



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2015

No. 155

## House of Representatives

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

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
October 22, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHARLES J. FLEISCHMANN 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.

### TRANSPORTATION REAUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today, the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee will consider a surface transportation reauthorization. Unfortunately, calling it a "reauthorization" doesn't make it so.

This legislation calls for a 6-year period of reauthorization and hopes to be funded for 3 years, but it doesn't actually provide a single dime of revenue

from the highway trust fund. It is simply an empty shell.

It really doesn't have to be this hard. There is a single solution that is supported by everyone outside of Capitol Hill, one that has been employed by six red Republican States already this year and championed by Ronald Reagan when he was President: raise the gas tax. Our problems are that we are trying to fund 2015 infrastructure with 1993 dollars—the last time we raised the Federal gas tax.

I have a bill that will accomplish this fact. H.R. 680 provides that assurance and certainty by phasing in a gas tax increase over 3 years. It will permit us to fully fund a 6-year reauthorization for the first time since 1998 without resorting to gimmicks. It is cosponsored by over three dozen House Members, but, more importantly, it enjoys the broadest base of support for any major piece of legislation before Congress.

Is there any other bill of any significance that is endorsed by the U.S. Chamber and the AFL-CIO, countless business and trade associations, as well as individual unions, the American Trucking Association, representing that industry, and auto users, represented by AAA?

The answer is "no."

The coalition includes bicyclists, engineers, local government, transit agencies—virtually anyone who builds, maintains, or depends upon our transportation system.

For all the rhetoric about "strengthening the economy," this will be the one proven way of putting several million people to work at family-wage jobs while it reduces the deficit and strengthens our communities from coast to coast. Every State, every metropolitan area, every rural region of America would benefit both by the transportation improvements as well as the economic impact this work will create.

This has been recognized by independent analysts, editorials in major

newspapers, and in small newspapers all across the country. There really is no controversy.

Indeed, in the over two dozen States that have raised transportation revenue since 2012, the legislators who voted for more transportation revenue got reelected by a higher percentage than the legislators who voted against it. It is broadly supported, not politically controversial, and is desperately needed.

I am glad my colleagues were able to reach a compromise on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and put forward some interesting ideas. It gives a hint of what could happen if we had a real funding source, which we don't; and the bill being marked up raises more questions, therefore, than it answers. Even if the House were to embrace it unanimously, we would still be where we were 3 months ago, 6 months ago, and many times before that.

We are facing another short-term extension—this will be the 35th—and are providing zero assurance or long-term certainty to the many who rely on our transportation system. No country became great building its infrastructure 8 months at a time.

We can have markups and pass a reauthorization shell on the floor of the House; but until we embrace H.R. 680 and raise the gas tax, finding revenue that is sustainable, dedicated, and big enough to do the job, we are still going to be spinning our wheels; and America will be stuck.

### ASHLEY MITCHELL

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

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the accomplishments of a truly remarkable lady in my district.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H7093

Ashley Mitchell is a student at Alexandria High School in Louisiana, and her hard work and dedication to the sport that she loves so much has paid off in huge dividends.

Miss Mitchell just broke two world records while participating in the World Powerlifting Championships in the Czech Republic. Those records were the deadlift at 326.5 pounds and the other at 762 pounds. Now, those are impressive numbers, but even more impressive when you keep in mind that this young lady is 94 pounds. She represented the United States well and has returned home as the world champion for the United States of America.

It is young people like Ashley, who are leaders among their peers and who will be leaders in our communities very soon, whom we encourage.

I urge my colleagues to keep these young people, their potential, and their impressive accomplishments in mind as we do our jobs here in D.C. I commend Ashley for her talent, for her tireless effort, and for representing this country on an international stage in such an impressive manner.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE AND ADAPTATION

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, this morning, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration announced that last month was the warmest September in recorded history. Our reality can no longer be ignored. Climate change is here, and communities across the country—and the world—are feeling its effects. Just take the events we have seen unfold in 2015 as an example.

In April, drought-stricken California witnessed a snowpack with virtually no snow. On the other side of the country, Boston recorded its snowiest year with 110 inches between July 2014 and June 2015. Boston had so much snow, it did not melt until mid-July. 2015 also brought us the wettest months ever recorded in the U.S. within the 121 years of NOAA's recordkeeping; and this year, Tropical Storm Ana became the second-earliest tropical storm in history to make landfall in the U.S., in early May.

So what does all of this mean?

It means that we are no longer at a place where talking about climate change is enough. We need to act, and we need to act now.

I am proud that we have a President who is taking actions like reducing dangerous greenhouse gas emissions to mitigate climate change. Altering our current policies and enacting new ones will help reduce the impacts of climate change in the future. But mitigation is only one piece of the solution. We also need to adapt our policies to handle the effects of our already-changing climate in the present.

Climate change is already happening; and adaptation to climate change is

the only way we can help protect the people, the infrastructure, businesses, and ecosystems that are already threatened. We know that societies have adjusted to and have coped with changes in climate with different degrees of success; but our modern life is tailored to the stable climate we have been accustomed to. As the President recently pointed out, our climate is changing faster than we are adapting to it.

While climate change is a global issue, it is often felt on a hyper-local scale, so our cities have to be at the front line of adaptation. We need communities that have better flood defenses, plans for dealing with higher temperatures and heat waves, as well as better management of our water storage and use. Some cities are already taking steps to create these adaptation plans. Roughly 20 percent of cities around the globe have adopted adaptation strategies. My city of Chicago is included on that list.

The most obvious changes that Chicago is dealing with are hotter summers and more intense heat waves. Increased temperatures are leading to countless unforeseen consequences, such as heat-related illness and a deterioration in air quality. Higher temperatures are also boosting the demand for electricity, placing stress on our power plants. Heavy rains and snow are becoming more frequent in winter and spring. Increasing downpours make travel more dangerous, pollute our drinking water, damage crops, and disrupt infrastructure and transportation across the city.

But adaptation means more than protecting our cities. We must also protect our national defense. Many of our most critical military installations are already at risk.

A 2011 National Research Council report found that 128 U.S. military sites could be impacted by a sea-level rise of just 3 feet. Of those 128 sites, 56 are naval facilities valued at \$100 billion. Recent hurricanes have pushed water levels to dangerous heights in Norfolk, Virginia, threatening the largest naval base in the world. As sea levels rise and storms intensify, climate change threatens to require the relocation of that naval base.

This proves that local and State efforts are simply not enough. We need congressional action to produce lasting solutions that address the root causes of climate change and to prepare us for a very different future.

In closing, I defer to Charles Darwin, who said, "It is not the strongest of the species that survives nor the most intelligent; it is the one that is most adaptable to change."

I urge my colleagues to heed this warning and adapt to the reality in front of us.

#### SENSE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to paint a picture of the incredible progress of an industry that is making my district in western Pennsylvania a better place to work and live.

For many years, the coal industry has been an important part of the economy in Pennsylvania. Historic mining activity, unfortunately, left behind large piles of coal refuse. These piles consist of lower-quality coal mixed with rock and dirt.

For a long time, we did not have the technology to use this material, so it accumulated in large piles in cities and towns, close to schools and neighborhoods, and in fields across the region. This has led to a number of environmental problems: vegetation and wildlife have been harmed, the air has been polluted, acid mine drainage has impaired nearby rivers and streams, and problems compound when these piles catch fire.

The cost to clean up all of this is astronomical. Pennsylvania's environmental regulator estimates that fixing abandoned mine lands could take over \$16 billion, \$2 billion of which would be needed for the coal refuse piles alone. We needed an innovative solution to this tough challenge. A commonsense compromise was necessary to get the job done and protect the environment. That is where the coal refuse to energy industry comes in.

Using advanced technology, they have been able to use this previously unusable fuel to generate electricity. This activity powers remediation efforts that have, so far, been successful in removing over 200 million tons of coal refuse and repairing formerly polluted sites. I visited the Nanty Glo waste coal site, in my district, earlier this week and witnessed the massive transformation this area has undergone.

In this picture, you can see an example of the progress that has been made across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. In the foreground are the remnants of a coal refuse pile that is up to 40 feet deep. In the distance, you can see what used to be a coal refuse pile that is almost completely restored. A little bit of work remains. This hillside has been restored, and, soon, it will be covered with trees and wildlife. This is an example of the environmental progress that is being made.

□ 1015

The Nanty Glo site is one of the many examples of the good work being done by the coal refuse energy industry in Pennsylvania and in historic coal sites across the country.

We can all agree that we want to be good stewards of our natural resources and to use them as efficiently as possible. We also want to ensure that regulations do not hamper job creation, the economy, and opportunity for our families.

Unfortunately, expanding EPA regulations threatens to bring much of the waste coal industry's activity to a halt. That would leave billions of dollars of vital cleanup unfinished and hurt jobs and Pennsylvania's energy security.

A lot of people in Washington like to offer up a false choice between protecting the environment and economic opportunity. The success of the coal refuse industry shows that that does not have to be the case.

This week I am introducing a commonsense approach to keeping these facilities open while holding them to tough standards. We are calling this bill the Satisfying Energy Needs and Saving the Environment Act, or SENSE Act, for short.

The bill addresses problems arising from two of the EPA's more expansive rules: the mercury and air toxin standards and the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule, known as CSAPR.

Under CSAPR, which relies on allocations to limit emissions, we are requesting that the status quo remain in place with regard to sulphur dioxide emissions from bituminous coal refuse-fired power generators. Due to the nature of the coal refuse, these facilities would be unable to comply with a new standard that is expected in 2017. Under the mercury and air toxin standards rule, we are proposing to hold the industry to alternative limits for hydrogen chloride or sulphur dioxide emissions.

Consistent with this legislation, Senators TOOMEY and CASEY recently offered an amendment in the Senate exempting these plans from both the MATS and CSAPR requirements. While this proposal was supported by a bipartisan majority of Senators, it failed to achieve the supermajority required to pass.

This shouldn't be a controversial or partisan issue. We want to hold this industry to high standards, but standards that they can actually achieve. My bill will help keep the coal refuse industry in business so that the local community, economy, and environment will continue to reap the benefits. The fact that this industry performs such a vital environmental function means that we owe it to our communities to recognize these circumstances and do everything we can to allow them to keep up the good work.

Dennis Simmers, an engineer with Colver Power Project in Cambria Township and a long-time resident of the area, told me why he hopes my legislation is signed into law and the waste coal industry can go forward. "It's personal," he said. "Three generations of my family lived in Nanty Glo. Unfortunately, they died without ever seeing this environmental catastrophe corrected. There is a real shot now that I will see that in my lifetime."

With my legislation, I am working to ensure his vision becomes a reality.

#### AFFORDABLE CARE ACT AND HEALTHCARE WITHIN CA-46

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today a little disheartened, disheartened because my colleagues across the aisle seem to have forgotten about the priorities and the needs of the American people.

For an unprecedented 61st time, the majority has introduced a measure that would cripple the landmark Affordable Care Act. The consequences of such a budget measure would be terrible. Millions of Americans would lose their healthcare insurance, and premiums for others would skyrocket.

The majority claims that the ACA somehow is ineffective, costly, or illegal. They claim that it doesn't work. Well, they are just wrong.

Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act is working. It has been working. It has been working in my hometown. It has been working in Orange County, California, under the Affordable Care Act, the CHIP, and Medicaid. We have expanded insurance to over 12.3 million individuals; 2.6 million of those individuals are Latinos.

Costs under the ACA have been greatly reduced, and the ACA is projected to save the United States \$200 billion in the next decade and over \$1 trillion in the second decade. I would say that those statistics speak to the success of the Affordable Care Act.

The ACA has had great success back home in my home district. In Orange County, we had the highest number of new people enroll into the healthcare benefit exchange that we have in California. Currently, there are more than 1.3 million Californians that now have health insurance that didn't have it before.

See, Mr. Speaker, before the enactment of the ACA, the folks in my district—well, they considered it a luxury. They chose between buying clothes for their kids to go to school or putting food on the table. Or worse, they used home remedies.

I know because I grew up on home remedies. I grew up not going to the doctor. I grew up trying all these crazy things at home, having a simple flu, and being out of school for 10 days because we couldn't afford to go to the doctor. It is pretty unacceptable in today's time, Mr. Speaker, in the greatest country in the world.

Health care should be a right, not a privilege. We need to continue moving forward. We need to continue moving our communities from a culture of coping to a culture of coverage.

No longer do people have to worry about being denied for their existing health conditions. Quality health insurance is now available to all who seek it. Because nearly 4 out of every 10 people in my district are Medicare recipients, I understand how important

this legislation is for working families; so I will continue to work to join with my community-based organizations to ensure that our people are covered.

So tomorrow, when my colleagues across the aisle once again vote—number 61—to defund the Affordable Care Act, I would like for them to think about all the families in America that will suffer when that is passed; think of all the families; think about all the kids and their home remedies.

My colleagues in the minority and I have stood up. We have tried to explain to the other side the importance of the Affordable Care Act, only to have our passionate voices fall on deaf ears.

Despite these continuous attacks against an existing law which has improved the lives of millions of Americans, I will continue to fight for quality health care for the folks back home in my district.

#### OBAMACARE IS FAILING

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk for a few minutes this morning about the families that are suffering under the false promises of ObamaCare. We are beginning to see this play out all across the country. The ObamaCare failings are very pronounced; and you see them in the communities; and you understand how they are affecting lives.

Now, the supporters of ObamaCare continue to have blinders on about this; and they don't want to admit that the entire premise is a theory, not proven. It was change for the sake of change. It was change for the sake of centralized control. It was change for the sake of the arrogance of the elite making decisions for millions of Americans and determining what kind of health care they were going to be able to access.

We all remember that the press said that the biggest fabrication of the decade was, if you like your doctor, you can keep him. It is all so unfortunate.

I want to look, Mr. Speaker, for just a few minutes at what has happened with these co-ops that are now failing. The failings are very pronounced, and they truly have an imprint and an effect in our communities.

One month before the ObamaCare-funded Oregon co-op announced its failure in bankruptcy, the CEO said she saw a "long health life in front of us." They had a \$50 million Federal loan, if you will, and had managed to enroll only 10,000 people. Now the taxpayers are beginning to wonder if that loan is ever going to be repaid.

Take a look at Colorado. In the Colorado co-op, the same story; 72 million taxpayer dollars, and they enrolled 83,000 people. Do the math on what the enrollment alone is costing the American taxpayer, and do the math on what kind of healthcare access could

have been if individuals were going straight to the marketplace.

We have heard Kentucky celebrated as being such a success story and the poster child for the success of ObamaCare. Here is the truth: they have \$146 million in Federal loans and then another \$65 million in an emergency solvency loan. They have 51,000 people in a co-op that is not functioning.

And in Tennessee, where our co-op is going under, \$73 million, and they had 27,000 people enrolled.

Now, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to say, oh, ObamaCare has been such a success. If you do the math and look at the numbers, I take issue with that. I would not term that a success. I term it a failure.

I wonder if the people in Oregon and Colorado, Kentucky and Tennessee are feeling success as they, once again, find out that simply having an insurance card is not health care. It is access to the queue, if the company is solvent and the queue exists.

Imagine, four States, a collective nearly \$500 million for experiments. That is half a billion taxpayer dollars for experiments in health insurance delivery, all before anybody received any mental health help or received a single mammogram or a single child's vaccine.

We know that ObamaCare is too expensive to afford; and, for all too many, it is too expensive to use once they get the insurance. It is proving to be a failure.

#### VIOLENCE IN ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express strong support for the people and nation of Israel and to wholly condemn the horrific acts of violence targeting innocent civilians.

My heart goes out to the families of the victims. All people have the right to live in peace and security, and every nation has the right to take actions to protect its citizens.

As chaos envelopes Israel from all borders, we must stand stalwartly with our strongest ally in the region. Over the past month, unprovoked Palestinian attacks against Israeli civilians, including children, police officers, and members of the IDF, have increased to shocking levels.

Perhaps even more disturbing are the Palestinian leadership's recent incitements to violence. In a September 30 address, Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas addressed the United Nations, saying that Palestinians would no longer be bound by their commitments to the Oslo Accords. One day later, Palestinians ambushed two Jewish Israelis, Rabbi Eitam and Naama Henkin, murdering them in front of their children.

Since then, barbaric terrorist attacks against civilians, including stabbings, rock throwing, and deliberate car crashes, have become all too commonplace.

□ 1030

We have seen a 15-year-old teenager stabbed in Jerusalem, two rabbis stabbed and killed in the Old City, five people attacked with a screwdriver in Tel Aviv, and a driver intentionally hitting civilians at a bus stop, then getting out of the car with a sharp object and causing more bloodshed and destruction in broad daylight.

These are only some of the innocent victims of this deplorable violence. Rather than showing leadership and calling for common civility, President Abbas and other Palestinian leaders have chosen to further incite violence.

President Abbas has perpetuated false accusations about the Israeli Government's treatment of Palestinians and undermined the Israeli Government's assurance that it seeks to maintain the status quo on the Temple Mount.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to support the United States' longstanding policy of supporting our partners for peace in the region to reach a two-state solution. However, the Palestinian Authority's words and lack of action to quell the violence calls into question those partnerships.

I call on the international community to speak out against these brutal terrorist attacks. In addition, we must put pressure on those who are taking inflammatory actions that deliberately fuel tensions.

Just yesterday six countries submitted a resolution to UNESCO with the sole intention of delegitimizing Jewish history in our own Holy Land. This is disgraceful. I applaud the efforts of this administration to oppose this harmful and incendiary resolution.

We must unequivocally condemn terrorist attacks and actions wherever and whenever they take place. These violent attacks against Jews in Israel are part of growing anti-Semitism around the globe. Tragically, over the past few years in particular, we have seen a rise in anti-Semitism from the streets of Paris to the streets of Miami Beach in my district.

Around the world, we have seen the spread of a violent and depraved ideology aimed at crushing the values that we hold dear: the freedom to practice and celebrate our own diverse religions and cultures; the right to express ourselves in print and in speech; the right to live in our homelands and walk in our streets with dignity, respect, and safety. We must stand up and speak out whenever these rights are threatened.

As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, I am proud to advocate for strong funding and cooperation with Israel on matters of mutual interest.

As our strategic and democratic ally, we must bolster efforts to ensure that Israel has the necessary resources she needs to be secure and confront the violent threats against her. The rise in violence in Israel and of anti-Semitism more broadly is deeply troubling to me, as a lawmaker who values and respects the strong U.S.-Israel relationship; but it also impacts me more personally, as a Jew who feels a significant and historic connection to the land of Israel.

No nation on Earth can be expected to sit back and take these kinds of attacks on her citizens without responding.

President Abbas and Palestinian leaders must take clear and meaningful steps to stop this violence and encourage unity and a return to the path toward a peaceful two-state solution. There is absolutely no justification for violence against innocent civilians under any circumstances, and I call for those responsible for these vicious terrorist attacks to be brought to swift justice.

I proudly and firmly stand behind Israel's right to defend herself against malicious, brutal terrorist attacks from outside her borders and from within, and call on others here and around the world to do the same.

#### NDAА VETO THREAT

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

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the House for 5 minutes and talk about what the President is saying he is going to do on the NDAA.

The President is determined to end his second term on a spending spree, and that spending spree will threaten the national defense of this country and hold our military hostage. He is showing his lack of leadership by threatening to veto the NDAA, the National Defense Authorization Act.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, does this President not understand that the NDAA provides the resources for the military to do their jobs, to protect our great Nation and the freedom that we all enjoy?

The President is willing to jeopardize our national security in favor of more welfare programs. He threatens this reckless veto in spite of the fact that the NDAA has passed for 53 years in a row, a rare display of bipartisanship in this city.

The American people have had enough of political games. They are tired of them. Just turn on the radio and television, and see if you can't learn that. It is especially important when it jeopardizes the men and women of our military and our national security.

It is hard to find a worse example of leadership than a Commander in Chief who is so irresponsible that he is willing to deny his military resources and sacrifice the security of our Nation

simply for political games. Even more importantly is that, and that solid statement is exactly what is going on at the White House as he approaches this veto.

I would hope that he would realize that people—men and women, of all ages, from the chief of staff of the Army all the way down to the lowest private—have gone and risked their lives fighting for freedom and for liberty for the last 12 years; and they are being rewarded by a President that won't even back them up by passing the National Defense Authorization Act, something that has been passed by every House, every Senate, and every President for the last 53 years.

His reasoning is, I want more money for the welfare programs, which have been plussed-up over the years until some of them are out of control. Doesn't he think about the guys out there getting shot at or blown up and who must wonder why the Commander in Chief, the person who our military ultimately answers to, is not on his side, is not standing up for the soldier?

In my district, we have sent warfighters from Fort Hood to these actions now for 12 years. They deserve the support of this Congress. They deserve the support of the President of the United States.

This is a good bill. It is a bill that meets the President's standards that he set for this bill, gives him the increases he requested in this bill; yet, he is going to veto it for his political convenience. This is a shame, a shame on the country, a shame on the Presidency.

I hope that the President will reconsider. If not, I hope this body will have the strength to override this veto and stand up for the American soldier.

#### PALESTINIAN TERRORISM IN ISRAEL

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, at least nine Israelis have been killed and many wounded in the latest wave of Palestinian terror.

Nearly every day in the past few weeks, Palestinians have stabbed, shot, or run over innocent Israeli Jews. These terrorists do not care who their victims are. They want to kill as many Jews as possible.

Earlier this month, Palestinian terrorists murdered an Israeli couple driving in the West Bank right in front of their terrified children. This level of hate violence has not been seen in this region since the suicide bombings in the 2000s.

Why is this happening? What has caused this sudden outbreak of terror? The answer is really pretty simple: incitement by Palestinian leaders.

Just last month, Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas praised violent riots on the Temple Mount in Jerusalem; yet, the world press ignores

his doctrine of murdering Jews. He called Palestinians killed in the clashes "martyrs, fighting to keep the dirty feet of Jews out of the holy site."

The Temple Mount is the holiest place in the world for Jews, but according to Israeli law, only Muslims are able to pray there. Israel has no intention of changing the status quo on Temple Mount, but Abbas simply wants to create a charged atmosphere of violence. This incitement doesn't just come from his speeches.

Get this, Mr. Speaker: Palestinian leaders have turned their schools into virtual incubators to raise children as terrorists. School textbooks in Palestinian schools routinely teach students that Jews are evil and have no right to live in Israel. They are not just taught to hate; they are even instructed specifically how to stab Jews in these school textbooks.

As all of this incitement translates into real violence that kills Jews and injures Israelis, what has Israel done in response? Israel has reacted how any democratic country would react to defend its people. The policy is simple: if a terrorist is wielding a knife and is spotted, Israeli security is ordered to shoot that terrorist.

Israel has also increased its arrests of terrorists in the West Bank, including the cofounder of Hamas, a terrorist group. To deter more murderous attacks, Israel has destroyed the homes of terrorists who have attacked its citizens. Perhaps these terrorists will think twice about killing people: women, children, and men.

What exactly has our government said about this huge wave of Palestinian terrorism? When Israel is up against the wall, fending off daily attacks, the State Department says that Israel may be using excessive force. Is killing someone who tries to kill you considered excessive force? When did self-defense become excessive force?

Secretary Kerry went as far as to blame the current Palestinian violence on Israeli construction in the West Bank. Mr. Kerry is totally uninformed about what the facts are on the ground. Does Secretary Kerry mean to say that Israeli civilians deserve to be murdered? That is tantamount to saying that 9/11 occurred because of America's foreign policy in the Middle East.

This dangerous logic by the State Department only encourages more terrorist attacks. It does not stop the terrorism. Nothing can justify the killing of innocents.

Instead of our government supporting our Israeli allies, we are turning our backs on them. Instead, we should be standing side by side with Israel, condemning the terrorists. We should be pointing our fingers at the Palestinian leadership who have instigated all of this violence; hold those who preach hate and violence accountable, not give them a pass. Instead of calling out Israel, the State Department should be highlighting the incitement to hatred and violence in the Pal-

estinian curriculum, in their textbooks.

We must stop making excuses for terrorists and stand up for the victims. We must stand up for all of our values and our friends and not betray them. That includes standing with Israel.

And that is just the way it is.

#### 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 42 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

Reverend Rod Cannon, New Vision Worship Center, Zolfo Spring, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we are thankful for You and for the government that was built on Your foundation.

We thank You for our Representatives who are charged with focusing on the districts they represent and our Nation as a whole.

Bless them, Father. Let the burden that they have for their communities be shared by the people they represent. I pray for unity in their hearts. May they share one focus, and may that focus be pleasing to You.

Lord, open our eyes that we would see wondrous things from Your law.

Grant every official a strong desire for Your wisdom, the courage to say it, and the commitment to never turn from rectitude.

Father, let our Nation once again be a land pleasing and prosperous in Your sight.

Bless our military and law enforcement who lay their lives on the line every day on our behalf.

In Jesus' name we pray.

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 Nebraska (Mr. ASHFORD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. ASHFORD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

#### WELCOMING REVEREND ROD CANNON

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Reverend Rod Cannon of Zolfo Springs, Florida.

This afternoon, Reverend Cannon offered the opening prayer as the guest chaplain for the House of Representatives. I would like to thank Reverend Cannon for traveling to Washington for this honor and House Chaplain Father Conroy for providing this opportunity to a pastor from the 17th District of Florida.

Reverend Rod Cannon is the senior pastor at New Vision Worship Center in Zolfo Springs, Florida. He comes from a family devoted to the Church of God, where both his father and his son have been influential pastors in that community.

Reverend Cannon has been a leader in his church and the Zolfo Springs community since he arrived at the New Vision Worship Center in 2009. He has offered prayers across the State of Florida, and I am happy that he can add the House of Representatives to his extensive ministry.

I commend Reverend Cannon's commitment to his ministry and wish to thank him for offering the opening prayer today. It was my honor to invite him to Washington as guest chaplain.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

#### BLOCKING EPA REGULATION

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, the EPA is at it again. A few weeks ago, this runaway agency released its most expensive regulation in history. The new ozone rule joins a number of other costly, expansive, and crippling regulations put out by the EPA during the Obama administration. According to the EPA's own estimates, this new regulation will be one of the most crippling in history, at a cost of \$1.4 billion a year.

While no one disagrees that the protection of air quality is an essential responsibility, Hoosiers have a proven track record of being good stewards of the environment and good stewards of the economy. Yet the EPA continues to issue rules that overwhelm Hoosier companies and threaten job creation.

We should focus on policies that grow the economy, protect our environment, and not burying job creators under red tape and mandates.

It is time to end the EPA's assault on business. That is why, today, I am introducing a resolution of disapproval that would block this harmful regulation. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

#### GREAT LAKES RESTORATION INITIATIVE

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I recently joined my colleagues on the Great Lakes Task Force to ask the White House to support funding for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative next year.

The Great Lakes is the world's largest system of fresh surface water. It supports 1.5 million American jobs and \$62 billion in wages.

In western New York, Lake Erie is the focus of an amazing transformation of Buffalo's waterfront. Keeping the lake clean for recreation and fishing is essential to sustaining that economic growth.

The Great Lakes Restoration Initiative has also been instrumental in the next phase of Buffalo's waterfront renaissance, the Buffalo River. \$30 million in funding to clean up the river has leveraged \$20 million in private investment. Now the river that the Federal Government declared biologically dead in 1968 will be swimmable and fishable in 5 years.

The Great Lakes Restoration Initiative is creating jobs and improving environmental quality in my community, and it is producing returns for the national economy.

I encourage my colleagues to support the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative funding in the upcoming budget negotiations and to support the passage of the Great Lakes Restoration Act, which would authorize this program through 2020.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

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

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, defending the American people is the chief responsibility of our government, and it is a constitutional obligation that the House and the Senate take seriously.

This week, Congress put the National Defense Authorization Act on the President's desk. It is an important example of how Congress should work together to get the job done for the American people. This is bipartisan. We do it every year to fund our military. For 53 years, Congresses have passed and Presidents have signed this legislation.

Later today, President Obama will veto.

My district is home to Fairchild Air Force Base, and I know firsthand the importance of our defense funding. The National Defense Authorization Act funds vital military operations and equipment. Military families rely on it for salaries, medical care, and transitional resources.

Our Nation was built on service before self. We have an obligation—and the Commander in Chief has an obligation—to ensure military and defense remains our top priority. Mr. Speaker, the President must act. Stop playing politics. Support our troops. Keep America safe.

#### POTENTIAL DEFAULT

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

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose any potential default on our Nation's fiscal obligations.

Treasury Secretary Lew stated that we must act before November 3 to avoid a default. If we default, we can't pay our obligations at home, and that means our veterans and seniors go without the benefits that they have earned.

There is no doubt that we must rein in spending, and we must work together—and I know we can—to do so. At the same time, we must keep the promises that we have made to our veterans, to our seniors, and to our Nation's bondholders.

President Ronald Reagan agreed that sacrificing our credit rating in the name of fiscal responsibility is not responsibility at all. He said of a potential default: "Brinkmanship threatens . . . those who rely on Social Security and veterans benefits. Interest rates would skyrocket, instability would occur in financial markets, and the Federal deficit would soar."

Colleagues, let's not bring the government again to the edge of a default. Rather, let's find a bipartisan pathway, which I know we can do, that will control our spending and prevent the devastating effects of default on our economy and our veterans.

#### RESTORING AMERICANS' HEALTHCARE FREEDOM RECONCILIATION ACT

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3762, the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act.

Over the past 10 months, the House has passed a budget, acted to defund Planned Parenthood and other abortion providers, and repealed ObamaCare; yet these actions by the House have been stonewalled in the Senate by its failure to garner the 60 votes necessary to deliver these important pieces of legislation to the President's desk. Now is our chance.

This bill provides an avenue for the Senate to pass what the House has already done. This bill prohibits Federal funding to entities like Planned Parenthood that engage in the practice of elective abortions. In turn, it provides funding to community health centers for improving women's health care.

It repeals the individual and employer mandates in ObamaCare. It repeals the medical device tax and the excise tax on high-cost health insurance plans. It achieves all of this and more, while saving almost \$79 billion in taxpayer dollars.

This bill finally provides a pathway to the President's desk for reforms that we in the House have long fought for.

#### HONORING ORTIZ FAMILY SERVICE IN U.S. ARMED FORCES

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a remarkable family of American heroes, men and women who since World War II have served in our Armed Forces to keep all of us and our way of life safe and secure.

The story begins with Mr. Esabel Parga Ortiz and his wife, Maria Montoya Ortiz, who migrated to the United States from Mexico in 1912 and, in 1915, moved to the Coachella Valley.

In the heart of our southern California desert, they put down roots—resilient roots, mind you—and raised their children to value the American Dream. It was those teachings that inspired and drove their sons, Pete and Joseph, to enlist in the U.S. armed services and defend our Nation. Ever since World War II, every generation of the Ortiz family, totaling over 50 family members, have bravely served in America's Armed Forces, putting their lives on the line to protect our freedoms.

For their selfless and honorable service, I am proud to recognize the valor and sacrifices of the Ortiz family.

Thank you for your service.

#### RECOGNIZING DEBBIE NYE SEMBLER

(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 recognize the accomplishments of one of the longest serving trustees of the University of South Florida, Mrs. Debbie Nye Sembler. For 12 years, Mrs. Sembler served on the USF board of trustees; and, for 10 years, she served as chair of the campus board of USF St. Petersburg.

As Mrs. Sembler's term of service ends, I pay tribute to her many accomplishments, in particular, her contributions to excellence in higher education, not just for students from Pinellas County and the Tampa Bay area, but

for students across the State of Florida and, indeed, around the world.

When Mrs. Sembler became a trustee in 2003, USF St. Petersburg was just earning a reputation as a student-centric research institution. Today, it has over 7,000 students in 37 undergraduate and graduate programs.

As a trustee, Mrs. Sembler has led USF St. Petersburg through this remarkable growth, ensuring the USF system is recognized today as one of our Nation's leading higher education institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating and thanking Debbie Sembler for her hard work and dedication to USF, for her commitment to higher education, and, most importantly, for her passion for student success.

#### REAL SCHOOL GARDENS' 100TH LEARNING GARDEN

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize REAL School Gardens, an organization that works in over 40 elementary schools in my district, building gardens that engage the curiosity of students through STEM education.

As a member of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, I am proud of the work that REAL School Gardens has done in creating a pipeline, a STEM pipeline, in Texas that increases hands-on learning for all the students, including more than 100,000 students as of this year.

Additionally, REAL School Gardens has become a great equalizer for many students in the Grand Prairie, Dallas, Arlington, and Fort Worth Independent School Districts who have limited access to learning resources.

On November 14, 2015, REAL School Gardens will break ground to create its 100th garden in partnership with Sprouts Farmers Market.

I congratulate REAL School Gardens on this achievement and for their work in engaging the minds of our youngest members in the community.

□ 1215

#### NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS WEEK

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, each year since 1960, the third week in October has been proclaimed National Forest Products Week. It is a week in which we celebrate all of the ways that paper and wood products enhance our daily lives.

This industry is particularly important to the economic success of North Carolina, where nearly 60 percent of the total land area is forest and more than 18 million acres are dedicated to growing timber.

With nearly 250 manufacturing facilities, the State's forest products industry employs more than 40,000 men and women at a payroll of approximately \$2 billion per year. The value of the products produced in and shipped from North Carolina is more than \$10 billion.

America's forests keep our air and water clean while providing renewable energy, wildlife habitat, and recreation. They are also an economic generator, especially in the Nation's rural communities, delivering the paper and manufactured products we rely on every day.

We are grateful for this industry in North Carolina.

#### WHITE HOUSE FELLOWS PROGRAM

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

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, this week the White House Fellows Association is honoring the 50th anniversary of the creation of the White House Fellows Program, established by President Lyndon Johnson back in 1964.

Since its inception, there have been 738 young men and young women who have served the President and the Vice President of the United States and the Cabinet officers in various capacities in all the Federal agencies.

Mr. Speaker, I was honored in 1981 to be selected in the first class of President Reagan's White House Fellows Program. I served with the former Governor of South Carolina, James B. Edwards, the Secretary of Energy, in the Department of Energy.

Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent program open to all young Americans early in their careers who want to spend some time in Washington and then go back to their former careers with a better understanding of how our Federal Government works.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. Con. Res. 82 to recognize the White House fellows and their many contributions to our country. I urge Members to support this resolution if and when it comes to the floor.

#### HONORING INDIANA'S BLUE RIBBON SCHOOLS

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

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and honor two southern Indiana schools for their distinguished success. Farmersville Elementary School in Mt. Vernon and North Elementary School in Poseyville were recently selected as 2015 National Blue Ribbon schools by the U.S. Department of Education for their academic excellence.

Each school will be honored in November, along with 333 other schools from across the country, at a ceremony here in Washington, D.C. Both schools

were recognized as exemplary high-performing schools which is, without a doubt, due to the hard work of dedicated teachers and faculty and committed students.

Congratulations to Farmersville and North Elementary Schools. This is a well-deserved national recognition.

#### REMEMBERING RANDOLPH HOLDER

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday night, right after dark, Officer Randolph Holder of the NYPD heard on his radio, "Shots fired." He immediately rushed toward the gunfire in East Harlem. He arrived, but was gunned down by an outlaw. Holder was assassinated with a shot to the head.

Just 33 years old, Randolph Holder was an immigrant from Guyana. According to his aunt, his job was first in his life. He cherished the opportunity to become a policeman here in America.

He was a third-generation police officer, following in the footsteps of his father and grandfather, who served as peace officers in Guyana. Randolph was proud to be the first in his family to serve in that capacity in America. His killer was a hardened, violent criminal who shouldn't have been on our streets, according to the mayor.

Mr. Speaker, the war on police officers has resulted in 31 officers being killed in the line of duty just this year. The badge that represents safety for most is a target for some. Those in blue do a job that many of us would never do. So we owe them all, like Officer Holder, our extreme appreciation for taking care of the rest of us.

And that is just the way it is.

#### VETOING THE NDAA IS IRRESPONSIBLE

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

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a simple request. Every day across the globe men and women of the United States Armed Forces make grave sacrifices for our country and are courageously protecting us from a number of evils.

From an Iranian regime pursuing a nuclear weapon to the self-proclaimed Islamic State terrorizing the Middle East, to Russia looking to expand its influence in a world where American leadership is on the decline, we rely on the men and women in uniform to keep us safe.

In Congress, we are tasked with supporting our military, promoting legislation that will give them the tools they need and providing for their families stationed back home.

The House and Senate fulfilled these responsibilities by passing the National

Defense Authorization Act in an overwhelmingly bipartisan fashion, reassuring our military that, as they protect us, we will support them.

It is totally irresponsible for the President to veto this bill while our troops are in harm's way, and I call on all Members of Congress to join together to override the bill. There is nothing political or partisan about the support for our military, and it is outrageous that the President would take this action.

#### JASON SPRADLEY ATTAINS EAGLE SCOUT RANK

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

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, today I want to give special recognition to a special individual.

Jason Spradley was recently awarded the Eagle Scout designation, the highest rank in the Boy Scouting program. He is a senior at Airline High School in Bossier City and hopes to pursue law and become a JAG officer in the Navy.

While Jason is just 17 years old, he has worked over a decade to reach this Eagle Scout status. The qualifications state a Boy Scout must earn 21 merits to reach this level. Jason earned almost 40.

These young men earn merits by proving their skills in camping, first aid, and many more, but more than learning how to fish or start a fire, Boy Scouts learn about serving their community. Obedience, loyalty, and many other characteristics make up what we know to be a true leader.

The Boy Scouts motto is "Be prepared." I would say Jason and these young men have already built a solid foundation in their lives. I wish him, the rest of the members in troop 105 in Louisiana, and the many other young men across the country who have attained Eagle Scout the very best. I know that they all have a bright future ahead.

#### NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS WEEK

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

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, this week we celebrate National Forest Products Week, and I rise to recognize the important contributions of our wood products across Montana and the country.

In my home State alone, we have more than 20 million acres of timber. We have 12 sawmills that employ thousands of Montanans; yet, we can't cut a tree in Montana. The number of lumber products has gone down because we can't figure out in this body how to cut a tree without a lawsuit.

There is a bipartisan bill in the Senate, the Resilient Federal Forests Act, that passed out of this body bipartisan,

and the Senate is not picking it up. We are not going to hear about forest fires from now until the end of winter, but they are there, and it is time to act.

When a bipartisan bill comes out of this House and the Senate refuses to pick it up, it has consequences on Montana, and it has consequences on hard-working families that just want to make a living in the timber industry.

#### AMERICAN FAMILIES ARE LESS SAFE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday the President's Iranian nuclear deal, a tragic mistake, went into effect. Instead of making the world safer, as promised, American families have become less safe. As reported in *The Post and Courier* of Charleston, since the Iran deal was reached, the Iranian regime tested a ballistic missile that could reach Israel, in direct violation of U.N. resolutions.

After the test of the missile, the Iranian defense minister said: "We don't ask permission from anyone." This does not come as a surprise. We know the Iranian regime cannot be trusted. Sadly, it is shocking that the President has dismissed the Iranian regime's flagrant disregard of international rules and still insists that Iran will uphold their part of the deal.

The evidence is overwhelming that the Iranian regime will break the agreement, with billions of dollars for new attacks. The President's legacy is American families at risk of terrorist attacks by jihadists and a rogue regime oppressing the people of Iran.

In conclusion, God bless our troops. The President, by his actions, must never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. Tomorrow is the gruesome 32nd anniversary of the murder of 241 Americans at the marine barracks in Beirut by Iran. Our sympathy for their families.

#### RAISING DOWN SYNDROME AWARENESS

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this weekend I will be joining countless advocates in Centre County, Pennsylvania, for a Buddy Walk hosted by the National Down Syndrome Society. These walks have been held across the Nation for the past 20 years, raising awareness and promoting self-advocacy for those living with Down Syndrome. In spite of some extra challenges, many people with Down Syndrome attend school, work, and contribute to society in a wide variety of ways.

In order to provide those living with Down Syndrome and other disabilities

the best start possible, I was happy to cosponsor, along with a majority of my colleagues in the House, the Achieving a Better Life Experience, or ABLE, Act, which was signed into law last year.

This law allows people with disabilities and their families to create a flexible account to help save for medical and dental care, education, community-based support, employment training, housing, and transportation.

In my home State of Pennsylvania, State legislation that will allow deductions of account contributions from State taxable income has been introduced in the Commonwealth's house and senate. I urge their passage to complete the work the Federal Government has started.

**DOWN SYNDROME AWARENESS MONTH**

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, this month we recognize Down Syndrome Awareness Month. As we celebrate the abilities of more than 400,000 Americans living with Down Syndrome, it is important that we address some of the problems these individuals and their families face.

Families and patients who are affected by Down Syndrome face many related health issues. I had the privilege of meeting a very inspiring patient during the Energy and Commerce's work on 21st Century Cures legislation. Madison, a young girl diagnosed with Down Syndrome, had four major open-heart surgeries all before her 3rd birthday.

An estimated 50 percent of children born with Down Syndrome have some form of heart defect, like Madison; yet, her surgeries are still fairly new in the medical world. Our Cures legislation encourages additional research for medications and procedures that could benefit children like Madison. We must continue our work to promote a better quality of life for all patients across the Nation.

□ 1230

**RECOGNIZING INTERNATIONAL DAY OF THE GIRL AND THE GIRL UP MOVEMENT**

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the International Day of the Girl and the Girl Up movement. Their mission is to raise awareness to the neglect and devaluation of girls around the world and to advance girls' lives and opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, in the Aw-Barre refugee camp in Ethiopia, girls under the age of 18 comprise about 30 percent of the

population. However, due to the lack of resources, many families of the Aw-Barre have stopped educating their girls. This leaves young women more vulnerable to be victims of sexual violence and significantly limits their lives and opportunities.

Girl Up, a local campaign in Illinois' Tenth Congressional District, is working to combat global crisis like the Aw-Barre refugee camp. Young women, like Celia Buckman of Glenview, are working with their high schools to provide resources like school uniforms, backpacks, and safe spaces to help young women succeed.

I am proud to work with Girl Up and recognize the International Day of the Girl to bring awareness to the complex challenges facing young women around the globe.

**COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE**

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, October 22, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in clause 2(h) of rule II of the rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 22, 2015 at 10:47 a.m.:

That the Senate passed with amendments H.R. 208.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 774.

With best wishes, I am  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

**PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3762, RESTORING AMERICANS' HEALTHCARE FREEDOM RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2015; WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(A) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES**

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 483 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 483

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3762) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of

order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. 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 October 23, 2015.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of October 22, 2015, or October 23, 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.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to start with the end of what our Reading Clerk read before I get to the excitement in the beginning.

At the end, what you heard was some blanket authority to consider what I will call housekeeping measures here in the House, and not because Republicans say so, not because Democrats say so, but because Republicans and Democrats come together, consult with one another, and try to find those issues on which we agree to bring forward.

I sit on the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker. The best thing that happens in this institution is when a bill comes through the Rules Committee, because my colleague Ms. SLAUGHTER and I always make it better. We always make it better.

But we include authority to avoid the Rules Committee for some of these issues that are going to come to the floor fast and furious. Here we are, at the end of a cycle. We are in a leadership change here in the House. You don't know what might happen. What the Rules Committee did last night was to create a pathway to allow the House to continue its business at a moment's notice, and I am glad that we included that provision in here. We also include same-day consideration authority.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that happened when the big freshman class that I was elected with in 2010 came is we said, for Pete's sakes, we need time to read the bills. We need to follow the rules and make sure that all Members have a chance to get deep into the information and legislation.

That persists still today. We have a process today that allows Members to get involved in that legislation. But we still have those emergency times here in this Chamber where something has to happen in a hurry. Whether we are talking about borrowing authority, spending authority, whether we are talking about something for our troops, something for our veterans, things still happen on a moment's notice.

What we have included in here is the ability to bring things more quickly to the floor here in the next short period of time. That is important from a housekeeping perspective, Mr. Speaker, but that is not what is important about this rule today.

What is important about this rule today is that 4½ years ago, the people of the great State of Georgia, its Seventh District, sent me to Congress. I was placed on the Budget Committee in this Congress, the Budget Committee, the committee that writes the framework by which the entire \$3.5 trillion Federal Government is funded. We got together and we worked hard here in the House, Mr. Speaker, and we produced a budget, but the Senate did nothing.

I came back that second year, 2012. We worked hard here in the House. Together, we produced a budget, but the Senate did nothing. We came back again 2013, worked hard here in the House, produced a budget, but the Senate produced nothing.

Mr. Speaker, what we are here today to do—what we are here today to do—is made possible for one reason, and one reason only. That is because, for the first time since 2001, Republicans and Democrats came together in the House; Republicans and Democrats came together in the Senate. We passed a budget; they passed a budget. We conferenced a budget, and America has a balanced budget which it lives under for the first time in 15 years—for the first time in 15 years.

Now, what does that mean?

It is not all that exciting to read the budget, Mr. Speaker. I recommend it to you if you haven't gotten into the details. I recommend it to anybody who hasn't gotten into the details.

But that is not what is exciting. It is not the numbers in the budget that are exciting. What is exciting is that, because we came together, not because we had our ideas and they had their ideas, but because we came together, we have triggered a process called reconciliation.

Now, I am saddened that reconciliation is now in the lexicon of the American people. It is not an important word that folks need to know ex-

cept for the fact that it gives us access to do things on their behalf that we wouldn't have been able to do before.

I am so pleased that the Secretary of the Senate sent that message over right before we got up to say that the Senate has just acted on two pieces of House legislation. One of those, enacted with no amendments, is going to be on its way to the President's desk. One, done with amendments, we are going to have to consider that again.

So often we do such good work, the 435 of us together in this Chamber, and it does not get past a Senate filibuster. Mr. Speaker, the filibuster is designed to protect the rights of the minority. Republicans use it when they are in the minority; Democrats use it when they are in the minority; but it prevents the people's business from moving forward.

Not so today. Not so today. Because we got together in the House with a budget and the Senate with a budget, because we brought a budget together, we are now in the process of reconciliation, which allows us to have the people's will be done. Fifty-one votes in the Senate now will move legislation forward, as it relates to balancing the budget.

You remember, Admiral Mullen, he said, Mr. Speaker, the greatest threat to American national security wasn't a military threat. He said it was our Federal budget deficit.

We have done such an amazing job collaboratively in this Chamber working on the one-third of the budget pie called discretionary spending. That is the spending that we have to work on here every year. What we have failed to do together is work on the two-thirds of the pie called mandatory spending, where the real growth in those budget programs occurs. But that failure ends today.

With the passage of this rule, we will move to consider the first reconciliation package that has come to Congress in the 4½ years that I have been here, made possible by the first balanced budget agreement that Congress has come to since 2001.

Mr. Speaker, this is why—this is why—I came to Congress, and we are doing it together here today.

Let me tell you what is in this bill. I have seen it described in the press as a complete and total repeal of the President's healthcare bill. That is nonsense. I would support such an effort if we could bring such an effort to the floor, but that is not what this bill is today. What this bill is today is a group of commonsense, budget-saving, spending-reprioritizing measures.

I will give you an example. There is a medical excise tax that the President's healthcare law put into effect. It is 2.3 percent. It is an excise tax, a gross receipts tax on all medical innovation in this country as it relates to devices. We all know the power to tax is the power to destroy. There is not one Member in this Chamber who supports destroying medical innovation, not one—not one.

But, back at the time when the Congressional Budget Office said the President's healthcare bill was going to cost \$1 trillion, the President said: I am not going to spend a penny more than \$1 trillion. I am going to make sure it is paid for.

He was out there looking hard for money. Turns out, medical innovation was a place he could look. We all see now, in retrospect, that was a terrible idea, much like the other nine bills that we have passed here in this House, that they have passed in the Senate, that the President has signed into law to repeal various unworkable parts of the President's healthcare bill. This is just yet another.

We can do this together here today, made possible by this first budget agreement that we have had since 2001.

The Cadillac tax it is called, Mr. Speaker, another provision that this bill will repeal. It is a Cadillac tax, Mr. Speaker.

As we all know, Cadillac is a fine American automobile. You get in a Cadillac, you feel good. We call it the Cadillac tax because it is on healthcare plans that are too good—too good. Turns out, Mr. Speaker, there are some labor unions in this country that are taking too good of care of their members. Turns out there are some businesses in this country that are looking after the healthcare needs of their employees too much. We want to keep that down. The last thing we want in this country, apparently, is folks having health care that is too good.

I tell people all the time, Mr. Speaker, I can make everybody in this country poor; I just can't pass a law to make everybody rich. We are so good at dumbing down the system for everybody. Well, that is what this Cadillac tax was designed to do.

The labor unions don't like it. Employers don't like it. We all know it is not the right thing to do, and in a bipartisan way we have introduced legislation to repeal it. This bill, this rule, gives us an opportunity to actually send that to the President's desk.

Mr. Speaker, I won't go on and on about all the good things that are in this bill. I am sure my colleague from New York is going to highlight a lot of those herself, and I don't want to steal all the thunder.

But we are here because 435 of us came together here, 100 came together there, and America is operating under a conferenced budget, and not just a budget, but a balanced budget for the first time since 2001.

A lot of disappointment has come out of Washington, D.C., Mr. Speaker, but we are here on the floor today talking about one of those things we get to celebrate, one of those successes on behalf of the families back home, that we have done together.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time

as I may consume. I really enjoy serving with him on the Rules Committee because he is always so cheerful and puts such a good face on everything, and heaven knows we can use that in the world.

But the truth is, Mr. Speaker, and my colleague knows it, that by taking away the funding for the healthcare act, you are killing the healthcare act. That means that people would go back to not having preexisting conditions covered.

That means that women in eight States and the District of Columbia would face the fact that their insurance companies consider domestic violence to be a preexisting condition, which translates out, if you are beaten up once, maybe they will cover you. The second time, it is obviously your fault. You have that propensity.

We can't go back to the rising cost of health care with so many Americans using the most expensive kind of health care in the world, the emergency room. We are told that if this were to pass, 13 million Americans would lose their health care.

But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, this is not going to pass, and we know that. As a matter of fact, I find myself saying over and over again the very same things. I remember saying this is the 35th vote, this is the 40th vote. This, Mr. Speaker, is the 61st vote, using tax money and wasting time, to take health care away from people.

Now, I have asked many, many times in the Rules Committee: What is this great urge to prohibit people from having access to health care?

□ 1245

The best I can come up with is it is not particularly that they don't care about those people, but they want to do something to upset the President. There was a good deal of talk yesterday that, if we could add a few amendments on here, it would really cause him grief.

It is not going to cause him any grief. If this should pass, if the Senate should pass it, which is in control of Republicans—and, you know, if you complain about not passing the bill, take it up with them—what we are going to be doing is, if it gets to the President, he is going to veto it, and you know very good and well that we don't have the votes here to override. So we are wasting time.

We are just wasting time and wasting money. I don't know how many millions of dollars of tax money it has taken with these 61 bills, but then they throw in a little something else here.

They say: Let's defund Planned Parenthood for 1 year. Why? I don't know. Three committees in the House of Representatives are studying Planned Parenthood, and we have got to look forward to one of those other new select committees which will go over the same thing over and over again and come up with the conclusion that Con-

gressman CHAFFETZ came up with after they grilled the president of Planned Parenthood, Cecile Richards, for 5 hours, that there was nothing there, that they broke no law.

I don't know why the American public is not outraged over the fact that none of their business is taken care of, but over and over and over again we talk about taking health care away from people.

One in five American women and a lot of men have used Planned Parenthood and do today. And then you add to that the 13 million people that will lose their health care if this should become law, 3 million of them children.

Now, what should we be doing? Well, how about the Export-Import Bank. It doesn't cost the taxpayers a dime, puts money back into the Treasury. It allows small companies in the United States to be able to afford to export their goods to other countries.

The loss of that bank has already received from both General Electric and Boeing words that they are going to take jobs out of the United States because we don't have it. There is no earthly reason not to have it. As I said, it doesn't cost us anything. It makes us money. It is just that for some Members of Congress they just don't like it.

Now, this is the same majority that has produced no highway bill. We really are on a road to nowhere. For the first time that I have been in Congress—a highway bill was always something everybody joined. It was always bipartisan.

But we have got roads and bridges crumbling. We have no high-speed rail. Airports are overcrowded. Everybody needs help. But we are working here to do something about the healthcare bill that is already working and Planned Parenthood.

Now, this is the same majority that brought us the 7 legislative days away from risking the full faith and credit of the United States. What that means is that we are refusing—the majority is—to bring up a bill here to pay the debt that they have already incurred. It is the Congress that spends the money, and now they decided they don't want to pay for it. So they are putting that off.

We have heard talks that tomorrow we are supposed to have a bill, but we all know—because we all hear everything that is going on—that there are only 170 votes for that bill, which won't pass it. So we may not see it.

So what we are going to do today is give everybody in the House of Representatives an opportunity to protect the full faith and credit of the United States and not risk another downgrade of our credit rating. To downgrade the credit rating of the United States was something that all previous Congresses felt was an impossible thing for them to allow.

But while this is all festering out there and nothing is being done about it, we are hurling toward another shutdown in mid-December.

So once again we find ourselves: Let's take away that health care. Let's shut down that thing over there. But let's not deal with the issues that we have been sent here, the things that we have been elected to do.

And one of those has to be to protect the full faith and credit of the United States of America, which has always been done and was a responsibility of all previous Congresses.

Now, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the reconciliation bill before us will take health care away from 16 million people, 3 million children, and I might add most of them didn't have any health care at all before the ACA was passed. As I said, it would also defund Planned Parenthood and endanger the health of men and women across the country. If I haven't said it enough, again, this defunds Planned Parenthood.

A scant 3 weeks ago we stood on the floor as the House majority threatened to shut down the government over the funding for Planned Parenthood. The American public gave a very resounding message to Congress: Don't do it. In fact, nearly seven in ten Americans oppose a government shutdown over Planned Parenthood funding, according to a Quinnipiac poll.

With this 61st vote to dismantle the ACA—and make no mistake about it. It doesn't say in there we are going to kill this thing. We are just going to take the money away from it.

And if you are smart enough to be a Member of Congress of the United States, you know that, if you take the money away from it, you have killed that bill. We all understand that. But as the majority continues to beat their head up against the brick wall of health care, the American people get the headache.

This budget reconciliation bill before us does two things. One, it takes health care away from, as I said, 16 million Americans. Two, it attacks women's health by defunding Planned Parenthood.

I believe that governing this body is a serious job with serious consequences. The brinkmanship that this majority continues to display is dangerous to our economy and unsettling to our Nation. The last time the majority shut down the government over the debt limit, it took \$24 billion out of this economy.

The consequences of this kind of brinkmanship are real. They are not imagined. We have been through it once. Why in the world would we self-inflict that wound on ourselves again?

We should not be pushed to the edge over and over again. We should be planning what we need to do, follow regular order. My dear colleague Mr. WOODALL talked about how wonderfully well Democrats and Republicans work together. I don't know where that is.

I know that the chair of the Benghazi Committee kept talking about he had 7 members. There are actually 12 on there. But it just demonstrated again

that the 5 Democrats on there did not signify with them.

We need to focus on the urgent needs of the Nation, not manufactured crises that we are insisting on creating.

To address the real issues, we have got a plan to allow us to pay the bills that this Congress has incurred and to protect the full faith and credit of the United States. We always call for this on rules. We do something called the previous question, which everybody sort of glides over.

This today, what we are doing—when the previous question on this rule vote is called, I hope that every Member who wants to do something about the debt limit and the full faith and credit of the United States will vote “no” so that our side can bring this up and give everybody an opportunity to go home for a weekend without worrying about whether this is going away.

By the time we get back here next week, there will be even fewer legislative days to deal with it. But our troops, national security, the whole Federal Government, and most of the people in the United States are very much concerned with what will happen if it shuts down.

Let’s relieve us of that burden and vote today to deal with the debt limit. I invite all Members to vote for the Democrats’ clean, simple bill. It doesn’t do anything about taking away regulations from the government, nothing. It simply deals with the most important matter at hand at this point, and that is the full faith and credit of the United States.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I confess. I was sitting over here going through my papers. I was afraid I had come down here on the wrong bill here today, listening to my friend describe it. I tell you that, if you listen to that description and you believe it, you ought to vote “no.” But it is just not true. It is just not true.

In fact, I will go line by line just a little bit. You will not find a CBO document over there that says House Resolution 483 is going to take health care away from 16 million Americans. We are not going to find it.

In fact, you won’t find a CBO document that says the underlying bill of H.R. 3762 is going to take health care away from anybody because such a document does not exist.

CBO did say that the President’s healthcare bill would provide health care for 16 million Americans. Yet, the President has joined with this House and that Senate nine times so far to repeal errant provisions of that healthcare bill, and that is what we are going to do here in this legislation today.

You won’t find any language that suggests that House Resolution 483 is going to deal with preexisting conditions to set back preexisting conditions coverage in any way whatsoever, nor will you find any paper that suggests

the underlying bill, H.R. 3672, is going to set back the conversation on pre-existing conditions.

Why? Because the President led on the issue of preexisting conditions, Mr. Speaker, much like a great Georgia speaker of this House, Newt Gingrich, and Bill Clinton got together and did in 1996. They got together and outlawed all preexisting conditions for federally regulated plans.

What President Obama did in his healthcare bill has said: Well, as States haven’t done it on their own, we are going to do it for all State-regulated plans, too.

This bill doesn’t dial that back one iota, not one bit. The President, I believe, won that debate in America. I don’t think we are ever going to revisit that debate.

I think that is a success story for families with preexisting conditions and, again, something else we ought to be celebrating here today, Mr. Speaker, not holding our heads low about.

Mr. Speaker, when the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff tells you that the greatest threat to America’s national security is our budget deficit—and, at the time that I arrived here in Congress, Mr. Speaker, in 2010, America was running its largest budget deficit in American history, three times the size that they are today—I tell you a bill like this that goes after those deficit numbers is a critically important bill. It is the business that my constituents back home sent me to be about here in this institution.

Now, of course, in the 4½ years that the folks in the Seventh District have lent me their voting card, Mr. Speaker, we have brought budget deficits down each and every year—each and every year—year after year after year after year. But that has been primarily on that discretionary one-third of the pie I talked about, Mr. Speaker.

There is so much more work to be done, and reconciliation is the tool we use to get around the filibuster, to allow the people’s will to be done with simple majorities on both sides of the Hill.

Good news. If you don’t believe what is in the underlying bill is good for America, you can vote “no,” and if 51 percent of your colleagues agree with you, this bill will not go forward. But that is not going to happen because this is good policy.

And good news, Mr. Speaker. When it goes over to the Senate, if the Senate does not believe this is good policy for America and 51 Senators vote against it, this bill will not go to the President’s desk.

But that is not going to happen because there is good policy in the underlying bill. This will go to the President’s desk.

As the President sits today, Mr. Speaker, contemplating vetoing the National Defense Authorization Act—in fact, that may be happening even as we are standing here now, that bill that provides authorized funding for all

of our troops—I can’t possibly predict what he will do when this bill arrives on his desk.

But what my friend from New York fails to mention every time she mentions that 61 times in this House we have dealt with trying to clean up the messes that the Affordable Care Act has created is that 9 of those times the President agreed with us.

It is just so critically important, Mr. Speaker. We get wrapped around the partisan axle in this body in ways that are tremendously discouraging to me, as if it is always an us against them proposition. It is not. It is just a proposition about us—about us—320 million of us.

And nine times so far, Mr. Speaker, just in the short time that I have been in Congress, the House, the Senate, and the President have gotten together and said the Affordable Care Act is broken and together we can begin to fix it.

I believe this is going to be one of those opportunities as well, Mr. Speaker. It is going to be a tremendous vote, I hope, on passing this rule, which will allow us to begin debate. Pass that underlying resolution.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I just say once again, no, they don’t say: We are going to take away pre-existing conditions. They just say: We are taking away the funding for the bill.

When the funding is taken away, it dies. I think almost all Americans understand that.

I am pleased now to yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

□ 1300

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to discuss the rule for reconciliation, which I believe we are wasting on a doomed attempt to repeal ObamaCare for the 61st time. That we are doing this again for the 61st time is a problem. But that we are wasting our one shot at budget reconciliation on this is a tremendous shame. We should be using this opportunity to avoid the Senate filibuster to actually make law, not make a point to our bases. The way to do this is by focusing on a bipartisan issue: canceling the sequester.

Mr. Speaker, the sequester is a unique problem in American public policy, a program that is intentionally designed to be a bad idea. It cripples the programs that made the 20th century one of unprecedented progress, and it weakens the bravest military in the world. It is bad for us at home, and it is bad for us overseas.

Its blundering destructive approach to deficit reduction was supposed to push this Congress to compromise. Unfortunately, we have not gotten there

because a few intransigents refuse to give up this hostage. But it isn't this body that is paying the ransom for our inaction on the sequester; it is the American people of all walks of life. It is the millions of workers, businesses, public servants, and soldiers who are facing uncertainty and inadequate support.

Mr. Speaker, I would encourage us to stand up and use this one shot on something that matters and can pass, and canceling the sequester is something that both sides could actually agree on. So I urge my colleagues, please, to bring this theater to a close and to return to something we can all support. Let's use reconciliation to cancel the sequester once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

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

Mr. Speaker, if I could say to my friend from Michigan, I think there is a lot of wisdom in what he had to say. My friend has been here, Mr. Speaker, since 1965, I believe. I can't remember if he was elected in 1964 and began service in 1965. He has seen a lot of failures and a lot of successes in this institution.

Reconciliation exists for one reason and one reason only, and that is to do the really hard things that we can't get done in other times. I would say to my friend, Mr. Speaker, that the die has been cast on reconciliation for 2015. But as a member of the Budget Committee, I will commit to you that we are going to come back, and we are going to get a conferenced balanced budget next year as well. I hear that drumbeat beginning around this institution: What is it that we can get done together? I hope we get this done.

Make no mistake, I believe this is good underlying legislation. But the past, well, three decades now since 1980, as I think of the big reconciliation measures that have gone through have been things that have changed America for the better forever, and I am grateful to the gentleman for reminding us all of the power of this tool.

Mr. Speaker, 61 times we have had a vote on the President's healthcare bill, that is true. But it is because there are real problems there—again, nine times of which the President has agreed with us about those real problems.

The folks who crafted the President's healthcare bill were smart. I don't have any concerns about the funding that my friend from New York has, Mr. Speaker, because the bill has funding buried in it in such a way we don't have any access to it from this institution. That is why we passed 4½ years' worth of legislation here without getting our arms around that funding.

What we are talking about here, Mr. Speaker, are budget deficits. What we are talking about here is an opportunity to move the needle on mandatory spending. What we are talking about here is about \$81 billion in static scored money, closer to 130 in dynam-

cally scored money, moving the needle on the budget, as Admiral Mullen, then the Chair of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, encouraged us to do.

I don't know where the vote is going to come out, Mr. Speaker. I feel pretty good about it. I feel pretty good about it because it is good underlying policy. I feel pretty good about it because we did this the right way. We started in the Budget Committee. We conferenced it with the Senate. We then sent those reconciliation instructions out to the Energy and Commerce Committee, the Education and Labor Committee, and the Ways and Means Committee. Each committee did its work, sent that work back to the Budget Committee, and we then brought all that legislation together. Mr. Speaker, if you want a textbook case of how it is supposed to work around here, this is it.

Now, as a fellow who has been disappointed many times in 4½ years in this institution, I am just going to tell my colleagues that if any of my new colleagues believe they are going to have it their way every day of the week, the answer is no. I was disabused of that notion in week one.

But what we can do is bring the collective wisdom of the body together, the collective wisdom of the body and the collective wisdom from our committee structures, and this bill does that. There is only one way to get to this bill, though, Mr. Speaker, and that is to pass this rule today, House Resolution 483, and I encourage my colleagues to do that.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. I do so as somebody who comes from a State which, unlike maybe the gentleman from Georgia, actually embraced this law. The Governor set up an exchange right away, and we have had what Forbes Magazine has described as the highest functioning exchange in the country. Our uninsured rate went from 8 percent down to 4 percent. We have more insurers in the marketplace today than we did before the ACA was passed.

On Labor Day, I was at a picnic with some friends, and there was a gentleman there who was the head of HR for the second largest employer in this community that I was at. It was about a 300-employee firm, a trash hauler, who was actually quite concerned about the ACA's definition of part-time and full-time in terms of raising his rates. For the last 2 years, his rates have gone down. He yelled from the pool where he was playing with his kids, splashing around in the water, saying: Tell President Obama thank you for the Affordable Care Act because our rates have gone down for the 275 people that worked there.

So, Mr. Speaker, then the question is: What does this bill do? The fact of

the matter is, by eliminating the individual mandate, by basically destroying the financing of tax subsidies, which is precisely the way that you broaden the insurance market so that you can implement an elimination of preexisting conditions, you, in fact, are totally capsizing the market.

I know that because the State of Connecticut insurance department and the exchange have looked at what this bill is going to do to the individual mandate, and that is precisely what they said the outcome would be, that it would send rates through the roof and basically shatter the success that our State has accomplished.

What is so ironic about this is that the design of this bill with an individual mandate and tax subsidies for insurance came from the Heritage Foundation. Stuart Butler was the mastermind of this back in the 1990s. I was chairman of the Public Health Committee back then, and I remember vividly that that was the Heritage Foundation, the conservative alternative to healthcare reform, to the Clinton healthcare plan. But, obviously, for political reasons, that is not mentioned very much by the majority as we again debate this ad nauseam.

What is sad is that 2 weeks ago we passed a bill, H.R. 1624, sponsored by my good friend, Mr. GUTHRIE from Kentucky, which amended the Affordable Care Act. It changed the definition of "small employer," and it was done on a bipartisan basis, completely unanimous. It sailed through the House, and President Obama signed it.

Why did that work? Because they did it surgically, because BRETT was smart enough to understand that if you want to get people to come together, you don't load it up with a bunch of poison pills, that you actually present an idea with focus and with logic behind it. Guess what will happen. You will actually get bipartisan support, the complete opposite of the bill that we have before us here today.

Now, I want to point out, though, that there are some signs of intelligent life in this reconciliation bill.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, section 305 does, as the gentleman from Georgia points out, eliminate the excise tax on high-class plans.

It is interesting to note that 5 years ago it was the House Members who pushed hard against that proposal with the administration, and we delayed that tax for 5 years. H.R. 2050, which I am the lead sponsor of, I am proud to say we have 166 bipartisan cosponsors. It is verbatim the language that was incorporated into the reconciliation bill.

So I point that out because I do think that it, in fact, will basically sharply increase people's out-of-pocket

deductibles because that is what actuaries tell us is the only way you can respond to that kind of tax. It is true that 83 organizations, including organized labor, business groups, and small-business groups have said this is not a workable plan. I mention that here because there is an opportunity here to do what Congressman GUTHRIE did, which is to take an individual component, an idea, and not load it up with a lot of other baggage which is going to capsize the insurance market, which we know is going to happen if other provisions of the reconciliation bill are passed, that we can actually get it done.

You are giving the White House a perfect excuse to veto this bill and robbing us of the ability to actually address this real problem, which section 305 does recognize, and H.R. 2050 is out there and is on standby for us to move forward on. So let's get rid of the blunt instruments, the baseball bats, and the butchering of this law, and let's focus on bipartisan surgical fixes to real problems.

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

Mr. Speaker, I say to my friend from Connecticut that the point that he made was made very well by the gentleman from Oklahoma last night while we were in the Rules Committee. You only get to use this procedure once—actually, you can use it three times; but for a variety of different reasons, it is only going to come together for us once this year—and you have to choose how to do that.

I am thrilled—thrilled—that the story that the gentleman from Connecticut tells is of success for his constituents back home in Connecticut. I think that is fabulous. I think that is fabulous.

Mr. Speaker, I don't get to tell as many of those stories. I tell stories of folks who had plans that they liked, and those plans were outlawed by their government. I tell stories about folks who have doctors that they had had relationships with for decades, who were promised that if they liked their doctor they could keep their doctor, who lost access to their doctor because their government told them "no more for you."

I tell stories of the small businesses in the district that were doing the right thing by providing health care for their employees who have now been priced out of that marketplace. They are not required by law to do it, but rates have gone up so much they can't do it themselves—not because of our efforts to provide health care to people, but because of our efforts to tell people what kind of health care is good for them and what kind isn't.

Mr. Speaker, you may not know, the chairman of the Budget Committee is Georgia Congressman Dr. TOM PRICE. Dr. TOM PRICE, in H.R. 2300, has a replacement plan. Dr. TOM PRICE wants to see preexisting conditions out of the marketplace. Dr. TOM PRICE, in H.R.

2300, wants to see individuals able to move their policies from business to business, from place to place.

Mr. Speaker, it is a doctor-patient relationship. It is not a Federal Government-patient relationship. It is not a Federal HHS, Health and Human Services-patient relationship, and it is not an insurance company-doctor relationship. It is about me and my physician, you and your physician, our families and our family physician, 320 million Americans at a time.

We have it right here in this institution. We have replacement options right here.

Do not let it be said that in the name of trying to bring sanity to our Federal spending, in the name of trying to fix the errors that were created in the Affordable Care Act, do not let it be said that any Member wants to trample on the healthcare opportunities that families have back home. Our goal is to expand those opportunities, not to contract them.

I celebrate what has happened in Connecticut. I only wish that folks in Connecticut, New York, and elsewhere would support us in Georgia with the challenges that we are having and help us get back to that very personal doctor-patient relationship that we believe is the right of every American.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the budget reconciliation bill avoids the real problems before us, including the debt limit, the Export-Import Bank, a highway bill, a looming shutdown, and more. Instead of addressing the urgent needs of the Nation, the bill doubles down on attacking women's health and marks the 61st time that the House majority has voted to repeal, to defund, or to undermine the Affordable Care Act.

Mr. Speaker, let's try to salvage something from the money we have spent on this hour here at a time that we have literally wasted again, for the 61st time. Let's salvage something from it by voting "no" on the previous question. We can actually accomplish something then.

If the previous question is defeated, we will be able to vote to take care of the issue of debt limit, the full faith and credit of the United States of America.

□ 1315

A simple vote "no" allows us to bring that up, vote for that, go home this weekend not having to be chewing everybody's nails and then everybody in the country wonders what in heck is going to be going on here.

Why don't we for a change here on this day, on this Thursday, do something positive, do something that needs doing, do something we know sooner or later we will do. Do it today on a clean bill, no additions of any kind, just to do it. It is an opportunity that I certainly hope people will take advantage of. I urge them to do that.

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" so that we can vote "yes" on a vote to deal with the debt limit issue and a "no" vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe there is more that unites us than that divides us not just in this Chamber, but in this Nation.

As I have listened to my colleague from New York talk about some of the priorities that America has, I think she is spot on. I think she is spot on.

I am missing votes in the Transportation Committee right now where we are moving that long-term transportation bill so that I can be down here on the floor moving this reconciliation bill.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of rust in the gears around here. There is a lot of rust in the gears. It has been since the 1990s that Congress—House and Senate combined—have sent all the appropriations bills to the President before the end of the fiscal year. It has been since the 1990s.

Newt Gingrich ran this institution the last time we did that. Bill Clinton was in the White House the last time we did that. There is a lot of rust in the gears that has accumulated under both Republican and Democratic leadership in this place.

But this year we passed more appropriations bills earlier in the fiscal year than at any point since 1974. This year we are moving the first long-term highway bill that we have seen in almost a decade.

This year we have conferenced a balanced budget for America for the first time in a decade and a half. That is not just a notch to put on the belt of America to say this is what we have done. This is an opportunity to move this budget reconciliation bill.

Mr. Speaker, I do. I am saddened that reconciliation is a word that folks have to go and look up and learn, but it is the only way—the only way—in divided government that the people's voice can be heard.

There is no other procedure in the United States Congress that allows 51 percent of America to prevail. There is no other ability in the United States Congress for the majority of Americans who have lent their power to Washington to express their views and change the law of the land, save this one.

Mr. Speaker, budget deficits have gone down each and every year since Speaker JOHN BOEHNER stood right there where you are standing today

and NANCY PELOSI handed him the gavel—every year—from record high levels now to the lowest budget deficit in the Obama administration, and we have an opportunity today to do more.

I have heard my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, talk about those things that we can do together, and I agree. I agree.

I have heard my colleagues on the other side talk about their priorities in terms of raising the debt limit and not seeing the government shut down. I halfway agree.

I don't want to see the government shut down either. We avoided a government shutdown 2 weeks ago and got a little thank you note from a young lady who was in the office.

She said: Dear Congressman, It was good to see you today. Thank you for not letting the American History museum close down while my family was in Washington.

There are real impacts to that. But the fact is the reason we are having the conversation is not because anybody wants to shut the government down. It is because folks want to borrow more money. Mortgaging our children's future to the tune of \$18 trillion apparently is not mortgaging it enough. We are going to be back and make it \$19 trillion or \$19.5 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about a debt limit that is coming around today. We are talking about one that came around in the spring. The government has just been borrowing and borrowing and borrowing even beyond that debt limit, and they are borrowing because we are spending too much.

Mr. Speaker, look at the tax rolls right now. Do you realize, as we are standing here today, not only is America collecting more in constant dollars—not static dollars, but constant dollars adjusted for inflation—we are collecting more money than at any time in American history, any time.

Per capita in this country, Americans are paying more in taxes than they have ever paid in the history of the Republic, not in inflated 2015 dollars, but in constant dollars adjusted for inflation. The real impact on American families is greater today in taxes than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, the problem is not that we don't raise enough money. The problem is that we spend too much money. I can't count the number of good pieces of legislation that have gone to the Senate and failed not on their merits, but because a Democratic filibuster would not even allow the bill to be debated.

With this rule and with this underlying bill, we allow the people's voice to be heard, we allow the American majority's voice to be heard, and we have an opportunity to put a bill that will make a difference for American families on the President's desk for the very first time.

I encourage all of my colleagues' strong support of the rule. Upon pas-

sage of that rule, Mr. Speaker, I encourage their strong support for the underlying reconciliation measure. We have an opportunity today together to make a difference.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 483 OFFERED BY  
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That 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. 3737) to responsibly pay our Nation's bills on time by temporarily extending the public debt limit, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on 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. 2. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3737.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT  
IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

NATIONAL STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS PRODUCTION ACT OF 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 481 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. 1937.

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

□ 1323

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. 1937) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness, 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.

General debate shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1937, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2015. This bill was introduced by my good friend and colleague, Representative MARK AMODEI of Nevada, and myself as the first cosponsor.

Not a day goes by when Americans don't use a product that is made from critical minerals. In fact, life as we know it in the 21st century would not be possible without these minerals.

There would be no computers, no BlackBerries, no iPhones. There would be no MRIs, CAT scans, or x-ray machines. There would be no wind turbines or solar panels. Mr. Chairman, the list is exhaustive of these things that depend on critical and strategic minerals that make our lives possible.

Rare earth elements, a special subset of strategic and critical minerals, are core components of these products in the 21st century. Yet, despite the tremendous need for rare earth elements, the United States has allowed itself to become almost entirely dependent on China and other foreign nations for these resources.

America has a plentiful supply of rare earth elements, but roadblocks to the development of these critical materials have resulted in China producing 97 percent of the world's supply. That is 97 percent.

Our current policies are handing China a monopoly on these elements, creating a dependence that has serious implications for American jobs, for our economy, and on our national security.

Burdensome red tape, duplicative reviews, frivolous lawsuits, and onerous regulations can hold up new mining projects here in the U.S. for more than 10 years. These unnecessary delays cost American jobs as we become more and more dependent on foreign countries, such as China, for these raw materials.

The lack of domestically produced strategic and critical minerals are prime examples of how the U.S. has regulated itself into a 100 percent dependency on at least 19 critical and unique minerals. It has also earned the United States the unique and unfortunate distinction of being ranked dead last when it comes to permitting mining projects.

The 2014 ranking of countries for mining investment out of 25 major mining countries found that the 7- to 10-year permitting delays are the most significant risk to mining projects in the U.S. We are dead last in that ranking. I can't speak for the other countries, but the reason the U.S. is so slow to issue new mining permits is very simple: government bureaucracy.

H.R. 1937, introduced by my colleague from Nevada, will help us end foreign dependence by streamlining government red tape that blocks America's strategic and critical mineral production. Instead of waiting for over a decade for mining permits to be approved, this bill sets a goal for the total review process for permitting at 30 months, 2½ years.

Now, this isn't a hard deadline, Mr. Chairman. It can be extended. But it is a goal to push the bureaucrats into action on these important infrastructure projects. It shouldn't take a decade to get a project built for minerals that we need in our everyday lives and for our national security. No company can reasonably forecast the price of minerals 10 years in advance.

Finally, above all, this is a Jobs bill. The positive economic impact of this bill will extend beyond just the mining industry. For every good-paying metal mining job created, an estimated 2.3 additional jobs are generated. For every nonmetal mining job created, another 1.6 jobs are created.

This legislation gives the opportunity for American manufacturers, small businesses, technology companies, and construction firms to use American resources to help make the products that are essential to our everyday lives.

As China continues to tighten global supplies of rare earth elements, we should respond with a U.S. mining renaissance that will bring mining and manufacturing jobs back.

The National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act, H.R. 1937, is important to our jobs and to our economy. We must act now to cut the Government red tape that is stopping American domestic production and furthering our dependence on foreign countries for our mineral needs.

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

□ 1330

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill takes us in the wrong direction. It not only fails to make any meaningful reforms to our antiquated system of mining in this country, but it proposes to make them worse. We have a mining system that was put together in the 1870s when the number one goal for President Grant at that time was to get people to settle in the West. I am here to tell you, Mr. Chair, the West has been settled.

As a resident of southern California, we have this 150-year-old bill that really makes things as easy as possible for miners. We still have a law that doesn't require any royalties to be paid on the extraction of hard rock minerals on public lands. Let's be clear. If you drill for oil or gas on public lands or mine coal or soda ash or potash or a number of other minerals, what do you do? You pay a royalty to the American taxpayer, but not if you mine copper or silver or platinum or gold or other valuables. You get to mine royalty free.

When the Mining Law of 1872 was enacted, there was no such thing as environmental safeguards. There was no concept of the multiple uses of public lands to ensure that mining could coexist with grazing, with recreation or conservation. There were no requirements for miners to clean up after themselves when they were done mining. Simply mine as long as it is profitable, and when you are done, just pick up and leave, and don't worry about it, except that the people who live anywhere near the half million abandoned mines in this country need to worry about it. Communities located near the tens of thousands of miles of polluted rivers with toxic acid mine waste, they need to worry about it, and, certainly, the United States Congress needs to worry about it.

But, instead of tackling this problem, what does this bill do? It declares that the biggest problem we have with mining in this country is that we are not doing it fast enough.

So this bill proposes to undermine one of our bedrock environmental laws—the National Environmental Policy Act—and it makes land managers who are reviewing mine plans prioritize mineral production over every other potential use of the land, which threatens hunting, fishing, grazing, and conservation.

Mr. Chair, it would be one thing if the data showed that a large number of mines were being delayed for no good reason; but, in fact, according to the data from the Bureau of Land Management, mines are getting approved much faster. We just heard that it takes a decade, but let's be clear what the data says.

Between 2005 and 2008, on average, 54 percent of the plans were approved in less than 3 years. In 2009 to 2014, 69 percent of the plans were approved in less than 3 years. So, in reality, rather than

taking a decade, we are seeing that the Obama administration is permitting mines at a much faster rate than the Bush administration.

Now, I have an amendment that would address one of the key problems in this bill. This bill has an incredibly broad definition of what is a strategic and critical mineral. I have yet to hear anyone tell me—and we asked in committee—what mineral now doesn't qualify as strategic and critical under this bill. Certainly, none of the witnesses we had at our Natural Resources Committee hearing could, and the majority hasn't suggested anything. Now we are talking about expediting the process for sand and gravel, crushed stones, gold, silver, diamonds. All of these are now going to be considered strategic and critical by the definition in this bill. All get an expedited process for permitting, and they have weaker environmental reviews.

But, even if this bill were limited to the definition for critical minerals that the rest of the world goes by—basically, that those minerals be important, they be unique, and, most importantly, we are defining them as strategic and critical minerals because they are subject to a supply risk—it is clear that this bill does not help.

We had one rare earth element mine start up in this country a few years ago. The rare earth elements are ones that are truly critical. Two months ago, that mine stopped operating because prices were too low. That is what has happened. That one mine was already permitted, already built, and already operating, and it had to be shut down because of economics.

I don't think changing the environmental laws in any way solves the problem of economics, but it certainly would help major international mining conglomerates—companies based in Canada or Australia. It is going to help them grease the skids when they want to open their next giant copper mine or gold mine or uranium mine right next to a national park or a sensitive watershed.

Mr. Chair, this bill is bad policy. The outcomes here won't be any different than the outcomes over the past two Congresses. This bill is dead on arrival in the Senate, and the administration has already expressed its strong opposition.

What should we be doing?

We should be here today, discussing how to fix our outdated and antiquated mining laws, how to make mining companies pay their fair share, how to clean up the half million abandoned mines that litter our landscape from coast to coast. We shouldn't be here talking about a bill that is only going to make things worse.

I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 1937.

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

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

I would point out to my friend and colleague from California that the National Research Council study has said: "All minerals and mineral products could be or could become critical to some degree depending on their importance and availability."

So you have to look at the total circumstances surrounding the current supply of a mineral and what that mineral is, and they all, literally, could fit that definition according to the National Research Council.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the great State of Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS), my colleague, who is also the vice chairman of the full Committee on Natural Resources.

Mrs. LUMMIS. I want to thank Chairman LAMBORN and my good friend and fellow Western Caucus member, Nevada Representative AMODEI, for their work on this important legislation.

Mr. Chairman, let me start by addressing why strategic minerals matter and why we ought to have a piece of legislation like this.

My home State of Wyoming is the headquarters for our Nation's nuclear intercontinental ballistic missile force. These missiles ensure that those who would do us harm are deterred from using nuclear weapons. These weapons are on call 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, but they need regular maintenance and replacement components. Rare earth elements are an important part of these components—from batteries, to computer chips, to display screens and engines. These components—components vital to our technological edge—would require elements that can be difficult to procure.

Now, China controls nearly 80 percent of rare earth production. As we know, China has used this leverage to bully our allies, to limit exports at a time of a dispute, especially recently, with Japan over the control of islands in the South China Sea. The U.S. Navy plans to conduct operations in the area to remind China of the importance of respecting maritime boundaries and the freedom of navigation; but China is using its 80 percent share of rare earth minerals to leverage our allies. They can do it anytime they want because they have such massive control of this resource.

The bill that Mr. AMODEI is sponsoring, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act, would simplify the permitting process for domestic mines that will provide resources used in components that are vital to our national security. That is why we need to do it.

Here is an example of the existing problem.

In my home State of Wyoming, the Bear Lodge Critical Rare Earth Project has been going through the current process since 2011. It will be the only large-scale production facility in the U.S. for some rare earth elements designated as critical by the U.S. Depart-

ment of Energy. They have to coordinate their permit application between the Forest Service, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Army Corps of Engineers, and the Department of Energy.

Under Mr. AMODEI's legislation, one Federal agency would become the lead agency and set project timelines for permit applications and decisions. The total review process would not be authorized to exceed 30 months unless extended by all parties involved. These parties would include State and local governments and local stakeholders. This ensures that local voices will be heard.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot emphasize enough how important I think this legislation is. I am a cosponsor of the legislation. It passed the House in previous Congresses on a bipartisan basis. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 1937. I thank Mr. AMODEI for his thoughtful consideration of this bill.

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

I would just like to point out that the proponent of the bill has said—I believe it was the National Research Council—that all minerals and products could be or could become critical to some degree. That is really what they said, but let's be clear what this bill says and what the National Research Council's definition is. That is, really, what we are talking about, and we are going to discuss that later on.

Just what is the definition?

In the bill that we see before us, in terms of strategic and critical minerals, the term "strategic and critical" means minerals that are necessary for national defense and national security requirements—there certainly are some of those—for the national energy infrastructure, including pipelines, refining capacity, electrical power generation, and transmission and renewable energy products, for supporting the domestic manufacturing of any mineral for agriculture, housing, telecommunications, health care, transportation and infrastructure, or for the Nation's economic security and balance of trade. For that reason, they are saying let's shorten the process, eviscerate NEPA—the National Environmental Policy Act—and let's expedite this process.

I ask you: What mineral is not included in this definition? They are including everything.

Let's see what, in actuality, the National Research Council said. They published the report in 2008. It was called: "Minerals, Critical Minerals, and the U.S. Economy," and it defined what should be our definition of strategic and critical minerals.

It states: "To be 'critical,' a mineral must be essential in use." We agree. They talk about strategic, and those proponents talk about essential minerals; but the National Research Council also says: "To be considered 'critical and strategic,' it must be subject

to supply restriction.” We do not see anything in this bill about supply restriction.

Therefore, what it is is a blank check for mining companies to mine anywhere, to have an expedited process so as not to protect communities; and I think that is a great mistake and takes us the wrong way and is exactly the opposite of what the National Research Council has called for.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), who is also a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. GOSAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1937, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act.

This commonsense legislation will streamline the permitting process and allow for better coordination amongst the relevant State and Federal agencies in order to foster economic growth, create jobs, and ensure a robust domestic supply of strategic and critical minerals.

People have been digging in Arizona for precious metals for centuries. In the 1850s, nearly one in every four people in Arizona was a miner. Without a doubt, mining fueled the growth that makes Arizona the State it is today. In fact, it is part of the five Cs that built Arizona with copper.

□ 1345

Today, the Arizona mining industry is alive. Minerals such as copper, coal, gold, uranium, lime, and potash are still mined throughout my district, but not at the levels they used to be.

These projects employ hundreds of my constituents with high-paying jobs, jobs that pay over \$50,000 to \$60,000 a year, plus benefits. In rural Arizona, these types of jobs are few and far between.

As I meet with companies that do business throughout my State, the message is clear: we could do better. The length, complexity, and uncertainty of the permitting process is stymieing development and discouraging investors from committing to U.S. mining.

The folks on the ground tell me that because of regulatory excessive overreach by the Federal Government and the cumbersome permitting process, that it can take as long as 10 years. It is becoming a bad business decision to even attempt to get a new U.S. mine off the ground, despite a bountiful supply of domestic resources. We must correct this problem and prevent more American jobs from leaving America.

Rare earth and other critical minerals have been discovered throughout rural Arizona, have been the main economic driver and provider of jobs for communities that otherwise probably wouldn't make it at all. The critical minerals produced in these areas are

resources our country badly needs to meet the demand for production of everyday items like cell phones, computers, batteries, and cars.

Let's lessen our dependency on importing critical minerals from countries like China and restore some sanity to our permitting and regulatory process so we can get American miners back to work. Imagine our slogan, “Made in the USA with materials mined in the USA.” Now, that is what this bill is all about.

I applaud Mr. AMODEI for his leadership on this critical issue and urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 1937.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chair, today we are debating yet another Republican bill restricting access to the courts to only those with deep pockets. H.R. 1937 continues the alarming trend of Republican-sponsored legislation that proposes to limit the average American's access to the courts so businesses that line the pockets of these politicians with campaign contributions can continue to profit.

Misleadingly disguised as a bill stimulating the increased production of strategic minerals, this legislation is actually about shielding the mining industry's poor environmental practices from accountability to victims while simultaneously disenfranchising mining-impacted communities.

H.R. 1937 allows regulators to exempt mining projects from the Equal Access to Justice Act, EAJA. The EAJA allows average Americans access to legal representation to protect their communities. Without EAJA, impacted communities cannot afford lawyers, much less the litany of scientific and technical experts needed to mount a serious challenge to a multinational mining company. This exemption cripples the ability of those concerned with environmental protection to seek representation and redress in the courts.

For that reason, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this bill and preserve justice for all.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), a senior member of the Natural Resources Committee.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I am very proud of this bill, and I am a sponsor of this bill, and no one is lining my pockets. I resent that comment. I am thinking of the United States of America and how we are importing these 31 known minerals and the process that we have to go through to mine our own natural resources in our great Nation.

It impedes our capability to be secure, regardless of what one might say. You just don't do this overnight. You have to have time to develop, especially the rare earths. The rest of the minerals we are importing using out-

side people, countries to import those products from, which we live with. We have people in this Congress and across this place who say we don't need it. We have to follow the example.

By the way, if a miner tries to develop a mine, you have to go through so many different permits; and then when you get done, guess what we have. The lawyers from the big, big environmental organizations like the Safari Club, Sierra Club, and Friends of the Earth, all 58 different groups, file suit by a legal body that impedes the progress for this Nation.

We cannot continue to import all which we need to have this living style we have today, yet that is what a lot of people on that side of the aisle insist upon.

This is a good bill. Mr. AMODEI thought about this bill. How do we retain our security? But more than that, how do we keep jobs within the United States? His comment is “made in the United States by resources mined in the United States.” That is what we should be looking at as this Congress instead of following, I call it, the blind piper: We don't need to drill our oil; we will buy it from abroad. We don't need to mine our minerals; we will buy it from abroad. And, by the way, we will ship our jobs overseas, and we will be further in debt \$18 trillion.

We need our resources. That is what made this Nation great. Everything in this room, in these hallowed Halls, this body came from the earth. It was mined, it was cut, it was manufactured from the earth. Why should we buy it from abroad?

Let's be American. Let's mine for our resources. Let's cut our trees for our resources. Let's build our resources. As it says right up there: “Let us use our resources God has given for the benefit of mankind.” If we don't do that, we are abusing the job we have here.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would really like to discuss in a little bit more detail the idea that the permitting process is so onerous, that it takes so long to do it.

In 2012, 2013, and 2014, let's talk about the last 3 years of permitting of mines, of plans of operation, what really is the data? I will tell you that of all the plans of operation that were approved in 2012, 93 percent of them were done in 3 years or less; in 2013, 79 percent were done in 3 years or less; and in 2014, it was 68 percent. In summary, in the last 3 years, close to 80 percent of all plans of operation were permitted in less than 3 years. So we are not talking about an onerous time.

Also, let us remember that the same bill was twice introduced last year. It was twice introduced in the last session, and it was also introduced once in the 112th Congress. It never got taken up in the Senate.

This bill, if it ever did get through, let's see what the administration says. I read to you a Statement of Administration Policy:

“The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 1937, which would undermine existing environmental safeguards for, at a minimum, almost all types of hardrock mines on Federal lands. Specifically, H.R. 1937 would undermine sound Federal decision-making by eliminating the appropriate reviews under the National Environmental Policy Act if certain conditions are met, circumventing public involvement in mining proposals, and bypassing the formulation of alternatives to proposals, among other things. The Administration also opposes the legislation’s severe restrictions on judicial review. Although the legislation purports to limit litigation, its extremely short statute of limitations and vague constraints on the scope of prospective relief that a court may issue are likely to have the opposite effect.

“The Administration strongly supports the development of rare earth elements and other critical minerals, but rejects the notion that their development is incompatible with existing safeguards regarding the uses of public lands, environmental protection, and public involvement in agency decision-making.”

If we are really concerned about updating this old law, let’s work together and come up with a better definition of what is a critical and strategic mineral and let us not eviscerate the environmental protections and the public participation which we now afford people.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD an exchange of letters between Chairman BISHOP and Chairman GOODLATTE of the Judiciary Committee on this bill.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,  
Washington, DC, 28 July 2015.

Hon. ROBERT GOODLATTE,  
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On July 9, 2015, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered favorably report H.R. 1937, National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2015. The bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Natural Resources, with an additional referral to the Committee on the Judiciary.

I ask that you allow the Committee on the Judiciary to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so that it may be scheduled by the Majority Leader. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support having the Committee on the Judiciary represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and your response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Natural Resources to memorialize our understanding, as well as in the Congressional Record when the bill is considered by the House. Thank you for your consideration of my request, and for your continued strong cooperation between our committees.

Sincerely,

ROB BISHOP,  
Chairman,  
Committee on Natural Resources.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, July 28, 2015.

Hon. ROB BISHOP,  
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BISHOP, I am writing with respect to H.R. 1937, the “National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2015,” which the Committee on Natural Resources recently ordered reported favorably. As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions in H.R. 1937 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I agree to discharge our Committee from further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1937 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and asks that you support any such request.

I would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration of H.R. 1937.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,  
Chairman.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), chairman of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, they once asked the famous spitball pitcher Gaylord Perry if he put a foreign substance on the ball, and he calmly answered: No. Vaseline is 100 percent American product.

We used to only have to import a handful of rare earth minerals in this country, like eight. Today, we are importing dozens of them because we have, with this administration, a policy of trying to stockpile these resources. Hopefully, when we get through them, we will be able to find some other country that can help us to resupply those resources, kind of like Blanche in “A Streetcar Named Desire,” where we are dependent on the kindness of strangers at all times.

Would it not be wiser for us simply to have a consistent policy where we actually have a workforce that is developing, on a regular basis, these rare earth minerals that we can have for our use so that we can have the jobs from them, it can help our economy, and it could give us the security we desperately need? We don’t need to keep importing stuff into this country. I mean, we imported the Expos from Montreal to here in Washington. That should be sufficient. That is enough.

I read an article the other day about mining rare earth minerals in the Democratic Republic of the Congo where rare minerals, necessary for iPhones and the Samsung Galaxy phones, were being produced. Miners

used their bare hands to filter out the minerals in order to earn a whopping \$5 a day. If the miners use their hands to find the rare minerals, how do you think they handled environment protections and how do you think they reclaimed these projects?

What we need desperately is to use 21st century technology and pay our labor force 21st century wages to produce the strategic and critical minerals that are necessary for our way of life and not be dependent on other countries for these minerals and not take advantage of their miners. This is a no-brainer. Let’s do the right thing. As Satchel Paige said: Just throw strikes. Home plate don’t move.

We know what we are doing. Pass this bill. It is a good bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. The Chair notes a disturbance in the gallery in contravention of the law and rules of the House.

The Sergeant At Arms will remove those persons responsible for the disturbance and restore order to the gallery.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK), who is also a member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1937, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act.

Over the past several decades, our Nation has lagged far behind much of the world in the development and extraction of domestic mineral resources. Falling behind on this front has made our Nation dependent on foreign sources of many vital mineral resources that our economy and national defense need to continue functioning.

Falling behind has also led to the loss of good-paying jobs throughout the country. We have seen this in my district in northern Michigan in the mines that have shut down and the mines that have not been permitted. There is a mine in the western part of my district that has been over 10 years in the permitting process and is still not near open. These jobs are critically needed in my district.

The mines of the U.P. have served our country in times of need, providing many of the raw minerals that we have needed for national defense. If the resources that we have beneath our feet were needed today, these mines would have to go through a significant permitting process that would likely take almost 20 years.

While I support making sure that we behave in an environmentally responsible manner, it is ridiculous that overly burdensome Federal regulations are keeping us from being competitive in the world economy. This bill will cut through some of the bureaucratic red tape that is holding our economy back, leading to a nation that is less dependent on foreign resources for vital natural resources and creating jobs.

I urge all my colleagues to support the responsible development of our domestic natural resources and to vote in favor of this commonsense and long-overdue legislation.

□ 1400

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from the Silver State, Nevada (Mr. AMODEI), a former member of the Committee on Natural Resources and the author of this bill.

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Chairman, God forbid we place dealing with bedrock American issues ahead of the culture of political cliché. It is always nice to be informed of what the status is in the Intermountain West by people from towns that end in the name "Beach."

I find it incredibly interesting that we have heard on several occasions that the administration's average for the supermajority of applications is 36 months or less and how we need to work together on things when the legislation on the floor right now calls for a 30-month timeframe, which is extendable, by the way, with the consent of both parties.

So instead of, Well, let's have an amendment to make it 36 months and put this on the suspension calendar, we are subjected to "This is bad" and "It disenfranchises the public" and all that.

Let's talk about what this is really about. There is an old saying in the law: When you have got the facts, you argue the facts. When you have got the law, you argue the law. When you don't have either, you just argue.

Here we are. Because everybody in the room knows, depending on what side of the issue you are on, the big tool in this thing is, if we can outwait them, the capital will go elsewhere. Guess what. The folks that believe in that are winning.

When we talk about those bedrock American issues, things like jobs, things like public participation—you know, 30 months, that is longer than we get to hang out here after the people of our district give us their voting card. That is longer—used to be—than somebody would take to try to talk you into voting for them for Governor or President.

Nobody can accuse this legislation, at 2½ years, extendable by stipulation, of forcing the public to sit on their hands. Jobs, participation of the public, balance of trade, that is not important.

I mean, why should we be concerned about balance of trade and exporting the minerals that this country is wealthy with? You want to talk about abandoned mines? In my State, those folks happen to be doing a great job. If you want to talk about the culture of the 1870s, yeah, but it has come a long way.

God forbid, when we talk about paying your fair share, in my State, the

industry pays north of \$80,000 a year. Those people pay Federal income taxes. They buy goods and services that are federally taxed: gasoline, tires, all that stuff. But, no, let's send those jobs overseas where none of that happens. None of that happens. That is smart policy. I simply disagree.

God forbid we talk about commercial supplies, national security, strategic supplies. Other speakers have talked about that. This is not some dream job for the minerals extraction industry.

Oh, by the way, let's not look at the folks down in the Palmetto State right now who are experiencing phenomenal floods that might need materials to kind of rebuild their State.

God forbid we talk about sand and gravel for those folks in the Golden State after the Loma Prieta earthquake and they needed to rebuild things called freeways lickety-split.

This is not about supplying sand for your kid's sandbox. This is not about gravel for your driveway in your subdivision. This is about having flexibility to address issues that are mineral related. Because you know what, nobody has called this place, regardless of who is running it, nimble.

When one of these issues comes up, God forbid you give them: That is right, folks. Hang on to your hats. Thirty months to try to get the permission from the Federal Government to extract minerals on that.

With all due respect, what this is all about is: Do you continue to let folks who are opposed to things try to starve them out and wait and wait and wait until the capital goes elsewhere or do you take the folks and the administration's word: Nice job. Takes you 36 months? You want us to change it to 33 months and put it on the suspension calendar? I will do it. But short of that, me thinks thou doth protest too much.

I solicit your earnest support, and I am looking forward to the Senate work on it this time because we are nimble compared to those folks on the north end of the building.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

In closing, we have heard in this discussion that we should have a sweeping definition, every mineral should be under the definition of a critical mineral, and that we should not be beholden to foreign sources if we don't do that. Well, I agree in many ways. We should not be.

This bill doesn't really deal with that issue because, if the authors were really concerned about restrictions to the supply, they would make the definition of "critical" and "strategic minerals" much narrower. We would not give up our environmental protections. We would not give up our public participation. We would not give up our legal protections when, in fact, there is no

danger to the Nation's supply of this mineral.

The problems are really that we are now broadly including everything under this definition, and the bill that is in the Senate under—I think it is Senator MURKOWSKI—has a much more limited definition of what is a strategic and critical mineral.

I urge the authors here, the proponents, to really amend this bill so that we can all work together on this to really restrict the two very specific occasions of when we would enable a change in the protections that we already have under NEPA. Right now, everything is included. This eviscerates all of our protections. I urge a "no" vote.

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

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

In closing, much has been debated here on the floor about what is strategic and what is not strategic. Let me suggest two ways that you could define strategic minerals.

You could define it by making a definition so narrow that, in effect, the legislation picks winners and losers or you could write law that says that certain conditions that require certain elements will be the driver of what is strategic and critical. That means the marketplace will decide what is strategic and critical.

I think that is a much better approach when I talk about this because I recall hearing that, in the late 1890s, the U.S. Patent Office issued a statement—I think I have this correct here—saying that we ought to close down the U.S. Patent Office because everything that can be invented has been invented.

That was in the 1890s. That was before airplanes. That was before cars were commercially available. That was before most telecommunications. This means all the minerals that go into these things weren't even thought of at that time.

What we do in this bill is just very straightforward. We say that the strategic and critical minerals will meet any of the following four criteria—and, by the way, you can find these on page 5, section 3, under "Definitions":

A, for national defense and national security. That is so evident, it hardly needs to be debated.

B, for the Nation's energy infrastructure, including pipelines and refining. That is because of the importance of energy. That certainly should not be debated because we have to have a good energy source if we are going to have a growing economy.

Also, C, to support domestic manufacturing. That includes, obviously, agriculture and housing as well. In other words, to support our economy. Doesn't that make good sense to have a source of strategic and critical minerals for that?

Finally, D, for the Nation's economic security and balance of trade. That

makes such good sense because we are seriously out of balance now with China.

This approach is more of a long-term solution because 25 years from now there will be a mineral that somebody will find that will be used for new technology. But if we have defined it so narrowly, as the other side would suggest, that we don't know what that technology is, we have, in fact, been picking winners and losers, and that is the wrong approach.

The right approach is what is embodied in this bill to say that these four conditions will be the ones that define strategic and critical minerals.

Finally, let me close on this: Some people make fun of sand and gravel as being strategic. I guarantee you that, after a major earthquake in northern or southern California, when the freeways collapse, I can tell you that cement and sand and gravel will absolutely fit that definition.

In this bill, strategic and critical minerals are not defined, as some have suggested, as all minerals all the time. Instead, H.R. 1937 allows any mineral to be deemed strategic and critical at a given time when the appropriate situation warrants it. This is vital to protecting our economy, our jobs, and our way of life.

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

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1937

*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 "National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act of 2015".

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The industrialization of developing nations has driven demand for nonfuel minerals necessary for telecommunications, military technologies, healthcare technologies, and conventional and renewable energy technologies.

(2) The availability of minerals and mineral materials are essential for economic growth, national security, technological innovation, and the manufacturing and agricultural supply chain.

(3) The exploration, production, processing, use, and recycling of minerals contribute significantly to the economic well-being, security and general welfare of the Nation.

(4) The United States has vast mineral resources, but is becoming increasingly dependent upon foreign sources of these mineral materials, as demonstrated by the following:

(A) Twenty-five years ago the United States was dependent on foreign sources for 45 nonfuel mineral materials, 8 of which the United States imported 100 percent of the Nation's requirements, and for another 19 commodities the United States imported more than 50 percent of the Nation's needs.

(B) By 2014 the United States import dependence for nonfuel mineral materials in-

creased from 45 to 65 commodities, 19 of which the United States imported for 100 percent of the Nation's requirements, and an additional 24 of which the United States imported for more than 50 percent of the Nation's needs.

(C) The United States share of worldwide mineral exploration dollars was 7 percent in 2014, down from 19 percent in the early 1990s.

(D) In the 2014 Ranking of Countries for Mining Investment (out of 25 major mining countries), found that 7- to 10-year permitting delays are the most significant risk to mining projects in the United States.

#### SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS.—The term "strategic and critical minerals" means minerals that are necessary—

(A) for national defense and national security requirements;

(B) for the Nation's energy infrastructure, including pipelines, refining capacity, electrical power generation and transmission, and renewable energy production;

(C) to support domestic manufacturing, agriculture, housing, telecommunications, healthcare, and transportation infrastructure; or

(D) for the Nation's economic security and balance of trade.

(2) AGENCY.—The term "agency" means any agency, department, or other unit of Federal, State, local, or tribal government, or Alaska Native Corporation.

(3) MINERAL EXPLORATION OR MINE PERMIT.—The term "mineral exploration or mine permit" includes—

(A) Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service authorizations for pre-mining activities that require environmental analyses pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(B) plans of operation issued by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service pursuant to 43 CFR 3809 and 36 CFR 228A or the authorities listed in 43 CFR 3503.13, respectively, as amended from time to time.

#### TITLE I—DEVELOPMENT OF DOMESTIC SOURCES OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS

##### SEC. 101. IMPROVING DEVELOPMENT OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS.

Domestic mines that will provide strategic and critical minerals shall be considered an "infrastructure project" as described in Presidential order "Improving Performance of Federal Permitting and Review of Infrastructure Projects" dated March 22, 2012.

##### SEC. 102. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE LEAD AGENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit shall appoint a project lead within the lead agency who shall coordinate and consult with cooperating agencies and any other agency involved in the permitting process, project proponents and contractors to ensure that agencies minimize delays, set and adhere to timelines and schedules for completion of the permitting process, set clear permitting goals and track progress against those goals.

(b) DETERMINATION UNDER NEPA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To the extent that the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) applies to the issuance of any mineral exploration or mine permit, the requirements of such Act shall be deemed to have been procedurally and substantively satisfied if the lead agency determines that any State and/or Federal agency acting pursuant to State or Federal (or both) statutory or procedural authorities, has addressed or will address the following factors:

(A) The environmental impact of the action to be conducted under the permit.

(B) Possible adverse environmental effects of actions under the permit.

(C) Possible alternatives to issuance of the permit.

(D) The relationship between local long- and short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity.

(E) Any irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources that would be involved in the proposed action.

(F) That public participation will occur during the decisionmaking process for authorizing actions under the permit.

(2) WRITTEN REQUIREMENT.—In reaching a determination under paragraph (1), the lead agency shall, by no later than 90 days after receipt of an application for the permit, in a written record of decision—

(A) explain the rationale used in reaching its determination;

(B) state the facts in the record that are the basis for the determination; and

(C) show that the facts in the record could allow a reasonable person to reach the same determination as the lead agency did.

(c) COORDINATION ON PERMITTING PROCESS.—The lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit shall enhance government coordination for the permitting process by avoiding duplicative reviews, minimizing paperwork, and engaging other agencies and stakeholders early in the process. For purposes of this subsection, the lead agency shall consider the following practices:

(1) Deferring to and relying upon baseline data, analyses and reviews performed by State agencies with jurisdiction over the proposed project.

(2) Conducting any consultations or reviews concurrently rather than sequentially to the extent practicable and when such concurrent review will expedite rather than delay a decision.

(d) MEMORANDUM OF AGENCY AGREEMENT.—If requested at any time by a State or local planning agency, the lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit, in consultation with other Federal agencies with relevant jurisdiction in the environmental review process, may establish memoranda of agreement with the project sponsor, State and local governments, and other appropriate entities to accomplish the early coordination activities described in subsection (c).

(e) SCHEDULE FOR PERMITTING PROCESS.—For any project for which the lead agency cannot make the determination described in 102(b), at the request of a project proponent the lead agency, cooperating agencies, and any other agencies involved with the mineral exploration or mine permitting process shall enter into an agreement with the project proponent that sets time limits for each part of the permitting process, including for the following:

(1) The decision on whether to prepare a document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(2) A determination of the scope of any document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

(3) The scope of and schedule for the baseline studies required to prepare a document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

(4) Preparation of any draft document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

(5) Preparation of a final document required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

(6) Consultations required under applicable laws.

(7) Submission and review of any comments required under applicable law.

(8) Publication of any public notices required under applicable law.

(9) A final or any interim decisions.

(f) **TIME LIMIT FOR PERMITTING PROCESS.**—In no case should the total review process described in subsection (d) exceed 30 months unless extended by the signatories of the agreement.

(g) **LIMITATION ON ADDRESSING PUBLIC COMMENTS.**—The lead agency is not required to address agency or public comments that were not submitted during any public comment periods or consultation periods provided during the permitting process or as otherwise required by law.

(h) **FINANCIAL ASSURANCE.**—The lead agency will determine the amount of financial assurance for reclamation of a mineral exploration or mining site, which must cover the estimated cost if the lead agency were to contract with a third party to reclaim the operations according to the reclamation plan, including construction and maintenance costs for any treatment facilities necessary to meet Federal, State or tribal environmental standards.

(i) **APPLICATION TO EXISTING PERMIT APPLICATIONS.**—This section shall apply with respect to a mineral exploration or mine permit for which an application was submitted before the date of the enactment of this Act if the applicant for the permit submits a written request to the lead agency for the permit. The lead agency shall begin implementing this section with respect to such application within 30 days after receiving such written request.

(j) **STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS WITHIN NATIONAL FORESTS.**—With respect to strategic and critical minerals within a federally administered unit of the National Forest System, the lead agency shall—

(1) exempt all areas of identified mineral resources in Land Use Designations, other than Non-Development Land Use Designations, in existence as of the date of the enactment of this Act from the procedures detailed at and all rules promulgated under part 294 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations;

(2) apply such exemption to all additional routes and areas that the lead agency finds necessary to facilitate the construction, operation, maintenance, and restoration of the areas of identified mineral resources described in paragraph (1); and

(3) continue to apply such exemptions after approval of the Minerals Plan of Operations for the unit of the National Forest System.

#### **SEC. 103. CONSERVATION OF THE RESOURCE.**

In evaluating and issuing any mineral exploration or mine permit, the priority of the lead agency shall be to maximize the development of the mineral resource, while mitigating environmental impacts, so that more of the mineral resource can be brought to the marketplace.

#### **SEC. 104. FEDERAL REGISTER PROCESS FOR MINERAL EXPLORATION AND MINING PROJECTS.**

(a) **PREPARATION OF FEDERAL NOTICES FOR MINERAL EXPLORATION AND MINE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.**—The preparation of Federal Register notices required by law associated with the issuance of a mineral exploration or mine permit shall be delegated to the organization level within the agency responsible for issuing the mineral exploration or mine permit. All Federal Register notices regarding official document availability, announcements of meetings, or notices of intent to undertake an action shall be originated and transmitted to the Federal Register from the office where documents are held, meetings are held, or the activity is initiated.

(b) **DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW OF FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICES FOR MINERAL EXPLORATION AND MINING PROJECTS.**—Absent any extraordinary circumstance or except as otherwise required by any Act of Congress, each Federal Register notice described in subsection (a) shall undergo any required reviews within the Department of the Interior or the Department of Agriculture and be published in its final form in the Federal Register no later than 30 days after its initial preparation.

### **TITLE II—JUDICIAL REVIEW OF AGENCY ACTIONS RELATING TO EXPLORATION AND MINE PERMITS**

#### **SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS FOR TITLE.**

In this title the term “covered civil action” means a civil action against the Federal Government containing a claim under section 702 of title 5, United States Code, regarding agency action affecting a mineral exploration or mine permit.

#### **SEC. 202. TIMELY FILINGS.**

A covered civil action is barred unless filed no later than the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date of the final Federal agency action to which it relates.

#### **SEC. 203. RIGHT TO INTERVENE.**

The holder of any mineral exploration or mine permit may intervene as of right in any covered civil action by a person affecting rights or obligations of the permit holder under the permit.

#### **SEC. 204. EXPEDITION IN HEARING AND DETERMINING THE ACTION.**

The court shall endeavor to hear and determine any covered civil action as expeditiously as possible.

#### **SEC. 205. LIMITATION ON PROSPECTIVE RELIEF.**

In a covered civil action, the court shall not grant or approve any prospective relief unless the court finds that such relief is narrowly drawn, extends no further than necessary to correct the violation of a legal requirement, and is the least intrusive means necessary to correct that violation.

#### **SEC. 206. LIMITATION ON ATTORNEYS' FEES.**

Sections 504 of title 5, United States Code, and 2412 of title 28, United States Code (together commonly called the Equal Access to Justice Act) do not apply to a covered civil action, nor shall any party in such a covered civil action receive payment from the Federal Government for their attorneys' fees, expenses, and other court costs.

### **TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS**

#### **SEC. 301. SECRETARIAL ORDER NOT AFFECTED.**

Nothing in this Act shall be construed as to affect any aspect of Secretarial Order 3324, issued by the Secretary of the Interior on December 3, 2012, with respect to potash and oil and gas operators.

The CHAIR. No amendment to this bill is in order except for those printed in House Report 114-301. 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. LOWENTHAL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 114-301.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. 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 5, strike lines 1 through 15 and insert the following:

(1) **STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS.**—The term “strategic and critical minerals”—

(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), means—

(i) minerals and mineral groups identified as critical by the National Research Council in the report titled “Minerals, Critical Minerals, and the U.S. Economy” and dated 2008; and

(ii) additional minerals identified by the Secretary of the Interior based on the National Research Council criteria in such report; and

(B) does not include sand, gravel, or clay. Page 5, line 25, after “ties” insert “for strategic and critical minerals”.

Page 6, line 3, after “operation” insert “for strategic and critical mineral mines”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 481, the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would fix a critical problem with this bill, namely, that the name of the bill doesn't match the substance of the bill.

When you read the title, you would think this bill has something to do with critical and strategic minerals, but, in fact, as currently written, the bill would define practically every mined substance—and that is every mined substance in the United States—as being strategic and critical. Sand, gravel, gold, copper, clay, all of these, are strategic and critical under this bill, and I think that is going too far.

In fact, I am still waiting for someone to explain to me what mineral wouldn't fall under the definition of this bill. Certainly none of the witnesses at our June Committee on Natural Resources could name one.

The National Research Council published a 2008 report called “Minerals, Critical Minerals, and the U.S. Economy,” and it states: To be critical, a mineral must be both essential in use and subject to supply restriction.

They go on to point out some specific examples of minerals that are essential, but not critical, such as copper, iron ore, and construction aggregates, such as sand and gravel, except that this bill would completely ignore the National Research Council and many other organizations that know what criticality means and define all of these—copper, iron ore, sand, gravel, and more—as strategic and critical minerals.

There is no doubt that these minerals are essential, but they are widely produced in the United States, and there is no danger of a break in the supply chain. Let me state that again. There is no danger of a break in the supply chain.

Let's talk about the sand and gravel that was just mentioned before. There are roughly 6500 sand and gravel quarries in the United States. We are not

going to run out of gravel by not permitting one more gravel mine.

Gravel is important, but no one from the National Research Council or the Department of Energy or any organization that knows the real definition of critical minerals would consider sand and gravel to fall in that category, period, end of discussion.

My amendment would ensure that the scientifically vetted definition determined by the NRC is what the Secretary of the Interior uses to assess the criticality of minerals to be mined under this bill. It would ensure that the bill actually addresses the intent that is suggested by its own title: critical minerals.

□ 1415

It puts no time limits on the identification of these minerals. So, as conditions change over time, the Secretary would be able to add or remove items from the list of critical minerals, as necessary.

Republicans in the Senate understand this. Senator MURKOWSKI, the chair of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, which oversees mining, has introduced a bill that requires a methodology for determining which minerals would qualify as critical.

That methodology is to be based on an assessment of—I quote in her bill—“whether the materials are subject to potential supply restrictions and also important in use.”

I may not agree with everything that is in Senator MURKOWSKI’s bill, but I believe that she at least understands the definition of a critical mineral and is making a serious attempt to expand the production of minerals that are actually critically important and strategic.

But without my amendment, this bill is just a guise for mining interests to loosen public review, judicial review, and environmental protections for all hardrock mining.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

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

In response, I just have to say one word: earthquake.

During the 2008 Great Southern California ShakeOut, which studied and analyzed the potential effects of a major earthquake, the USGS discovered that there would be a shortfall of building materials, namely, sand and gravel, if there was a major earthquake, God forbid, causing significant damage in the L.A. basin and the surrounding areas.

This amendment, if we accept it, would preclude that sand and gravel would be defined as critical, hindering expedited development of these resources.

Furthermore, by explicitly excluding sand, gravel or clay, this amendment is at fundamental odds with the National Research Council study—I have quoted it earlier—which stated: “All minerals and mineral products could be or could become critical to some degree, depending on their importance and availability.”

The California Geological Survey recently released information forecasting a continuing shortage in California of permitted aggregate resources so as to meet only one-third of demand over the next 50 years in the State of California.

So we have a shortage coming, whether people like it or not, and that is without a major earthquake. Once again, God forbid.

The bill, as currently structured, does allow the market and the Nation’s needs to define a mineral as critical, thereby allowing the flexibility necessary for carrying out the provisions of the act.

However, this amendment would hinder the efficiency and fluidity this bill seeks to inject into the permitting process for critical and strategic minerals by imposing an extra bureaucratic determination to be made by the Secretary of the Interior. It also picks winners and losers in the mining industry.

So for those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say, in conclusion, that we are talking about a definition of critical and strategic minerals that comes from the NRC, or the National Resource Council, that really talks about things that are essential.

But it also says that, to be declared critical, it must have a danger of disruption in the supply chain. We must have a limit to where we can access other materials.

As it was just pointed out, what happens if there is an earthquake in Southern California? God help us. Let’s hope that there is not going to be an earthquake in Southern California. And there is a limitation on the supply.

I would like to urge us to say that the Secretary has the ability to change what is on that list or not under my amendment.

I urge support of my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. DINGELL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114-301.

Mrs. DINGELL. 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:

Beginning at page 7, strike line 5 and all that follows through page 8, line 18, and insert the following:

(b) TREATMENT OF PERMITS UNDER NEPA.— Issuance of a mineral exploration or mine permit shall be treated as a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment for purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4331 et seq.).

Beginning at page 9, strike line 19 and all that follows through page 12, line 21.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 481, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

There are several troubling positions in this legislation, many of which my other colleagues have already addressed this afternoon. But I am particularly concerned with how H.R. 1937 treats the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, as it has become known.

If this bill were to become law, public comment would be severely limited and, in some instances, a proper environmental review may not be conducted at all.

The underlying bill employs a functional equivalence standard, which would permit the lead agency to circumvent a NEPA review if other agencies have performed reviews that are determined to be equivalent. There are several problems with this approach.

First, it is not clear that the six factors listed in the bill compromise all that a NEPA document would explore. So if functional equivalence was applied, the public may not have the complete story about the environmental impacts of a specific project.

Second, case law demonstrates that functional equivalence has historically not been extended to other agencies beyond the EPA because they are simply not equipped to do that kind of work.

That is why the committee heard testimony earlier this year that this provision ignores Congress’ choices in NEPA, as well as the judiciary’s struggle with functional equivalence.

My amendment strikes the functional equivalence provisions and replaces it with the language that makes it clear that all mine explorations or mine permits are major Federal actions and would require an environmental impact statement under NEPA.

It is well known that hardrock mining can have adverse health impacts, and these projects deserve a formal environmental review.

NEPA has a simple premise: Look before you leap. This landmark law gives the public an opportunity to review and comment on actions proposed by

the government, adding to the evaluation process unique perspectives that highly specialized, mission-driven agencies might otherwise ignore.

We should be preserving and protecting this important tool for public participation rather than undermining it.

I urge my colleagues to support the Dingell amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

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

I would urge rejection of this amendment because it would make the permitting process for critical and strategic minerals even worse than it currently is. It is already 7 to 10 or more years. It is dead last in the 25 major mineral-producing countries in the world, according to that recent study we cited earlier.

This amendment would strike several key sections of the bill, including the NEPA provisions, the expedited schedule provision, the time limit provision, and the applicability of this law to existing permit application provision.

First, this amendment seeks to remove the NEPA provisions. Our provision does not sidestep or avoid the NEPA process in any way; rather, it codifies a judicial determination for NEPA known as the functional equivalence doctrine.

This doctrine provides that, when an agency action, whether State or Federal, has addressed the substantive requirements of NEPA, such action may be substituted as sufficient rather than having to prepare an entirely new and duplicative environmental study.

This amendment rejects the functional equivalence doctrine and mandates that the issuance of every mineral exploration or mine permit constitutes a "major Federal action," thereby requiring the development of costly and time-consuming environmental impact statements, regardless of a proposed project's size.

Furthermore, this amendment strikes the provisions of the bill that requires the authorizing agency to develop a schedule for the permit process, and it removes the 30-month time constraints that would be put on said authorizing agency.

In other words, it restores the current 7- to 10-year permit process that plagues the mining industry and the production of jobs and the growth of our economy.

Let me mention one thing about automobile manufacturing in particular. An automobile contains rare earths for magnets, copper, aluminum, platinum, and many other critical minerals and elements.

According to Rare Earth Technology Alliance, the average hybrid car contains 61 pounds of rare earth metals. So it is important that we pass this bill.

This amendment unfortunately guts the bill. I would urge opposition to it.

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

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to quickly respond to some of the points made by my friends on the other side of the aisle.

I do recognize the importance of those metals in auto production. It is important to me. But this bill isn't going to impact them.

To be frank, I think this bill is a solution in search of a problem. NEPA is often a scapegoat for permitting delays, but this does not hold up when you closely examine the facts.

In fact, since 2008, the approval time for hardrock mines has decreased. Last year the average time it took to approve a plan of operations for a hardrock mine was 17 months—17 months—not 10 years.

I want jobs as much as my colleagues do on the other side of the aisle, but I want to protect people. Project complexity, local opposition, and the lack of funding are almost always the culprits for a project being delayed, but everybody wants to blame NEPA unfairly.

Hardrock mines could pose significant threats to public health, water, and the environment. We must ensure that every mining application is properly reviewed under NEPA, as my amendment proposes.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to remind us all that America has a plentiful supply of rare earth elements, but there are roadblocks to developing them, such that China produces 97 percent of the world's supply and there are at least 19 unique minerals that the U.S. has zero supply of.

So if we continue the current regime of 7 to 10 years to permit a mine project—and that is what will happen if we don't pass this bill—then we are going to be dependent on other countries and automobile and all kinds of manufacturing will be affected.

The 2014 ranking of countries for mining investment, out of the 25 major mining companies, found that the delays that we have in this country are the worst in the world; yet, we have such tremendous resources if we were only to use them.

So I think this bill is a good faith and reasonable effort to strike the balance between proper environmental protection by keeping functional equivalence and, yet, producing the minerals that will give us the jobs we need.

Mr. Chairman, I urge rejection of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1430

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

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

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CARTWRIGHT

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 114-301.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Beginning at page 14, line 1, strike title II.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 481, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, just off the floor of the House of Representatives, steps outside the door, we have a magnificent statue of one of our Founding Fathers, Thomas Jefferson.

Thomas Jefferson said: "I consider trial by jury as the only anchor ever yet imagined by man, by which a government can be held to the principles of its constitution."

The amendment I offer today, Mr. Chair, ensures that an important right of the American people is preserved: the right to hold the government accountable for their actions, the right of ordinary Americans to go into court and hold the government accountable.

The right to challenge the government in court should not be limited to large groups that are well funded and have the financial ability to pay for a lawyer, and that is exactly what this bill would do. This right should be extended to every American citizen, every small business, every nonprofit organization regardless of the size and scope of their wallets.

Now, as a lifetime courtroom lawyer, I know the importance of being able to access the court system. For many years, I fought to make sure that ordinary Americans could have their day in court and hold wrongdoers accountable.

Access to the courts is a key right envisioned by not only Thomas Jefferson, but all of the Founding Fathers, and is protected by the Equal Access to Justice Act, the EAJA, which allows eligible individuals to recover fees and expenses from the government if they win their day in court. As a Congressman and former trial attorney, I cannot and will not stand by silently and watch this bill chip away at this American right without standing up and speaking out.

By exempting exploration and mining permits from the Equal Access to Justice Act, this bill prevents valid

claims from reaching the courts by prohibiting the government from reimbursing legal expenses to parties that win in court. This overturns 30 years of legal precedent aimed at opening the court's doors to the public.

What I can't understand is why any of my colleagues across the aisle would want to limit review of the government's actions, given the fairly consistent message we hear that government has gotten too big and continues to come up with unnecessary rules and rulings.

EAJA allows average citizens to challenge this kind of thing in court, challenge the very kind of supposed overreach that the majority always likes to talk about.

We have heard time and time again from the majority that blocking access to the courts is necessary to halt frivolous and unnecessary litigation, as if judges are incapable or lack the intellectual rigor to be able to figure it out for themselves; but it is this bill that is frivolous and unnecessary, and the Congressional Budget Office proves it.

The Congressional Budget Office, the CBO, estimates that this bill, H.R. 1937, would reduce direct spending by less than \$50,000 a year. We are throwing up a barrier to access the courts for a paltry \$50,000 a year.

But the larger point is this is money that is awarded to successful claimants against the government. Why would you want to punish the successful claimants in the name of cutting down on frivolous litigation? Frivolous litigation, by definition, is claims that are so bad, they couldn't possibly win in court and never do.

The only reason I can see for the EAJA exemption in this bill is that it further solidifies industry's free pass to mine on U.S. public lands. First, this bill limits public and agency consideration by waiving the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, and setting unrealistic time limits. Then title II puts the nail in the coffin by eliminating the public's last opportunity to review a mine's permit by challenging it in open court.

My amendment today would strike all of title II, including the EAJA exemption, in order to maintain this vital, time-honored American public right to challenge the government's decisions in court.

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes title II of the bill, which addresses the judicial review of agency actions relating to exploration and mine permits. This title is designed to address one of the primary contributors to the long permitting timelines and delays we have been talking about this afternoon: relentless litigation brought by environmental organizations.

Regulatory agencies routinely try to craft a lawsuit-proof NEPA document. However, that is impossible. They are going to get sued no matter what. So title II seeks to provide some certainty in the litigation process. Rather than prohibit or block litigation, it does several reasonable things:

It expedites the judicial process by requiring timely filings no later than 60 days after a final agency action. It just keeps the ball rolling. That is entirely reasonable.

It requires the court to proceed expeditiously on reaching a determination in the case. That also is entirely reasonable.

Furthermore, title II provides the project proponent a guaranteed right to intervene. If a company has invested millions or even billions of dollars in a project, they deserve an opportunity to go to court on something that could adversely impact their investment. That, too, is entirely reasonable.

Also, title II limits certain prospective attorneys' fees under the Equal Access to Justice Act. This provision affects all parties to the lawsuit, including permitholders, and has as its purpose dissuading frivolous suits that would harm the Nation's ability to provide these vital resources. That, too, is entirely reasonable.

So for those reasons, I would say, let's reject this amendment. Let's keep title II in the bill. It is essential to have a predictable and reasonable permitting timeline so that we can explore and develop these resources to make our economy stronger. I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I acknowledge my colleague from Colorado. However, his silence on the point I was making is deafening.

The point I made is that cutting out EAJA from this act means that you are attacking successful claims. If your point is to attack frivolous lawsuits, you don't cut out reimbursing legal fees and costs for successful claims. What are we really up to by doing that?

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chair, just in answer to the gentleman's question, I would point out that what happens right now is that the EAJA is actually gamed. People can put in 15 or 20 frivolous claims, but if they have a finding on one substantial thing—and always, those lawsuits have a multitude of claims, but then one thing will be tucked in that is simply procedural that the agency forgot the deadline, it didn't have a meeting—and if the judge finds on one, then all are paid for. So they are allowed to bring frivolous actions with one substantiating claim, and it is those frivolous things that tie up and hold up development.

No one objects to the fact that sometimes the agencies are wrong. People do object to the fact that frivolous lawsuits come under the cover of one thing that is just almost inane in the whole discussion.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I have a simple question.

Name one Federal judge who has granted all of the attorneys' fees where there are 15 frivolous claims and one successful one.

I have never heard of such a thing.

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. PEARCE. I would be happy to respond. I will provide the documentation to the gentleman afterwards. I don't have it right here. But we see these things in New Mexico.

Mr. LAMBORN. Reclaiming my time, I will just conclude, Mr. Chairman, by saying that this amendment is not a good amendment for the bill because it guts title II.

We need some predictability in the litigation process as well as in the government bureaucratic process. This allows parties to go to court. It prevents the abuse of EAJA.

It is not the legitimate use of that law that we are after; it is the abuse of that particular law. That is why it is addressed in this bill.

I would urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 114-301.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike title III (page 15, beginning at line 15) and insert the following:

**TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS**  
**SEC. 301. SECRETARIAL ORDER NOT AFFECTED.**

This Act shall not apply to any mineral described in Secretarial Order 3324, issued by the Secretary of the Interior on December 3, 2012, in any area to which the Order applies.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 481, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chair, in the Permian Basin, which the Second District

of New Mexico falls just in the corner of that, two or three counties have tremendous assets. It is home to some of the most prolific and purest forms of potash, which is used for fertilizer, and then it also has significant oil and gas.

When I was elected to Congress in 2002, one of the first things that next year that we began to discover is that the oil and gas and potash industries have had an approximately 50-year running battle against each other. We began to try to sort through the differing opinions, working with the agency, the Interior Department, and over the next 10 approximate years, worked out an agreement with the Secretary of the Interior and the two different industries on how to both get along in the same area. That was a significant undertaking. It was a significant finding by the Interior Department and, again, took almost 10 years of very delicate negotiations. So my amendment to this bill, H.R. 1937, is simply to clarify that nothing in the bill overturns that agreement that has been reached.

Again, this agreement came under the Obama administration but dated back through the Bush administration, so it has been pretty well looked at by both sides, both parties, and has been functioning very well.

It is my desire to simply get the clarifying language that nothing in the bill is going to change that Secretarial order, and, likewise, the amendment does nothing to change the language in the bill. It is just clarifying that this is what we are going to do.

It is extremely important for New Mexico, but also for the Nation, because the potash provides the fertilizer for food sources across the Nation; but also, the oil and gas industry is providing much of the oil and gas that is coming into America's supply right now and driving down the price. The discoveries in that particular region will produce more oil and gas in one county than has been produced in the entire State for its entire history. So it is not as if these questions are insignificant.

Again, my amendment is very straightforward. It just seeks to clarify that nothing is going to affect that Secretarial order.

□ 1445

Mr. LAMBORN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEARCE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LAMBORN. We support the amendment and commend the author for offering it.

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time that is allotted to the opposition to this amendment, although I do not intend to oppose it.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I think it is interesting that this amendment is coming up, as it has in the past, because it simply proves the point we have been trying to make.

The larger point is that this bill is simply too broad. It covers every possible mineral you could mine, including potash. I think the gentleman from New Mexico would agree that potash is not a strategic and critical mineral. It does not need the environmental review waivers that this bill would provide.

What many of my colleagues and I are saying is that potash is no different from many other minerals. The concern for southeastern New Mexico is that potash development and oil and gas drilling should be able to occur without conflict. This bill would threaten that.

Well, we want to make sure that mineral development doesn't conflict with other things as well throughout the country, like hunting, fishing, camping, grazing, recreating, conserving, and other legitimate uses. Unfortunately, this bill threatens that, and we are likely not going to grant exemptions for these purposes like we are for the oil and gas industry.

I would certainly like it if sportsmen were protected from hastily adopted and permitted sand and gravel quarries the same way you want your oil and gas drillers to be protected from hastily permitted potash mines.

Interestingly, potash is a mineral where we import over 80 percent of our supply. We are entirely self-sufficient in sand and gravel. So, by that standard, you could say that potash is more critical and strategic than sand and gravel. But the majority will allow this amendment to be adopted because it benefits oil and gas producers.

Mr. Chairman, meanwhile, the Lowenthal amendment, which takes sand and gravel out of this bill for the benefit of everyone else in this country, is likely to get voted down. I think that is unfortunate.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, again, this is an amendment that does not change the underlying language of the bill. It simply seeks to clarify to all parties that no change was intended and no change will occur to the existing order from the Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge everyone to support the amendment and the underlying bill.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 114-301.

Mr. HASTINGS. 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:

Add at the end the following:

**TITLE \_\_\_\_\_MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS**

**SEC. 01. LIMITATION ON APPLICATION.**

This Act shall not apply with respect to a proposed strategic and critical minerals mining project unless the project proponent demonstrates that the combined capacity of existing mining operations in the United States producing the same mineral product that will be produced by the project, whether currently in operation or not, but not including mining operations for which a reclamation plan is being implemented or has been fully implemented, is less than 80 percent of the demand for that mineral product in the United States.

**SEC. 02. PUBLICATION OF NOTICE REGARDING TRANSPORTATION AND SALE OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.**

If any intermediate or final mineral product produced by a strategic and critical minerals mining project is to be transported or sold outside the United States, and the project proponent cannot demonstrate that the annual production of such product in the United States exceeds 80 percent of the demand for that product in the United States, the project proponent shall publish at least once prior notice of their intent to make such transport or sale in national newspapers or trade publications, by electronic means, or both, and on any Internet site that is maintained by the project proponent.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 481, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, when I saw H.R. 1937 as submitted, I agreed with the minority on the Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee that it was in need of a significant amendment, in particular, in the definition of "strategic and critical minerals."

The amendment submitted by Congressman LOWENTHAL is also a good basis and would correct the bill. However, as this has been rejected in the past, I took a less stringent approach that I believe would be a basis that would at least eliminate the most egregious aspects of the definition.

This bill addresses a real problem, which is that long permitting delays for mining projects in the United States, especially in remote or environmentally sensitive areas, can reach 7 to 10 years in some cases.

This represents a significant project risk for potential investors, which makes them historically more likely to develop projects outside of the United States when there are opportunities to produce the same mineral products.

Increasing international government scrutiny on environmental issues for mining projects outside of the United States along with civil instability in many mineral resource-rich countries

has prompted project proponents to look to the United States as a safer alternative, given that projects can be developed in a reasonable timeframe.

That said, Mr. Chairman, the majority's claims of mining permit delays for all kinds of mining projects that prompted this bill are unfounded. Last year the average time it took to approve a plan of operations for a hardrock mine was 17 months, and since 2008, the approval time has actually decreased. As of last year, the Obama administration had approved 69 percent of hardrock mines within 3 years.

Rather than addressing the problem directly with the responsible agencies, as President Obama did in his Presidential order "Improving Performance of Federal Permitting and Review of Infrastructure Projects" dated March 22, 2012, this bill is an end run around the permitting process, the authority of the permitting agencies, and the courts.

H.R. 1937 includes a very broad definition of "strategic and critical minerals" that does not take into account whether these minerals are actually in short supply in the United States. Under the definition as written, cement, and wallboard, as well as gold and diamonds would qualify. It makes one wonder if there is a strategic and critical shortage of jewelry in the United States.

The authors of this bill say that they do not wish to identify which mineral products are "strategic and critical" since this may change over time with changes in national priorities. Therefore, this amendment adds a simple test. This amendment requires proposed "strategic and critical minerals" projects to demonstrate that domestic capacity to produce strategic and critical minerals is less than 80 percent of domestic requirements. This would eliminate mineral products such as sand and gravel, which the authors claim the bill was never meant to encompass.

The amendment also requires that unless or until the domestic capacity for a "strategic and critical mineral" product exceeds 80 percent of domestic requirements, the public will be notified of the intent to transport or sell any final or intermediate strategic and critical mineral products outside of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of my amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I am having a little trouble understanding where this amendment is headed and what it is really trying to do. If I understand correctly, it proposes to limit export of strategic and critical minerals if the supply of those minerals is greater than 80 percent of domestic de-

mand. As I am trying to figure that out, one thing that jumps out at me is why is 80 percent a significant milestone? It seems sort of plucked out of thin air. It seems arbitrary.

How would you measure and find that 80 percent of something that is used in many ways around the country, I am not sure how that would be done, by advertising in national newspapers or something? I am just a little unsure.

Also, the amendment appears to be internally inconsistent. On one hand, the amendment seeks to prevent the use of the bill's provisions if the supply is greater than 80 percent of domestic demands. On the other hand, the amendment says that the project proponent cannot show that production exceeds 80 percent of domestic demand, the project proponent must advertise that fact in a national newspaper, trade publications, or Web site.

I am just a little confused as to what this amendment is really trying to get at. But it does seem to be, in the final analysis, a continuation of the overregulation that has produced this problem in the first place. We have so many regulatory obstacles to producing minerals that it does take 7 to 10 years.

Now, if you take a certain slice out of that process, it may sound like a smaller period of time. But when you add in litigation and everything else that accompanies the process, it is literally 7 to 10 years, especially for hardrock mine projects that produce rare earth minerals and things like that.

There might be a few exceptions for clay or other items that are of less concern, but for hardrock mining, there is no way to avoid the 7 to 10 years, unfortunately, in our country today. This would be another example of the kind of regulation that just gums up the whole process.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would urge the rejection of this amendment.

I urge a "no" vote.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. LAMBORN. 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. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. MARCHANT, 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. 1937) to require the Secretary of

the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness, 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 until approximately 3:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1532

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT) at 3 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.

#### NATIONAL STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS PRODUCTION ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 481 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. 1937.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) kindly take the chair.

□ 1533

#### 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. 1937) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness, with Mr. BOST (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 114-301 offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) 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 House Report 114-301 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. LOWENTHAL of California.

Amendment No. 2 by Mrs. DINGELL of Michigan.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. CARTWRIGHT of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

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. LOWENTHAL

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 253, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 560]

AYES—176

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

NOES—253

Abraham	Amodei	Barton
Aderholt	Babin	Benishek
Allen	Barletta	Bilirakis
Amash	Barr	Bishop (GA)

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

NOT VOTING—5

Beatty	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Granger	Payne	Visclosky

□ 1606

Messrs. BARR, TURNER, SCALISE, NEWHOUSE, BARTON, and COFFMAN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. COURTNEY and CAPUANO changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. DINGELL

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 248, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 561]

AYES—181

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

NOES—248

Abraham	Amodei	Barton
Aderholt	Babin	Benishek
Allen	Barletta	Bilirakis
Amash	Barr	Bishop (MI)

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

NOT VOTING—5

Castor (FL) Kelly (IL) Rice (SC)  
 Cramer Payne

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1610

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CARTWRIGHT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the

gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) 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 184, noes 245, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 562]

AYES—184

Adams Fudge Napolitano  
 Aguilar Gabbard Neal  
 Ashford Gallego Nolan  
 Bass Garamendi Norcross  
 Beatty Graham O'Rourke  
 Becerra Grayson Pallone  
 Bera Green, Al Pascrell  
 Beyer Green, Gene Pelosi  
 Bishop (GA) Grijalva Perlmutter  
 Blumenauer Gutierrez Peters  
 Bonamici Hahn Pingree  
 Boyle, Brendan Hastings Pocan  
 F. Heck (WA) Polio  
 Brady (PA) Higgins Price (NC)  
 Brown (FL) Himes Quigley  
 Brownley (CA) Hinojosa Rangel  
 Bustos Honda Rice (NY)  
 Butterfield Hoyer Richmond  
 Capps Huffman Roybal-Allard  
 Capuano Israel Ruiz  
 Cárdenas Jackson Lee Ruppertsberger  
 Carney Jeffries Rush  
 Carson (IN) Johnson (GA) Russell  
 Cartwright Johnson, E. B. Ryan (OH)  
 Castro (TX) Kaptur Sanchez, Linda  
 Chu, Judy Keating T.  
 Cicilline Kennedy Sanchez, Loretta  
 Clark (MA) Kildee Sarbanes  
 Clarke (NY) Kilmer Schakowsky  
 Clay Kind Schiff  
 Cleaver Kirkpatrick Scott (VA)  
 Clyburn Kuster Scott, David  
 Cohen Larsen (WA) Serrano  
 Connolly Conyers Larson (CT)  
 Conyers Cooper Lawrence  
 Costa Lee  
 Courtney Levin  
 Crowley Lewis  
 Cuellar Lieu, Ted  
 Cummings Lipinski  
 Davis (CA) Loeb sack  
 Davis, Danny Lofgren  
 DeFazio Lowenthal  
 DeGette Lowey  
 Delaney Lujan Grisham  
 DeLauro (NM)  
 DeBene Luján, Ben Ray  
 DeSaulnier (NM)  
 Deutch Lynch  
 Dingell Maloney,  
 Doggett Carolyn  
 Doyle, Michael Maloney, Sean  
 F. Matsui  
 Duckworth McCollum  
 Edwards McDermott  
 Ellison McGovern  
 Engel Mc Nerney  
 Eshoo Meeks  
 Esty Meng  
 Farr Moore  
 Fattah Moulton  
 Foster Murphy (FL)  
 Frankel (FL) Nadler

NOES—245

Abraham Barton  
 Aderholt Benishek  
 Allen Billirakis  
 Amash Bishop (MI)  
 Amodei Bishop (UT)  
 Babin Black  
 Barletta Blackburn  
 Barr Blum  
 Buck  
 Bucshon  
 Burgess  
 Byrne  
 Calvert  
 Carter (GA)  
 Carter (TX)  
 Chabot  
 Chaffetz  
 Clawson (FL)  
 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  
 Gibson  
 Gohmert  
 Goodlatte  
 Gosar  
 Gowdy  
 Granger  
 Graves (GA)  
 Graves (LA)  
 Graves (MO)  
 Griffith  
 Grothman  
 Guinta  
 Guthrie  
 Hanna  
 Hardy  
 Harper  
 Harris  
 Hartzler

Huelskamp  
 Huizenga (MI)  
 Hultgren  
 Hunter  
 Hurd (TX)  
 Hurt (VA)  
 Issa  
 Jenkins (KS)  
 Jenkins (WV)  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Cole  
 Collins (GA)  
 Collins (NY)  
 Comstock  
 Conaway  
 Cook  
 Costello (PA)  
 Cramer  
 Crawford  
 Crenshaw  
 Culberson  
 Curbelo (FL)  
 Davis, Rodney  
 Denham  
 Dent  
 DeSantis  
 DesJarlais  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Dold  
 Donovan  
 Duffy  
 Duncan (SC)  
 Duncan (TN)  
 Ellmers (NC)  
 Emmer (MN)  
 Farenthold  
 Fincher  
 Fitzpatrick  
 Fleischmann  
 Fleming  
 Flores  
 Forbes  
 Fortenberry  
 Foxx  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Garrett  
 Gibbs  
 Gibson  
 Gohmert  
 Goodlatte  
 Gosar  
 Gowdy  
 Granger  
 Graves (GA)  
 Graves (LA)  
 Graves (MO)  
 Griffith  
 Grothman  
 Guinta  
 Guthrie  
 Hanna  
 Hardy  
 Harper  
 Harris  
 Hartzler  
 Heck (NV)  
 Hensarling  
 Herrera Beutler  
 Hice, Jody B.  
 Hill  
 Holding  
 Hudson

NOT VOTING—5

Castor (FL) Payne  
 Kelly (IL) Rice (SC)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1615

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 246, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 563]

AYES—183

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

NOES—246

Abraham	Black	Burgess
Aderholt	Blackburn	Byrne
Allen	Blum	Calvert
Amash	Bost	Carter (GA)
Amodi	Boustany	Carter (TX)
Babin	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Barletta	Brat	Chaffetz
Barr	Bridenstine	Coffman
Barton	Brooks (AL)	Cole
Benishkek	Brooks (IN)	Collins (GA)
Billirakis	Buchanan	Collins (NY)
Bishop (MI)	Buck	Comstock
Bishop (UT)	Bucshon	Conaway

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

NOT VOTING—5

Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Payne
Clawson (FL)	Lummis	

□ 1620

Ms. MOORE changed her vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) having assumed the chair, Mr. BOST, 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. 1937) to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more effi-

ciently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness, and, pursuant to House Resolution 481, 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.

The question is on the amendment.

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. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PETERS. I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Peters moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1937 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

## SEC. 01. CLIMATE CHANGE IS REAL.

Nothing in this Act limits the authority of the lead agency with responsibility for issuing a mineral exploration or mine permit from assessing the extent to which the activity proposed to be conducted under the permit may contribute to climate change.

Mr. PETERS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

I have been a clear proponent for reducing regulatory burdens and streamlining the environmental review process in ways that make sense.

Before I entered public service, I practiced environmental law for 15 years in large firms, in a government office, and in my own firm. Through that experience, I learned firsthand of the frustration that many businesses and local governments face when they try to navigate a sometimes overly complex and underly responsive permit process.

I also know from experience that time is money. Often a business seeking a permit is paying dearly to hold a property or service a loan while it waits for that permit to be issued, and

that is why I have often said that, for applicants, no is the second-best answer. Tell us “no” or tell us how, but don’t string us along.

Unfortunately, the approach that the underlying bill takes is not to streamline the process for analyzing the significant impacts of hardrock mining, which I might support; it just eliminates the review process altogether.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment would not solve that problem but would make an important clarification. As these critical mineral mining projects undergo environmental review, agencies should be able to assess how the project may contribute to climate change.

Recently, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or NOAA, reported that the first 7 months of this year had been the hottest such period on record. Globally, average surface temperatures have increased substantially in the last century, and nearly twice as fast in the last 50 years alone. We know that the vast majority of climate scientists, including numerous leading scientific and academic organizations across the world, agree that the planet is warming due to human activities.

How many national academies reject the science of global warming? None. Between November 2012 and December 2013, there were 9,137 peer-reviewed papers written on climate change. Of those 9,137 papers, how many did not agree that climate change is happening because of human activity? One. That is right. Only 1 out of more than 9,000.

So it seems to me that when scientific organizations, including the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Chemical Society, the American Geophysical Union, the American Meteorological Society, the American Physical Society, the Geological Society of America, the National Academy of Sciences, and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change all agree that climate change is happening because of human activity, we ought to be listening.

If 99 doctors told you that you had diabetes and 1 said he wasn’t sure, wouldn’t you still do something?

Now, for too long, we have heard that we have to choose between a prosperous economy and a clean environment. San Diegans and people around the country know that is a false choice. We can and we must provide economic opportunity and clean air and water for future generations.

Given the high stakes associated with carbon emissions and climate change on coastal property, energy, defense, our food supply, and our quality of life, shouldn’t we at least understand the long-term costs associated with a project?

By allowing agencies to take a full environmental consideration of a project, including its potential contributions to climate change, my amendment rejects the false choice between a prosperous economy and a

healthy climate. We can and we must have both.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1630

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit is a procedural motion designed to slow down consideration of this important jobs bill. It is a purely procedural motion, not a substantive motion. I urge us to reject the motion.

It is important to pass this bill. Right now it takes 7 to 10 years to approve a mining project in the U.S. Mr. Speaker, this is dead last among major mining countries. The critical and strategic minerals we mine in this country go into vital infrastructure and manufacturing to improve our way of life.

Mr. Speaker, when we use American resources to create American jobs, we reduce our dependency on foreign countries like China. This bill will reduce bureaucratic red tape, speed up the legal and permitting process, and create certainty so that mining projects will stay here in America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and support H.R. 1937 to use American resources for American jobs.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 483; and adoption of House Resolution 483, if ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 246, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 564]

AYES—184

Adams	Bonamici	Cárdenas
Aguilar	Boyle, Brendan	Carney
Ashford	F.	Carson (IN)
Bass	Brady (PA)	Cartwright
Beatty	Brown (FL)	Castro (TX)
Becerra	Brownley (CA)	Chu, Judy
Bera	Bustos	Cicilline
Beyer	Butterfield	Clark (MA)
Bishop (GA)	Capps	Clarke (NY)
Blumenauer	Capuano	Clay

Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Pingree
Clyburn	Jeffries	Pocan
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Polis
Connolly	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Conyers	Kaptur	Quigley
Cooper	Keating	Rangel
Costa	Kennedy	Rice (NY)
Courtney	Kildee	Richmond
Crowley	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Cuellar	Kind	Ruiz
Cummings	Kirkpatrick	Ruppersberger
Davis (CA)	Kuster	Rush
Davis, Danny	Langevin	Ryan (OH)
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez, Linda
DeGette	Larson (CT)	T.
Delaney	Lawrence	Sanchez, Loretta
DeLauro	Lee	Sarbanes
DelBene	Levin	Schakowsky
DeSaulnier	Lewis	Schiff
Deutch	Lieu, Ted	Schrader
Dingell	Lipinski	Scott (VA)
Doggett	Loebsock	Scott, David
Doyle, Michael	Lofgren	Serrano
F.	Lowenthal	Sewell (AL)
Duckworth	Lowey	Sherman
Edwards	Lujan Grisham	Sinema
Ellison	(NM)	Sires
Engel	Luján, Ben Ray	Slaughter
Eshoo	(NM)	Smith (WA)
Esty	Lynch	Speier
Farr	Maloney,	Swalwell (CA)
Fattah	Carolyn	Takai
Foster	Maloney, Sean	Takano
Frankel (FL)	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Fudge	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Gabbard	McDermott	Titus
Gallego	McGovern	Tonko
Garamendi	McNerney	Torres
Graham	Meeks	Tsongas
Grayson	Meng	Van Hollen
Green, Al	Moore	Vargas
Green, Gene	Moulton	Veasey
Grijalva	Murphy (FL)	Vela
Gutiérrez	Nadler	Velázquez
Hahn	Napolitano	Visclosky
Hastings	Neal	Walz
Heck (WA)	Nolan	Wasserman
Higgins	Norcross	Schultz
Himes	O’Rourke	Waters, Maxine
Hinojosa	Pallone	Watson Coleman
Honda	Pascarell	Welch
Hoyer	Pelosi	Wilson (FL)
Huffman	Perlmutter	Yarmuth
Israel	Peters	

NOES—246

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

Loudermilk	Pittenger	Smith (NJ)	Fitzpatrick	Lamborn	Rogers (KY)	Lowenthal	Perlmutter	Sires
Love	Pitts	Smith (TX)	Fleischmann	Lance	Rohrabacher	Lowe	Peters	Slaughter
Lucas	Poe (TX)	Stefanik	Fleming	Latta	Rokita	Lujan Grisham	Pingree	Smith (WA)
Luetkemeyer	Poliquin	Stewart	Flores	LoBiondo	Rooney (FL)	(NM)	Pocan	Speier
Lummis	Pompeo	Stivers	Forbes	Long	Ros-Lehtinen	Lujan, Ben Ray	Polis	Swalwell (CA)
MacArthur	Posey	Stutzman	Fortenberry	Loudermilk	Roskam	(NM)	Price (NC)	Takai
Marchant	Price, Tom	Thompson (PA)	Fox	Love	Ross	Lynch	Quigley	Takano
Marino	Ratcliffe	Thornberry	Franks (AZ)	Lucas	Rothfus	Maloney,	Rangel	Thompson (CA)
Massie	Reed	Tiberi	Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer	Rouzer	Carolyn	Rice (NY)	Thompson (MS)
McCarthy	Reichert	Tipton	Garrett	Lummis	Royce	Maloney, Sean	Richmond	Tonko
McCaul	Renacci	Trott	Gibbs	MacArthur	Russell	Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Torres
McClintock	Ribble	Turner	Gibson	Marchant	Ryan (WI)	McCollum	Ruiz	Tsongas
McHenry	Rice (SC)	Upton	Gohmert	Marino	Salmon	McDermott	Ruppersberger	Van Hollen
McKinley	Rigell	Valadao	Goodlatte	Massie	Sanford	McGovern	Rush	Vargas
McMorris	Roby	Wagner	Gosar	McCarthy	Scalise	McNerney	Ryan (OH)	Veasey
Rodgers	Roe (TN)	Walberg	Gowdy	McCaul	Schweikert	Meeks	Sánchez, Linda	Vela
McSally	Rogers (AL)	Walden	Granger	McClintock	Scott, Austin	Meng	T.	Velázquez
Meadows	Rogers (KY)	Walker	Graves (GA)	McHenry	Sensenbrenner	Moore	Sanchez, Loretta	Visclosky
Meehan	Rohrabacher	Walorski	Graves (LA)	McKinley	Sessions	Moulton	Sarbanes	Walz
Messer	Rokita	Walters, Mimi	Graves (MO)	McMorris	Shimkus	Murphy (FL)	Schakowsky	Wasserman
Mica	Rooney (FL)	Weber (TX)	Griffith	Rodgers	Shuster	Nadler	Schiff	Schultz
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Webster (FL)	Grothman	McSally	Simpson	Napolitano	Schrader	Waters, Maxine
Miller (MI)	Roskam	Westrup	Guinta	Meadows	Smith (MO)	Neal	Scott (VA)	Watson Coleman
Moolenaar	Ross	Westerman	Guthrie	Meehan	Smith (NE)	Norcross	Scott, David	Welch
Mooney (WV)	Rothfus	Westmoreland	Hanna	Messer	Smith (NJ)	O'Rourke	Serrano	Wilson (FL)
Mullin	Rouzer	Whitfield	Hardy	Mica	Smith (TX)	Pallone	Sewell (AL)	Yarmuth
Mulvaney	Royce	Williams	Harper	Miller (FL)	Stefanik	Pascrell	Sherman	
Murphy (PA)	Russell	Wilson (SC)	Harris	Miller (MI)	Stewart	Pelosi	Sinema	
Neugebauer	Ryan (WI)	Wittman	Hartzler	Moolenaar	Stivers			
Newhouse	Salmon	Womack	Heck (NV)	Mooney (WV)	Stutzman			
Noem	Sanford	Woodall	Hensarling	Mullin	Thompson (PA)			
Nugent	Scalise	Yoder	Herrera Beutler	Mulvaney	Thornberry			
Nunes	Schweikert	Yoho	Hice, Jody B.	Murphy (PA)	Tiberi			
Olson	Scott, Austin	Young (AK)	Hill	Neugebauer	Tipton			
Palazzo	Sensenbrenner	Young (IA)	Holding	Newhouse	Titus			
Palmer	Sessions	Young (IN)	Hudson	Noem	Trott			
Paulsen	Shimkus	Zeldin	Huelskamp	Nolan	Turner			
Pearce	Shuster	Zinke	Huizenga (MI)	Nugent	Upton			
Perry	Smith (MO)		Hultgren	Nunes	Valadao			
Peterson	Smith (NE)		Hunter	Olson	Wagner			

## NOT VOTING—4

Castor (FL) Payne  
Kelly (IL) Simpson

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1636

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 254, nays 177, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 565]

YEAS—254

Abraham	Bridenstine	Costello (PA)
Aderholt	Brooks (AL)	Cramer
Allen	Brooks (IN)	Crawford
Amash	Buchanan	Crenshaw
Amodei	Buck	Cuellar
Ashford	Bucshon	Culberson
Babin	Burgess	Curbelo (FL)
Barletta	Byrne	Davis, Rodney
Barr	Calvert	Denham
Barton	Carter (GA)	Dent
Benishkek	Carter (TX)	DeSantis
Bilirakis	Chabot	DesJarlais
Bishop (GA)	Chaffetz	Diaz-Balart
Bishop (MI)	Clawson (FL)	Dold
Bishop (UT)	Coffman	Donovan
Black	Cole	Duffy
Blackburn	Collins (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Blum	Collins (NY)	Duncan (TN)
Bost	Comstock	Ellmers (NC)
Boustany	Conaway	Emmer (MN)
Brady (TX)	Cook	Farenthold
Brat	Costa	Fincher

Adams	Courtney	Grijalva
Aguilar	Crowley	Gutiérrez
Bass	Cummings	Hahn
Beatty	Davis (CA)	Hastings
Becerra	Davis, Danny	Heck (WA)
Bera	DeFazio	Higgins
Beyer	DeGette	Himes
Blumenauer	Delaney	Hinojosa
Bonamici	DeLauro	Honda
Boyle, Brendan	DelBene	Hoyer
F.	DeSaulnier	Huffman
Brady (PA)	Deutch	Israel
Brown (FL)	Dingell	Jackson Lee
Brownley (CA)	Doggett	Jeffries
Bustos	Doyle, Michael	Johnson (GA)
Butterfield	F.	Johnson, E. B.
Capps	Duckworth	Keating
Capuano	Edwards	Kennedy
Cárdenas	Ellison	Kildee
Carney	Engel	Kilmer
Carson (IN)	Eshoo	Kind
Cartwright	Esty	Kirkpatrick
Castro (TX)	Farr	Kuster
Chu, Judy	Fattah	Langevin
Ciilline	Foster	Larsen (WA)
Clark (MA)	Frankel (FL)	Larson (CT)
Clarke (NY)	Fudge	Lawrence
Clay	Gabbard	Lee
Cleaver	Gallego	Levin
Clyburn	Garamendi	Lewis
Cohen	Graham	Lieu, Ted
Connolly	Grayson	Lipinski
Conyers	Green, Al	Loeb sack
Cooper	Green, Gene	Lofgren

## NAYS—177

Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Payne
-------------	------------	-------

## NOT VOTING—3

Castor (FL) Kelly (IL) Payne

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1642

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3762, RESTORING AMERICANS' HEALTHCARE FREEDOM RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2015; WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(A) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 483) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3762) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016; waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 185, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 566]

YEAS—244

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

NAYS—185

Adams Boyle, Brendan Cartwright  
 Aguilar F. Castro (TX)  
 Ashford Brady (PA) Chu, Judy  
 Bass Brown (FL) Cicilline  
 Beatty Brownley (CA) Clark (MA)  
 Becerra Bustos Clarke (NY)  
 Bera Butterfield Clay  
 Beyer Capps Cleaver  
 Bishop (GA) Capuano Clyburn  
 Blumenauer Cárdenas Cohen  
 Bonamici Carney Connolly  
 Carson (IN) Carson (IN) Conyers

Cooper Kaptur Poliss  
 Costa Keating Price (NC)  
 Courtney Kennedy Quigley  
 Crowley Kildee Rangel  
 Cuellar Kilmer Rice (NY)  
 Cummings Kind Richmond  
 Davis (CA) Kirkpatrick Roybal-Allard  
 Davis, Danny Kuster Ruiz  
 DeFazio Langevin Ruppertsberger  
 DeGette Larsen (WA) Rush  
 Delaney Larson (CT) Ryan (OH)  
 DeLauro Lawrence Sánchez, Linda  
 DelBene Lee T.  
 DeSaulnier Levin Sanchez, Loretta  
 Deutch Lewis Sarbanes  
 Dingell Lieu, Ted Schakowsky  
 Doggett Lipinski Schiff  
 Doyle, Michael Loeb sack  
 F. Lofgren Schrader  
 Duckworth Lowenthal Scott (VA)  
 Edwards Lowey Scott, David  
 Ellison Lujan Grisham Serrano  
 Engel (NM) Sewell (AL)  
 Eshoo Luján, Ben Ray Sherman  
 Esty (NM) Sinema  
 Farr Lynch Sires  
 Fattah Maloney, Slaughter  
 Foster Carolyn Smith (WA)  
 Frankel (FL) Maloney, Sean Speier  
 Fudge Matsui Swalwell (CA)  
 Gabbard McCollum Takai  
 Gallego McDermott Takano  
 Garamendi McGovern Thompson (CA)  
 Graham McNerney Thompson (MS)  
 Grayson Meeks Titus  
 Green, Al Meng Tonko  
 Green, Gene Moore Torres  
 Grijalva Moulton Tsongas  
 Gutiérrez Murphy (FL) Van Hollen  
 Hahn Nadler Vargas  
 Hastings Napolitano Veasey  
 Heck (WA) Neal Vela  
 Higgins Nolan Velázquez  
 Himes Norcross Visclosky  
 Hinojosa O'Rourke Walz  
 Honda Pallone Wasserman  
 Hoyer Pascrell Schultz  
 Huffman Pelosi Waters, Maxine  
 Israel Perlmutter Watson Coleman  
 Jackson Lee Peters Welch  
 Jeffries Peterson Wilson (FL)  
 Johnson (GA) Pingree Yarmuth  
 Johnson, E. B. Pocan

NOT VOTING—5

Castor (FL) Mica Pittenger  
 Kelly (IL) Payne

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1649

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 187, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 567]

YEAS—240

Abraham Bishop (MI) Brooks (AL)  
 Aderholt Bishop (UT) Brooks (IN)  
 Allen Black Buchanan  
 Amodei Blackburn Buck  
 Babin Blum Bucshon  
 Barletta Bost Burgess  
 Barr Boustany Byrne  
 Barton Brady (TX) Calvert  
 Benishek Brat Carter (GA)  
 Bilirakis Bridenstine Carter (TX)

Chabot Hurd (TX) Reichert  
 Chaffetz Hurt (VA) Renacci  
 Clawson (FL) Issa Ribble  
 Coffman Jenkins (KS) Rice (SC)  
 Cole Jenkins (WV) Rigell  
 Collins (GA) Johnson (OH) Roby  
 Collins (NY) Johnson, Sam Roe (TN)  
 Comstock Jolly Rogers (AL)  
 Conaway Jordan Rogers (KY)  
 Cook Joyce Rohrabacher  
 Costello (PA) Katko Rokita  
 Cramer Kelly (MS) Ros-Lehtinen  
 Crawford Kelly (PA) Roskam  
 Crenshaw King (IA) Ross  
 Culberson King (NY) Rothfus  
 Curbelo (FL) Kinzinger (IL) Rouzer  
 Davis, Rodney Kline Royce  
 Denham Labrador Russell  
 Dent LaHood LaMalfa  
 DeSantis DesJarlais Lamborn  
 Diaz-Balart Diaz-Balart Lance  
 Dold Dold Latta  
 Donovan Donovan LoBiondo  
 Duffy Long  
 Duncan (SC) Loudermilk  
 Duncan (TN) Lummis  
 Ellmers (NC) Luetkemeyer  
 Emmer (MN) Lummis  
 Farenthold Fincher MacArthur  
 Fincher Fincher Marchant  
 Fitzpatrick Fitzpatrick Marino  
 Fleischmann Fleischmann McCarthy  
 Fleming Fleming McCaul  
 Flores Flores McCaul  
 Forbes Forbes McClintock  
 Fortenberry Fortenberry McHenry  
 Foxx Foxx McKinley  
 Franks (AZ) Franks (AZ) McMorris  
 Frelinghuysen Frelinghuysen Rodgers  
 Garrett Garrett McSally  
 Gibbs Gibbs Meadows  
 Gibson Gibson Meehan  
 Gohmert Gohmert Messer  
 Goodlatte Goodlatte Miller (FL)  
 Gosar Gosar Miller (MI)  
 Gowdy Gowdy Moolenaar  
 Granger Granger Mooney (WV)  
 Graves (GA) Graves (GA) Mullin  
 Graves (LA) Graves (LA) Mulvaney  
 Graves (MO) Graves (MO) Murphy (PA)  
 Griffith Griffith Neugebauer  
 Grothman Grothman Newhouse  
 Guinta Guinta Noem  
 Guthrie Guthrie Nugent  
 Hanna Hanna Nunes  
 Harper Harper Olson  
 Harris Harris Palazzo  
 Hartzler Hartzler Palmer  
 Heck (NV) Heck (NV) Paulsen  
 Hensarling Hensarling Pearce  
 Herrera Beutler Herrera Beutler Perry  
 Hice, Jody B. Hice, Jody B. Pittenger  
 Hill Hill Poe (TX)  
 Holding Holding Poliquin  
 Hudson Hudson Pompeio  
 Huelskamp Huelskamp Posey  
 Huizenga (MI) Huizenga (MI) Price, Tom  
 Hultgren Hultgren Ratcliffe  
 Hunter Hunter Reed

NAYS—187

Adams Chu, Judy Doggett  
 Aguilar Cicilline Doyle, Michael  
 Amash Clark (MA) F.  
 Ashford Clarke (NY) Duckworth  
 Bass Edwards  
 Beatty Cleaver Ellision  
 Becerra Clyburn Engel  
 Bera Cohen Eshoo  
 Beyer Connolly Esty  
 Bishop (GA) Conyers Farr  
 Blumenauer Cooper Fattah  
 Bonamici Bonamici Foster  
 Boyle, Brendan Courtney Frankel (FL)  
 F. Crowley Fudge  
 Brady (PA) Cuellar Gabbard  
 Brown (FL) Brown (FL) Gallego  
 Brownley (CA) Davis (CA) Garamendi  
 Bustos Davis, Danny Graham  
 Butterfield DeFazio Grayson  
 Capps DeGette Green, Al  
 Capuano Delaney Green, Gene  
 Cárdenas DeLauro Grijalva  
 Carney Carney DelBene  
 Carson (IN) Carson (IN) DeSaulnier  
 Cartwright Deutch Hastings  
 Castro (TX) Castro (TX) Dingell Heck (WA)

Higgins	Maloney, Sean	Schakowsky
Himes	Massie	Schiff
Hinojosa	Matsui	Schrader
Honda	McColum	Scott (VA)
Hoyer	McDermott	Scott, David
Huffman	McGovern	Serrano
Israel	McNerney	Sewell (AL)
Jackson Lee	Meeks	Sherman
Jeffries	Meng	Sinema
Johnson (GA)	Moore	Sires
Johnson, E. B.	Moulton	Slaughter
Jones	Murphy (FL)	Smith (WA)
Kaptur	Nadler	Speier
Keating	Napolitano	Swalwell (CA)
Kennedy	Neal	Takai
Kildee	Nolan	Takano
Kilmer	Norcross	Thompson (CA)
Kind	O'Rourke	Thompson (MS)
Kirkpatrick	Pallone	Titus
Kuster	Pascrell	Tonko
Langevin	Pelosi	Torres
Larsen (WA)	Perlmutter	Tsongas
Larson (CT)	Peters	Van Hollen
Lawrence	Peterson	Vargas
Lee	Pingree	Veasey
Levin	Pocan	Vela
Lewis	Polis	Velázquez
Lieu, Ted	Price (NC)	Visclosky
Lipinski	Quigley	Walz
Loebsock	Rangel	Wasserman
Lofgren	Richmond	Schultz
Lowenthal	Roybal-Allard	Waters, Maxine
Lowey	Ruiz	Watson Coleman
Lujan Grisham	Ruppersberger	Welch
(NM)	Rush	Wilson (FL)
Luján, Ben Ray	Ryan (OH)	Yarmuth
(NM)	Sánchez, Linda	
Lynch	T.	
Maloney,	Sánchez, Loretta	
Carolyn	Sarbanes	

## NOT VOTING—7

Castor (FL)	Mica	Rooney (FL)
Kelly (IL)	Payne	
Knight	Rice (NY)	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1656

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.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

## DEPUTY SANDBERG, WE ARE FOREVER GRATEFUL

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

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember fallen Deputy Steven Sandberg, who was shot and killed in the line of duty this past Sunday in St. Cloud, Minnesota.

Deputy Sandberg's death was both senseless and tragic, but we must remember him for the heroic way he chose to live his life.

Deputy Sandberg was an honorable man who served his community for 24 years. He began working for the Aitkin County Sheriff's Office in 1991 and worked as an investigator for the past 20 years.

Every day for more than two decades Deputy Sandberg put his life on the

line to protect others, and we will be forever grateful for his service.

Our community has suffered a major loss, and we will never forget what this exceptional man has done for us. Our thoughts and prayers are with Steven's wife Kristi and daughter Cassie as well as his many friends and colleagues during this difficult time.

□ 1700

## DEPUTY STEVEN SANDBERG

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

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Minnesota suffered a terrible tragedy when we lost Deputy Sheriff Steven Sandberg of Aitkin, Minnesota, in the line of duty last weekend.

Deputy Sandberg, a 20-year veteran of the Sheriff's Office, was loved and cherished by his family, by all who knew him, and by the entire region.

His daughter, Cassie, recently said, "I want everyone to know that my dad was so proud to do his job and to serve the entire community."

Cassie, we want you to know that we are proud, too. We are proud to have had your dad's great service in our community. His bravery and his service will never be forgotten.

Today I ask my colleagues to please keep his wife, Kristi, and his daughter, Cassie, in their thoughts and in their prayers.

Please remember to thank and to honor all of the law enforcement officers who put themselves in harm's way every day to keep us safe.

## HONORING MAJOR GREG TRUITT

(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 to honor Coral Gables native Major Greg Truitt on his retirement from the Miami-Dade Police Department.

Starting off as a rookie corrections officer in his early twenties, Greg has held many roles throughout his 40 years in law enforcement before retiring as Commander of the Village of Palmetto Bay's Policing Unit.

The mayor and city manager of Palmetto Bay are here in D.C. today to help honor his years of service and to join me in wishing Major Truitt good health, happiness, and all the best in the years ahead.

Major Truitt's profound leadership and commitment to south Florida have allowed him to shape the lives of countless individuals throughout his impressive career. Greg has shown that there is no greater reward than the satisfaction of serving one's fellow neighbor. For having embraced this most noble of endeavors with such lofty principles, I thank him so very much.

Not one to rest on his laurels since his retirement, Greg continues to volunteer his time to serve our community through his church, the Boy Scouts of America, and as a police reserve officer with the Miami-Dade Police Department.

Godspeed to Greg Truitt.

## CONGRATULATIONS TO THE MINNESOTA LYNX

(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, the word "dynasty" gets thrown around loosely these days, but with three championships in 5 years, the Minnesota Lynx fit the bill.

Led by Maya Moore, who averaged over 23 points in the playoffs, the Lynx won the title with a hard-fought victory over the Indiana Fever in game 5. Coached by Cheryl Reeve, the Lynx overcame injuries and fatigue to clinch the top seed in the West during the regular season and set up their path to the title.

Mr. Speaker, as the WNBA continues to grow, the players often are called upon to do more than just play basketball. In that vein, the Lynx players have been tremendous ambassadors to the community and are heroes to numerous girls who are pursuing their athletic dreams.

I congratulate the Minnesota Lynx players and the coaches on yet another WNBA title.

## FEDERAL-STATE CYBERSECURITY COOPERATION

(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, today, here on Capitol Hill, I visited with various National Guard units from different States to learn more about the innovative ways they are keeping us safe in cyberspace. I appreciate their efforts and their service.

The House has passed several measures to protect our cybersecurity this year, and the Senate is now working to do the same. There is a clear, bipartisan consensus that more needs to be done to protect us from data breaches, malicious hackers, and those who would inflict harm on the American people in using our cyber networks.

Several high-profile data breaches include a hack of the Office of Personnel Management, which accessed highly sensitive information that puts our national security at risk as well as that of many people's private lives.

We must act now to protect our cybersecurity before an even more catastrophic attack occurs. More integration and cooperation is needed among Federal, State, and local levels to be on the same page for the cybersecurity Americans expect of us in government

and are promised. I feel we are falling woefully short should another attack occur. We must be prepared better than we are.

PREGNANCY DISCRIMINATION  
AMENDMENT ACT

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

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members of our House today to join me in support of H.R. 2800, the Pregnancy Discrimination Amendment Act.

This important piece of legislation expands upon existing law to help protect pregnant women from workplace discrimination, and I am proud to be a cosponsor.

Women account for nearly half of the workforce in our country, so it is particularly hard to believe, in today's society, women are still denied jobs or lose their jobs because they are pregnant. Every time this happens to a mom, it hurts her, it hurts her family, and it hurts our economy.

We must ensure that hardworking moms and moms-to-be are protected from unfair employment decisions. As a society, we should encourage and support all workers. We should help ensure that moms and dads are physically and financially healthy and secure as they approach parenthood.

As a single father myself, who raised my son from the time he was in diapers, I know firsthand how important it is to have a support system. That includes a supportive work environment where soon-to-be parents are not worried about being fired or about being overlooked for jobs or promotions because they have decided to have children.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-70)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLY of Mississippi) laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

*To The House of Representatives:*

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 1735, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016." While there are provisions in this bill that I support, including the codification of key interrogation-related reforms from Executive Order 13491 and positive changes to the military retirement system, the bill would, among other things, constrain the ability of the Department of Defense to conduct multi-year defense planning and align military capabilities and force structure with our national defense strategy, impede the closure of the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay, and prevent the implementation of essential defense reforms.

This bill fails to authorize funding for our national defense in a fiscally re-

sponsible manner. It underfunds our military in the base budget, and instead relies on an irresponsible budget gimmick that has been criticized by members of both parties. Specifically, the bill's use of \$38 billion in Overseas Contingency Operations funding—which was meant to fund wars and is not subject to budget caps—does not provide the stable, multi-year budget upon which sound defense planning depends. Because this bill authorizes base budget funding at sequestration levels, it threatens the readiness and capabilities of our military and fails to provide the support our men and women in uniform deserve. The decision reflected in this bill to circumvent rather than reverse sequestration further harms our national security by locking in unacceptable funding cuts for crucial national security activities carried out by non-defense agencies.

I have repeatedly called upon the Congress to work with my Administration to close the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and explained why it is imperative that we do so. As I have noted, the continued operation of this facility weakens our national security by draining resources, damaging our relationships with key allies and partners, and emboldening violent extremists. Yet in addition to failing to remove unwarranted restrictions on the transfer of detainees, this bill seeks to impose more onerous ones. The executive branch must have the flexibility, with regard to those detainees who remain at Guantanamo, to determine when and where to prosecute them, based on the facts and circumstances of each case and our national security interests, and when and where to transfer them consistent with our national security and our humane treatment policy. Rather than taking steps to bring this chapter of our history to a close, as I have repeatedly called upon the Congress to do, this bill aims to extend it.

The bill also fails to adopt many essential defense reforms, including to force structure, weapons systems, and military health care. Our defense strategy depends on investing every dollar where it will have the greatest effect. My Administration's proposals will accomplish this through critical reforms that divest unneeded force structure, slow growth in compensation, and reduce wasteful overhead. The restrictions in the bill would require the Department of Defense to retain unnecessary force structure and weapons systems that we cannot afford in today's fiscal environment, contributing to a military that will be less capable of responding effectively to future challenges.

Because of the manner in which this bill would undermine our national security, I must veto it.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 22, 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the veto

message and the bill will be printed as a House document.

Pursuant to the order of the House of October 21, 2015, further consideration of the veto message and the bill are postponed until the legislative day of Thursday, November 5, 2015, and that on that legislative day, the House shall proceed to the constitutional question of reconsideration and dispose of such question without intervening motion.

SYRIAN DISPLACEMENT CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the Syrian displacement crisis has consumed seven nations in the Middle East, among them Lebanon, Jordan, Turkey, obviously, and Syria itself, and has spawned the largest refugee crisis Europe has faced since World War II.

The scope of the damage is incredible. This protracted conflict has decimated Syria's infrastructure and has already taken the lives of over 250,000 civilians, has displaced over 4 million people, and has subjected tens upon thousands of children in that nation to Assad's horrific barrel bombs. Most everyone who remains in Syria endures power and water cuts, the threat of shelling, galloping inflation, and rampant speculation about: What will happen next? Who will help us, the innocents?

With roads often subject to ambush, freedom to travel has been heavily curtailed. Checkpoints and concrete blast barriers have become accepted adornments of daily life. Institutions such as schools, hospitals, and offices remain open in government-held areas, though many schools have become shelters for the legions of war injured and homeless. Truly, it is grim. Often, classes are held in double shifts to make room for the extra students. This is everyday life in Syria.

Five years into the conflict that has ravaged this once-modern nation, more than half of the Syrian population is displaced, with over 4 million refugees in neighboring countries and tens of thousands moving toward Europe. We see this on television every evening.

My hometown of Toledo has taken in 8 weary Syrian families—refugees who have now again found hope in the liberty that America offers—but fewer than 2,000 Syrians have come to the United States, though the war has displaced more than 12 million since 2011. The free world simply cannot allow this savage slaughter and dislocation to continue.

We ask ourselves: Where is the leadership for resolution?

□ 1715

Now, in addition to daily airstrikes against civilians by the Syrian Government violating international humanitarian law, Russian warplanes are

striking medical facilities and residential areas in non-ISIL areas where rebel forces are fighting to overthrow the Assad regime while Russia publicly proclaims its aim of eliminating ISIL targets.

I brought a map to the floor here that essentially shows most of Syria, who holds it. If one looks at these red dots here, the Russian planes are mainly bombing in the rebel-held areas, not in the ISIL-held areas. So we see a complex situation that has developed on the ground.

As Putin moves with defiance to maintain the Syrian dictatorship, his actions simply must be checked because it tells us that, in the future, there will be more slaughter with what remains if those moderate forces are not allowed to survive.

Since Russia began airstrikes at the end of September, at least 127 civilians, including 36 children and 34 women, have been killed by Russian airstrikes, according to the opposition Syrian Observatory for Human Rights.

For the sake of liberty in Syria, in Europe, and around the world, America, NATO, the Transatlantic Alliance, and our allies in the Middle East must lead the region to peaceful settlement.

I happen to represent a region in America where Syrian Americans have lived for over a century. I can't even explain to you how they feel about the total destruction of their homeland, its artifacts, and its history. I am not even able to contain it in words here.

They came to see me last week, and they asked if I would read some of their words into the RECORD, which I promised I would do this evening. They want the American people and the world to know:

The biggest killer of civilians in Syria is the Assad regime's use of barrel bombs. Packed with TNT and shrapnel, these dumb bombs have no target and are just dropped from helicopters on civilian neighborhoods. These bombs cause massive destruction and casualties. Thousands upon thousands of children have been killed and injured by these helicopter flights.

And they said to me: Congresswoman, if you can say one thing to the Congress and to those in Washington who can make a difference, please tell them to disrupt and stop these helicopter flyovers. So the barrel bombs aren't coming out of the F-16s obviously flying over Syria, but they are coming from helicopters that the Assad regime is dispatching across that country.

The most important step that can be done to save lives would be the imposition of a no-fly zone. A no-fly zone will turn the tide of war, and bring down the regime of terror and force Assad to negotiate his exit.

We know there is resistance to that, but the world community must meet this latest test in order to secure a better life for the people that remain in Syria, those who may wish to return, and, obviously, the millions that have fled and are in refugee camps throughout that region and now as far as Western Europe.

I would urge the President of our country to consider the appointment of a special envoy without portfolio for Syrian peace to work full-time to bring all relevant nations together to resolve this unfolding tragedy and aim at a civil military strategy for transition and settlement.

I include for the RECORD Anthony Cordesman's writings.

[From the Center for Strategic & International Studies, Oct. 1, 2015]

THE LONG WAR IN SYRIA: THE TREES, THE FOREST, AND ALL THE KING'S MEN

(By Anthony H. Cordesman)

Clichés are clichés, but sometimes it really is hard to see the forest for the trees. In the case of Syria, the "trees" include the UN debate between Obama and Putin over Syria and the fight against Islamic extremism, Russia's sudden military intervention in Syria, the failure of the U.S. training and assist missions in both Syria and Iraq, and the developing scandal in USCENTCOM over exaggerated claims of success for the U.S.-led air campaign in Syria and Iraq.

The most important "tree," however, is trying to negotiate an end to the fighting from the outside, as if Assad was the key issue and as if it would be possible for some diplomatic elite or mix of power brokers to bring Syria back to some state of stability if only Assad would agree to leave and the United States and Russia could agree on how to approach the negotiations.

FOCUSING ON THE TREES WHEN THE FOREST IS BURNING

The problem is that the "forest" is dying, burning, and occupied by four broad sets of fighters that have little reason to cooperate with any UN-led negotiating effort, outside agreement over Assad—with or without U.S. and Russian cooperation.

To shift from one cliché to another, Syria presents far more problems than Humpty Dumpty. "All the king's horses and all the king's men" couldn't put Syria back together by negotiating a solution from the outside even if there was one King instead of a divided mix of the United States, Russia, Iran, Turkey, Iraq, the other states surrounding Syria, the Arabian Gulf states, Egypt, and France and the other interested European powers.

It shouldn't take a child's nursery rhyme to point out the obvious—although it is one whose origins may date back to England's civil wars and first appeared in print shortly after it became fully clear that there was no way English could ever bring the 13 colonies back under its control. To begin with, there is no equivalent of Humpty.

PUTTING FOUR HUMPTYS TOGETHER WITH NO KING AND NO UNITY AMONG THE KING'S MEN

The problem is not simply ISIS or Assad. ISIS is one of the four "Humptys" in a shattered Syria, but ISIS controls only a limited part of Syria's population even in the east. ISIS occupies both parts of Syria and Iraq. It continues to systematically purge any religious and ideological dissent while neither government in Damascus or the government in Baghdad have shown any clear ability to gain support from a major portion of the Sunnis in the area that ISIS controls.

So far, neither the forces of the Syrian or Iraqi government have had much military success against ISIS, and U.S. claims that Iraq has regained some 35% of the territory it lost to ISIS are little more than dishonest spin. They are based on the maximum line of ISIS advance before any fighting took place and before ISIS established any level of governance or control. They include vast areas

of unpopulated desert: areas where no one controls anything because no one is there.

THE KURDS

The second Humpty consists of the Syrian Kurds—who have gone from a partially disenfranchised minority to the equivalent of a mini-state in the north and east of Syria, and have been the only real U.S. military train and assist success. They have no reason to support Assad or any of those who support Assad. They too are divided, and some have ties to Turkish Kurds, some to Iraqi Kurds, some to both, and some are independent.

At the same time, they have no clear economic viability as a state, face growing water problems, and would need to grab a significant part of Syria's limited oil and gas resources in the East to be viable unless they somehow united in a broader Kurdish entity—one that included Turkish and/or Iraqi Kurds and would be likely to create a new set of regional conflicts.

Furthermore, these Administration claims and maps that talk about liberating 35% of the area that ISIS occupied ignore the fact that control of much of the disputed populated areas in Anbar remains undecided, and that it was the Iraqi Kurds which not only recovered much of the lost populated areas that did matter, but grabbed a large additional part of Iraq—including Kirkuk and its oil fields—and created a whole new dimension of the Kurdish problem and its tensions with Iraq's Arab and the Turks while the corrupt government in the Kurdish zone of Iraq has divided and threatened to create a new round of internal power struggles.

THE OTHER SUNNI FIGHTERS

The third Humpty consists of an uncertain coalition of other Sunni fighters. They control—or are fighting for control—in many of the most populated areas in Syria. There are no reliable unclassified estimates of the number, strength, and ideological character of these factions but there are well over 20 groups—and some estimates go well over 30.

Some, like the Al Nusra Front—one of the most successful in military terms—are linked to Al Qaeda. Others are less radical Islamist factions, but are scarcely secular or moderate, also have no ties to the hollow outside efforts to create moderate governments in exile, and are being backed by Arab states like Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and the UAE. The small groups being given limited support with U.S. weapons and Special Forces assistance are at best petty and uncertain players.

This is also a group of fighters that is fighting the pro-Assad forces in what is increasingly becoming a wasteland. The fighting on the ground, Assad's barrel bombs and the threat of poison gas, deliberate isolation and efforts to starve out rebel held areas have created one of them most serious humanitarian disasters in any one country in modern history.

Many of the more than 4 million Syrian refugees that had left Syria lived in the area where this fight takes place. The same is true of the well over 7 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) that no longer have a real home, job, business, or access to key services like health and education.

Many of the more than 250,000 Syrian civilian dead, and at least 500,000 seriously wounded are the product of this fighting—although it is important to note that the UN ceased to be able to make meaningful casualty estimates well over half a year ago, and the estimates of refugees and IDPs have ceased to increase because (a) there no longer is a basis for guesstimating the increase, and (b) many of the remainder are simply too poor to leave.

To go back to cliché number one, this is the area where the forest has now been burning for some four years. This was one of the

most populated and developed parts of Syria. It is an area where Syria's already poor economy probably now has a GDP around 20% of what it was in 2011 and has no clear basis for recovery. It is an area where no top down negotiation between Assad or his backers and any outside faction can begin to put even one Humpty back together again.

#### THE ASSAD FACTION(S)

The fourth version of Humpty is the group of factions and fighters supporting Assad. It is important to note that this is not a unified group. No one has given most of those in the area Assad control a choice as to who controls them. The majority of the population is Sunni and other non-Alawites. The Alawites are not Shi'ite, and are a gnostic religious group that may have political ties to Iran and the Hezbollah, but Alawites are not Muslims in the normal sense of the term.

There are no reliable data on Syria's population. The CIA estimates, however, that some 17–18 million people remain in Syria, it estimates that 87% are Muslim (official; includes 74% Sunni 74% and 13% that are a mix of Alawi, Ismaili, and Shia). Some 10% are Christian (includes Orthodox, Uniate, and Nestorian), and the final 3% are Druze and some small number of Jews who remain in Damascus and Aleppo).

If one looks at the maps of Syria's sectarian and ethnic divisions before the fighting, they are also distributed into a series of small enclaves, many near the coast. They have no clear "region," and it is far from clear how many of the Sunnis in the regular Syrian forces, the real Shi'ites and other minorities in Syria, or the more secular Sunni businesspersons and civilians would support either Assad or any mix of Assad supporters if they had a choice.

It is also important to note that the World Bank rated the Assad regime as having some of the worst governance in the world before the uprising began in 2011. It was also rated as deeply corrupt. Transparency International rated it as the 159th most corrupt country in the world—out of 175—in 2014. The Arab and UN development reports warned that the younger Assad was no better in moving the country towards real economic development than his father, and that the massive population increase in Syria had created a "youth bulge" for which there were often no real jobs.

The Syrian GDP per capita was at best around \$5,100 even in Purchasing Power Parity P terms in 2011 before the upheavals began—and ranked a dismal 165th in the world. It now may average half that level. Some 33% of the population is 0–14 years of age; 14% is 15–24, and over 500,000 young Syrian men and women now reach job age each year in a country where direct (ignoring disguised) unemployment is estimated to be 33–35%, and the poverty level was well over 12% before the fighting started.

#### A TIME FOR HONESTY, TRANSPARENCY, AND REALISM

One cannot ignore trees, anymore than one can ignore the forest. The failure of U.S. policy and military efforts, Russian and Iranian support of Assad and major Russian military intervention, and the conflicting ways in which other states intervene will all make things worse. The impact of religious warfare and extremism, and failed Syrian secularism, are even more serious problems.

It is time, however, to stop focusing on either ISIS or Assad, to pretend that Syrian "moderates" are strong enough to either affect the security situation or negotiate for Syria's real fighters, and act as if a shattered nation could be united by some top down negotiation between groups that hate each other and have no competence in dealing with the economic, social, and governance challenges Syria now faces.

The first step in solving a problem is to honestly assess it. No negotiation can work that does not deal with grim realities and divisions created by years of fighting. No amount of U.S. and Russian intervention and argument can bring security or stability. No UN effort at conventional negotiation can survive encounter with reality, and no effort of any kind that does not address the sheer scale of Syrian recovery and reconstruction.

Ms. KAPTUR. Anthony Cordesman, probably one of the most respected thinkers on this subject, ends a very significant analysis of the situation in Syria and greater Europe with this admonition. He tells America: "We face a moment of facing up to honesty, transparency, and realism."

And he tells us, "One cannot ignore trees anymore than one can ignore the forest," related to Syria. "The failure of U.S. policy and military efforts, Russian and Iranian support of Assad and major Russian military intervention, and the conflicting ways in which other states intervene will all make matters worse. The impact of religious warfare and extremism, and failed Syrian secularism, are even more serious problems.

"It is time, however, to stop focusing on either ISIS or Assad, to pretend that Syrian 'moderates' are strong enough to either affect the security situation or negotiate for Syria's real fighters, and act as if a shattered nation could be united by some top-down negotiation between groups that hate each other and have no competence in dealing with the economic, social, and governance challenges Syria now faces.

"The first step in solving a problem is to honestly assess it. No negotiation can work that does not deal with grim realities and divisions created by years of fighting. No amount of U.S. and Russian intervention and argument can bring security or stability. No U.N. effort at conventional negotiation can survive encounter with reality, and no effort of any kind that does not address the sheer scale of Syrian recovery and reconstruction" can work.

I commend his writings to my colleagues and the major studies that have been done this year by the Center for Strategic and International Studies as providing a glimmer of the road that we must walk toward.

I want to just thank my colleagues for the opportunity to place this in the RECORD tonight.

I want to thank the Syrian Americans that live in northern Ohio for their patriotic citizenship and their deep concern about what more the United States of America could do to bring resolution to this deeply troubling conflict in Syria that has precipitated such unrest, not just through that region but, indeed, to all of greater Europe.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

#### PRESIDENTIAL VETO OF NDAA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMMER of Minnesota). Under the

Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Fifty-three years ago is a long time. In 1962, John F. Kennedy was President. Gas was 28 cents a gallon. The first Walmart opened. The U.S. Navy SEALs were created, and the Cuban Missile Crisis was on everyone's minds.

Now, we have gone through a lot as a nation since then, but one thing has remained constant: the U.S. Congress and the President of the United States have fulfilled one of our primary obligations according to the Constitution of providing for the common defense by passing a National Defense Authorization Act. You may say that Congress hasn't always passed legislation that is needed, but on the National Defense Authorization Act, we have gotten it right. For 53 years in a row now, our Nation's national security needs have been taken care of.

Sadly, that might not be the case this year. The reason? Not because the Representatives of the people did not do their work. It is because the Commander in Chief has chosen to use the military as political pawns to advance his domestic agenda by choosing to veto the NDAA.

Never before in our Nation's history has a President vetoed the National Defense Authorization Act in order to leverage concessions on other areas of government spending. Let me say that again. President Obama's veto stems not from defense policy but, rather, from his desire for more domestic spending unrelated to national defense. This is unprecedented.

Four times during the past 53 years, Presidents have vetoed the NDAA, but it was over specific defense-related provisions in the NDAA itself. Differences were able to be worked out with Congress and concerns quickly addressed so the bill could move forward and our men and women in uniform would have the tools, equipment, and resources they need to keep us safe. Not this year.

Just minutes ago, our President vetoed our Nation's most important bill, which provides for full funding for our military.

Let me share with you what provisions are in this bill and why it is so important. It provides: a 1.3 percent pay raise for our troops; retirement benefits for the 83 percent of our troops who currently see none; the authority for commanders to allow soldiers to

carry guns on base to defend themselves, their colleagues in arms, and their families; vital resources and new tools to combat cyber attacks on our critical infrastructure; restrictions on Guantanamo detainee transfers to address the potential illegality of the President's previous unilateral transfers; 12 new F-18 Super Hornets to be built in my home State of Missouri; \$300 million of assistance in lethal aid so the people of Ukraine can defend themselves; \$330 million in funding for the iron dome missile defense system for Israel; and it directs the deployment of a new advanced ballistic missile defense system to defend against the threat of an Iranian intercontinental ballistic missile.

In short, at home and abroad, the NDAA ensures our military has funding for national defense and overseas operations. These are the selfless individuals who we rely upon for our safety and freedom that we are talking about. And in a strongly bipartisan fashion, Congress has authorized that funding at the exact level that the President requested.

In this unprecedented move, the Commander in Chief is using the very troops he commands as pawns in a very dangerous political game. It is wrong to add to the uncertainty our men and women in uniform face as they stand on the front lines of an increasingly uncertain world.

Let us remember, the President recently made a decision to keep almost 10,000 of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines in Afghanistan. On the heels of such a serious decision, asking them to leave their families and lives on hold for another year or more, how could he justify not signing the bill that provides the pay and benefits for our troops?

I am thankful for my colleagues who stand with me here today to tell you why this is such a critical piece of legislation and why this veto cannot stand. We are here to make sure the men and women who put themselves in harm's way for our freedom are a priority to our Nation and not held hostage to political games.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE), a Navy veteran and currently lieutenant commander in the United States Navy Reserve.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER) for all her hard work on these issues.

Just as a point of maybe disagreement, I am no longer in the Navy Reserve. I joined the Oklahoma National Guard, and I will be flying with the Oklahoma Air National Guard.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for hosting this Special Order, and I would like folks to understand really what my friend from Missouri just said.

The President of the United States vetoed the Defense Authorization because he wants more spending for other

domestic programs. This is unprecedented and, quite frankly, it is scary for this country. I am still dumbfounded by it, that you are going to hold defense hostage for a domestic agenda. We don't do that in the United States of America. This President somehow doesn't understand that you don't take the defense of this country hostage for a domestic agenda, and yet that is what he has just done.

I want to share with my colleagues why we do an authorization every year, because the world changes. Things get more dangerous year after year after year.

As a Navy pilot and now as a National Guard pilot, we utilize space. I am on the Strategic Forces Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. We hear all kinds of things about space.

I can tell you, as somebody who has used it, we use space for over-the-horizon communications with our space-based communication architecture. We use it for weather so that we can make sure we can get to the target on time. We use it for intelligence. We use it for missile warning. We use it for a whole host of things: the position, navigation, timing, our GPS satellites, for actually hitting our targets.

Space is critical, yet something has changed drastically in the last few years. The Russians have been launching various things that were not registered with the International Telecommunication Union, the ITU.

□ 1730

What are we discovering that these objects are doing? Well, they are doing very sophisticated co-orbital maneuvers, demonstrating that they can do proximity and rendezvous operations, which means—guess what—ultimately that could be an antisatellite capability.

Friends, if we lose our satellites, we could have even more risk. Imagine your ATM not working. Imagine the food in the grocery store not being there when you go shopping. National security in this country is critically important, and the President is holding it hostage for a different domestic agenda that has absolutely nothing to do with national security. This is absolute craziness.

So what did we do in the NDAA? We plussed up spending on space protection, which is critically important; and we not only plussed up spending on space protection, but we provided authorities, critically necessary authorities so the Department of Defense can actually protect this country in ways that it hasn't had the opportunity to do so before.

For our communications architecture, we are doing Pathfinder programs, and we are purchasing communications in space in ways that we have never done it before. Why? Because we need to distribute the architecture so it complicates the targeting solution for our enemies. We are not doing this

because it is fun or because we like it. We are doing it because it is critical for national security.

When the President of the United States vetoes it, it puts all of us in jeopardy. I want to be clear. This is about the troops, there is no doubt about that, but when we are talking about somebody's ATM working, this is about the security of the United States of America, and the President is holding it hostage for a domestic agenda.

When it comes to the troops, just a few items. We talk about the authorities in the NDAA. Well, those of us who have served understand that there are special pays that we receive: combat pay, hazardous duty pay, bonuses for reenlistments, flight pay for those of us who fly. There are pays that are going to be in jeopardy now that otherwise wouldn't be in jeopardy.

By the way, a lot of these pays are for people who are right now serving this country overseas. Do we not understand that, Mr. President? I should say, Mr. Speaker, the President should understand that.

This is a momentous day in American history and not for good reasons—for tragic reasons.

I would like to thank my colleague from Missouri for hosting this Special Order and giving somebody like me and all these colleagues behind me the opportunity to make sure that America understands what is at stake here. The gentlewoman's leadership on these issues is critical, and America is in jeopardy.

We need to understand what happened today is not the norm. It must not be the norm, and future Presidents must never hold hostage American national security for a domestic agenda.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. BRIDENSTINE for his service to our Nation and his firsthand perspective on how vital this is and what a tragic day it is for our Nation that our Commander in Chief would do this.

Now I would like to turn to another friend and hero to our Nation in many ways, who served both in the Army and the Marine Corps, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN).

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri, VICKY HARTZLER, for her leadership on the Armed Services Committee and on this critical issue.

I rise today in strong support of the National Defense Authorization Act, and I urge my colleagues to override President Obama's veto. This bipartisan bill provides essential pay and benefits to the men and women serving in our military today. Expanded retirement options for our troops, greater protections against sexual assault in the military, and increased cybersecurity defense funding are among some of the most important authorizations included in the NDAA.

For the Sixth Congressional District of Colorado, the NDAA also contains provisions and language that help

Buckley Air Force Base. Buckley not only plays a critical role in our Nation's defense, but it is the largest employer in my district.

Finally, the NDAA also includes language to prevent the transfer of GTMO detainees to U.S. soil. Last week, a delegation from the administration surveyed potential locations for GTMO detainees in Colorado. Along with most Coloradans, I remain adamantly opposed to this move and strongly support the language in the NDAA. There is absolutely no reason to close the Guantanamo Bay detention camp only to finance the incarceration of enemy combatants in the United States.

This legislation is too important to our Nation and to Colorado to become the subject of political games by the White House. Once again, this bill must become law, and I urge my colleagues in the House to override the President's veto.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. COFFMAN made several excellent points, not only about the importance to Colorado, but certainly to our Nation. He raised a very important point that hasn't been brought up yet: how it prevents the transfer of the prisoners at Guantanamo Bay from coming to our soil; and that is what the administration wants to do is to put them in our backyards and our prisons, and we do not support that, and this NDAA prevents that.

Now I would like to turn to another friend and colleague from the Armed Services Committee, Mr. WILSON. He is quite a hero to this Nation in many ways, but certainly having four sons who have served in the military is one of his major contributions. We are so proud of him and his family and his service.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. I thank Congresswoman VICKY HARTZLER for her leadership for military families, and I thank her for referencing my four sons. Of course, I want to give all credit to my wife, Roxanne. She did a great job raising four sons who truly know how important it is to serve our country.

Sadly, President Obama has vetoed this year's National Defense Authorization Act, even though it allocates the same amount of funding as the Department of Defense request that he made himself. The President does not support the bipartisan NDAA because it utilizes wartime funds. Despite utilizing these funds himself, the President accepted this fabrication to veto the NDAA and put servicemembers, military families, and veterans at risk.

On October 3, The Washington Post editorialized: "Refusing to sign this bill would make history, but not in a good way. Mr. Obama should let it become law."

I believe the veto underscores the President's legacy of weakness. This is leading to instability. It is leading to aggression, mass murders, and it is leading to citizens fleeing the violence causing children to drown at sea.

This year's NDAA provides for servicemembers and equips our troops to fight serious threats to American families, like the murderous Islamic State. It supports our allies, like Ukraine and Israel, to defend themselves from aggression. The NDAA establishes meaningful reforms to the Department of Defense acquisition process and creates commonsense improvements to the military retirement system. It fully staffs and resources Cyber Command, which I appreciate as chairman of the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, to protect American families.

American families deserve peace through strength. The National Defense Authorization Act gives our military critical resources to defend us as we constantly face new threats. It is sad for the President to weaken these reforms and funds and put American families at risk.

Fellow Members, I strongly urge you to override the President's veto. As the appreciative son of a World War II Flying Tigers veteran, as a 31-year veteran of the Army myself, and as the grateful father of four sons serving in the military, I know firsthand that your bipartisan vote will help protect and better serve our troops, military families, veterans, and all American families by promoting and ensuring peace through strength.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I really appreciate the gentleman's service to this Nation as a 31-year veteran; but also serving as chairman of the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, he has a unique perspective on the inherent dangers facing our Nation now that our President has vetoed this important bill. I thank him for sharing his insights.

Now I will yield to another member of the Armed Services Committee, but more than that, he is a decorated Navy SEAL, and I look forward to hearing his thoughts on this very important moment in our Nation's history. I turn to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE).

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to the President's veto and ask my colleagues to override it. I come before this body not only as a Representative of the great State of Montana, but also a former commander of SEAL Team Six and a former deputy- and acting commander of Naval Special Warfare's efforts in the Persian Gulf.

The job of the Commander in Chief is bound by the Constitution to support the troops, to be the leader, and yet this President vetoes a bipartisan bill to defend our country.

I talk not only as a former commander, but also a father. My daughter is a Navy diver, and my son-in-law is an Active-Duty Navy SEAL. My wife watched her daughter, her husband, and her son-in-law all deploy.

I have seen the consequences of war. I am probably the last individual that would advocate for war. I have seen the

consequences and the pain. But when we go to war, the Commander in Chief is obligated to make sure we go to war to win. He has to make sure that our troops have the right training, the right equipment, the right leadership to win decisively on the field of battle. Before this Commander in Chief sends them into harm's way, it is his obligation and duty to make sure that we know the conditions to bring them home.

His actions today are a dereliction of his duty. It affects every soldier, sailor, airman, and marine in harm's way. A veto and the subsequent continuing resolution causes harm to our troops. I call it garrisoning, where our troops don't train, our fleet can't go in and receive the maintenance necessary. Above all, it gives a message to the troops that are in harm's way that their Commander in Chief does not have their back.

This isn't a Republican or Democratic issue. This is an American issue, because it is America's sons and daughters that we put in harm's way. It is the obligation of a great nation to make sure when we do that we give them everything they need to come home safely.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I don't know of a more articulate way to say how important and imperative it is that we override this veto. I thank Mr. ZINKE for sharing his very real and heartfelt and expert thoughts on this issue.

Now I have a friend who is going to share who is passionate about lots of things and competent on many issues, but I tell you, serving on Armed Services Committee with the gentlewoman from Indiana, JACKIE WALORSKI, I can tell you her main passion is for the men and women in uniform, for our national defense.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman and my friend from Missouri, VICKY HARTZLER.

The NDAA, as we have heard tonight, is the largest single authorization bill that Congress considers and one of this body's most significant pieces of legislation and accomplishments this year. This legislation is critical to our national security. It continues to fund the entire national defense of this country.

For 54 years, Republicans and Democrats in both Houses in this body have come together to pass this defense bill. This year was no different. This Congress sent a bipartisan bill to President Obama. Today, though, the President vetoed this defense budget in order to gain leverage for additional increased spending, his demands of spending, a process of a budgetary procedure that is completely unrelated to this bill.

This defense bill helps our men and women in uniform by adjusting pay and retirement benefits. It removes barriers that prevent access to urgent

medical care for members of the armed services while also expanding employment opportunities for those exiting the service. It helps us retain our most experienced servicemembers. It makes those individuals safer by enhancing and improving military training and modernizing our resources and programs.

Lastly, this bill provides very real authorities, such as the ability to protect Americans by keeping terrorists secured in the detention facility known as GTMO, or Guantanamo Bay. For 54 years, this defense bill has transited party lines and Washington dysfunction. As a candidate, President Obama promised to do the same. But with this veto, he has threatened to end this staple of bipartisanship in this Chamber.

Our servicemen and -women put their lives on the line every day. The least we can do is offer them the security of knowing that they can provide for their families and plan for their own futures.

□ 1745

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank the gentlewoman. I appreciate that.

Next we have another member of the Armed Services Committee, who is a decorated Army commander, who led soldiers in Iraq, and whose unit was responsible for finding Saddam Hussein, to share his thoughts on this day when the President has vetoed the NDAA and why it is so important that we override this veto.

I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL).

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for all of her hard work on the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I served my country 21 years in the Infantry in the United States Army and have deployed operationally to Kosovo, Kuwait, Afghanistan and Iraq.

As a combat Infantry veteran, I know firsthand the hardships and dangers that our warriors face. The question that we have to ask is: Why has the President increased the hardship and danger to our troops? Has he forgotten that we have troops in the field that are still fighting?

Has he forgotten that he has committed to contingency operations that created new hardships, new deployments, unscheduled training, unscheduled maintenance? And now, after asking them to turn everything on their heads, he is not even going to support it.

A Presidential veto blocks needed funds for our ongoing combat operations and for our emergency operations and contingencies.

The President claims that we need to do this right; yet, he has created the foreign policy mess that has required our troops to deploy on contingencies and then has asked this body to get additional Congressional authorization for those efforts. And now he adds to their burden.

The veto eliminates crucial planning time just for normal peacetime operations in training from 3 to 6 months, forcing the military to waste millions of dollars as they play a catch-up game, usually in the spring, by having to deal with such efforts to try to make up for lost time.

The veto reduces certainty in our overall national security posture. The veto also blocks a revised retirement program benefiting 83 percent of our warriors that are not currently covered, and it denies expanded access to health care and blocks access to needed drugs.

It continues to leave our warriors defenseless at recruiting stations, camps, posts, and bases by denying their ability to carry firearms in their defense against terror threats.

The veto also blocks a mediocre pay raise that the President himself already reduced by 1 percent, and now they will not even get that pathetic 1 percent pay raise, 1.3 percent.

Mr. Speaker, a Presidential veto makes one thing crystal clear: Nothing is too good for our troops and nothing is what he is going to give them. That is why we will fight to overturn this veto, so that he can hear the people of the United States and our constitutional requirement to defend this republic.

We will overturn this veto, and we ask, Mr. Speaker, that the Nation join us in this fight.

I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I couldn't agree more with the gentleman. Thank you for your leadership, service to our country, and your call for the American people to join us and come alongside us as we fight for the defense of our Nation and for the men and women in uniform.

The thing that I feel is so important tonight is that the American people and everyone here in the House has had an opportunity to hear from people who not only care about their Nation, who are today's patriots, but many of them who have either served themselves on the front line and who have experienced danger and put themselves in harm's way because of it or they have family members that they are supporting in that line of duty.

Our next speaker I want to turn to is certainly one of those, not only a colleague on the Armed Services Committee, but a father who has three sons who are serving in the military, and he knows firsthand the dangers, the sacrifice, and how important this NDAA is to our Nation.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT).

Mr. NUGENT. Congresswoman HARTZLER, I really appreciate you taking the time to do this today on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, it is an outrage that the President would veto, as the Commander in Chief of our military in general.

Think about this. I have three sons that have served in the military, that currently serve in United States Army, that have served in Iraq and Afghanistan, that have done trips to Haiti to help during reconstruction as it related to an earthquake.

The President of the United States has made them political pawns.

One of the things that my wife and I felt when they were deployed to Iraq or Afghanistan was that they were the best equipped, best led, best trained troops on the face of the earth. By vetoing the National Defense Authorization Act, we are putting a dagger in the heart of what we are supposed to be holding up.

The Constitution of the United States says that this Congress has the obligation to stand up an Army, to stand up a Navy, to support the President of the United States and the actions that we must take to protect this Nation.

The actions today are strictly a political action when you do a press conference to hold up the fact that he vetoed the National Defense Authorization Act.

You have heard so many members here today talk about the things that this act did or does. And so I call upon all of our friends across the aisle. Democrats, unite with us to overturn this veto because we live in the most dangerous of times.

Go back in time. I can't think of a time—I don't know if you can—where it has been more dangerous in regards to a resurgent Russia, to China, to Iran, to North Korea, to all of the non-state actors out there that are threatening this Nation and our friends and allies around the world.

This is not the time to play political brinksmanship with our military. This is a time to hold them up, lift them up, and let them do their job and know that their Commander in Chief has their back.

I truly do appreciate, Mrs. HARTZLER, your doing this.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, Mr. NUGENT. I just thought it was so important that you shared, as a parent. I have heard you say this before in committee, that, as a parent, it is vital for you and your wife to know that you are sending the best equipped, best trained force possible over into harm's way so, when you send your sons, you know that they are going to be able to come back safe.

Mr. NUGENT. People forget that there is actually flesh and blood, parents and children, of those young men and women that are serving this country. They forget there are real people in those uniforms. And so that is why this is so important.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Absolutely. And what message is that sending to them right now? Thank you.

Now I would like to turn to Representative DOUG LAMBORN, my friend from Colorado, who has the privilege and does such a great job representing

one of the most military-intense districts in the country. I had the opportunity to visit the Air Force Academy around Memorial Day. I appreciate your leadership on this issue.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) for whatever he would like to share.

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, today's veto from the President breaks dangerous new ground for callous disregard for the needs of our men and women in uniform.

While he worked so hard to make sure that the Iranian military had the funding they needed via his disastrous nuclear deal, today he chose to willfully disregard the needs of our own military to make a political point with his veto.

The Presidency has sunk to a new low today. For the first time in history, an American President has vetoed a defense bill because of issues that the bill itself cannot possibly address.

Most of us here in Congress agree that defending our Nation is the first and most important priority, a sacred constitutional duty we have to protect the American people and to keep us safe in an increasingly dangerous world.

Tragically, President Obama is willing to hold defense hostage to try to get more money for agencies like the IRS and the EPA, all of this while we remain at war with extremist groups like al Qaeda and ISIS that want to attack America, all of this while we still are having troops killed overseas, including some from Colorado.

This is pretty simple, really. This administration wants to cut our military and increase spending almost everywhere else. Our troops have already endured massive cuts similar in size to the Clinton drawdown in the nineties, although this time global threats are rising, not falling.

On top of all this, the President wants to send Guantanamo detainees to U.S. soil, including to my own district in Colorado, and is also issuing his veto for this reason.

Look, terrorists will find a reason to hate us no matter what happens in Guantanamo.

I ask my colleagues: Are we willing to let this happen on our watch?

To my fellow Republicans who are rightly concerned about out-of-control Federal spending and an out-of-control Federal debt, please hear me when I say we are working on real reform and real accountability for the large defense budget.

But please also hear me when I say that defense is simply not the driver of our debt, especially over the long term. Defense spending ensures and protects our way of life.

I strongly urge my colleagues to do the right thing for our military and the right thing for America: override Presi-

dent Obama's reckless and truly dangerous veto.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank the gentleman so much because he raises a very good point as far as spending goes in that this bill, the NDAA, provides the exact amount of funding for our defense that the President requested.

Mr. LAMBORN. Down to the penny.

Mrs. HARTZLER. We worked hard to come up with that, but we made sure that our troops had the funding they need. And, yet, as the Commander in Chief, he requested \$612 billion. We gave him \$612 billion in this bill, and then he vetoes it.

Mr. LAMBORN. It makes no sense. It is dangerous, and he is doing it for political reasons that can't be solved in this bill.

Mrs. HARTZLER. You are exactly right. Thank you for your comments.

Now I have a gentleman from Georgia that I have been privileged to be elected with in 2010 and serve alongside in both Agriculture Committee and Armed Services. I believe he is one of the most hardworking members on Armed Services.

If you are his constituent, I want you to know he is at every hearing. He does his homework. And I appreciate him coming out tonight to share his thoughts on the NDAA.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. I want to thank you, Mrs. HARTZLER, for what you have done here.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for the opportunity to discuss what has happened here today. As we talked earlier today, I honestly thought there was a chance that we wouldn't be here speaking about this. I thought that maybe this one time our Commander in Chief would do what was right.

I hope you will take an opportunity to look at the news. I am looking at it right now.

Obama to hold photo op to veto defense bill. Obama plans to hold a photo op in the Oval Office when he uses his veto pen on the National Defense Authorization Act, according to his public schedule.

Ladies and gentlemen, when I am around the District, I hear a lot of complaints: Why can't Congress just work together? Why can't you get along?

The National Defense Authorization Act came out of the Armed Services Committee 60-2, 60-2. There was one Democrat and one Republican that voted against the bill; 60-2.

It came through the House. A significant majority voted for the National Defense Authorization bill on the floor. It passed out of the Senate with over 70 votes.

When I am talking to Americans, I have used this as an example of how not everything you see in the press is true, that there are issues like national security that the Democrats and the Republicans in Washington, D.C., absolutely take very seriously, and when it

comes to the well-being of our men and women that serve the country and their families and making sure that they have the training and the equipment that they need, that this is an example of how we are able to put partisanship aside and work in the best interest of everybody in the country, most especially those that serve so honorably.

And the President held a photo op to veto the bill.

I want to thank my fellow colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, for their work on this bill. Certainly I supported it. I continue to support it.

I think one of the things that continues to be mentioned and needs to be mentioned over and over and over again is the President got the total of what he asked for with regard to the authorization of the funds for carrying out the fight against ISIL, for the operations of the military.

There were a couple of things in it that he didn't like. One the them was the transfer of terrorists out of Guantanamo Bay.

□ 1800

Now, I would just ask that you think about the fact that, since the first NDAA 50 years ago, it has only been vetoed four times. In each instance, there was an agreement effectively prior to the veto on how to resolve it.

But not this guy, not this guy. He holds a photo op. He holds a photo op so that he can show off while he vetoes the National Defense Authorization Act.

I just hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will join us as we work to override the President's veto in the House. I honestly believe that we will get the votes in the House to do that.

I hope that the Members of the Senate who voted for the National Defense Authorization Act will vote for it again when they have the opportunity to do so after we send the bill over there, after we have overridden the President's veto with this piece of legislation in the House.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to apologize. If the President won't do it, I want to do it. What happened today I think will long be looked upon as one of the worst moments of American leadership.

With that, Mrs. HARTZLER, I thank you again for what you have done for the men and women who serve and your service in this House.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank the gentleman.

I think it is so important to remember that national defense is not a partisan issue. It is a constitutional duty. It is a constitutional privilege that we have, as elected officials in this country, to provide for the common defense.

The bill did pass overwhelmingly with bipartisan support in the House, in the committee, and over in the Senate. I am hopeful as well that we will

be able to continue to join together to override this veto.

My friend from Georgia also made the comment and the sad news about the photo op that the President did today as he vetoed this piece of legislation.

I wonder, where is the photo op with the soldiers right now fighting in Afghanistan and some of them, sadly, who have died lately? Where is the recognition for them? Where is the photo op with the sorties that are being flown and our pilots that are going into harm's way to take on ISIS right now? Where is the photo op with all the military families that are sacrificing?

It is truly shameful, I think, that this occurred. I stand alongside with those who are fighting for the people of this country to keep them safe.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GIBSON), another friend who is a champion of this, who is a decorated Army commander, proudly serves on the Armed Services Committee and does a wonderful job.

Mr. GIBSON. Thank you. I really want to express my gratitude to the gentlewoman. I thank her for leading tonight, putting this together.

I also want to thank my colleagues that came out tonight to share their views and share their experiences.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very critical topic we are talking about here today. The first function of government is to protect its people.

Mr. Speaker, every single one of our service chiefs are on record, under oath in sworn testimony, saying that, if they do not get the additional resources that are provided in parts of this bill, that they will not be able to execute the national security strategy, that it will break our military.

Mr. Speaker, this is at a time that we have Russian tanks in Syria. We have got a significant challenge from the Islamic State. We have got major issues with Iran. We are dealing with a very aggressive Putin in Eastern Europe. We have got a quixotic leader in North Korea and an ambiguous situation in China.

Now is not the time to be taking a knee on our national security strategy. Now is not the time to be breaking our military.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure it is clear just how partisan the President's actions are. The American people need to know just how partisan this action is.

This process, our national security policy bill, is collaborative.

In our committee, in the House Armed Services Committee, we hold hearings. It is fully collaborative. Both sides—Republicans and Democrats—get to come together, work on the issues, bring forward the questions, collaborate in that whole process of the hearing.

Then we have a markup. We have a markup at the committee level. This markup lasts for, in some cases, over 12 hours. Every single person in that com-

mittee, regardless of party, is able to bring forward their ideas, to speak for their people, to offer their amendments, to have debate, and to have a vote on those amendments.

As the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) mentioned, at the culmination of that process in the House Armed Services Committee, the vote in our committee was 60-2, a strong vote, a bipartisan vote. The representatives of the people of the United States voted to support our servicemen and -women and their families.

The vote that was taken here on the floor of the House was a strong, bipartisan vote. Our colleagues over in the Senate, as was mentioned—the vote on the conference was 70-27. Three individuals who are running for President of the United States who were not present expressed support for it. Seventy-three votes, almost three-quarters of the United States Senate, represented the will of those respective States that they were here to represent. It was a strong, bipartisan vote.

We have a supermajority supporting this bill for our servicemen and -women and their families.

The President of the United States, despite all that, vetoed this bill when it is so clear that every single one of our service chiefs have said that they need these additional resources or we will not be able to execute the national security strategy.

Mr. Speaker, this is also very personal for me. I enlisted at the age of 17 as a private in the Infantry back in 1981. In my early years in the military, I was part of an effort to try to increase the readiness of our Armed Forces, and I saw those efforts working. I saw us continuing to build capability throughout the eighties and standing on the principle of peace through strength.

We won the cold war without a major conflict. We put ourselves in the position, when we had conflict in 1990 in the Persian Gulf war, that we had a military with overmatch so that we were able to prevail in that conflict with as few casualties as was possible.

Mr. Speaker, over time, in the 29 years that I served in the military, the other important facet of peace through strength is it forged trust with those who were willing to come forward and defend this Nation, trust that their leaders here in Washington, D.C.—regardless of party—would always have their back, would ensure the resources necessary so that they could be fully equipped and trained, would be there for them, that their pay and benefits would always be there for them, and that, when they deployed forward, that the programs would be there to support their families.

Mr. Speaker, that trust was really called into question today by our President, who, in a very partisan manner, vetoed an overwhelmingly bipartisan piece of legislation. I can't even begin to tell you how disappointed I am.

Mr. Speaker, we will fight this. We are working now with our colleagues. We feel like we are in a strong position in the Senate to override this. We have more work to do here in the United States House. That work is ongoing. We need to enact this bill.

Let me just end where I began and thank the gentlewoman for her leadership. I thank her for coming forward today to organize this, to really inspire us to come together to express so that the American people can know what happened today and how their representatives, in a bipartisan way, will rise to this challenge and make sure that we get this important national security policy bill into law.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank the gentleman for his service and for sharing how important it is, how vital it is, that we override this veto and do what is right for our troops and for America.

The last speaker is the newly elected gentleman from California who I have really enjoyed getting to know and is a privilege to serve with on the Armed Services Committee.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT).

Mr. KNIGHT. I thank Congresswoman HARTZLER for her leadership in this role. This is of vital importance.

I want to start this discussion with just a little bit of reference. When I got elected 9 months ago, everyone said: You have to go to Congress. You have to get some things done. You have to work across the aisle. You have to build some friendships. You have to do these things.

I think in the one committee that I sit on, Armed Services, we do that. We talk about the military. We talk about what is best for it, what is best for America, what is best for the readiness, and what are the programs and the projects and the arms and the things that we are going to do to make sure that our men and women are the best prepared to go into battle, if called upon.

But today I think we saw a little bit of politics, and maybe we have seen that for the last week or more. But political football shouldn't happen around the military. We should be able to hammer these things out.

As you heard from some of the speakers before, this has been vetoed four times, and every time it has been basically an issue that has then been worked out. We have come back, we have taken care of that issue, and it has gone forward.

So for 53 years, the NDAA has worked like it is supposed to: put the military first, put America first, and move forward through the disagreements.

But as you have heard—and we heard this in the discussion with part of the NDAA—that this was going to be vetoed. The President was forecasting maybe he would veto this.

Well, this wasn't a secret operation we were doing. The NDAA was out in the open. I don't know of a chairman

that is better than the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services at working across the aisle, working with the issues, and trying to get everything done before we get to a problem like this, including working with the White House. That is exactly what happened.

But I would disagree with some of the speakers that came before me when they said that the President came out and he brought his pen and he did a photo op. This was forecasted that it was going to be done today, today.

Is there something that is happening today that is going to take up all the news, that is going to be in all of the papers tomorrow, that is going to be on Twitter? That is right. The Benghazi hearing is happening right now, and it has been happening for hours.

During this veto, the Benghazi hearing was happening. I just went on Twitter. There are 200 times more Twitter feeds on Benghazi than the NDAA veto.

In politics, we would call that cover. We would call that: You know what? I have to do something bad; so, I had better do it when they are not looking at me. That is exactly what happened today.

Let's talk about the NDAA a little bit. Yes, we have had some disagreements, and we have figured them out: 60-2 in the House. How do you get something done when you get such a bipartisan vote? Well, you sit there for 20 hours and you work through a chairman and you get the issues worked out.

\$612 billion was asked for. \$612 billion was given. A 1.3 percent pay raise from the President's budget, a 1.3 percent pay raise to our military, that was done.

In July, we lost four Marines to a tragic incident in Tennessee. When I went home, many people said: What are you going to do about this? Can you change something? Shouldn't they be armed? Shouldn't something happen?

That is in the NDAA. Now we give post commanders the appropriate ability to arm our recruiting and our reserve centers.

But let's go a little further. This allows our friends and enemies to know what is happening in America. Now, today they say: Is something happening in America that is weak? Because for 53 years, it has been the military first, America first. We are going to be strong. And today I have got to believe that our friends and enemies might be scratching their head and saying: What is happening in America?

That is not something we ever want. We want our friends to know that we are going to be shoulder to shoulder with them, and we want our enemies to know that we are as strong as we possibly can be.

I am going to finish thanking the gentlewoman from Missouri. We have a kindredship. In my district, we tested and built every B-2. In her district, she houses the B-2 Spirit that sends them off to do difficult deals, difficult sorties. I am very proud of what the B-2 does, just as I am proud of every man

and woman in the military and every mission that they complete.

□ 1815

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to stand with the military, then let's stand with the military. If we are going to turn our back and say that this is not what we believe, then that is not what I want to be part of. I think we should work as hard as we possibly can to override this veto. That is the mission. That is the vision.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, gentleman. I share that vision and look forward to working alongside you to do the right thing for the American people.

I think you brought up many good points, but certainly the situation now under this Commander in Chief is that we have a situation where our allies don't trust us and our enemies don't fear us. This action today can't help but contribute further to that thinking. We have got to reverse this. America is strong when it is safe, and it is safe because it is strong.

We have heard this evening, Mr. Speaker, from many people who are experts on this issue. Not only do they care about it passionately, but they themselves have put on the uniform and made the sacrifices. They have left families to serve their country, and they know what it is like, what our troops are facing and what potential dangers we can be in by jeopardizing their security by not providing for them and passing a National Defense Authorization Act. We have heard from other colleagues here who are parents and who have children who have answered the call and signed up to serve their country and gone into harm's way, some of them who are there right now.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard how distressing it is for our troops to hear today—no matter where they are, whether they are in Afghanistan, Iraq, whether they are in the Pacific or they are in the jungles of Africa, or whether they are advising as we look and see what is going on with Ukraine and the President, and whether they are monitoring intelligence around the world, cyber threats and cyber attacks—when they turn on their TV tonight, to find out that their Commander in Chief has vetoed the bill that would provide for the resources that they need to carry out their mission, to find out that it is not done because of some specific provisions in the bill, unlike a few times in the past 53 years where we have passed this, but because the President wants to advance a domestic agenda that has nothing to do with providing for our common defense. It is wrong and it is disheartening.

Just a reminder of the things in this bill, the reasons it is so important. It provides: \$612 billion for our national defense, the exact amount of money that the President requested; a pay raise for our hardworking troops; retirement benefits for those that don't

have it now; the authority of commanders, like Representative KNIGHT shared, to be able to make a policy to allow the soldiers on their installation to be able to defend themselves and carry guns so hopefully we won't see the senseless tragedy again; to restrict allowing Guantanamo Bay detainees—terrorists, basically—to be brought here to America and put into our jails in our backyard; and to support our allies, whether it be the Iron Dome for Israel that has been so helpful in saving countless thousands of lives in Israel in the last few years, but also to provide funding for those fighting for freedom in Ukraine, allowing them to protect themselves.

Other speakers talked about space protections, protections against sexual assault in the military, preventing the transfers, supports our allies, some of the things I have said, acquisition reform. We did everything we could in this bill to help make the Pentagon more efficient and more effective to save money, and we will continue to do that.

We also heard about the dangers and how, with the President's veto, it is going to eliminate critical training time, and parents are going to be able to question whether their child is going to be safe when they send them to war.

Mr. Speaker, we can't allow this veto to stand. If the Commander in Chief is going to forsake his most fundamental duties, then the people of the House, the representatives of the people of America, will and are going to do everything possible to override this veto and to make sure that those in harm's way have what they need, that we don't jeopardize our national defense, and that we continue to have our priorities right as a nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to come on the House floor tonight and to share about this very, very important issue and this very historic day, and to also lay the groundwork for November 5, when we will vote for an override of this veto. I ask all my colleagues to support that, and I look forward to a positive vote.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded not to engage in personalities toward the President.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, October 22, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 22, 2015 at 3:09 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 799.  
With best wishes, I am  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. KELLY of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for October 20 through 23 on account of family medical issues.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISIONS TO THE AGGREGATES AND ALLOCATIONS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2016 BUDGET RESOLUTION RELATED TO LEGISLATION REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,  
Washington, DC, October 22, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER, I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record revisions to the budget allocations and aggregates of the Fiscal Year 2016 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget, S. Con. Res. 11. Section 2002(b)(3) of S. Con. Res. 11 permits the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget to make adjustments to the budget resolution levels for a reconciliation measure upon the determination that it complies with its reconciliation instructions. The Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015 complies with the instructions set forth in section 2002 of S. Con. Res. 11 as determined under section 310(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The adjustments are set forth in the attached tables.

This revision represents an adjustment for purposes of budgetary enforcement. These revised allocations and aggregates are to be considered as the aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to S. Con. Res. 11, as adjusted. Pursuant to section 3403 of such concurrent resolution, this revision to the allocations and aggregates shall apply only while H.R. 3762 is under consideration or upon its enactment.

Sincerely,

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

TABLE 1.—REVISION TO ON-BUDGET AGGREGATES  
(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal Year	
	2016	2016–2025
<b>Current Aggregates:</b>		
Budget Authority .....	3,040,743	1
Outlays .....	3,092,541	1
Revenues .....	2,675,967	32,233,099
<b>Adjustment for H.R. 3762, Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015:</b>		
Budget Authority .....	-9,700	1
Outlays .....	-9,100	1
Revenues .....	-12,700	-197,900
<b>Revised Aggregates:</b>		
Budget Authority .....	3,031,043	1
Outlays .....	3,083,441	1
Revenues .....	2,663,267	32,035,199

<sup>1</sup> Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2017–2025 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

TABLE 2.—REVISION TO COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS, AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS  
(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

House Committee on Ways and Means	2016		2016–2025 Total	
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Budget Authority	Outlays
Current Allocation .....	963,250	962,255	13,218,695	13,217,578
Adjustment for H.R. 3762, Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015 .....	-8,700	-8,700	-268,000	-268,000
Revised Allocation: .....	954,550	953,555	12,950,695	12,949,578

TABLE 3.—REVISION TO COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS, AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS  
(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

House Committee on Energy and Commerce	2016		2016–2025 Total	
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Budget Authority	Outlays
Current Allocation .....	389,635	392,001	4,341,991	4,346,043
Adjustment for H.R. 3762, Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015 .....	-1,000	-300	-15,200	-12,400
Revised Allocation .....	388,635	391,701	4,326,791	4,333,643

TABLE 4.—REVISION TO COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS, AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS  
(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

House Committee on Education & the Workforce	2016		2016–2025 Total	
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Budget Authority	Outlays
Current Allocation .....	-14,389	-11,569	-208,805	-203,704
Adjustment for H.R. 3762, Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act of 2015 .....	0	0	4,300	4,300
Revised Allocation .....	-14,389	-11,569	-204,505	-199,404

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 322. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 16105 Swingley Ridge Road in Chesterfield, Missouri, as the "Sgt. Zachary M. Fisher Post Office".

H.R. 323. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 55 Grasso Plaza in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "Sgt. Amanda N. Pinson Post Office".

H.R. 324. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11662 Gravois Road in St. Louis, Missouri, as the "Lt. Daniel P. Riordan Post Office".

H.R. 558. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 55 South Pioneer Boulevard in Springboro, Ohio, as the "Richard 'Dick' Chenault Post Office Building".

H.R. 1442. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 90 Cornell Street in Kingston, New York, as the "Staff Sergeant Robert H. Dietz Post Office Building".

H.R. 1884. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 206 West Commercial Street in East Rochester, New York, as the "Officer Daryl R. Pierson Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 3059. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4500 SE 28th Street, Del City, Oklahoma, as the James Robert Kalsu Post Office Building.

H.R. 3116. An act to extend by 15 years the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to conduct the quarterly financial report program.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1362. An act to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify waiver authority regarding programs of all inclusive care for the elderly (PACE programs).

S. 2162. An act to establish a 10-year term for the service of the Librarian of Congress.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on October 21, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 1735. To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, further reported that on October 22,

2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 3116. To extend by 15 years the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to conduct the quarterly financial report program.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 23, 2015, at 9 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3229. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Insular Areas, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft bill to permit the use of resettlement and relocation funds provided to the people of Bikini to be used within or outside the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3230. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Insular Areas, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft bill to improve air service capabilities in American Samoa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 1090. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide protections for retail customers, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-304, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2583. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for greater transparency and efficiency in the procedures followed by the Federal Communications Commission, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-305). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Education and the Workforce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1090 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### 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. ROTHFUS (for himself, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3797. A bill to establish the bases by which the Administrator of the Environ-

mental Protection Agency shall issue, implement, and enforce certain emission limitations and allocations for existing electric utility steam generating units that convert coal refuse into energy; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 3798. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to permit private persons to compel the Securities and Exchange Commission to seek legal or equitable remedies in a civil action, instead of an administrative proceeding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. STEWART):

H.R. 3799. A bill to provide that silencers be treated the same as long guns; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VELA, Mr. YOHO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 3800. A bill to amend section 9A of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require that local school wellness policies include a requirement that students receive 50 hours of school nutrition education per school year; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. BASS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LEE, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ):

H.R. 3801. A bill to redesignate the Federal building located at 935 Pennsylvania Avenue Northwest in the District of Columbia as the "Federal Bureau of Investigation Building"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BABIN (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. ZINKE, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3802. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for the disposition, within 60 days, of an application to exempt a projectile from classification as armor piercing ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. RIBBLE):

H.R. 3803. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to establish joint resolutions on the budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of

such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRAT:

H.R. 3804. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to provide that any estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office or the Joint Committee on Taxation shall include costs relating to servicing the public debt, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LONG, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. OLSON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 3805. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide for the inclusion of broadband conduit installation in certain highway construction projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER (for herself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 3806. A bill to establish certain requirements with respect to pollock and golden king crab; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. LEE, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BEYER, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. COSTA, Ms. MOORE, Mr. TAKAI, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 3807. A bill to provide a process for ensuring the United States does not default on its obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 3808. A bill to require the withdrawal and study of the Federal Housing Finance Agency's proposed rule on Federal Home Loan Bank membership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3809. A bill to establish a pilot program in certain agencies for the use of public-private agreements to enhance the efficiency of Federal real property; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 3810. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, and SAFETEA-LU to direct the Secretary of Transportation to give preference to certain surface transportation

projects that achieve cost efficiencies through the use of project development, finance, operations, and delivery methods, such as design-build, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 3811. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the disclosure of the total number of a company's domestic and foreign employees; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCNERNEY (for himself and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 3812. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the identification of corporate tax haven countries and increased penalties for tax evasion practices in haven countries that ship United States jobs overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Ms. EDWARDS):

H.R. 3813. A bill to establish a grant program to encourage States to adopt certain policies and procedures relating to the transfer and possession of firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 3814. A bill to permit aliens seeking asylum to be eligible for employment in the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself, Mr. MESSER, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. GROTHMAN):

H.J. Res. 70. A joint resolution disapproving a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. KLINE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. WALZ):

H. Res. 486. A resolution congratulating the Minnesota Lynx women's basketball team on winning the 2015 Women's National Basketball Association Championship; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas (for herself and Mr. NEAL):

H. Res. 487. A resolution recognizing the importance of cancer program accreditation in ensuring comprehensive, high quality, patient-centered cancer care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. STEFANIK):

H. Res. 488. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Retirement Security Week, including raising public awareness of the various tax-preferred retirement vehicles, increasing personal financial literacy, and engaging the people of the United States on the keys to success in achieving and maintaining retirement security throughout their lifetimes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### 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. ROTHFUS:

H.R. 3797.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, "[t]o regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes . . ."

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 3798.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (The Congress shall have Power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States and within the Indian Tribes") and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (The Congress shall have Power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof").

Additional authority derives from Article III, Section 1 ("The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall hold their Offices during good Behaviour, and shall, at stated Times, receive for their Services, a Compensation, which shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office.) Additional authority also derives from Article III, Section 2, Clause 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 3799.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1—"The Congress shall have the 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."

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3800.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution relating to the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States)

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3801.

At 121 Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 8

By Mr. BABIN:

H.R. 3802.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment II:

A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 3803.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BRAT:

H.R. 3804.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has explicit and implicit powers to spend, to raise revenue, and to borrow throughout Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution. Coherent management of fiscal

powers requires a complete assessment of the effects of proposed legislation, so it is both necessary and proper for the estimating agencies to inform Congress of total fiscal impacts.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 3805.

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 Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:

H.R. 3806.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. HONDA:

H.R. 3807.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 3808.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerate in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution.

Additionally, Article 1, Section 7, Clause 2 of the Constitution allows for every bill passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed by the President to be codified into law; and therefore implicitly allows Congress to amend any bill that has been passed by both chambers and signed into law by the President.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3809.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 3810.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 3811.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 3812.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 3813.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8.

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 3814.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section I, Article 8

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes; duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.J. Res. 70.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

- H.R. 167: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.  
H.R. 303: Mr. MICA, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. NORCROSS.  
H.R. 430: Mr. NORCROSS.  
H.R. 592: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. LUCAS.  
H.R. 662: Mr. PALAZZO.  
H.R. 721: Mr. PITTS and Mr. POE of Texas.  
H.R. 766: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.  
H.R. 799: Ms. STEFANIK.  
H.R. 829: Ms. BROWN of Florida.  
H.R. 842: Mr. LOBIONDO.  
H.R. 845: Mr. LOUDERMILK.  
H.R. 846: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.  
H.R. 863: Mrs. BLACKBURN.  
H.R. 865: Mr. PETERSON.  
H.R. 882: Mr. KEATING.  
H.R. 885: Mr. HECK of Washington.  
H.R. 921: Mr. DOLD.  
H.R. 932: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. QUIGLEY.  
H.R. 953: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 985: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.  
H.R. 1090: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. PITTINGER, and Mr. DUFFY.  
H.R. 1145: Mr. ASHFORD and Ms. STEFANIK.  
H.R. 1192: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. MULLIN.  
H.R. 1217: Mrs. DINGELL.  
H.R. 1221: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. VARGAS.  
H.R. 1233: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mr. SHIMKUS.  
H.R. 1247: Ms. DUCKWORTH.  
H.R. 1248: Mr. DESJARLAIS.  
H.R. 1258: Mr. LANCE.  
H.R. 1284: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.  
H.R. 1288: Mr. PAULSEN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. KIND.  
H.R. 1309: Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. CHABOT.  
H.R. 1343: Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. DONOVAN.  
H.R. 1439: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. GALLEGRO, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.  
H.R. 1450: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
H.R. 1475: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.  
H.R. 1594: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Ms. DUCKWORTH.  
H.R. 1595: Mr. HASTINGS.  
H.R. 1604: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.  
H.R. 1614: Mr. JOLLY.  
H.R. 1625: Mr. POLIS and Mr. HECK of Washington.  
H.R. 1688: Mr. NORCROSS and Mr. FOSTER.  
H.R. 1728: Mr. HECK of Washington.  
H.R. 1737: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York and Mr. HOLDING.  
H.R. 1763: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. PETERSON.  
H.R. 1901: Mr. RUSSELL.  
H.R. 1902: Mr. CONNOLLY.  
H.R. 1982: Mr. OLSON.  
H.R. 2003: Mr. BERA.  
H.R. 2043: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.  
H.R. 2083: Ms. BONAMICI.  
H.R. 2114: Mr. NADLER.  
H.R. 2142: Ms. STEFANIK.  
H.R. 2205: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.  
H.R. 2254: Mr. HUFFMAN.  
H.R. 2293: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Ms. MATSUI.  
H.R. 2342: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. PETERS.  
H.R. 2350: Mr. MACARTHUR.  
H.R. 2355: Mrs. TORRES.  
H.R. 2450: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
H.R. 2460: Mr. COLE.  
H.R. 2493: Ms. GABBARD and Mr. MACARTHUR.  
H.R. 2495: Ms. MENG.  
H.R. 2515: Mr. POCAN.  
H.R. 2520: Mr. CRENSHAW.  
H.R. 2546: Mr. ELLISON.  
H.R. 2646: Mr. WALDEN.  
H.R. 2657: Mr. DOLD and Mrs. LOVE.  
H.R. 2660: Ms. NORTON and Mr. GRAYSON.  
H.R. 2726: Ms. GRAHAM.  
H.R. 2733: Mr. HECK of Nevada.  
H.R. 2737: Mr. YOHO.  
H.R. 2789: Mr. HOLDING.  
H.R. 2826: Mr. DELANEY.  
H.R. 2858: Mr. LANCE.  
H.R. 2894: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.  
H.R. 2903: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.  
H.R. 2917: Mr. DESAULNIER.  
H.R. 2948: Ms. CLARKE of New York.  
H.R. 2972: Mr. MCGOVERN.  
H.R. 2980: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.  
H.R. 3016: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.  
H.R. 3033: Mr. BABIN.  
H.R. 3071: Mr. COHEN, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. SERRANO.  
H.R. 3074: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. MICA.  
H.R. 3090: Mr. DEFAZIO.  
H.R. 3091: Mr. DEFAZIO.  
H.R. 3092: Mr. DEFAZIO.  
H.R. 3119: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.  
H.R. 3137: Ms. DELBENE.  
H.R. 3222: Mr. HARRIS.  
H.R. 3225: Mr. PETERSON.  
H.R. 3229: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Mr. LUCAS.  
H.R. 3268: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.  
H.R. 3286: Mr. COSTA.  
H.R. 3287: Mr. HOLDING.  
H.R. 3314: Mr. SALMON and Mr. SMITH of Texas.  
H.R. 3326: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi and Mr. NUNES.  
H.R. 3337: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.  
H.R. 3338: Mr. KLINE.  
H.R. 3339: Mrs. WAGNER.  
H.R. 3384: Mr. JEFFRIES.  
H.R. 3390: Mr. ASHFORD.  
H.R. 3406: Mr. SMITH of Washington.  
H.R. 3407: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.  
H.R. 3445: Ms. LOFGREN.  
H.R. 3455: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. ADAMS.  
H.R. 3466: Mr. TAKANO.  
H.R. 3471: Mr. MCDERMOTT.  
H.R. 3473: Mr. HARRIS.  
H.R. 3477: Ms. MCCOLLUM.  
H.R. 3488: Mr. RATCLIFFE and Mr. LOUDERMILK.  
H.R. 3516: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. CULBERSON.  
H.R. 3537: Mr. KING of New York.  
H.R. 3547: Mr. KING of New York.  
H.R. 3579: Ms. WILSON of Florida.  
H.R. 3582: Mr. POCAN.  
H.R. 3588: Ms. CLARKE of New York.  
H.R. 3590: Mr. WITTMAN.  
H.R. 3629: Mr. COHEN, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. NORTON.  
H.R. 3636: Mr. HOLDING.  
H.R. 3637: Ms. CLARKE of New York.  
H.R. 3638: Ms. BROWN of Florida.  
H.R. 3643: Mr. VELA.  
H.R. 3656: Mr. GARAMENDI.  
H.R. 3664: Mr. VARGAS.  
H.R. 3690: Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. TAKAL.  
H.R. 3696: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BEYER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. ESTY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. NADLER, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.  
H.R. 3700: Mr. CLEAVER.  
H.R. 3706: Mr. HANNA.  
H.R. 3729: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.  
H.R. 3741: Mr. PETERS and Mr. POLIS.  
H.R. 3746: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. MCDERMOTT.  
H.R. 3764: Mr. GOSAR.  
H.R. 3779: Mr. CUELLAR.  
H.R. 3785: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIRES, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. VELA, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. FARR, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. BEYER, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CUELLAR, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.  
H.R. 3788: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California and Ms. LEE.  
H.J. Res. 48: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois and Ms. LEE.  
H.J. Res. 51: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.  
H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi and Mr. LAHOOD.  
H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. GUINTA, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. BOUSTANY.  
H. Con. Res. 62: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.  
H. Res. 110: Mrs. DAVIS of California.  
H. Res. 145: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LEE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. DEUTCH.  
H. Res. 210: Mr. POE of Texas.  
H. Res. 276: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.  
H. Res. 293: Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. BASS, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.  
H. Res. 371: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. SARBANES.  
H. Res. 394: Mr. HASTINGS.  
H. Res. 416: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. NUNES, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.  
H. Res. 423: Mr. HUDSON.  
H. Res. 428: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Ms. MENG.  
H. Res. 459: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.  
H. Res. 467: Mr. SERRANO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. TSONGAS.  
H. Res. 469: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.