courts. But we will never get our jobs back.

Those individuals that you were talking about, Congressman BARR, those individuals that came up to you, they are not going to have a job.

They will have left Kentucky. They will have gone someplace else to try to find something else. They are going to be uprooted from their communities.

No, we have to fight. This is the fight now.

I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR. I agree with you 100 percent.

I would just mention, too, it is not just about the coal mining jobs and the coal miners who will lose their jobs.

My district is mainly not a mining district. My district mainly is known for thoroughbred horses and bourbon distilleries and cattle, in addition to the University of Kentucky and the City of Lexington, but we do border the coal industry.

What I do know about those senior citizens on fixed incomes or low-income folks who live in those noncoal-producing counties in my district is that their electricity bills are going to double or triple if this Clean Power Plan goes into effect.

I have talked to the utilities. Over 90 percent of the electricity in Kentucky comes from coal. Coal keeps the lights on. Coal provides affordable energy.

The estimates from the utilities is that, in a single year, folks who live below the poverty line are going to see their electricity bills increase by two times, maybe three times, and that is simply something that they can't afford.

So this is an assault on low-income Americans, not just coal-mining families, but, also, fixed-income seniors and other low-income Americans.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I do appreciate the gentleman's additional comments.

So as we leave here tonight, let's make sure that we go back over what we have talked about.

We have talked about the impact on coal. We have talked about the individuals, as you just referred to on their electric bills. We see the drama that is going to play out over this.

We have seen the numbers of regulations that are coming forth with this, with these bullying tactics, this hostility toward coal. We have seen this last result, the Clean Power Plan. These have to stop. America needs to wake up.

This is something that is happening, but we have the ability here to reach

out and try to communicate to more people across West Virginia and the Nation, in Kentucky and Illinois, to Montana, to California, to demonstrate to them that you are already using coal. You are getting the advantages of coal.

Work with us to get the clean coal technology so that we can cut down our emissions. The idea of shutting off coal is short-sighted, and the rest of the world isn't following.

Someone said about leadership: You know, if no one is following you, then all you are doing is a man taking a walk.

So we have to find people that can lead. We have groups that are willing to take this on and fight for coal, fight for the jobs and the people that are affected by this.

So I thank you all for coming out here tonight.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1994, VA ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3236, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION AND VETERANS HEALTH CARE CHOICE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2015

Mr. SESSIONS (during the Special Order of Mr. MCKINLEY) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–234) on the resolution (H. Res. 388) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1994) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3236) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, to provide resource flexibility to the Department of Veterans Affairs for health care services, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CALIFORNIA DROUGHT SOLUTION

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, we had a most interesting discussion on coal. Let's continue on with natural resources for a few moments here.

I represent a good portion of the State of California. I put this map up as an opportunity for interested parties to observe what is happening in the State of California.

We are well into the fourth year of our drought in California. You can see from this map, in 2003, we had a serious drought, the yellow.

We are now looking at July 1, 2014. The yellow is now just a small part of the State of California, meaning it is still serious.

It is mostly out in the delta, out in the desert and in southern California, Imperial Valley, part of San Diego, Riverside, and San Bernardino County.

And there is a little bit of drought up here in the far north, north coast area, in Del North County.

The red and the brown, that is really, really serious. So California is really in a very serious state of hurt at the moment.

The drought is severe. It is having an enormous impact not just in the San Joaquin Valley, but really throughout the entire State of California.

Twenty-five percent water reduction is mandated by the State for the entire State. And so, in southern California, central California, northern California, that dramatic reduction in the consumption of water is well underway.

I live here in the central part, in the delta of California, which I will talk about at some length.

Three weeks ago this House passed legislation to address this issue, the Valadao bill. What it really was all about was a relaxation of the environmental protections and, thereby, a mechanism to basically take what water remains in northern California here in the Sacramento Valley and transport it down into the San Joaquin Valley here.

It is basically the classic water grab, which we have seen so much of over the years.

While all of that talk is going on here in Washington, D.C., what is happening is that California is doing what it has done so very well, and that is mine not coal, which we heard about from our colleagues from the coal states, but, rather, mine water.

This map basically shows what is happening in the aquifers of California. In June of 2002, you see a lot of green. The aquifers, while still depleted, were thought to be in pretty good shape.

In 2008, as a result of expansion of agriculture in cities and communities throughout California, the mining of water was going on so much so that we are now beginning to see these yellow and brown areas show up.

As the drought continued on from 2008 to 2014, we are beginning to see the very severe overdraft of the aquifers of California. Will these aquifers rebound when the rains return? Perhaps.

But we also know that many of them will not. And the result of this extraordinary overdrafting of the aquifers in California will place in jeopardy many, many communities, agricultural communities as well as the human communities.

We know that down here in the San Joaquin Valley along the eastern side communities are simply out of water.

The aquifers have been mined, overdrafted, to the point where there is no more ability to draw from the aquifers, and these communities are out of water today.

Extraordinary efforts are underway to provide these communities, many of whom are low-income communities with very little resources of their own, unable to dig deeper wells to provide themselves with water.

So part of the bill that passed 3 weeks ago attempted to address this, but in a very insufficient way.

There are alternatives. There are ways that California can and must deal with the drought, and they basically are short term, immediate, and long term.

That legislation has been introduced. I draw the attention to the Huffman bill, which is a comprehensive effort to deal with California's both short-term and long-term efforts.

I also draw attention to the Napolitano bill and basically draw your attention to how it should not be done, which was the Valadao bill.

Now, action is underway in the Senate. Our Senator, DIANNE FEINSTEIN, is about to introduce legislation. We have not had a chance to see the full legislation.

We do know that some of the Huffman bill is introduced into it, and we know that some of the Napolitano bill is also introduced.

I want to deal with those opportunities that present themselves and, at the same time, suggest that the Valadao bill should not be passed.

There is no need to push aside the environmental laws. There is no need to waive the California constitution and the water rights system in the constitution as the Valadao bill does. It is hidden, but it is there.

So what I want to really talk about is how we can address the California water needs. I call this the little sip/big gulp strategy. It is a proposal that I made some 3 years ago and continue to work on. It is a water plan for all of California.

It is similar to a program put out by the California administration, not for tunnels, not the California water fix, not the BDCP—all of those programs are simply a way to transfer water—but, rather, what we call a water fix, a water plan, for all of California.

Basically, what it involves is a mechanism to provide water for the growing population of California for the agricultural areas, Sacramento and San Joaquin, called the Great Central Valley, for the urban regions here in the bay area and down in southern California.

I will go through it very, very quickly.

Let's talk about southern California. Basically, it now takes water from northern California from the Colorado River. It brings water into the southern California area, where it is consumed.

After being cleaned, it is consumed. It is cleaned yet again, and a great amount of water is dumped then into the Pacific Ocean.

You say: Wait a minute. You mean to tell me they are taking water from northern California 400 or 500 miles from the Colorado River, bringing it into southern California, cleaning it, using it once, and then dumping it into the ocean?

The answer is yes. That is exactly what has happened, so much so that what I think is probably the fifth biggest river on the West Coast of the Western Hemisphere is, in fact, the sanitation plants in southern California.

So the first option would be to recycle that water. That is very much a part of the Napolitano bill, as well as the Huffman bill: recycling. Use the water that is already there. Clean it and reuse it.

This is actually happening in Orange County down here. Orange County has one of the largest recycling programs anywhere in the United States. Good for them. But that much more can be done.

For maybe a billion dollars, a billion and a half dollars, you may be able to get 500,000 acre-feet of new water that is already in southern California.

So that is the recycling: San Diego, southern California, the great Los Angeles Basin, as well as the great San Francisco area.

Here in Sacramento a major recycling program is now underway by the Sacramento Regional Sanitation District. Good for them.

That water will be reused, some of it in the Sacramento area, the rest of it put back in the river as clean water and then available for environmental purposes in the bay as well as for the San Joaquin Valley and, indeed, all the way to Los Angeles.

So recycling is very, very much a part of the future of California.

A lot of people talk about desalinization. Yes, certainly there is now a desalinization plant that is opening that will be producing a significant amount of water down here in Carlsbad in San Diego County. There is also a desalinization plant in the Santa Barbara area.

□ 1945

Those are important. However, desalinization is far more expensive than recycling. The recycled water turns out to be quite cleaner than the ocean water. It doesn't have all the salts and other contaminants because it has already been significantly cleaned in the sanitation process—so recycling.

The most important and most immediate and, frankly, underway, as I said, 25 percent reduction in water consumption required in California now, that is called conservation. Clearly, conservation is the simplest, least expensive, and the largest source of water for the future.

Conservation is taking place by mandate now, but also a great deal of conservation is taking place in the agricultural areas up and down the coast as well as the agricultural areas in the Monterey Bay area and, actually, everywhere in California.

As much as has been done in the years leading to this moment, more can and must be done in conservation, both urban as well as agriculture. Perhaps estimates by the State government indicate somewhere between 3 and 5 million acre-feet of water can be saved through a very robust conservation program up and down the State.

Once again, this is in the Democratic legislation that has been put forth by Ms. NAPOLITANO as well as by Mr. HUFFMAN. A major and very, very important element in California water future is a continuation of this conservation program.

So you have recycling; you could do desalinization in certain places; and, thirdly, conservation, with conservation being the single biggest and the most inexpensive of all of the options.

There are things that need to be done. Money needs to be made available, Federal Government grants as well as State and local government, and participation by farmers and communities up and down the State.

Thirdly, we need to develop more storage. Here is where the twin tunnel concept that is being pushed by Governor Brown and the administration makes no sense at all. I want to put up a map that displays this a little better. I am going to go to the really big map here because this really needs to be understood.

This is a picture of the delta of California. It is an inland delta. It is the largest estuary on the West Coast of the Western Hemisphere. It is basically this entire region here. Sacramento is up here; Stockton is here; Contra Costa County, Pittsburg, Antioch down here; and then San Francisco Bay begins right in this area.

So what we have here is this inland delta. The San Joaquin River comes up from the south. The Sacramento River, the largest river in California, flows from the north all the way from the Oregon border, Mt. Shasta, flows down through the Sacramento Valley, past the city of Sacramento, and comes in and joins the San Joaquin River in the delta of California.

I have had the pleasure to live in this area for the last 40 years and represent this area for, well, since 1974 in one way or another. It is an extraordinary ecological system. The largest estuary, it is the nursery for dozens of different species of salmon and other fish. It is extremely important for the ecology not just of the delta, but also of the entire West Coast. It is from this area that the salmon go out to sea, providing thousands upon thousands of jobs and recreational opportunities—other species, in this area, of fish. It is also a major flyway for the waterfowl that migrate north and south through the area.

It is also a very rich agricultural area, several hundred thousand acres of agricultural land, and provides enormous recreational opportunities with more than a thousand miles of rivers, sloughs, and waterways of various kinds.

It is in trouble. It is in serious jeopardy because of the transfer of water from the north through the delta to the great pumps here at Tracy that could pump up to 15,000 cubic feet of water per second out of these pumps, sending that to the San Joaquin Valley here, and then on into Los Angeles.

This is the hub, and this is where the controversy exists. What the Governor wants to do is to start up here in one of the richest agricultural areas in all of America and basically create two, three intakes and two massive tunnels that come all the way down here to the pumps, in the process destroying a lot of the agricultural land. The pumps are big enough. These tunnels are capable of carrying 15,000 cubic feet of water per second; and with intakes that are at 9,000, you add another intake, you can get the full 15,000.

Keep in mind, the Sacramento River flowing past Freeport, Sacramento, flows at somewhere around 15,000 cubic feet per second water into the Sacramento and into the delta. So this system that the Governor wants to build is big enough to literally drain the freshwater from the delta, destroying this extraordinary ecological system, the largest estuary on the West Coast of the Western Hemisphere.

So we say to the Governor, why would you build something that has such destructive capacity? A recent report that was done on the economic benefits of this—remember, it is about $15 billion to build these two tunnels and the intakes and the pumps that go with it, about $15 billion. The economic analysis that was recently published in the Sacramento Bee said, well, wait a minute, the total economic benefit of all of this is like $5 billion over the lifetime of the tunnels. That is 50 years. You are spending $15 billion in the next decade or so, and you are only going to get $5 billion of economic benefit? It doesn't make much sense.

The other thing that is so foolish about this proposal is there is no storage. There is no storage north of the delta. There is no storage south of the delta. There is no storage in the delta. So where are you going to put the water? It is really nonsense.

So what we are saying is don't waste $15 billion or $17 billion here. Don't set up a system that could destroy the ecology of the delta and the agriculture of the delta and put at risk the communities that rely upon the freshwater. Don't do that.

There is a better option that is available. We call that the little sip/big gulp.

First of all, fix the levees. Fix the levees, the key levees that allow for the transport of water through the delta that protect the communities of the delta, that protect the flow of water as well as the agriculture. Probably less than a billion dollars and you could armor these levees. You could

upgrade those levees to maintain the current flow of water, when necessary, through the delta to the pumps, and at the same time protect communities such as Stockton and the communities down here in the Contra Costa area. That is the first thing. That gives you about half of the water that would be needed.

So where does the other half come from? The other half is what I call the little sip. I think you can see this on the map. This is the Sacramento deepwater shipping channel. It actually intersects the Sacramento River way up here in Sacramento, taking water, a little bit of water into the shipping channel and coming down here to a community called Rio Vista. About 40 percent of a system is already in existence.

If you were to put a fish screen here at the opening on the Sacramento River, allowing 3,000 cubic feet per second of water to flow into the shipping channel, down the shipping channel, capture that water way down here where the shipping channel ends, there are levees on either side of the channel. Capture the water there, and then bring the water across to Old River, which is right here. Bring that water across to Old River, and it goes then to the pumps here at Tracy.

So what you have here is a mechanism which we call the little sip, 3,000 cubic feet per second, big enough to be operated virtually every day of the year in a normal water year—not this year with the severe drought, but in a normal water year.

Oh, by the way, you could not operate the big tunnels, either. So this big project that the Governor wants to propose could not be used this year because there simply isn't water in the river.

But this little project in most every year, both the low flow as well as the high flow in the average year, could take that 3,000 cfs every day, bringing it down to the pumps here at Tracy, delivering 2 million acre-feet of water every year. That is the little sip.

When you have the big rain flows, which we hope to have in the future, and actually did have twice this year, you could turn the big pumps on down here, and you could take the rest of the 2 million or 2½ million acre-feet, giving you the 4½ million acre-feet that is desired to flow south to southern California and to the San Joaquin Valley. Little sip/big gulp.

You have, in fact, protected the delta because you are going to have to maintain the levees, bring them up to code so that they are 100-, 200-year flood levees, and you have set up a mechanism that could not destroy the delta because it is only 3,000 cubic feet per second coming out of the Sacramento River way up high. You avoid all of the destruction that would occur in the Clarksburg-Courtland area up here, that would occur as a result of the three intakes or four intakes that would be built on the Sacramento River, and all of the disruption that would occur as you build these two massive tunnels.

These tunnels are 40 feet in diameter. We are talking about, well, actually higher than this ceiling here in the Chamber. This is probably like 30 feet to the ceiling. But it would be 40 feet, two massive tunnels, 40 feet in diameter, that would be drilled down through the delta, through some of the most complex soils anywhere in the United States, disrupting all of this area and creating the opportunity for an existential threat to the delta because they are so big and can take so much water.

What would this cost? Maybe a third, maybe less than a third, maybe a quarter, because so much of it is already built. You already have the channel all the way down to here. You would have about a 10- to 12-mile pipeline across the delta into the Old River or a new canal built along the Old River to the pumps at Tracy. It makes a lot of sense.

The rest of the money, perhaps another $10 billion or $12 billion that would be otherwise spent on the massive twin tunnels could then be used for storage systems south of the delta.

Let me put this down for a second and put up the map of California. Where would those storage systems be?

Here is the delta once again. South of the delta there is a reservoir here called San Luis. It needs to be repaired because of earthquake potential. You can expand that. Just to the south, you have Los Banos Grandes Creek. That would be Los Banos Grandes Reservoir. There are numerous reservoirs that could be built along the California aqueduct as it comes into the Central Valley.

Most important of all are the aquifers. Remember this: The aquifers of the Central Valley are seriously overdrafted. These are the major storage reservoirs of California. So as water is brought out of the delta, we need to make sure that that water is put in surface storage reservoirs where possible, San Luis, maybe Los Banos Grandes. Los Vaqueros Reservoir here in Contra Costa County needs to be upgraded, added to. So you have these surface storage reservoirs that are certainly going to be necessary, and most important of all, you have got the aquifers.

As we look to the future, we need to figure out the hydrological systems to bring water through the canals when it is available and recharge the aquifers of the San Joaquin Valley. Some of them will not be able to be recharged. They are gone. Once you drain those aquifers, they may never be able to recover. But some could be recovered, and those are the ones we need to identify, and we need to recharge them.

Similarly, in the Sacramento Valley, north of the delta, there are several storage opportunities available to us. Some of these have been studied.

Way up here is the largest reservoir in California, the Shasta Reservoir. There is talk—and it has been studied—to raise the dam and increase the capacity perhaps by 130,000 acre-feet of yield here at Shasta. Further south, not on the river, but an off-river reservoir called Sites Reservoir, which my Republican colleague, Mr. LAMALFA, and I are authoring legislation to build Sites Reservoir, which would take water during the flood flows on the Sacramento off stream, pump it into this reservoir, a very large reservoir, about 1.9 million acre-feet, and that water would then be available to be put back into the Sacramento River for export to the south or for salinity control, freshwater into the San Francisco Bay, and also would create the opportunity for the reoperation, that is, to work in conjunction with Folsom Reservoir here in Sacramento, the Feather River Reservoir, the Oroville Dam and Reservoir, and the reoperation of the Shasta as well as the Yuba reservoirs.

□ 2000

In other words, this would great flexibility to the way in which we would then be able to operate the Sacramento River system for the benefit of the environment, for the benefit of exports to the southern valley—San Joaquin Valley, as well as southern California—and for salinity control in the environment of the delta. At the same time, like the San Joaquin Valley, there are enormous aquifers here in the Sacramento Valley that need to be maintained and recharged so that what we could build, if we thought about it in this holistic way, we would build a system that would be conjunctive use, so that when there was a lot of water, we would store that water. We would store it in off-stream reservoirs. We would store in an expanded Shasta. We would store it in the underground aquifers of the San Joaquin Valley or in the reservoirs along the west side of the San Joaquin Valley, as well as in southern California.

When you recycle in southern California, you could then store that water in the aquifers that exist here in the Los Angeles and the southern California basin. These aquifers actually have greater capacity than the Shasta Reservoir.

So you have got the aquifer of the San Fernando. You have got the aquifer of the San Gabriel, the San Bernardino, Orange County, West Basin, and several other smaller aquifers in the Los Angeles Basin. Of course, there are others as you move south towards San Diego.

That is the storage system that you would then use in a conjunctive water management program. This is the holistic approach that we need to look at. I call it the little sip in the delta. Build a small facility—3,000 is not small—3,000 cubic feet per second facility, taking that water out of the Sacramento River at Sacramento; put it into the deepwater shipping channel—the Sacramento channel all the way down here just north of Rio Vista—take it across

the delta, put it in a canal into Old River to the pumps, 3,000. The remaining water would be taken out of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta when it is available, when the delta smelt and other fish are not at the pumps, and turn the pumps on, sending that water south to be stored or used in the aquifers stored in new surface storage reservoirs along the way. Of course, north of the delta, you would have the surface storage reservoir at Sites and perhaps the enlargement of Shasta, then the ability to use it.

So why don't we do it? For the $15 billion that the Governor wants to spend on digging two tunnels that do not create 1 gallon of new water, but do create an existential threat to the largest estuary on the West Coast of the Western Hemisphere. Don't waste your money. Don't spend $15 billion on a $5 billion benefit—and that is over 50 years.

Why would you ever make that investment when you could do something that creates water, creates perhaps as much as 5 million acre-feet of new water for California's future, water that would be available from recycling and storage in southern California aquifers, available from storage north of the delta, the replenishment of the aquifers in the great Central Valley of California, and the creation of new storage surface reservoirs along the way? And most important, conservation—we have to conserve. It is mandated now. It is part of our future.

This is a water plan for all California. These ideas are not new. I didn't dream them up, although I put them together. And interestingly enough, 3½ years ago, when I made this first proposal, about a year later the Governor and the Department of Water Resources put forth a paper called a Water Action Plan for California, and it is exactly the same—without the tunnels.

Their Water Action Plan didn't speak to the tunnels. It did speak to storage north of the delta; it did speak to conservation; it did speak to the aquifers; it did speak to desalinization and recycling—all of those things that have been in the water plan for California for about 30 years.

This is not new. I have been involved in these issues since the 1970s, and I know that if we were to back away from the twin tunnel proposal, which is so destructive of the delta, and went to the little sip/big gulp strategy, using all of the various mechanisms available to California, we could create maybe 5 million acre-feet of new water. We could address the future drought that California will have again some day in the future.

Now, what about today's drought? I want to deal with that.

The people of California last November passed a $7 billion water bond. That water bond allows for conservation, replenishment of the aquifers, surface storage—perhaps Sites Reservoir, yet to be determined—and recycling, replenishment of the aquifers and, most important for now, today, money for those communities that are out of water and have no water at all so they can drill their wells deeper or bring in surface water from nearby rivers or communities that may be available.

That is a particular problem here in this area of the San Joaquin Valley and a few of the communities up here in the Sacramento Valley and up in the foothills. We need to provide that immediate relief for those areas, and we need to get on with conservation and some of the money that is necessary in order to do that. The water bond is available. That money is going to be coming out over the next 18 months or so as the State of California moves projects forward.

Immediately, and this is what I hope would be in the legislation that we should pass here in Washington is that we would use those Federal programs that exist today—and there are a multitude of Federal programs that already exist in Federal law, money that is already appropriated but not focused on the drought, not only in California, but throughout the West. And what I would suggest as we move legislation forward—perhaps this will be in Senator FEINSTEIN's bill. I would hope so. And if not there, as we hopefully all work together on solving the problem of drought in the West, particularly in California, that we focus our attention on the immediate opportunities that the Federal Government can presently present to solve problems.

The Environmental Protection Agency has the clean water grant programs. The Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Reclamation, has the WaterSMART program, which is conservation and recycling. We know that the Army Corps of Engineers has programs. There are other programs spread throughout the Federal Government that, if they were focused immediately on the needs of California and other States, that money could move to solve the community problems.

The clean water grant program could be used to provide water programs for those communities that are out of water—the recycling, conservation programs. All of those have money that is presently already appropriated but not focused; and if they focus that money so that it was in coordination, augmented, and supplemented and ahead of the California water bond programs, you could advance the water bond programs by as much as 18 months. It will take that long for California to move that money out of the bond.

So move the Federal Government in conjunction, in alignment with the programs that the State of California already is planning to do but doesn't yet have the money available. Put the Federal money there. Do the planning, the engineering, the environmental reviews, if necessary, and you advance so that today's drought can be dealt with. Now that is beginning to make sense.

I think we can do this. We need to push aside all of the fighting we have had over these many, many years. Don't take water from somebody, but work on programs to expand the water potential for all California. Don't push aside the environmental laws, because it is, in fact, the environmental laws that protect this largest estuary on the West Coast of the Western Hemisphere—San Francisco Bay and the fishing industry up and down the coast, all the way to the Columbia River between Oregon and Washington.

Don't put us in a situation where we are destined to fight, but rather put us in a situation where we can work together. That is my plea to my Republican colleagues who pushed that bill through here basically on a party-line vote and now headed to the Senate. I ask Senator FEINSTEIN to work with those of us that represent the delta and that have worked for generations and decades on how to protect the delta.

There is a solution. I call it a little sip/big gulp. You can put any name you want to on it. In fact, the Natural Resources Defense Council came up with a similar program that they called a portfolio approach: conservation; recycling; desalinization, aquifers; storage systems, both large and small, surface and aquifer. It is all there. This is not new. This is working together to solve a major challenge to the largest economy in the United States, the seventh largest economy in the world, the largest population—35 million people. This is a challenge, but this is a challenge we can do.

So my plea to anybody that cares to work on water is to work with us. There are ways we can solve and mitigate the current drought and solve the problem for the future drought. It is there. It is not going to be any more expensive than the massive tunnel programs that the Governor is proposing.

In fact, if you took that $15 billion and you were to spend it on building Sites Reservoir, expanding reservoirs to the south, putting in the systems for the underground aquifer replenishment and recycling programs in southern California, how much progress could we make? Well, we could solve the problems for the next drought, and we could mitigate and reduce the harm of the current drought. That is what it is all about: working together, taking the best ideas of one group or another.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have covered this issue, hopefully making some sense of what is a very complex problem for California and, therefore, for the Nation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

NATIONAL SECURITY, THE RULE OF LAW, AND PLANNED PARENTHOOD VIDEOS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be able to address you

here on the floor of the House of Representatives and to speak some words here that hopefully will be picked up by the rest of the country that causes us to think a little more, think a little deeper, and think about the destiny of this country, Mr. Speaker.

I come to the floor to talk to you this evening about a couple of topics. One is national security, and the other is the rule of law. I will say the third thing that threads into that is the Planned Parenthood videos. We have now seen three of them, as they penetrate into our conscience.

Let me address first the Planned Parenthood videos. It has been now several weeks since the first video came out that showed the supposed doctor that worked for Planned Parenthood cavalierly discussing how to harvest the organs of innocent little unborn—aborted, though—babies, and the cavalier approach to that: sitting there over dinner, chatting away as if they were talking about a soccer game or maybe talking about spending the weekend with their family, having a glass of wine and talking about taking organs out of innocent little creatures that are created in God's image, as we all are, Mr. Speaker. That was video number one.

It should have shocked us to our core to see the attitude, but it didn't confirm decisively what was actually going on. It implied—and it was fairly strong evidence—but it didn't confirm.

The second video was the older lady sitting in a different restaurant, chatting along about how a transaction would be to harvest kidneys and lungs and livers and hearts and brains and body parts from innocent babies who just wanted a chance to live and love and laugh and learn; to worship, to grow, to enjoy life—to enjoy that first right, that right to life that comes before the right to liberty, which comes before the right to the pursuit of happiness, as our Founding Fathers prioritized those rights in the Declaration of Independence, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1915

That lady, in the second video, wanted enough out of that, that she—I will use that word again—''cavalierly'' said: I want a Lamborghini.

I am sure she would say to us: I was just joking.

Well, to joke about that topic in a setting like that, that told me it wasn't just a casual conversation. There was attention being paid to the business deal that was being negotiated, and it didn't seem like it was conclusive, but there was a direction and a course for that conversation.

Now, today, we see a third video, a video interviewing a young woman who has worked in a Planned Parenthood center whose task was to harvest the organs of little babies. The video shows the separation of that, shows the little feet, the little arms, the little hands.

It shows the kidneys; it shows the brain. It shows the pieces of that little baby that was perfect in every way until it was torn apart by the abortionist, using a technique, a methodology that is designed to preserve the most valuable organs so that they can be sold on the market to laboratories and for medical experiments, Mr. Speaker.

When I saw that video today and I saw each of the other two videos when they came out, the first day that one was available, and then I saw one, and I saw the second video as a preview before it came out to the public.

Either one of those, when I was listening to the verbiage, certainly told me that there is an evil, evil element within Planned Parenthood, a cavalier attitude, a ''this is the business we do'' attitude; not a human compassion was exposed in either one of those first two videos.

I have been in a lot of debates about abortion. I have read a lot of material about it. I have listened to a lot of testimony about it. Sitting on the Judiciary Committee, we moved legislation that put an end to partial-birth abortion or at least attempted to, and so we have had a lot of life-and-death debates in the Judiciary Committee here in the House of Representatives.

When I saw the video of the young woman talking about the task that she was given, pick up these forceps and begin to separate these organs and sort them out, and these are good, and the lab will take that, and essentially, These will bring good money, let's make sure we protect them, it sickened me.

It caused my gut to knot up, Mr. Speaker, in a way that reminded me of the first time I walked into a funeral home to see the dead body of a loved one. That is an experience in anybody's lifetime that you remember. Seeing this video is an experience that I will remember.

As I watch this Congress and I think how Congress is reacting, I am glad that there are investigations going on. I am glad that the Speaker has spoken up on this issue. I am glad that there is a pro-life movement in this country.

I am glad that there are people that are protesting and there are people that are making their positions known to the Supreme Court, to the United States Congress, to the President of the United States.

However intransigent the President will be on this, this is a subject that should have the immediate attention of the Department of Justice. This would be something that Loretta Lynch should be on now, should be conducting an investigation now, should be bringing about the evidence and preparing a prosecution against the people that have, essentially, admitted in the videos that they have committed a crime, perhaps multiple crimes.

This isn't about there is a piece or there is an argument on one side versus an argument on the other side.

Planned Parenthood says: Well, we don't do it for a profit. We just do this to get our money back out of the costs we have to preserve these organs and pass them along. After all, this poor mother is just making a contribution to science, and so we should appreciate that.

That is not what the Congress thought when they passed the laws against trading in little, unborn baby body parts, Mr. Speaker. It is about the law, and the law says thou shall not do such a thing.

No amount of excusing away; no amount of trying to explain that it was with a positive motive, instead of a profit motive; no amount of saying that, Well, that is just our costs, and we are recovering our cost; no amount of saying that the money that comes from the taxpayer into the pockets of Planned Parenthood doesn't ever go to abortion because it will be said now, hundreds of times, Mr. Speaker, in fact, thousands of times, it will be said: Money is fungible. Money is fungible. Money is fungible.

If you dump a half a billion dollars into Planned Parenthood's coffers—that is out of the pockets of the taxpayers. We hand them the debt, borrow the money from the Chinese, hand it over to Planned Parenthood, and Planned Parenthood then uses that to run their operation to free up some of their other operations that end up being what they call an operation, which is an abortion, that is snuffing out the lives—we are closing in on 60 million little babies since Roe v. Wade in 1973, closing in on 60 million.

At the same time, we have people that are arguing that we need to open up our borders and let an unlimited number of people come into America because our birthrate is not high enough to replace the people that are dying off as they reach the end of their life.

Rather than to say let's bring every one of these babies to birth, give them an opportunity to fill their lungs full of free air, give them an opportunity to live, to love, to learn, to laugh, give them an opportunity to contribute to this country, to this society, rather than do that, we abort the babies and bring in people from another culture and think we are making America a better place, when we have the sin of up to 60 million abortions on our country, on our heads, on our conscience, on our Supreme Court, Mr. Speaker, and on this Congress, to a degree, the House and Senate, and certainly on the President of the United States, who said he—and I will leave his family out of it, Mr. Speaker, but I think some know the thought that crossed my mind.

It is time for this Congress to step up to defund Planned Parenthood. I won't be satisfied with just a moratorium of waiting around for a year while we study this situation and put together maybe a select committee that can look at it for a while longer and hold some hearings in Congress. They are going to look at the videos and listen to the testimony on both sides.

All that does, Mr. Speaker, is give Planned Parenthood an opportunity to spend some of those millions of dollars, some percentage of the half a billion dollars that we send to them out of the taxpayers' pocket, borrowed from the Chinese, and indebted onto the children that are born, to lobby this Congress to tell us: Well, there is really some good there at Planned Parenthood after all, and so we should continue to fund them.

That is what we are faced with, Mr. Speaker.

The object is this: Shut off all funding to Planned Parenthood; they should not receive one dime of taxpayer dollars further.

There has been a strong movement on this over the years since the time I have been here, and the States want to move, too, Mr. Speaker. The States want to shut off funding to Planned Parenthood.

They are afraid that Congress, or the President of the United States, through one of his executive edicts, will order that the funding going to a State that would cut off the funding to Planned Parenthood would be cut off itself, that their Medicaid money might be stopped by this administration if a State would deign to cut off funding and no longer subsidize Planned Parenthood.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress needs to deal with this. We need to give the States all authority to cut off any funds, in the discretion of their own legislature and Governors, any funds that go to any organization that provides abortion. They will call it services or counseling.

If we do that, then we can restore a component of the culture of life in this country. If we do that, we begin to respect and appreciate innocent, unborn human life, we will see families that will grow. We will see children that are cherished. We will see more and more foundation of education and faith and wholesomeness in our country.

If we turn our backs on those innocent, unborn, little babies that are being systematically aborted, while we are subsidizing Planned Parenthood with borrowed tax dollars, under the guise of somehow they do some good, this is evil, Mr. Speaker. What is happening to these innocent babies and what is happening to the mothers is evil, and it is evil for profit. It is on video, and we have seen three of these videos, Mr. Speaker. We are not done yet.

This Congress should not just pledge to study this for a year. This Congress—and we go forward with funding for the fiscal year, next fiscal year, we have got the witching hour, September 30, at midnight.

It is likely to come as a continuing resolution. That continuing resolution has to have in it the language that will cut off the funding to Planned Parenthood. I will cut it off to any organization that provides abortion, as they say, services or counseling.

That subject is on the front of my mind, Mr. Speaker, and I wanted to get that off of my chest.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. KING of Iowa. The next piece that I want to talk about is our national security. As we are watching presidential debates unfold—and our 16 or so candidates that are announced for President of the United States, I am grateful for every one of them.

I have never seen such a field of candidates that step up and want to serve this country from the Oval Office, the high quality of the character and the integrity that they have, the varied experience, and the success that they have demonstrated in their lives. There have been a lot of easier times to win the Republican nomination than there is now, Mr. Speaker.

As I look at the candidates that are out there—and I have been tuning my ear, encouraging them—I have yet to hear any of the candidates deliver a compact, inclusive approach to how to defeat Islamic jihad.

I listen to them speak, and I like the components that I hear from them. One of them says: We win; they lose.

I like that; but how are we going to do that? We need a strategy.

One of them says: If you attack us, we will kill you.

Okay. Well, let's kill them first. That is fine with me. They have declared war on us.

ISIS, for example, has established a caliphate. They declare it to be a caliphate. It is a caliphate. In northern Syria and in north and western Iraq, that real estate that they control is a caliphate, and they threaten all of the rest of the region, and they threaten us. They say that their black flag is going to fly over the White House. Well, some would say that will be a cold day, Mr. Speaker.

We have seen some dramatic changes in history over the last few years. I would say to the United States: We need to step up to this. We need to recognize our enemy. We need to defeat our enemies.

Our enemies are Islamic jihad, and Islamic jihad is comprised of the element within Islam that believes that their path to salvation is in killing us and that they can bring out some kind of worldwide revolution where, in the end, it will just be the purest of the pure of Islamists that are left on the planet. They will have killed everybody else; and all, whoever is left, must knuckle down to sharia law.

We need to defeat the ideology, Mr. Speaker, and when I say defeat the ideology, and I am speaking to a group of people, I will often see that look on their face, such as: Why do you think you can defeat an ideology? You can't defeat an ideology. You can't change a culture. You can't defeat ideology.

I recall one of those rebuttals that came to me, and I said, tell that to the Japanese. In fact, in World War II, in a 3½ year period of time, this country, with our allies, very powerfully, this country defeated three ideologies: the ideology of Japanese imperialism, the ideology of Italian fascism, and the ideology of German nazism.

All three of those ideologies went down in flames in a 3½ year period of time, in the face of—I will say this, Mr. Speaker—the superior culture.

The Western civilization, a superior culture that has a robust free enterprise, that has people that volunteer to engage in the economy, into the military, that reach out and pull each other up the ladder.

This robust United States of America, coupled with our allies, reaching across the map of Western civilization, rose up, rose up and defeated three ideologies in a 3½ year period of time in the Second World War; and then it took on a fourth ideology, which was the Russian version of communism. That took about 45 years. They were a little more tenacious.

It was not then just a kinetic operation. It wasn't just going up in flames. I am grateful that it wasn't. Instead, it was the economic and then political collapse of the Soviet Union brought about this way.

□ 2030

Ronald Reagan saw this. Margaret Thatcher saw it. Margaret Thatcher went to Ronald Reagan and said: With Mikhail Gorbachev, I have found a man with whom we can do business.

I don't quite understand the motive of Gorbachev, and he seems to have a little bit of revisionist history that comes out of him from time to time.

But I also know that Pope John Paul II traveled throughout areas of Europe and went into Poland and told them do not despair because they could be a free people.

The forces of the ideology of western civilization, western Christendom, as Churchill described it in his speech in Fulton, Missouri, are the forces that stood up against Russian communism.

In about 1984, when Jeane Kirkpatrick stepped down as Ambassador to the United Nations under Reagan, she made a statement upon her departure which was this.

She said: What is going on in this cold war—and that was near the height of the cold war—what is going on is Monopoly and chess on the same board. The United States and the Soviet Union are playing chess and Monopoly on the same board. It is just that the only question is: Will the United States of America bankrupt the Soviet Union economically before the Soviet Union checkmates the United States militarily?

That was the question. It was succinctly put. And I believe that will also show up on her Wikipedia page, but I happened to find it in the Des Moines Register back in that year, 1984.

Jeane Kirkpatrick was right. Five years later the Soviet Union imploded. On November 9 the wall went down in Berlin, and that was a symbol. Actually, I will say literally the Iron Curtain came crashing down throughout

Berlin and the Iron Curtain all across Europe went crashing down.

People flowed freely back and forth. The free world had defeated the ideology of communism that was the Soviet version of it. For a time, freedom echoed all the way across Eastern Europe all the way to the Pacific Ocean. And it can be restored again, Mr. Speaker.

That is the foundation that we have that we work with. We are the people that—because of free enterprise, because we have idea people with good educations and a solid moral foundation and a good work ethic, this country has generated more patents than anybody else, created more inventions than anyone else, but cooperated with especially the western world and with the creativity that we have.

We have been able to rise up against ideology after ideology, defeat three of them during World War II and defeat Soviet communism in a 45-year period of the cold war.

Now we are faced with another ideology that rises up to challenges: Islamic jihad. If you go back to the time of Mohammed, about the last 20 years of his life and for 100 years after his death, there was a conquest going on of—shall I call them religious conversions by the sword? And, as the conquest was going on, Islam was invading and occupying most of the known world at the time.

By 732 AD, Mr. Speaker, the Islamists were outside the city of Tours in France when Charles Martel brought his infantry into the trees to face the cavalry charge of the Islamists.

And cavalries don't operate very well in the forest, Mr. Speaker, and that is how the Charles Martel, Charles The Hammer's infantry defeated them there and chased them out of Tours and across the plains and left their bones scattered a long ways back towards Spain. That was 732 AD.

And you can fast-forward again and again to catch some of the milestones: In 1571, the battle of Lepanto where an Islamist navy was sunk by the Holy League navy that went to meet them in the Aegean Sea.

You can go to 1683, when Vienna was surrounded by Islamists of the time. On July 14, they surrounded Vienna, and for more than 2 months—they besieged Vienna for roughly 2 months.

And then, on September 11, the three German infantries under three German kings and Jan Sobieski, the Polish king, brought his cavalry, they held a service at Kahlenberg Church, which was razed. It was in ruins at the hands of the Islamists.

But they held a service there in the evening of September 11 and prayed for God's deliverance of their battle the next day that it already enjoined on September 11 and the deliverance of Vienna, which happened, as in the famous battle of Vienna, September 11 and 12, 1683.

It goes on. Then September 11 became the date that lived in infamy for the people who attacked us on September 11, 2001—New York, Pentagon, and Pennsylvania—and then again on September 11, 2012, Benghazi.

That date means something to them. It ought to mean something to us. They have been fighting western civilization for 1,400 years, and they have been adapting themselves to the technology that is created in the western world, creating very little themselves, but borrowing our technology, Mr. Speaker.

And some of that technology that is now being borrowed is the Internet, the Internet that is being used to inspire and to recruit and to direct the Islamists that are attacking Americans and attacking people that are not in alignment with ISIS and with Islamic jihad.

That is the effort that is coming and the ability that they have to use the Internet to coordinate and communicate. They will say as high as 100,000 tweets and emails and communications a day are coming out of ISIS and Islamic jihad in the broader definition of it. As high as 100,000 a day.

We need to bring about warfare against them. And it means not just defensive warfare to protect ourselves, but offensive warfare to attack them through the same medium that they are using to attack us.

So here is the list. It is not just a kinetic war against them, which they have declared against us, the kinetic war.

We need to do cyber warfare, financial warfare, educational warfare against them. We need to build a strong alliance with especially the moderate Muslim countries in the Middle East, those who should be our allies but for being a—let's say given the short end of the stick from our State Department during this administration.

And I am speaking of countries like Egypt; the United Arab Emirates, for example; Jordan, to a lesser degree. But they are natural allies to the United States. They are natural allies. In fact, they are allies to Israel today. They have been attacking our Islamist enemies in that part of the world.

The Egyptians allowed for planes to fly out of there, to fly into Yemen. And the Emirates sent some of their Air Force there. You have seen the Saudis do the same thing.

We can build an alliance in the Middle East with Saudi Arabia, whom I have got slightly less confidence in than I do in Egypt, and in the United Arab Emirates, with Jordan, and, also, working in cooperation with Israel.

When President el-Sisi of Egypt says to me that his relationship with Prime Minister Netanyahu is stronger with Egypt and Israel and President el-Sisi and Prime Minister Netanyahu stronger than it is with the United States, we should be troubled by that, Mr. Speaker.

We should be troubled by a foreign policy that has alienated the Egyptians, that has caused the UAE to wonder: What is America doing? Why are we paving the road to Damascus for our enemies? Why would we consider doing such a thing?

So this strategy, a strategy that I have put into an op-ed in the National Review, which was just published here in the last couple of days, Mr. Speaker, lays out a strategy to conduct cyber warfare, both offensive and defensive, and economic warfare to shut off the funds that are flowing to Islamic jihad wherever they might be flowing from, wherever they might be flowing through, whoever might be doing business with them and thinking they are going to profit.

We have got to turn that the other way. And then we need to shut down and shut off, if we can—and this is the most difficult component of the task—the educational system out there that is teaching this kind of hatred into the next generation. Build alliances with the moderate Muslim countries, as I have said, encourage them.

We need to be arming the Kurds with everything that we can get to the Kurds, everything the Kurds can use. And that doesn't mean send it through Baghdad to get the Baghdad stamp of approval. It means directly to the Kurds along with special operation forces that could be on the ground with the Kurds and call in airstrikes and support the Kurds as one jaw of the vice that will squeeze ISIS in Iraq and in Syria.

The other jaw of the vice is a natural. It is already there. It is Assad. And when those two jaws of the vice to come together and crush ISIS, by that point, we can take a look at Assad and decide how to approach the power that may be left in Syria at that point in time.

This is just a quick list, Mr. Speaker, of a strategy to defeat the ideology of Islamic jihad. The time has come for us to do that.

I want to see a Presidential candidate—or 16 of them, I hope—who can articulate a vision to bring about the defeat of this enemy that has been bringing battle against western civilization for 1,400 years, that targets the United States of America as the great Satan and the center of their efforts. They would like to destroy all of the United States of America.

And while this is going on, we have got a treaty proposal from the President of the United States with Iran. In the spring or summer of 2008, as a candidate, he said to Iran: Mr. Ahmadinejad, if you will unclench your fist, we will extend our hand. I would remind the public of that, Mr. Speaker.

Because that fist is still clenched in Iran. And the President is poised to hand over $150 billion to the Iranian economy that will juice that economy up.

It will allow them to bring conventional weaponry to bear. It will allow them to fund more Hezbollah. It will allow them to continue to develop the most recent version of centrifuges.

And even if they comply, in 10 years, the situation is set up where, rather than one weapon, it is 100 weapons, ICBMs sticking out of the sand in the Middle East, Mr. Speaker.

There is much to be done for this western civilization. We need to strengthen our culture. We need to believe in who we are. We need to sort the best things out of what we are and strengthen them. We need to cull out the weaknesses that we have. And we need a leader whom God will use to restore the soul of America.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of attending the funeral services for U.S. Navy Petty Officer 2nd Class Randall Smith.

Ms. JACKSON LEE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for July 27 and today on account of official business.

Mr. LEVIN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 4:30 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of official business at Trans Pacific Trade Partnership.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 876. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals to provide certain notifications to individuals classified by such hospitals under observation status rather than admitted as inpatients of such hospitals.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1482. An act to improve and reauthorize provisions relating to the application of the antitrust laws to the award of need-based educational aid.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 29, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2308. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Captain John W. Korka to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half), in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2309. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Law and Policy, Legal Division, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — 2013 Integrated Mortgage Disclosures Rule Under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (Regulation X) and the Truth in Lending Act (Regulation Z) and Amendments; Delay of Effective Date [Docket No.: CFPB-2015-0029) (RIN: 3170-AA48) received July 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2310. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility; Maine: Alna, Town of Lincoln County [Docket ID: FEMA-2015-0001] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8387] received July 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2311. A letter from the Director, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Imposition of Special Measure against FBME Bank Ltd., formerly known as the Federal Bank of the Middle East Ltd., as a Financial Institution of Primary Money Laundering Concern (RIN: 1506-AB27) received July 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2312. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Performance Standards for Ionizing Radiation Emitting Products; Fluoroscopic Equipment; Correction; Confirmation of Effective Date [Docket No.: FDA-2015-N-0828] received July 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2313. A letter from the General Counsel, Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Removal of Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board Regulations received July 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2314. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No.: 140117052-4402-02] (RIN: 0648-XD985) received July 27, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2315. A letter from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting draft legislation entitled ''Federal District Judgeship Act of 2015''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2316. A letter from the Acting Director, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel (02REG), Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Update to NFPA Standards, Incorporation by Reference (RIN: 2900-AO90) received July 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2317. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Attorney General's Third Quarterly Report of FY 2015 on the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994, pursuant to the Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act of 2008 (Pub. L. 110-389); jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Veterans' Affairs.

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:

(Omitted from the Record of July 27, 2015)

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1656. A bill to provide for additional resources for the Secret Service, and to improve protections for restricted areas; with an amendment (Rept. 114–231). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state or the Union.

(Filed on July 28, 2015)

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 455. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to conduct a northern border threat analysis, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–232). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 2786. A bill to require the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to submit a report on cross-border rail security, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 388. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1994) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3236) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, to provide resource flexibility to the Department of Veterans Affairs for health care services, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–234). 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 Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 3231. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to protect unpaid interns in the Federal government from workplace harassment and discrimination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 3232. A bill to protect unpaid interns from workplace harassment and discrimination; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 3233. A bill to amend the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 to protect unpaid interns in the legislative branch from

workplace harassment and discrimination, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. ROBY:

H.R. 3234. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish within the Department of Veterans Affairs an Office of Failing Medical Center Recovery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3235. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, to make grants to States for screening and treatment for maternal depression; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 3236. A bill to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, to provide resource flexibility to the Department of Veterans Affairs for health care services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, Science, Space, and Technology, Natural Resources, Veterans' Affairs, Education and the Workforce, the Budget, and Homeland Security, 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. ELLISON:

H.R. 3237. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to award grants for municipal solid waste prevention and recycling program development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. EMMER of Minnesota (for himself, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. AMASH, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 3238. A bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Financial Services, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EMMER of Minnesota (for himself, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H.R. 3239. A bill to provide enhanced security at Armed Forces recruitment centers through the installation of reinforced bulletproof glass and entry doors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 3240. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to carry out a plan for the purchase and installation of an earthquake early warning system for the Cascadia Subduction Zone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 3241. A bill to amend title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to authorize the establishment of, and provide support for, State-based universal health care systems that provide comprehensive health benefits to State residents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Oversight and Government Reform, Armed Services, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana (for herself and Ms. ESTY):

H.R. 3242. A bill to require special packaging for liquid nicotine containers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LANCE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 3243. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify waiver authority regarding programs of all-inclusive care for the elderly (PACE programs); to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. REED, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 3244. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a pilot program to improve care for the most costly Medicare fee-for-service beneficiaries through the use of comprehensive and effective care management while reducing costs to the Federal Government for these beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.R. 3245. A bill to prohibit the Federal Government from contracting with entities that donate or match employee donations to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 3246. A bill to provide for the temporary use of Veterans Choice Funds for certain programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN (for himself and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3247. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to exempt covered heavy-duty tow and recovery vehicles from certain weight limitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 3248. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to carry out a pilot program on issuing grants to eligible veterans to start or acquire qualifying businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi):

H.R. 3249. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the Pat Harrison Waterway District approximately 8,307 acres of National Forest System land within the Bienville National Forests in Mississippi, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio (for himself and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 3250. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prevent the abuse of dextromethorphan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 3251. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to exclude coverage of advance care planning services under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 3252. A bill to provide grants to eligible entities to develop and maintain or improve and expand before school, afterschool, and summer school programs for Indian and Alaska Native students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 3253. A bill to establish procedures for the expedited consideration by Congress of the recommendations set forth in the Cuts, Consolidations, and Savings report prepared by the Office of Management and Budget; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. MARINO:

H.R. 3254. A bill to amend the Dale Long Public Safety Officers' Benefits Improvements Act of 2012 to change the retroactive application of the Act to cover injuries sustained by rescue squad or ambulance crew members on or after December 1, 2007, rather than June 1, 2009; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. CONAWAY):

H.R. 3255. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income certain amounts realized on the disposition of property raised or produced by a student farmer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. COOK, Mr. LONG, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. PALMER, Mr. BRAT, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. CULBERSON):

H.R. 3256. A bill to require each agency to repeal or revise 1 or more existing regulations before issuing a new regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. MEADOWS (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. COOK, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK):

H.R. 3257. A bill to amend section 6906 of title 31, United States Code, to provide funding for the payment in lieu of taxes program for an additional five years, to provide a five-year extension of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for

a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NORCROSS (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 3258. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to establish a scholarship program for dislocated workers or unemployed individuals transitioning into manufacturing employment; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 3259. A bill to grant authority to the President to detain non-diplomatic officials of the Government of Iran in the United States and non-diplomatic officials of the Government of Iran in certain other countries until all United States citizens held by the Government of Iran are released and returned to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 3260. A bill to require all newly constructed, federally assisted, single-family houses and town houses to meet minimum standards of visitability for persons with disabilities; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FARR, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 3261. A bill to amend part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to deliver a meaningful benefit and lower prescription drug prices under the Medicare Program; 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. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 3262. A bill to provide for the conveyance of land of the Illiana Health Care System of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Danville, Illinois; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 3263. A bill to make innovative technology loan guarantee support available for battery storage technologies; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 3264. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the Saver's credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, 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. WELCH:

H.R. 3265. A bill to simplify the process for determining the need and eligibility of students for financial assistance under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. WELCH (for himself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 3266. A bill to improve the productivity and energy efficiency of the manufacturing sector by directing the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the National Academies and other appropriate Federal agencies, to develop a national smart manufacturing plan and to provide assistance to small- and medium-sized manufacturers in implementing smart manufacturing programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 3267. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the rate of payroll and self-employment taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COHEN, Mr. JOLLY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. MARINO, Mr. FARR, Mr. JONES, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BRAT, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MEADOWS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MICA, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. LANCE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. POSEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. VELA, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. KEATING, Mr. JOYCE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. FORBES, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. YODER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SALMON, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DONOVAN, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. MENG, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. WALZ, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HANNA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. COOK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. TURNER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. KILMER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. NUGENT, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DOLD, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mrs. BEATTY):

H.R. 3268. A bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3269. A bill to implement the Convention on the Conservation and Management of the High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean, as adopted at Tokyo on February 24, 2012, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3270. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to exempt Indian tribes from compensatory mitigation requirements in connection with certain discharges of dredged or fill material, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3271. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to allow preservation leasing as a form of compensatory mitigation for discharges of dredged or fill material affecting State or Indian land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. POCAN):

H. Con. Res. 65. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the upgrading of Malaysia on the 2015 Trafficking In Persons report; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HARPER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. NADLER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. TONKO, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. BLUM, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. FARR, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DENT, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. HAHN, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. DOLD, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. ESTY, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. BEYER, and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H. Con. Res. 66. Concurrent resolution recognizing and honoring the 25th anniversary of the date of enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H. Res. 385. A resolution declaring the office of Speaker of the House of Representatives vacant; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GALLEGO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. HAHN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. TITUS):

H. Res. 386. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the availability of high-quality child care for working parents should be increased; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H. Res. 387. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DELANEY (for himself, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. HANNA):

H. Res. 389. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to lower the threshold at which the gross budgetary effect of a piece of legislation requires the cost estimates provided for the legislation to incorporate macroeconomic variables resulting from the legislation, and to require the cost estimates provided for appropriation bills and joint resolutions to incorporate such variables; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DENT, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. FATTAH):

H. Res. 390. A resolution recognizing July 28, 2015, as ''World Hepatitis Day''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 391. A resolution expressing support for designation of August 22, 2015, as national ''Chuck Brown Day'' and honoring his contributions to music and to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. HUNTER introduced a bill (H.R. 3272) for the relief of Myles Newlove; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 3231.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 3232.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 3233.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. ROBY:

H.R. 3234.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 3235.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I of the United States Consitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 3236.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (related to laying and collecting Taxes, and providing for the common defense and general Welfare of the United States), Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes), and Clause 7 (related to establishment of Post Offices and Post Roads).

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 3237.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.''

By Mr. EMMER of Minnesota:

H.R. 3238.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 to regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations.

By Mr. EMMER of Minnesota:

H.R. 3239.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United Sates, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 3240.

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 common defense and general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 3241.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana:

H.R. 3242.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and cluase 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for the carrying out of the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3243.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 3244.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 as applied to the Medicare program under Title 18 of the Social Security Act.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.R. 3245.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 states that: ''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, and to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.''

Article 1, Section 9 states that: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations by Law.''

These two clauses provide Congress with the ''power of the purse.'' Congress has the Constitutional authority regarding authorizing and appropriating Federal spending on Federal government contracts.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 3246.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, this legislation is authorized by Congress' power to ''provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.''

By Mr. FLEISCHMANN:

H.R. 3247.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, 7 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 3248.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority for this bill is pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 3249.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Property Regulation, Federal

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio:

H.R. 3250.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 3251.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 3252.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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

18. To make all Laws which shall be necessary and power for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK:

H.R. 3253.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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

18. To make all Laws which shall be necessary and power for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 3254.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 (General Welfare Clause)—the Congress shall have Power to law and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the Common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause)—the Congress shall have Power . . . to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 3255.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 3256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 3257.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I. Section 8, 18 To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. NORCROSS:

H.R. 3258.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 3259.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 3260.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 3261.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 3262.

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) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 3263.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 3264.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 3265.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 3266.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 3267.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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. YOHO:

H.R. 3268.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution which reads: ''The Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.''

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3269.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3270.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3271.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 3272.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which provides Congress the power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 93: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 132: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 169: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois and Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 188: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 220: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 223: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 228: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 244: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 275: Mr. TAKAI.

H.R. 303: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 320: Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 333: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 348: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 366: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 407: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 425: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 456: Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 478: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 525: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 556: Mr. WALZ and Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 578: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 592: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 624: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 699: Ms. BASS and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 702: Mrs. LOVE, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 757: Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 765: Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 785: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 793: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 800: Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 816: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 836: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 842: Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 845: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 868: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 875: Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 902: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 916: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. KEATING, and Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 940: Mr. BRIDENSTINE and Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 961: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 969: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 994: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 997: Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 1061: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1062: Mr. HILL.

H.R. 1086: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 1100: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1133: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1150: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 1188: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1199: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 1210: Mr. PITTENGER and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 1217: Mr. DONOVAN and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1220: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1270: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 1286: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1301: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 1312: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1340: Mr. KATKO, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1347: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1354: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1371: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 1384: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 1391: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

H.R. 1401: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1434: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1439: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 1475: Ms. ESTY and Mr. ASHFORD.
H.R. 1479: Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 1490: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 1505: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 1552: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1553: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 1559: Mr. NEAL.
H.R. 1603: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
H.R. 1608: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 1610: Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 1624: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 1671: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 1686: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 1706: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1718: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 1728: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1737: Mr. PITTENGER and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 1748: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 1786: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 1814: Mr. JOLLY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 1854: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 1877: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 1899: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1902: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1904: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 1905: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 1934: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 2017: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 2050: Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. JOYCE, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 2058: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 2061: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. TROTT.
H.R. 2067: Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 2071: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2072: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2096: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 2101: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2102: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2132: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 2156: Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 2180: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 2216: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2217: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2241: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 2254: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 2258: Mr. ABRAHAM and Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 2259: Mr. ZINKE.
H.R. 2285: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 2287: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2315: Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 2327: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 2336: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 2342: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 2369: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 2400: Mr. BABIN, Mr. BARTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 2404: Mrs. NOEM and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2410: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 2412: Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 2450: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2460: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 2494: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 2510: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 2514: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas and Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 2521: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 2535: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2536: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 2602: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 2622: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 2624: Mr. HASTINGS and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 2638: Mr. KENNEDY and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
H.R. 2646: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DENT, Mr. BENISHEK, Ms. TITUS, and Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 2653: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 2661: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 2675: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2680: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 2689: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 2698: Mr. MULVANEY and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H.R. 2711: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. NUNES, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 2713: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. PETERS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 2715: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. LEE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 2721: Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 2739: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. TAKAI.
H.R. 2742: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2752: Mr. DOLD, Mr. KIND, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 2769: Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 2775: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 2799: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2802: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 2817: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 2820: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HUDSON, and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 2823: Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 2849: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2863: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 2873: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2875: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 2892: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
H.R. 2894: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 2896: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 2903: Mr. PETERSON, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MARINO, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 2922: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 2942: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 2944: Mr. GUINTA and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2948: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2972: Mrs. BEATTY and Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 2978: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2999: Mr. COSTA and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3011: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 3029: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3037: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 3040: Mr. NEAL and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3041: Ms. NORTON and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 3052: Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 3064: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 3068: Mr. NOLAN and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 3095: Mr. YOHO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3106: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 3110: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.
H.R. 3115: Mr. WALKER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BABIN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. JONES, Mr. PALMER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RIGELL, and Mrs. LOVE.
H.R. 3120: Mr. TROTT, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 3126: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 3129: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. LONG.
H.R. 3132: Mrs. LOWEY and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3134: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 3136: Mr. RUSSELL.
H.R. 3137: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 3139: Mr. KLINE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DOLD, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. RIGELL, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 3150: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SIRES, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 3151: Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 3155: Mr. POLIS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 3156: Mr. POLIS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. MOORE, and Mrs. LOVE.
H.R. 3158: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 3163: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 3165: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 3183: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 3184: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3185: Mr. KIND, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 3188: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 3189: Mr. GARRETT and Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 3190: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 3193: Mr. POLIS, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 3197: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FLEMING, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
H.R. 3209: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 3221: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TAKAI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. NEAL.
H.J. Res. 9: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. COLE, and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.J. Res. 59: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H. Con. Res. 40: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. WOODALL.
H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H. Res. 15: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FARR.
H. Res. 24: Mr. NORCROSS.
H. Res. 28: Mr. HIMES.
H. Res. 56: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H. Res. 110: Mr. COOPER.
H. Res. 130: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H. Res. 230: Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H. Res. 263: Mr. RUIZ.
H. Res. 265: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H. Res. 289: Mr. SCHIFF.
H. Res. 290: Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 294: Ms. ADAMS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H. Res. 318: Mr. ISRAEL.
H. Res. 327: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. VEASEY.
H. Res. 339: Mr. ROSKAM.
H. Res. 348: Mr. POCAN.

H. Res. 354: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H. Res. 367: Mr. WALDEN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H. Res. 368: Ms. ADAMS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. LEE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 374: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H. Res. 378: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

H. Res. 383: Mr. HUDSON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BARR, Mr. BABIN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. ROSS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. VEASEY.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 or rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. BENISHEK

My amendment to be offered to H.R. 1994, the VA Accountability Act of 2015, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Natural Resources in H.R. 3236, the Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. KLINE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce in H.R. 3236 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. MCCAUL

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Homeland Security in H.R. 3236 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. MILLER

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Veterans Affairs in H.R. 3236 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. PRICE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 3236, the Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 3236, the ''Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015,'' do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY MR. SHUSTER

H.R. 3236, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF TEXAS

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology in H.R. 3236, the ''Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015,'' do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 3236 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.