United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 7, 2016 No. 4

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, January 11, 2016, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, JANUARY 7, 2016

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 7, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DARIN LAHOOD to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2016, 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.

VISAS AND WORK PERMITS

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, Washington has, once again, undermined and betrayed struggling American workers who seek jobs that pay enough to support their families.

In December, on less than 72 hours' notice, Congress and President Obama shoved down the throats of Americans a 2,000-page, financially irresponsible, $1.1 trillion omnibus spending bill that not only risks America's solvency, it also threatens American jobs for American workers.

Under old law, 66,000 H–2B foreign worker visas could be issued each year. Buried deep inside the 2,000-page omnibus spending bill, on page 701, is an obscure provision without even a heading that, according to labor expert John Miano, increases available H–2B visas up to 264,000 per year, effectively quadrupling visas for low-skilled, temporary nonagricultural foreign workers.

Making matters worse, on New Year's Eve, while America focused on football games and celebrations, President Obama issued a 200-page proposed rule to illegally bust statutory green card immigration caps by approving unlimited numbers of work permits for foreigners who don't have green cards. This White House action is yet another brazen display of contempt for immigration statutes, the rule of law, and American workers.

The White House argues importing foreign labor is necessary because of a claimed shortage of American labor. Similarly, House Speaker PAUL RYAN claims increasing foreign worker visas ''helps small businesses who cannot find labor when there's a surge in demand for their labor, like seafood processing or tourism.''

This claimed labor shortage is unsupported by jobs or wage data and is political bunk. Per Federal labor statistics, 57 percent—57 percent—of Americans without a high school diploma had no job in 2015's second quarter. That bears repeating. Fifty-seven percent of Americans without a high school diploma had no job in 2015's second quarter. That is a lot of Americans who would love to have those jobs President Obama and Congress denied Americans and gave to foreigners.

Economics 101 explains that wages rise if there is a labor shortage and fall if there is a labor surplus. According to Census Bureau data from 2007 to 2014; wages for security guards went down 6.1 percent, for cooks down 4.4 percent; for janitors down 1.2 percent; for ushers, lobby attendants, and ticket takers, down 7.1 percent; for hotel, motel, and resort desk clerks, down 7 percent. The list of falling wages for low-income American workers goes on and on. This falling wage data is compelling evidence that there is no shortage of American labor and, to the contrary, that there is an oversupply of American labor that demands cutting foreign labor, not expanding it.

Mr. Speaker, while these surges in foreign worker visas and foreign labor work permits is a huge victory for special interests that profit from suppressed wages, it is a debilitating loss for struggling American families.

Unemployed and underpaid Americans desperate for a good-paying job have every right to be angry at a Federal Government that takes American jobs from American citizens and gives

☐ 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.

them to foreigners. Americans have every right to be angry at Washington elected officials who care more about special interest campaign contributions than American voters who elected us. I hope those Americans will remember their anger during 2016's primary and general elections. That is the way to force Washington to represent us.

Mr. Speaker, I can't speak for anybody else, but, as for me, MO BROOKS from Alabama's Fifth Congressional District, I fight for the economic interests of American citizens and against policies that undermine the struggling American voters who sent us here. That is part of the reason why I voted against December's financially irresponsible omnibus spending bill—and am proud of it.

MALHEUR NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, with the odd drama playing out in Oregon where armed thugs have taken over a Federal wildlife facility, it is important to reflect on what the wildlife refuge system is all about.

If these people had any argument with the President, it was with President Roosevelt, who 108 years ago established the Malheur National Wildlife Refuge as a response to protect natural resources, especially the slaughter of wild birds for feathers to adorn women's hats.

It is ironic that the President, who in his younger days participated in the slaughter of over 6 million buffalo that roamed the Midwest plains on a magnificent ecostructure, realized the necessity of protecting these resources. Today we benefit from the foresight of this conservation President who provided the cornerstone of environmental protection that enriches us all.

The notion that somehow this is the ''wild west,'' where people can do with public land what they want, is thoroughly discredited. This mind-set from the 1800s that there were endless, wide-open spaces, where people could do what they wished, when they wished, where they wished, is tinged with regret and tragedy. We took away the land from Native Americans that our government had given to them in solemn treaty, ratified by Congress.

The mind-set that public lands of the West were to be exploited as rapidly as possible is still embodied in the Mining Act of 1872, which essentially allows anyone, including foreign mining operations, to exploit our country's mineral resources at basically no cost and with no enforceable obligation to repair the damage they inflicted. The West is now blighted with thousands of abandoned mines and oil and gas wells that will risk being a permanent scar on the landscape. While private profit was pursued, the public was left with the consequences and the cost of cleanup, if it ever occurs.

The longstanding battles over American rangeland between competing owners and between competing uses, like cattle and sheep, were not pretty. There is no doubt that there are still significant problems dealing with public land management, in part because the rules of the game are still set by the Mining Act of 1872 and the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934.

All but the most reckless individuals would agree that if these statutes were written today they would look fundamentally different with more protections and clarity. It was into this void that Teddy Roosevelt stepped, declaring critical national monuments. He established wildlife refuges to benefit countless generations to come.

These amazing treasures are not just scenic wonders. They hold extraordinarily valuable habitat for wildlife, waterfowl, helping preserve the land and the water and the ecosystem that goes far beyond what is simply spectacular to look at.

This is America's heritage. We struggle on an ongoing basis to recover from the reckless, thoughtless exploitation of the last two centuries. The vast majority of the American public supports this effort, even if they never visit the remote Western regions. Indeed, the fact that they are often inaccessible is the only way that they are preserved. Imagine tour buses, motorized vehicles, hordes of tourists, their infrastructure and their litter, and the destructive effects that would have.

The sideshow with the Malheur National Wildlife Refuge obscures a much larger and important public policy: protecting our heritage, enhancing it, and avoiding reckless behavior of a few that will penalize generations to come.

That is why the Harney Basin Wetlands Initiative of people in that region, facilitated by the refuge between 2010 and 2013, was a textbook example of collaboration, where all the stakeholders created a vision and a 20-year plan for the refuge and the surrounding landscape, including the biggest wetland restoration project ever undertaken.

It would be valuable for us to look behind the headlines to the facts on the ground, the history of the resource, the struggle for protection, the tremendous benefits for all Americans, and what the stakeholders in that region accomplished together.

REPEALING THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I was proud to vote in favor of the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act, which repeals the Affordable Care Act, or the ACA. With yesterday's passage of the bill, it marks the first time repeal of the ACA has been sent to President Obama's desk.

In the past year, several significant problems with this law have become ever more clear. We have seen a large number of healthcare co-ops go under. One major healthcare provider, UnitedHealthcare, announced it is pulling out of the ACA exchange. This system is just not sustainable.

Late last year, the Congressional Budget Office released a report stating that the ACA will lead to a reduction of work-hours equivalent to 2 million jobs over the next decade. The CBO attributes this reduction to healthcare subsidies tied to income, raising effective tax rates for Americans, and creating a disincentive for people seeking promotions or new, higher paying jobs. It also points to higher taxes and penalties as a reason for the reduction in work-hours.

In comparison, the Restoring Americans' Healthcare Freedom Reconciliation Act will reduce the Federal deficit by more than half a trillion dollars over the next 10 years. It will also eliminate costly provisions, such as the individual and employer health insurance coverage mandates, the Cadillac tax on high-cost plans, and it will enhance the solvency of Medicare. It also ensures that Federal tax dollars will not go to providers of abortion.

Mr. Speaker, over the past several years, dozens of ACA reforms have been signed into law. However, we have only scratched the surface when it comes to addressing problems with this law. It is time to come together to support a comprehensive approach that ensures responsible use of taxpayer dollars and fixes the issues affecting our Nation's healthcare system.

HAYMARKET CAFE

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today I am honored to share the story of the Haymarket Cafe, started by brothers Peter and David Simpson, in Northampton, Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, one of the surest signs of a vibrant local economy is a lively restaurant scene. You know a town or a region is humming economically when you have a wide variety of restaurants to choose from. It is a sign that people have enough money left over after paying all of their bills to spend on treating themselves and their families. It is a strong indication that people feel secure in the direction of the economy.

But for millions of low-wage workers across the country, the story is more complicated than that, and the picture is not all that pretty. For all the economic vibrancy associated with restaurant culture—and though restaurants employ almost 1 in 10 private

sector workers—restaurant workers are among the worst paid, worst treated within the economy as a whole.

□ 1015

While non-restaurant private sector workers make a median hourly wage of $18, restaurant workers earn a median hourly wage of $10, including tips. The results are predictable in that more than 16 percent of restaurant workers live below the poverty line.

This picture is made even worse by how it is skewed along race and gender lines. The highest paid positions in restaurants tend to be held by men and people who are White while the lowest paid positions are typically held by women and people of color. At the bottom of the ladder are undocumented workers, who comprise over 15 percent of the restaurant workforce, more than twice the rate for non-restaurant sectors.

The good news is that it doesn't have to be this way. There are forward-thinking restaurant owners who are choosing the high road, restaurants where conscious efforts are made to break down gender and ethnic divisions and that choose to pay a living wage with good benefits.

If you ask them, the owners of these establishments will tell you that they choose this path because it is not only the right thing to do, but it is also the smart thing to do financially. They choose this path because it is a solid business model that improves the chances of success in a highly competitive industry.

I am proud to represent one of those restaurants in my district. The Haymarket Cafe in Northampton, Massachusetts, has led the way for almost a quarter century in treating its employees with respect and in paying them a living wage.

I attended an event a couple of weeks ago at the Haymarket Cafe at which the owner, Peter Simpson, announced that his restaurant was moving to a $15 per hour minimum wage and would be eliminating tips. Now, I have known Peter for a long time, and I was not surprised that he would take such a step.

Peter opened the Haymarket with his brother, David, almost 25 years ago. From the beginning, they were committed to paying a fair wage and in creating a positive work environment for their employees. In talking to Peter, I realized that his decision, while it reflected his idealism, was rooted in hard-nosed business sense.

You don't survive and thrive for a quarter century in the highly competitive restaurant industry, especially in a small, tight-knit community like Northampton, if your business model isn't airtight. Every decision you make has to make sense financially in order to succeed and stay competitive.

The decision to go to a $15 per hour minimum wage and eliminate tips was not something Peter took lightly. He did his homework. He looked at other restaurants in other cities that had made a similar move. He talked to all of his employees. He worked closely with the Pioneer Valley Workers Center, which is leading the charge to better the lives of low-wage immigrant workers in western Massachusetts.

Eliminating tips allowed Peter to make the wages between better paid waiters and less well-paid kitchen staff more equitable. It allowed his wait staff to earn a wage they could count on, rather than having to depend on the tipping whims of customers. It also gave him increased staffing flexibility, as he could train all of his staff to do all jobs so he could more easily shift people around when necessary. In committing to a $15 per hour minimum wage, Peter also increased staff loyalty while decreasing turnover and training costs.

As a result of Peter's bold decision, the Haymarket Cafe has been overwhelmed by an outpouring of support. Staff and customers are equally enthusiastic, and business has jumped. This commitment to wage equity has shown, once again, to be a sound business strategy and has shown that a business based on such principles can provide a decent living for its staff and can contribute to the economic health of the community.

Mr. Speaker, the Haymarket Cafe is living proof, especially in an industry with such a dismal track record on wages, that paying a living wage is good for business and that a commitment to wage equity makes financial sense. The restaurant industry can and must do better, and I am proud to say the Haymarket Cafe is leading the way.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S EXECUTIVE ACTION ON THE SECOND AMENDMENT

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

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the President took aim at our Second Amendment rights.

We know his purpose was to restrict the constitutional right of law-abiding citizens. It will undermine our personal privacy rights. It will make it to where due process is taken away from many of our citizens, but it won't stop criminals from carrying firearms. As a father and as a grandfather, my heart is broken over the many tragedies and attacks that have occurred around this Nation, but this won't cure the problem.

In this Congress, we must fight for the rights of our Constitution. We must also use the courts to fight for those rights. We must do more.

Mr. Speaker, not only I, but you and every Member of this Congress, took an oath of office when we took these positions. We took that oath, and it was to uphold and to defend the Constitution, all of the Constitution, not just the First Amendment, but the Second Amendment as well and every part thereof.

When I took that oath, I took it very, very seriously. I am doing my part. I am upholding the oath that I took. I believe the President should uphold his.

HONORING DR. SHARON ELLIOTT-BYNUM, A TRAILBLAZER

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

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my condolences on the passing of a giant in the Durham, North Carolina, community, a trailblazer, one who dedicated her life to improving health outcomes for disadvantaged citizens, including veterans.

This trailblazer, Mr. Speaker, was my friend, Dr. Sharon Elliott-Bynum. Sharon passed away on Sunday, January 3, at the young age of 58, 2 days before her 59th birthday.

We lost this giant far too soon, but not before she revolutionized the delivery of care for those in need through the founding of Durham's first free-standing, comprehensive healthcare clinic, called Healing with CAARE.

My first visit as Durham's Congressman was an enlightening visit to CAARE. I saw Sharon at work, I saw paid staff, and I saw dozens of community volunteers. We mourn this tremendous loss, but we also celebrate Sharon's remarkable life, which was replete with the success that many can only hope to achieve.

Born in Durham, Sharon Elliott-Bynum was a graduate of Northern High School, Durham Technical Institute, the Watts School of Nursing, and my alma mater, North Carolina Central University. She also received a master's degree and a Ph.D. from Victory International College.

Sharon was a dedicated member of a great sorority, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. As a member of the Durham Alumnae Chapter, founded in 1931, she led by example. Sharon was also a member of the National Council of Negro Women, of Sigma Theta Tau International, of the Top Ladies of Distinction, and of many more service organizations. Finally, she was a faithful member of the Faith Assembly Christian Center in Durham.

Dr. Elliott-Bynum was attracted to the field of nursing when she, at the age of 16, began volunteering at the historic Lincoln Community Health Center. Sharon's volunteerism motivated her to pursue a nursing career. So, in 1995, Dr. Elliott-Bynum and her late sister, Patricia—''Pat'' she called her—founded Healing with CAARE, Inc.

What began as a nonprofit, community-based provider of services for individuals who were living with HIV expanded to being the primary healthcare home for more than 1,000 individuals who live with cancer, cardiovascular disease, diabetes, and obesity. CAARE

also provides free dental care, substance abuse counseling, a food pantry, and free housing for homeless veterans.

Her remarkable work has been honored over the years through many awards and recognitions. They include The Order of the Long Leaf Pine, which is the highest civilian honor presented by the Governor; the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation's Veterans Braintrust Award; the NCCU Distinguished Alumni Award; and the Durham Chamber of Commerce Women's Leadership Award.

Dr. Elliott-Bynum's lifetime of tireless work and service to thousands of disadvantaged individuals had an immeasurable impact on the Durham community, a grateful community that joins me today in celebrating this life.

I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing our recognition to Dr. Sharon Elliott-Bynum's two children, Ebony Elliott-Covington and Damien Elliott-Bynum; to her beloved brother, Joe Elliott, Jr.; to her sisters, Carolyn Hinton and Addie Mann; to her grandson, Ahmad; to the entire CAARE family; and to all of those who have been impacted by her extraordinary work. Some of her family members are with us today.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, on tomorrow, I will say just a few words at the Celebration of Life service in Durham by making a very plain, but profound, point. It goes like this: Durham, North Carolina, is a better place to live and work because of the unselfish service of Dr. Sharon Elliott-Bynum.

May she rest in peace, a life well lived.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF LAWRENCE AGEE

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in sadness to commemorate the life of Mr. Lawrence Agee, a man I call a friend.

He was a long-time resident of McArthur, California, in eastern Shasta County. Born in 1937, he operated an institution in the area for 55 years, known as the Highway Garage, which was the smallest, I think, Chevrolet dealership, maybe, in the West, and it was the only one for about an 80-mile radius for a lot of years until the reorganization of General Motors happened and they took the franchise away.

On that lot, he might have in his inventory seven, eight, nine new cars—pickups, mostly, for the farmers and ranchers in the area. It was really an institution to the people of the area. When that dealership was pulled, they continued on, he and his family, in providing service and towing and all of the things that you would need in that area.

I got to know Lawrence when I was a new candidate in 2002, striking out from where I lived—about 2½ hours away—to go out and meet people in the vast northern California district I have represented over the years. I stopped in one day on Highway 299, in eastern Redding, right in McArthur there, and said hi to this tall, lanky fellow here, who just felt like the heart of America right there. I struck up a conversation and had a great old time.

For many, many years, he did operate a Chevrolet dealership, but I drove up in my Ford. So that started a little banter going back and forth, especially if you are a partisan NASCAR fan or an automobile brand fan, which kind of tends to go with that there.

One of the lines I remember him teasing me about was, ''Well, you know, it is a nice car there, but here we sell the best and service the rest.'' I guess he probably figured he was going to have to service my car a lot if I were in the neighborhood. Yet, the teasing and the banter was just one of the great parts of our friendship and relationship.

Soon after that, every time I would have a chance, I would go through there, whether it was going up to the Inter-Mountain Fair for a day or two right there in town. He was a big part of that institution as well and would hang out with the people there.

There is a parade at that fair each year. After I got to know him and Eleanor and his family a little bit, he even let me use his convertible to drive in the parade there. It was a neat, old Chevy SSR.

I think that was his subtle way to get me into a Chevrolet at least once a year. The funny thing is that he didn't drive it that much; so, people around there would only see it once a year. And they got to thinking it was my car or something; so, it was a funny deal.

That just shows his generosity and his trust. I know he was well loved in the whole community because, during fair time, he was a big, big supporter and sponsor of the fair. But I don't know if he got to go to it very often because he was always helping people with lock-outs and dead batteries or was making a tow run nearby or whatever. He was just helping keep that town together.

For many of us who are in and around Shasta County there, I know he will be greatly missed. His wife, Eleanor, is a gem as well. My heart goes out to her and to the whole family there because there is really a lot happening around Highway Garage in McArthur.

Again, at fair time, you would see a lot of destruction derby cars lined up at that place. His son, David, was always working on those, as were other family members. I think that is the place if you need a destruction derby car. Go see them, and they might be able to give you the best technology on that as well.

In his service, he was nationally recognized as one of the best serving dealers in that dealership they had, up until 2009, when he moved on to service only and was no longer selling cars.

□ 1030

You could see it on the awards in the shop building. This big wooden building there just takes you right back to Americana from 80 years ago. I think the dealership was established in 1924. His family took over in 1949. With the passing of his father in 1959, Lawrence took over as the youngest dealer, again, in the West of a Chevrolet dealership.

He was a volunteer with the McArthur Fire Department. He was a longtime leader of the Cloverleaf 4–H for over two decades. He was a member of the Fort Crook Masonic Lodge, citizen of the year at least twice, blue ribbon winner, and a longtime supporter of the Inter-Mountain Fair in many capacities. Of course, he leaves behind a legacy of what small-town America really is about.

The impact he had on his community was felt not only there, but far, far away. For those people that were helped by him in the middle of the night—there maybe would be a rock in the road or something like that and if somebody would run over that, he would go out and bail them out. Indeed, one of the times when I was up for the fair and leaving town, there he was, coming up the grade in his big, yellow tow truck. That is Lawrence right there.

A rewarding part of this job is getting to know people like him, and you hate it when you have to lose people like that, that are pillars in the community. Doggone it, he leaves a great legacy, and I am proud to have known him.

God bless his family.

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ANNIVERSARY AND EVERY STUDENT SUCCEEDS ACT

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, Friday marks the 14th anniversary of the enactment of the No Child Left Behind legislation which, when we passed it, held so many dreams and so many aspirations for all of us because we believed that our children would get a world-class education out of that. Unfortunately, No Child Left Behind, with all its potential, fell short.

So I think it is important that we all understand and we all believe in this Chamber that through education, we lift this Nation. It is probably the greatest investment that we can make in the American people. That is why, as lawmakers, we have to really work on the best policies for education, starting at the national level, because we now compete internationally, and, of course, at the State and at our local levels right at our school boards.

I have been to every single school in my district in Orange County. I have

met with teachers, with parents, with administrators, and with business leaders. They all had concerns with No Child Left Behind. That is why I think the recent passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act, or ESSA, a landmark piece of bipartisan legislation, hopefully will fix the outdated policies of that No Child Left Behind legislation.

The new legislation, the new law we just passed, takes into consideration the collective criticisms of the teachers, the students, parents, administrators, business leaders, and everyone who is involved in the education of our children. The ESSA has the support of many civil rights groups, teaching groups, and community institutions.

I would like to highlight a few of the improvements our parents and students can look forward to with this new law.

During the No Child Left Behind era, schools were not held accountable for ensuring that the most disadvantaged students actually were aided and helped to get an education. The Every Student Succeeds Act changes this. It benefits low-income students, minority students, English language learners by requiring the schools to include student data about these groups so that we can make better policy for the accountability of how these students learn.

States are also required to create exit and entrance exams for English language learners, ensuring that they will actually receive attention in these classrooms and will learn.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that we all think that there are way too many tests in life every single day, and of course it is not the favorite part of the school day to take a test. The high-stakes testing that was under No Child Left Behind has created a lot of anxiety campuswide. Teachers felt the need to teach to the test, rather than actually teach the student that critical learning that must take place in the classroom at an early age.

My mom was a teacher. She finally got out because she got tired of teaching to the test, test, test, test. She had seven kids, and they all have master's and Ph.D.s. She was a parent teacher before she went to teach in the classroom, and she knew that students learn in different ways, that not everybody learned the same way.

She would work with students. Some students learn verbally, some by test-taking, others by acting out plays that get across the idea. There was no time in the classroom after No Child Left Behind. It was just one way: the test, the test, the test.

I am proud to say that high-stakes testing under the new law will no longer disadvantage our schools who don't pass those tests. There are going to be other ways, including tests, to decide whether schools, teachers, and educators are doing well by our children in the classroom. Testing students will not be the end-all of what is happening in the classrooms.

Schools also have the flexibility to pilot innovative testing measures, allowing more time for learning in the classroom.

I am excited about this new law, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that we continue to look at it and make sure that every child has a chance in this education system.

REPEAL OBAMACARE

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

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, an interesting thing happened when President Obama was elected in 2008: We basically had a national consensus about some elements of health care. What I mean by that is, most people recognized two things about our healthcare system that were flawed. First, they recognized that it was too expensive; and, second, they recognized that people with a preexisting condition should be included and not be excluded from an insurance pool. There was a great deal of consensus around that, and that is where the opportunity was for the Obama team to bring the country together around those two core things.

Instead, they did something different. Instead, they went out on a highly partisan path, and that was to create ObamaCare. We were told that the bill had to be passed in order to understand what was in it, and so forth and so on. We are familiar with the false premises and the false claims and the false narratives about it.

Do you remember this? We were told that if you liked your doctor, you got to keep your doctor. If you liked your insurance coverage, you got to keep your insurance coverage. Your insurance policies, the premiums per family were going to drop by over $2,000 a year. None of that turned out to be true. None of it. People lost their coverage. People lost their physicians. Their premiums have gone up.

So now what has happened, there has been this effort, and the effort over the past several years has been met by some mockery from some who have said: Hey, your efforts to repeal ObamaCare, how many times are you going to do it? Do you know how many times we are going to do it? We are going to do it until it gets done. Now it is closer than ever.

I have three constituents that I want to briefly mention to you. One is a fellow that I connected with on the phone last night. His name is Jay. Jay told me that, notwithstanding the false promises of ObamaCare, his insurance premiums for him and his daughter have skyrocketed to the point where the amount of anxiety that he was communicating to me on the phone was palpable. This is not somebody who is just upset about the direction that the country has gone under this false claim of ObamaCare. He is fearful of it, and he is anxious for his future and the future of his daughter.

How about Diane? My other constituent is a 9-year breast cancer survivor who was told, if you like your doctor, you get to keep your doctor, until all of a sudden, her insurance policy, after ObamaCare, kicks her physician out of the group, and she doesn't have access to the doctor that had cared for her and kept her cancer-free for 9 years.

How about the small-business owner who I met with on Monday in Kane County, Illinois, who said: Congressman, we would really like to expand our business; we want to open up a new location. It was a restaurant. If we do it—and we have done the math—it is going to cost us $150,000 a year in ObamaCare payments, and we can't afford to expand.

Here is what we have got to do: We have got to repeal this thing, and we have got to replace it and get back to those two core themes that say, let's deal with the underlying cost drivers in health care that make it more expensive than people can afford—and we can do that—and let's deal with the preexisting condition question. We can do that through high-risk pools and other things that don't cost the trillions of ObamaCare.

Now, there is an interesting thing that has been happening, and that is this: The story of ObamaCare is shifting. You ask, well, how is it shifting? It is shifting in this way: It is shifting because we have been told that there is no way to undo this. There is no way. It is basically orthodoxy in our country. It is an entitlement, which it is, and it is so deeply embedded that it is all a fait accompli. In other words, there is no way to undo this.

For a long time, that appeared to be—although it wasn't true, it appeared to be true because the Senate blocked its passage. Now, as we know, the other body has actually preceded us in this and, through the reconciliation activity, we are now able to avoid the 60-vote threshold. A simple majority of United States Senators can join with a majority of the United States House of Representatives, which I would argue is reflecting a majority of the American public, to say: Get this thing off our backs. Let us flourish. Yeah, we can deal with these things. Yes, health care needs improving, but this thing on our backs is simply smothering us.

So here is the opportunity. This will be on President Obama's desk. Will he veto it? Absolutely. It is the first time it has ever gotten on his desk before. What it says is this: that there is only one office between us and the repeal of ObamaCare. One office is between us and the repeal of ObamaCare, and that office changes next November. So in 11 months, there is every opportunity for us to see its repeal and, ultimately, its replacement.

REDONDO UNION HIGH SCHOOL PROTEST

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, this upcoming Monday, the Westboro Baptist Church plans to hold protests outside of Redondo Union High School in Redondo Beach, California. We have seen these protests before, often at the funerals of our fallen servicemen and -women. They are known, unfortunately, for their hateful message, especially against LGBT Americans.

The members of this church believe that America's generation of high schoolers is ''utterly without hope.'' They say that because these young students are promoting acceptance and inclusion of all people, regardless of whether they are gay or straight.

I couldn't disagree more with their premise of calling these students ''without hope.'' I think because these students are promoting acceptance and inclusion of all people, regardless of whether they are gay or straight, they are building a future full of hope. I have the utmost faith in the next generation as the future leaders of this Nation.

Of course, no matter how much I disagree with this group, these individuals should be allowed to exercise their right to protest, and they do have a right to free speech in this country. The students have those same rights, and an inspiring group of Redondo High students are organizing a peaceful counterprotest on Monday.

Yesterday, I wrote a letter to the members of the school's Gay-Straight Alliance and told them that I wished I could be there on Monday to protest alongside of them. These students deserve to live in a world where they can be who they are and love whom they choose. In standing up against hate and living a life of acceptance, inclusion, and understanding, they are making that world a reality.

I know my colleague here, TED LIEU, who represents Redondo Beach, joins me in saying that we are so proud of these students. We are proud of their courage, their bravery, their intelligence, and skill in standing up for what they know is right, just, and for being brave enough to organize a counterprotest.

□ 1045

I am going to be in Washington, D.C., on Monday. But if I were not here, I would want to be standing alongside each and every student to show my solidarity with them. Instead, let me tell them that I will be there in spirit.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MIAMI-DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

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

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Miami-Dade County Public Schools, where the graduation rate recently reached an all-time high of 78.1 percent for the 2014–2015 academic year, surpassing the State average of 77.8 percent.

This is a 1.5 percent growth from last year's rate, marking the highest graduation rate MDCPS has achieved since the Florida Department of Education began implementing new standards to track graduation figures in the late 1990s. This is a landmark accomplishment, considering the major challenges Miami schools face, including high poverty rates and a large population of English language learners.

As a former member of the Miami-Dade County School Board, I salute the students, teachers, faculty, and parents for their dedication and for their commitment to excellence. I also want to recognize School Board Chair Perla Tabares-Hantman, my other former colleagues, and Superintendent Alberto Carvalho for their exceptional leadership. I think of them frequently, and I am constantly reminded of how fortunate our community is to have them.

To the entire MDCPS family, congratulations. You are a model for the Nation. I am proud to represent you.

BULLETPROOF VEST PARTNERSHIP GRANT ACT OF 2015

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on October 24, 2015, Monroe County Sheriff's Deputy Josh Gordon found himself in a firefight with a robbery suspect on Stock Island in the Florida Keys. Amidst the exchange of gunfire, Deputy Gordon's bulletproof vest stopped a round of ammunition, ultimately saving his life. If a bullet would have strayed a few inches one way or another, the outcome could have been entirely different.

Every day, men and women in law enforcement put their lives on the line to ensure our safety. Incidents such as this shed light on the significance of effective body armor for those who protect us. Officers like Deputy Gordon are never off duty, and we must, in turn, do everything in our power to protect them.

To address this, I stand in strong support of H.R. 228, the Bulletproof Vest Grant Act of 2015, which extends the grant program for armored vests through fiscal year 2018. I strongly encourage Congress to pass this essential legislation and protect the backbone of our Nation's domestic defense.

MIAMI INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PASSENGER RECORDS

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Miami International Airport and their record-breaking year in 2015. Forty-four million passengers passed through this world-renowned airport last year, shattering the previous annual record of 40.9 million passengers in 2014.

MIA has some of the most dedicated employees in the country who ensure passengers have a pleasant experience on their journey, whether visiting relatives, conducting business, or visiting the abundance of attractions south Florida has to offer. Tens of thousands of passengers pass through MIA on a daily basis, and I am proud to recognize an airport that connects so many people throughout the world.

I offer my continued support to my friend, MIA Director Emilio Gonzalez, as his team works in the new year to attract more domestic and international routes, and I know cafecitos will continue to be available at each terminal so all visiting guests can enjoy the wonderful culture of south Florida.

VIOLENCE AGAINST SIKHS

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support and stand with the Sikh community in the San Joaquin Valley.

In the past 2 weeks, two Sikh men have been brutally attacked and, very sadly, one of them was killed. He lost his life. The Fresno City Police Department has labeled these two crimes as potential hate crimes.

Amrik Singh Bal was attacked in the middle of the street while waiting for a ride so he could go to work, as any average American would do throughout our country. Gurcharan Singh Gill was killed while working at a local convenience store. Both tragic incidents took place in my district. My thoughts and prayers are with Amrik and his family, and my deepest sympathy and condolences go to the Gurcharan family for the loss.

The attacks on these innocent American citizens are really an attack on all American citizens who choose to practice their religion and observe their cultural heritage, as Americans do throughout our land.

Sadly, since September 11, 2001, the Sikh community has endured discrimination because of a lack of understanding of Sikhism, which is based on equality and love. They are not alone.

As a nation of immigrants, we must remember, we have an opportunity to learn and benefit from the thousands of different cultures that are part of the mosaic of what makes America great. After all, we are a nation of immigrants, both past and present, and we must never ever forget that.

Today, in Fresno, in spirit, we are all part of the Sikh community as we mourn these tragic incidents. Every American citizen, regardless of race, creed, or gender has the right to live free of fear and discrimination.

I commend Chief Dyer and the Fresno City Police Department for working diligently to find the individual or individuals who killed Gurcharan and for continuing to look for the other individuals who are responsible for the attack on Amrik.

I continue to urge the FBI and the U.S. Attorney General's office to work, as they have been, in making this investigation inquiry resolve itself, solving these very sad crimes that we

think were based on hate and is truly an unfair and discriminatory situation that occurred in the last 2 weeks.

CENSURING PRESIDENT BARACK OBAMA

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

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, time and time again, the President has violated the boundaries of executive power. He has refused to enforce our immigration laws. He has opened the borders to Syrian migrants against the will of the American people. He has even changed the provisions of his own disastrous healthcare bill.

This week, the administration once again thumbed its nose at Congress and the American people by jeopardizing the gun rights of law-abiding citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are fed up. The American people continue to see the executive branch not only deciding which laws they choose to enforce, but changing and interpreting the laws as they see fit. The White House has become judge, jury, and executioner, in clear violation of the principles on which this Nation was founded.

Today I am introducing a resolution to censure President Barack Obama to serve as a clear rebuke and condemnation of the unconstitutional actions of this President. This is a bold measure, but is one that is necessary to preserve the very institution that we are all honored to serve: the United States Congress.

The Constitution requires that the President shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed. This President has failed to do so on numerous occasions.

The Constitution also requires the President to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. The President has failed to do so.

Not only is the President trying to do our job, but he has failed to do his.

His announced actions on gun control are just the latest example of blatant executive overreach by the President. Congress must fight back. I want to make it very clear. This is not about President Obama. This is about the actions of a President who has encroached too far on the powers of Congress.

Under the Constitution, Congress is an equal branch of government and should be treated as such. We cannot roll over on every executive overreach. We cannot wait to fight next time.

We cannot wait for the next President because it is not about this President or the next President. It is not about politics. It is about preserving the power of the legislative branch against this President and any future President who seeks to use egregious executive action at the expense of Congress.

A resolution of censure of the President has been used rarely, but is not without precedent. It is a way for Congress to fight back against executive overreach. Censuring the President will preserve for the historical and legal record that this Congress at this time disapproves of this President's executive overreach. It is time Congress fights back as an institution.

I urge my colleagues to live up to their oath of office, both Republican and Democrat, to support this resolution to censure the President and put the executive branch on notice that violating the separation of powers and using unconstitutional executive overreach will not be tolerated by Members of the United States Congress now or in the future.

WHITE RIVER NATIONAL FOREST OIL AND GAS LEASES

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an ongoing environmental review process within my district that I firmly believe represents yet another in a long line of abuses of private property rights by the Federal Government and, more specifically, the land management agencies that oversee the majority of the land in the United States.

The outcome of this process will likely set a disturbing precedent under which the integrity of contracts that the Federal Government enters into with private parties is undermined.

The Bureau of Land Management is currently reviewing 65 existing oil and gas leases issued in White River National Forest beginning in 1993. This retroactive review was prompted by a 2007 decision on three of the leases by the Interior Board of Land Appeals in which the BLM was found to have not formally adopted a Forest Service environmental policy analysis that was utilized to make these leasing decisions—basically, what amounts to an administrative oversight.

It should be emphasized that there are extensive environmental reviews that did, in fact, take place and that the BLM played a significant role in that process. The agency argued as much to the Board of Land Appeals during the review.

The fault was simply that the BLM needed to sign on the dotted line, and the Board expressly made this option available to remedy the problem. However, instead of adopting that commonsense approach, the BLM succumbed to political pressure from the environmental extremists and determined to revisit every one of the leases issued since 1993.

The new proposal from the BLM deals with leases in one of two ways. It either imposes new, significantly restrictive stipulations that were not in place at the time of the original leases when they were acquired or it outright revokes the leases.

The Federal Government is acting as nothing more than a highway robber in this case and in many others, robbing citizens and businesses of property that they have bought and paid for, telling us that we should simply be grateful that there is someone looking out for our greater interests.

I highlight this particular process because, should the BLM follow through with certain of its proposed actions, it will set a precedent not only for oil and gas development, but for any lessee or permittee who, in entering into a contract in good faith with a Federal agency, may see their lease or permit threatened with retroactive revocation or severely restricted based on any flimsy pretext.

Many important industries rely on Federal leases and permits, including livestock grazing, recreation, and renewable energy; and no business can successfully operate if its license to do so no longer enjoys protections against arbitrary cancelations or changes, depending on the ideology of the current occupant of the White House.

Numerous stakeholders and local governments recognize that the BLM's final decision would have impacts far beyond those of the specific leases in question and undertook efforts to draft detailed and substantive feedback to the agency.

□ 1100

This is a very laborious and time-consuming process. Yet the BLM provided only the bare minimum public comment during this period required by law, and the agency's scheduled comment period overlapped with Thanksgiving, Christmas, and the New Year's Day holidays.

It also overlaps another environmental review comment period for the well-known Roan Plateau, which involves many of the same stakeholders and local governments and has been under review in some form since the late 1990s.

As such, several stakeholders and local governments, with the support of several members of Colorado's congressional delegation, requested a modest extension of the comment period. These extension requests are routinely granted by Federal agencies in recognition of the technical nature of these issues: interruptions due to Federal holidays and when there are several similar issues under simultaneous review.

Despite this, the requests in this instance were dismissed out of hand. One can only conclude that the BLM is afraid of the scrutiny that could result from them effectuating a government taking of property rights under the guise of rectifying an administrative error from over 20 years ago.

It is abundantly clear that the BLM intends to ramrod through a decision that will trample on lease owners' rights by canceling or altering leases to the point as to make them economically unviable. This is, unfortunately,

in line with a disturbing trend of Federal agency abuses of private property rights, whether it is the Forest Service's repeated attempts to leverage special use permits to forcibly acquire private water rights, or the EPA's determination to classify every ditch and puddle as a ''water of the United States'' to further insert itself into the everyday lives of ordinary, hard-working Americans.

Property rights and the integrity of contracts are at the very foundation of our economic system, yet too often Federal agencies casually cast these important considerations aside.

If the BLM is confident that it is making the right decision and is willing to defend it, then they should have no problem providing additional time for the public and other interested stakeholders to be able to comment on the proposed actions in the White River National Forest.

DO NOT LIFT SANCTIONS ON IRAN

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

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call on this administration to keep intact all existing sanctions on the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, Iran. Sanctions must remain, and closer scrutiny and more accountability by this administration on Iran's continuing illicit activity must occur. It is imperative for peace, security, and stability in the Middle East and across the globe that we do this.

Iran's conduct over the past few months and the lack of clear and exact leadership by this administration in response is cause for serious alarm. Iran has not changed its tone and conduct since the signing of the deal. In fact, they have doubled down on their unwillingness not to comply with international agreements, and they have created more danger and instability in the process.

Here is the central point why I am speaking on the House floor here today: Once we lift sanctions, we have even less leverage.

So let's look at how Iran has honored their commitments in the past few months and ask ourselves: Do we anticipate Iran will conduct itself in the months and years to come better or worse?

On October 10, Iran carried out a precision-guided ballistic missile test. This violates U.N. Security Council Resolution 1929 and 2231. Now that Iran is prohibited from such testing under the deal, what do they do? They send weapons to Bashar al-Assad on Russian cargo planes. This violates U.N. Resolution 1747. They did that in October.

On November 21, they carried out a medium-range ballistic missile test with capabilities to carry a nuclear warhead. They can't do that either.

Last month, they fired several unguided rockets 1,500 yards from two U.S. vessels.

Just a few days ago, they unveiled a new underground missile depot showing precision-guided missiles that have the capability to hold a nuclear warhead.

What has been the response of this administration? They notify us they will respond with sanctions against Iranian individuals and businesses linked to Iran's ballistic missile program.

What happened since they notified us of that? Nothing. They have walked it back.

Here is my fear, Mr. Speaker. We are forecasting to Iran that they have carte blanche to do as they wish. And once we lift the sanctions, we can expect more of that. Iran is not honoring its commitments, so nor should we.

We know the State Department classifies the deal not as a treaty, not as an executive agreement. It is not even a signed document. It is merely a political commitment. And it is clear Iran is not acting in good faith to our political commitment.

I signed correspondence to the administration requesting that the President ''immediately void the deal and restore and/or continue all relevant sanctions on Iran that have been or will be relaxed under the JCPOA.''

Let's not concern ourselves if Iran voices outrage or condemnation that we voided a political commitment on the basis that they feel they have somehow honored the deal because, number one, they violated U.N. resolutions since the deal was signed, the Iranian Parliament refuses to ratify the deal, and the Ayatollah forbids further negotiations with the U.S.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that Iran's U.N. violations clearly violate the spirit of our political commitment to them. Their conduct threatens our national security, it threatens the security of our allies, and it further erodes an already precarious and unstable environment in the Middle East.

Iran isn't honoring its commitments, so nor should we. Let's keep the sanctions in place. Do not lift them.

OBAMA'S EXECUTIVE ACTION ON GUNS

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to start my time by quoting directly the Second Amendment of our Constitution: ''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.''

Aren't those beautiful and resounding words? As a man who likes to keep it simple, I appreciate the Founding Fathers not only for their foresight to protect the right to bear arms, but also how plain and simple they made it.

The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed upon. Unfortunately, I think our Founding Fathers spoke too plainly for certain people and certain Presidents to understand. That President may always remind us that he taught constitutional law. Sadly, I have yet to encounter someone in that position who disregards the Constitution so regularly.

Not only does that President trample on the Second Amendment, but he would also trample on Article I, which, as you know, is the Congress and going through them to make laws. That President should have known that regulations regarding buying guns must come from legislation, not by an oral decree.

That President tried to legislate in the Senate several times, but his colleagues refused to do it, even though there was a majority. Now that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are not in the majority in Congress, I am assuming that this administration is deciding to create their own regulations—the Constitution be damned—because, sadly, there are no checks and balances anymore.

We know even if Congress passes a bill to repeal any type of order that any President makes, it would still have to go to that individual for the bill to be signed. So what are the chances of putting together a bill that some Congress may have seen as an inappropriate action and then send it to the person that created that inappropriate action and expect him to sign it?

I think, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that has so disappointed the American people is the inability to have their Representatives voice their complaints and do their legislative responsibility with an out-of-control government. So each week, as the administration or a group is intent on disregarding the Constitution, people become numb. The American people become numb to these illegal actions.

I think it is time that we brought attention to some of these illegal actions that some Presidents in the past and some Presidents in the future may create. I think it is time that we bring these actions to the attention of the American people and let them know what our Founding Fathers had the intention to do originally, what they intended the Constitution to mean, and how it was interpreted by those very first legislators: President Washington, the Supreme Court, and others.

They took this document as a simple document. It was very plainly written and read. But, unfortunately, we have had Supreme Courts, Presidents, and legislative bodies that have tried to take these simple, basic words and turn them into something that they could use for their benefit, to try to change the way that this world works and how the laws they make are applied to our citizens.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are going to try to do as much as we can in the near future to try to bring this to the attention of the American people and the world, because I think our Constitution

has been a great cornerstone for this world and for any country that wants to have a republic, a democracy, and a people-driven form of government and to really feel that coat of liberty wrapped around them. I think our Constitution is that.

So I think it is time for us not only to make the citizens aware, but to make this whole world aware of what has been going on and what we are going to do to stop it.

RECESS

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

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

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

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

As the energy and tensions of the second session gather, may there be peace among the Members of the people's House. Grant that all might be confident in the mission they have been given and buoyed by the spirit of our ancestors who built our Republic through many trials and contentious debates. May all strive with noble sincerity for the betterment of our Nation.

Many centuries ago, You blessed Abraham for his welcome to strangers by the oaks of Mamre. Bless this Chamber this day with the same spirit of hospitality so that all Americans might know that, in the people's House, all voices are respected, even those with whom there is disagreement.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

SPYING ON CONGRESS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last week The Wall Street Journal reported that the National Security Agency, the NSA, is actively spying on Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, one of our Nation's closest allies. This revelation comes just 2 years after the President's announcement that the United States would cease spying on our allies.

The Journal wrote: ''Officials said Obama insisted that keeping tabs on Netanyahu served a 'compelling national security purpose.' ''

Specifically, the President sought to learn about President Netanyahu's opposition to the dangerous Iranian nuclear deal. In so doing, the NSA also intercepted personal, direct communication between Members of Congress, the Prime Minister, and his staff.

An editorial by The Post and Courier—republished in The Hill this week—raised important questions about the legality of the NSA's sharing private conversations with the White House and not discarding or getting judicial permission. Regrettably, this is another example of the President's disregard for our Constitution by spying on Congress, corrupting the NSA.

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

Our sympathy to the family of Staff Sergeant Matthew McClintock, an American hero.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). Members are reminded not to engage in personalities toward the President.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DOUGLAS WILSON WALKER

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

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life and legacy of my friend, Doug Walker, who passed away on December 31 on Granite Mountain, near Snoqualmie Pass.

It is this wild, rugged landscape that lured Doug to Washington State and that stoked his creativity, energy, and passions for more than four decades.

A gifted mathematician with an insatiable fondness for climbing, he established strong roots in the community. The impact he, along with his wife, Maggie, had on our community and on the many charitable causes to which he gave his time and wisdom is unparalleled.

A true champion for conservation, he cared deeply about protecting the North Cascades' most treasured lands, but his greatest passion was in broadening the constituency for conservation. He worked tirelessly to ensure that all people, especially youth and those in underserved communities, could access the outdoors.

For his incredible spirit and generosity, Doug will be remembered and missed by so many whose lives he touched. His legacy of inspiring others to experience and protect the outdoors lives on.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S EXECUTIVE ACTION ON GUN CONTROL

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

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak out against the proposed executive assault—I mean action—on our Second Amendment rights. The President has yet again overstepped, has fired off another round, and has taken dead aim at the Second Amendment. It is time Congress takes dead aim at his lawlessness.

We have three branches of government for a reason, and one branch cannot continue to unilaterally act. It is tyrannical, and it erodes the foundation of this great Nation: our Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, it is very curious to me that the President, who doesn't want his background checked into—his birth certificate, his school records, or his college grades—wants an anti-Second Amendment intrusion into actual Americans' backgrounds.

When is this administration going to realize that denying Americans their constitutional right to carry won't prevent bad people from doing bad things? It simply ensures criminals a safe path to crime.

That is how I see it. Lord help us last over these next 12 months.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Once again, Members are reminded not to engage in personalities toward the President.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY TO IMPORT HIGHLY ENRICHED LIQUID NUCLEAR WASTE

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, in 2014, the Department of Energy announced plans to import highly enriched liquid nuclear waste into the country via the busiest northern border crossing and through a major metropolitan area.

This route was approved 20 years ago, pursuant to a pre-9/11 analysis, and for

a less dangerous type of nuclear waste. Yet, the Department has refused to undertake a contemporary environmental review or threat assessment.

In response, this House passed legislation by a vote of 416–0, requiring a threat assessment of a potential terror attack on such cargo. Yet, the Department of Energy announced that it intends to ignore the clear will of this House and authorize 150 truck shipments this year without conducting the threat assessment this House demanded.

Mr. Speaker, this route was a bad idea when it was first approved 20 years ago. Disregarding the terror threat, which has increased since then, is dangerously negligent, and we will not stand by while our communities are at risk.

CONGRATULATING BEIGER ELEMENTARY STUDENTS ON WINNING 2015 INDIANA FIRST LEGO LEAGUE STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the team from Beiger Elementary School in Mishawaka, Indiana, for winning the 2015 FIRST LEGO League State Championship.

The Beiger Bots is a team of students who was judged in three areas: a theme-based project, a robot competition, and an evaluation of core values, like teamwork.

The project portion challenged the group to reduce, reuse, or recycle garbage. These students visited a local landfill and discovered that Styrofoam cutouts cannot be recycled. They brainstormed new uses for them, ultimately deciding to repurpose them as a folding breakfast tray.

After conquering Indiana, the Beiger Bots will now emerge in April at the world competition in St. Louis, the FIRST LEGO League World Festival.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Beiger Bots on their big win, and I wish them all the luck in St. Louis.

I also want to thank the parents, the coaches, the teachers, the principals, and all of the community that supported them for this big win.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the names of these students and coaches.

NAMES OF STUDENTS ON BEIGER BOTS

Jonas Knorr
Ana DeVries
Lilly Wilson
Illiana Vanlue
Jacob Stanton
David Sharp
Elizabeth Newland-Ball
Ben Pamachena
Max Ford
Briella Buchmann

NAMES OF COACHES OF BEIGER BOTS

Robert Pamachena
JoAnn Pamachena
Sarah Knorr
Maria DeVries

IN HONOR OF GARY LOCKE

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Gary Locke, a man who has brought pride and joy to my community for more than three decades as the director of the Riverside Community College's marching band.

When Gary was hired to direct the program in 1984, the school had no drums, no uniforms, and just 16 kids who showed up to camp that first summer.

Thirty-two years later, the Marching Tigers are a world-renowned marching band that has represented Riverside proudly in blockbuster movies, in television shows, and at prestigious venues around the world.

Last week Gary and his wife, Sheila, led the band for the final time when they performed ''Bon Voyage'' at the New Year's Day parade in Paris.

Congratulations, Gary, on your retirement. Thank you for inspiring your students and for invigorating our community throughout your incredible career.

TITUS MOUNTAIN

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

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, last year my district was the home of a manhunt that captured the attention of the entire Nation.

For almost a month, local, State, and Federal law enforcement agents and corrections officers made Franklin County, New York, their home as they searched for two killers who had escaped from the Clinton Correctional Facility.

Titus Mountain is a family ski area in the Adirondacks that became a part of law enforcement history as the main staging area for this intensive manhunt. I visited this past August and saw firsthand the facilities that were provided to these law enforcement agents by the Monette family.

This weekend, Titus Mountain is hosting a special event for the brave men and women who were involved in the search for these killers. It is to say thank you for their help in protecting our community.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank these law enforcement agents and corrections officers who risked their safety to protect the families in our community and to thank Titus Mountain for hosting this event.

SOUTH SOUND BEHAVIORAL HEALTH COALITION

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to highlight some progress being made to improve health care.

Right now, in my district in Pierce County, Washington, we have a startling shortage of beds for folks who are suffering from mental illness. It is a problem. It has led to overcrowded jails, it has led to people who are in severe mental crisis ending up in emergency rooms, it has led to people not getting the treatment that they need, and it has led to there being desperate families.

Folks in our region have decided to do something about it. Together with the two largest healthcare providers, our community has formed the South Sound Behavioral Health Coalition, which is comprised of healthcare experts, social service providers, local elected officials, law enforcement, business, labor, and faith leaders. We have come together with a plan to build a new facility that includes 120 beds and that bolsters local behavioral health care.

It is an extraordinary contrast to the action this week in this body in which the House voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act for the 62nd time. Leaders shouldn't be stripping away care. They should be coming together. They should take a page from my community, where folks are coming together and are moving forward together.

HONORING THE LIFE OF WILLIAM WALLACE SPRAGUE, JR.

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay respect to William Wallace Sprague, Jr., who peacefully passed away last week at the age of 89.

Mr. Sprague was born on November 11, 1926. He served 2 years in the United States Navy during World War II, and he graduated with a degree in mechanical engineering from MIT and Yale in 1950.

From 1972 to 1994, he was chairman of the board and the CEO of Savannah Foods and Industries, which was the maker of Dixie Crystals sugar. Under his leadership, Savannah Foods grew from a small regional sugar refinery to a major national sugar company and a Fortune 500 member. In fact, from 1980 to 1990, Savannah Foods was number two in total returns to shareholders with a total return of 4,862 percent.

Over the years, he also served as the director of several national and international associations. In 1999, he was inducted into the Georgia Southern University's Business Hall of Fame.

He was very involved in the Savannah community, serving as director, trustee, or president for numerous community organizations, and he also worked to improve the lives of people in the community in which he lived.

His passion for life, his sense of humor, and his enthusiasm for making Savannah, Georgia, a better place will truly be missed. My thoughts and prayers go out to his family.

□ 1215

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. PETERS. Souderton, Pennsylvania, December 15, 2014:

Patricia Hill, 75 years old.
Joanna Koder Hill, 57.
Aaron Flick, 39.
Patricia Flick, 36.
Nicole Hill, 33.
Nina Flick, 14 years old.
Rice, Texas, September 20, 2013:
Israel Alvarez, 33 years old.
Misael Alvarez, 10.
Cain Alvarez, 8.
Israel Junior Alvarez, 4.
Tulsa, Oklahoma, January 7, 2013:
Julie Jackson, 55 years old.
Misty Nunley, 33.
Rebeika Powell, 23.
Kayetie Melchor, 23 years old.
Colorado Springs, Colorado, November 27, 2015:
Officer Garrett Swasey, 44 years old.
Jennifer Markovsky, 35.
Ke'Arre Stewart, 29.
Cadiz, Kentucky, October 26, 2014:
Lindsey Champion, 62 years old.
Joy Champion, 60.
Emily Champion, 32.
Vito Riservato, 22.
Palestine, Texas, November, 14, 2014:
Carl Johnson, 77 years old.
Thomas Camp, 46.
Hannah Johnson, 40.
Nathan Camp, 23.
Austin Camp, 21.
Kade Johnson, 6.

THERE IS NO BURGER KING PROVISION IN THE CONSTITUTION

(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, the administration blames the violence in America on gun dealers and Congress. So the administration is going to issue some more executive memos and unilaterally ignore the Second Amendment.

Never mind that the administration's illegal action would not have prevented any of the tragic mass shootings in recent years. The administration should be prosecuting criminals who use guns, not vetoing the Second Amendment.

The administration's executive action on gun control is just the latest example of the White House attempting to bypass the Constitution and the legislative branch to implement a political agenda.

The Constitution does not have a Burger King provision for the executive branch. The President cannot have it his way. Laws are written by Congress. The executive is to enforce the law, and the former constitutional professor should know better than to dictate new law, regardless of whether he thinks it is a good idea or not.

The administration's edict granting of executive amnesty has already been ruled unconstitutional by lower courts, but it seems that the administration won't let the Constitution get in the way of political expediency.

And that is just the way it is.

GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION LEGISLATION

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, this time last year, I attended the State of the Union Address with my guest, Richard Martinez, whose son Christopher was gunned down during a tragic Isla Vista shooting that rocked our local community on the Central Coast of California.

Together, we committed that ''not one more'' life should be lost, ''not one more'' family affected, ''not one more'' community torn apart by gun violence.

On Tuesday, Mr. Martinez stood with the President as he announced executive actions to curb gun violence. These actions are an important step forward, but they are also a recognition that Congress has shirked its responsibility to take action to protect all Americans from this epidemic.

If we are ever going to fulfill our pledge ''not one more,'' we must take bold action.

I speak today to urge my colleagues to join us. It is far past time to act with urgency, put partisanship aside, do what is necessary to keep our neighborhoods safe. We may never be able to guarantee the elimination of gun violence entirely, but we can guarantee that, if we do nothing, nothing will change.

STAFF SERGEANT CHESTER McBRIDE

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, lining the streets of downtown Statesboro, Georgia, last weekend, hundreds of people holding American flags gathered to pay respects to a fallen hero. Air Force Sergeant Chester McBride was killed in an attack in Afghanistan that also claimed the lives of five more servicemembers last month.

He was laid to rest on Saturday, January 2. Chester was only 30 years old. He was a former starting cornerback for the 2001 Statesboro High School championship team. He excelled in sports in school, graduating from Savannah State University in 2007.

Chester had dreams of joining the FBI when he returned home. He was posthumously awarded four medals for his actions in service by the United States Air Force.

Chester chose to serve his country, and we will always remember the sacrifices he made in the name of freedom. A family has lost a son, and a community has lost a hometown hero.

May God continue to bless our servicemen and -women and their families. Let us never forget what was said 2,000 years ago: that the greatest love one can offer is to offer their lives for another.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues from both sides to stand up for the 100,000 people who have been killed by gun violence over the past decade.

It is time to stand up for the over 2,600 children who die from gun violence and the over 6,400 women who are murdered by an intimate partner by a gun each year.

I believe it is the responsibility of this body to take the steps in order to protect our citizens. We are not limiting a person's right to bear arms by requiring everyone or an entity selling firearms to obtain a license and to do background checks. We are saving lives. We are not limiting a person's right to bear arms by looking at safety technology, gun safes with fingerprint technology. We are saving lives.

We are certainly not restricting a responsible citizen from obtaining a firearm by investing in mental health care and by renewing domestic violence outreach efforts, as both are causes of gun violence.

It is time to respond to this now. The status quo is no longer acceptable.

MARCH FOR LIFE

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

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we made history. For the first time, Congress put a bill on a President's desk to defund Planned Parenthood, an organization that puts its financial interests ahead of women and children. More than that, Congress is investing in women's health by redirecting this funding to organizations that don't take innocent lives.

In Michigan, there are 20 federally qualified health clinics for every single Planned Parenthood location. Let's eliminate funding for Planned Parenthood and invest those dollars in federally qualified health centers and rural health clinics. This will ensure that women receive high quality medical care while protecting the life of the unborn.

West Michigan and the Second District of Michigan are home to passionate and dedicated pro-life organizations in Grand Rapids, Holland, and the Tri-Cities area, and Muskegon, Newaygo, and Mason Counties.

Later this month, hundreds of thousands of Americans, including many

from west Michigan, will be marching in their hometowns, as well as in Washington, D.C., as they honor the sanctity of life. I look forward to joining them.

BISHOP JAMES ARMSTRONG

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Bishop James Armstrong, a dedicated faith leader who served the west Dallas community for the past 30 years.

Bishop Armstrong was born July 12, 1940, in Karnack, Texas. He eventually relocated to Dallas to pursue a career as a professional machinist. At some time after he moved to Dallas, he felt the call to serve. He pursued his doctorate of divinity from the Christian Bible Institute and Seminary.

In 1992, Mr. Armstrong found the Community Care Fellowship Church, where he served as the senior pastor for 25 years. During his three decades of service, Bishop Armstrong remained dedicated to creating a safe environment for the community he ministered. From advocating for a neighborhood YMCA to helping the homeless, west Dallas will not forget Mr. Armstrong's devotion to serving others.

He is survived by his wife of over 50 years, Mable Armstrong; one son; three daughters; 12 grandchildren; and 11 great-grandchildren.

I urge my colleagues to join me in remembering and celebrating the life of Bishop James Armstrong's legacy and generosity to the community.

DELAWARE VALLEY FRIENDS SCHOOL

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

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Delaware Valley Friends School, its staff, students, and their parents on a very prestigious honor.

On January 19, the Paoli-based school will be presented with the Apple Distinguished School Award by the technology company Apple. This award is presented to outstanding schools and programs worldwide for innovation, leadership, and educational excellence based on five best practices: visionary leadership, innovative learning in technology, ongoing professional learning, compelling evidence of success, and a flexible learning environment.

Schools honored to receive this award must achieve educational excellence in all categories. In fact, Delaware Valley Friends School is one of only two Chester County schools to be presented with this prestigious award.

I regret I cannot attend this ceremony, but I wish the school the very best here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives on this historic achievement.

Best wishes to the Delaware Valley Friends School as they continue to provide educational excellence to its students.

TONEY ARMSTRONG

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, in Memphis, Tennessee, today our director of police, Toney Armstrong, announced he would be leaving his position.

Director Armstrong served the city of Memphis as a policeman since 1989. In 2011, he became the director of police, the youngest director in the city's history. He did a great job.

I started my career as an attorney for the police department in Memphis and served 3½ years there and knew all the directors, and none were better than Toney Armstrong, becoming director at 44 and having risen through the ranks. It is a tough job being a policeman, and it is a tough job being director of an urban police department. He did a fine job.

Toney Armstrong is moving over to St. Jude Children's Research Hospital to be head of security there. St. Jude is a blessing to Memphis and a blessing to the world. They are going to employ 7,000 new people in the next 6 years and increase their opportunities to treat children by 20 percent.

Toney Armstrong will be a great director. It is a great team, Toney Armstrong and St. Jude. Thank God for each.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON SECOND AMENDMENT

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

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the administration's most recent action that runs afoul of our Second Amendment rights.

The President's executive orders could easily impact citizens' privacy and due process, all at the whim of a bureaucrat.

Rather than putting in place new hurdles for citizens who chose to exercise their Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms, the administration's focus should be on the laws already on the books that they are not enforcing.

The administration's actions are unconstitutional and simply are another attempt to distract from the real issues at hand, particularly the onward march of terrorism and the destabilizing effect the deal with Iran is having in the Middle East. It would serve the country better to focus our full effort on defeating radical Islamic terrorists.

EXECUTIVE ACTIONS TO REDUCE GUN VIOLENCE AND MAKE OUR COMMUNITIES SAFER

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

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, nearly 5 years ago to the day, I rose to offer my support for one of my closest friends and our former colleague, Gabrielle Giffords. That day, many of us, from both sides of the aisle, mourned the six Americans whose lives were taken by a deranged gunman in Tucson, Arizona.

Since then, it has become eerily commonplace for a Member to lead a moment of silence to honor their murdered constituents: a colleague of ours whose life changed forever, twenty 6-year-old children, a Federal judge, worshippers in church.

How does Republican fervor over the right to own a gun trump the right not to be murdered by someone who shouldn't have a gun?

President Obama's executive actions are a critical step to reducing this national epidemic. They are well within his legal authority and will help keep guns out of dangerous hands. They are so critical because of Republican inaction on closing loopholes, which a majority of Americans support, and their failure to rise above the NRA's fearmongering.

Democrats will continue to bring meaningful, commonsense solutions to this floor so we can keep our Nation safer.

□ 1230

CONGRATULATIONS TO JESSICA SLAVIK

(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 recognize Deputy Jessica Slavik from the Anoka County Sheriff's Department who has recently been named the 2015 Deputy of the Year by the Minnesota Sheriffs' Association.

Jessica has worked for the Anoka County Sheriff's Office for 8 years, serving in the jail division, patrol division, court security unit, and currently as a deputy in the crime scene unit.

From staff within her department to jurors, the county attorney's office, and even a judge presiding over a case she worked on, there is no lack of praise for Deputy Slavik.

Anoka County Sheriff James Stuart says: ''Deputy Jessica Slavik exemplifies what it means to go above and beyond and embraces her role as an ambassador in our communities.''

We are proud to have a leader like Jessica in the Anoka community. Her work is invaluable to the safety of the people of Minnesota's Sixth District, and for that we are sincerely grateful.

Thank you, Deputy Slavik. Keep up the excellent work.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CRISANTA ROMERO

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

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and honor the life of 81-year-old Crisanta Romero of Thermal, California. She passed away on January 2, 2016, but she leaves behind an extraordinary legacy.

Cris is an inspiration. She graduated from Coachella Valley High School and knew the importance of being disciplined, never missing a single day of work at J. C. Penney for over 40 years. After retiring, she returned to work in the food industry for another 13 years.

She still had the energy and passion to volunteer countless hours for over 30 years with nonprofit organizations like the Coachella church, library, Center for Employment Training, senior volunteer programs, senior centers, chambers of commerce, and the list goes on and on.

She was a photojournalist for her own column, ''The Adventures of Cris.'' Mrs. Romero led the Boy Scouts of America's Helping a Boy Grow for over 20 years.

Cris was named Riverside County's volunteer of the year in 2000, and in 2003 she was honored as the city of Coachella's Citizen of the Year.

Her attitude toward life was admirable, her sense of community was exceptional, and her smile was irreplaceable.

RESTORING HEALTHCARE FREEDOM FOR AMERICANS

(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, after 5 years, the promises of ObamaCare that it would save families $2500 or so per year, let you keep your doctor, and let you keep your insurance plan have all been proven false.

In my district, rates will be seen again going up an additional 30 percent likely this year. People can no longer see their family doctor. Many people have been forced from their health insurance plans on to more expensive plans with less coverage and a higher deductible.

Thanks to a budget procedure known as reconciliation, we have avoided a Senate filibuster and placed a bill rolling back ObamaCare on the President's desk. This is a promise kept for restoring healthcare freedom for Americans.

If the President vetoes this measure, congressional Democrats have a choice to make. Will they side with Americans who need real reforms to the healthcare system and override this veto or with a President concerned solely with his legacy and a status quo that is destroying access to care and driving up costs? I wonder.

HOUSING ILLEGAL IMMIGRANT DETAINEES

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

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to the possible housing of illegal immigrant detainees on Maxwell-Gunter Air Force Base in Montgomery, Alabama.

An active military base like Maxwell-Gunter is no place to house detained minors, and I wasted no time making it clear to the Obama administration that I am paying attention to this and that I am going to fight any attempt to bring detained minors on the base.

I have written the Secretaries of Defense, Homeland Security, and Health and Human Services to express my strong objection and to explain why this is such a bad idea. I have also been in touch with leaders on base in Montgomery to discuss the potential effect on their missions.

Our personnel at Maxwell-Gunter are engaged in serious military activities: training, education, cyber warfare, many times in classified settings that are very sensitive. Their mission does not need to be distracted by being forced to house and secure hundreds of detained minors.

The most compassionate action we can take is to return these children to their homes. Housing illegal immigrants at an active military base like Maxwell-Gunter is a terrible idea, and I will continue to work every angle to shut it down, just like we did 1 year ago.

IRAN SANCTIONS ADVISER

(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, since the nuclear deal was adopted, Iran has blatantly violated U.N. Security Council resolutions on its ballistic missile program; yet once again the administration backtracked and announced a delay in applying U.S. sanctions, no doubt out of fear that the Iranians would back out of the nuclear deal. If the administration is unwilling to enforce existing law, then it is up to Congress to hold Iran accountable.

We need a senior adviser for sanctions policy in our House leadership office to help strengthen congressional oversight and coordination between the committees and ensure greater enforcement of our sanctions. This adviser would not supplant the roles of the relevant committees, but will coordinate with the committees to ensure maximum oversight and efficacy of our efforts in Congress to hold Iran accountable.

I urge my colleagues to support the creation of a slot for a House coordinator on Iranian sanctions.

THE PRESIDENT IS OVERSTEPPING HIS BOUNDARIES

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday morning President Obama formally announced his plans to unilaterally expand gun control laws. Unsurprisingly, the President has again overstepped the boundaries and powers of his office.

While we all want fewer senseless acts of violence, the President is choosing to punish lawful gun owners and restrict their Second Amendment rights instead of addressing the actual causes of mass murder, such as the need to improve our mental health system and the growing threat of terrorism.

In addition to the constitutional questions about his actions and the mislaid blame toward lawful gun owners, these executive actions won't even accomplish what the President claims is his reason for acting. Not a single mass shooting committed over the last few years would have been prevented by the gun control measures currently being discussed, a statement The Washington Post's Fact Checker gave a rare Geppetto checkmark, which is being described as ''the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.''

As a physician, I think if you want to try to prevent mass killings, you have to do more to intervene with individuals before they commit these heinous acts, which is why so many of us believe reforming our mental healthcare system is critically important.

As a proud American and concealed-carry permit holder, I am opposed to this executive overreach but will work tirelessly to accomplish reforms that reduce the chance of mass shootings ever occurring.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1927, FAIRNESS IN CLASS ACTION LITIGATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 581 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 581

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1927) to amend title 28, United States Code, to improve fairness in class action litigation. 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 amendments specified in this resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of

the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-38. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Further proceedings on any question on a motion relating to the disposition of the veto message and the bill, H.R. 3762, may be postponed through the legislative day of January 25, 2016, as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on House Resolution 581 currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring forward this rule today on behalf of the Committee on Rules. It is a structured rule that provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Given the House's schedule this month, the rule also provides that a vote on any motion relating to disposition of the veto message for reconciliation measure passed yesterday by the House may be postponed through January 25.

Consistent with the vision of Speaker RYAN and Chairman SESSIONS, I am pleased that the robust majority of amendments submitted to the Committee on Rules were made in order. Of the 13 amendments submitted, 10 amendments will be considered on the House floor.

Yesterday the House Committee on Rules received testimony from the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice, in addition to receiving amendment testimony from several Members.

Mr. FITZPATRICK from Pennsylvania brought forward an important amendment regarding FDA-approved medical devices. Although his amendment was not germane to this particular piece of legislation, he is a champion for his constituents, and I appreciate the testimony that he shared with the committee. His constituent suffered unimaginable pain, heartbreak, and ultimately her child because of Essure. It is my understanding that the FDA will release their Essure safety review next month. Once we assess the FDA's findings and conclusion, I hope Congress will take any appropriate action needed to protect the health of women and their unborn babies.

This rule provides for the consideration of H.R. 1927, the Fairness in Class Action Litigation and Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency Act of 2015, introduced by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, BOB GOODLATTE, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice, TRENT FRANKS.

Subcommittee hearings were held on this legislation. It was also marked up and reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. Although this bill went through regular order and enjoyed lively and meaningful discussion at the subcommittee and full committee levels, some misperceptions remain.

This legislation provides a targeted solution to a targeted problem. The core issue it presents is whether the injury suffered by named plaintiffs in a class action suit matches the injuries suffered by the class. Additionally, and this is the point to clarify, the civil rights class actions such as Brown v. Board of Education would not—and I repeat, would not—be impacted by H.R. 1927.

Let me be clear. This legislation does not kill class action. Virtually every time this body or the courts attempt to reform class action lawsuits after clear abuses, opponents claim the reforms, whatever they may be, will mean the demise of class action.

When Congress passed the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act in 1995 to limit frivolous securities lawsuits, opponents claimed it would kill securities class action. It did not. In fact, President Clinton vetoed the legislation, Congress overrode the veto, and our legal system is the better for it.

When Congress passed the Class Action Fairness Act, CAFA, in 2005, opponents once again claimed that the passage would mean the end of class actions. CAFA had two targeted goals: reducing abusive forum shopping by plaintiffs and requiring greater Federal scrutiny procedures for the review of class action settlements in certain circumstances.

You may recall an infamous Alabama class action involving Bank of Boston, where the attorneys' fees exceeded the relief to the class members, and the class members lost money paying attorneys for the victory. It doesn't sound like much of a victory. Yet at the time, the opponents of reform made virtually identical arguments against that legislation that they are making today against H.R. 1927. They are baseless and unsupported by history.

□ 1245

Researchers at the Federal Judicial Center conducted a study on the impact of CAFA and concluded that post-enactment there was an increase in the number of class actions filed in or removed to the Federal courts based on diversity jurisdiction, consistent with congressional intent.

The class action is alive and well and is an important part of our legal system, and it will remain that way. Claims to the contrary are overused and inaccurate.

H.R. 1927 is a targeted solution that says a Federal court may not certify a proposed class unless the party seeking the class action demonstrates through admissible evidentiary proof that each proposed class member suffered an injury of the same type and the extent of the injury of the named class representative or representatives.

This requirement already exists in rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Unfortunately, not all courts appropriately interpret and apply these standards. If my colleagues across the aisle disagree with rule 23 standards, then we can certainly debate the merits of that standard.

But to claim that codifying an existing standard to ensure consistent and appropriate application by the courts will kill the class action and discourage victims from seeking redress is simply not supported by the facts.

Class actions exist—and rightly so—to allow a group of individuals similarly harmed to seek monetary compensation for their injuries. Today, however, there are far too many cases in which a named plaintiff with an injury brings a lawsuit seeking to represent a class. No problem here. This is how the system was designed to work.

The abuse of the system arises when the class includes countless others that have suffered no injury at all. These no-injury class actions are designed simply to exploit companies and achieve a quick payday because either no genuine injury has occurred yet or because it never will.

Class actions should be preserved as a tool for those harmed to receive compensation. H.R. 1927 will allow the courts to focus their resources on cases where injury has occurred and ensuring those responsible are held accountable.

Not surprisingly, this commonsense approach is supported by the American people. A recent DRI National Poll on the Civil Justice System found that 78 percent of Americans would support a law requiring a person to show that they were actually harmed by a company's products, services, or policies to join a class action rather than just showing potential for harm.

Further illustrating this body's commitment to do right by victims and ensure that they are compensated for their injuries, H.R. 1927 also contains the text of the Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency Act, or the FACT Act.

The FACT Act is designed to reduce fraud in compensation claims for asbestos-related diseases so we can ensure that resources exist for true victims. Double-dipping is an all too common occurrence in asbestos claims, and for every dollar inappropriately given, it means $1 less for true victims who face mesothelioma and other asbestos-related illnesses.

True victims are often those to whom our country owes its greatest debt: our veterans. Veterans currently comprise 9 percent of the population; yet, they make up approximately 30 percent of asbestos victims. Veterans are uniquely positioned to benefit from the increased transparency that would result from the enactment of this bill.

Many veterans groups support this legislation, including the American Military Society, Save our Veterans, the Veterans Resource list, and numerous other State and local veterans groups.

Opponents of this bill also claim that it will negatively impact privacy rights for claimants. This is not true. The bill actually requires far less personal information than is currently required by State courts in their current disclosure forms.

This legislation will reduce fraud in the asbestos trust system, which will ultimately protect and maximize assets available to compensate future asbestos victims, veterans or otherwise.

I thank Chairman GOODLATTE and his staff for their tireless work to bring forward these pro-victim reforms, and I am pleased we will have robust general and amendment debate on this important topic.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule, which provides for consideration of H.R. 1927, called the Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act, which in practice will unfairly hamper large numbers of injured parties from effectively seeking redress in court, including civil rights, employment discrimination, consumer protection, and asbestos victim litigants.

Let me put my bona fides on the table here. I have filed class actions, particularly in civil rights cases. Each of them were certified as class actions. They led to the desegregation of schools in the county that I am privileged to serve, the desegregation of juvenile detention facilities, and several others too numerous to mention.

As a United States district court judge, I also had the privilege of presiding in cases where certification was sought for class actions. The great majority of those cases were not certified by me, largely for the reason that they did not meet the rigorous test that is already in place and that has been in place for nearly 40 years, with many changes having taken place over the years through the Federal process. That is what I would argue would be the best for us to do.

First, this bill includes language that prohibits Federal courts from certifying that a group can file a class action lawsuit unless the group demonstrates by admissible evidentiary proof that each proposed class member suffered an injury of the same type and scope of the injury of the named class representative.

A footnote right here. My read is that Brown v. Board of Education, the most significant school desegregation case in the history of this country, would not have qualified as a class action under this measure, as proposed.

My friends in the majority claim that this measure is necessary to reduce fraud and exploitation in the class action system, maintaining that, under current rules, Federal courts have certified classes that include individuals who have not been injured, but have been forced into a class action lawsuit against their will.

This claim and the legislation it inspired has been met by much opposition from a broad range of legal, civil rights, labor, consumer, and public interest groups, including the American Bar Association, the American Civil Liberties Union, AFSCME, NAACP, Consumer Federation of America, National Consumer Law Center, Public Citizen, Public Justice, and American Association for Justice, among a myriad of others.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters from the American Bar Association, Public Citizen, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, the Asbestos Disease Awareness Organization, and the Military Order of the Purple Heart. All of those organizations that I just identified are opposed to this legislation. Their language speaks for itself, for those who may peruse the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, June 23, 2015.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, House Judiciary Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: On behalf of the American Bar Association and its almost 400,000 members, I write to offer our views as the Committee considers class action reform. I understand that your Committee intends to mark up H.R. 1927, the ''Fairness in Clam Action Litigation Act of 2015'' tomorrow. The ABA has long recognized that we must continue to improve our judicial system; however, we cannot support legislation such as H.R. 1927, because it would unnecessarily circumvent the Rules Enabling Act, make it more difficult for large numbers of injured parties to efficiently seek redress in court, and would place added burdens on an already overloaded court system.

This proposed legislation would circumvent the time-proven process for amending the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure established by Congress in the Rules Enabling Act. Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure governs determinations whether class certification is appropriate. This rule was adopted in 1966 and has been amended several times utilizing the procedure established by Congress. The Judicial Conference, the policymaking body for the courts, is currently considering changes to Rule 23, and we recommend allowing this process to continue. In addition, the Supreme Court is poised to rule on cases where there are questions surrounding class certification. For example, the Court agreed to hear Tyson Foods v. Bouaphakeo, where they will determine whether a class can be certified when it contains some members who have not been injured. We respectfully urge you to allow these processes for examining and reshaping procedural and evidentiary rules to work as Congress intended.

Currently, to proceed with a class action case, plaintiffs must meet rigorous threshold standards. A 2008 study by the Federal Judicial Center found that only 25 percent of diversity actions filed as class actions resulted in class certification motions, nine percent settled, and none went to trial. These data show that current screening practices are working. However, if the proponents of this legislation are concerned about frivolous class action cases and believe that screening can be even more effective through rule changes, those changes should be proposed and considered utilizing the current process set forth by Congress in the Rules Enabling Act.

In addition to circumventing the rulemaking process, the proposed legislation would severely limit the ability of victims who have suffered a legitimate harm to collectively seek justice in a class action lawsuit. The proposed legislation mandates that in order to be certified as a class each individual member must prove he or she suffered an injury of the same type and scope to the proposed named class representative(s), and requires plaintiffs to show they suffered bodily injury or property damage.

We were pleased learn that a manager's amendment is expected to be offered during tomorrow's markup that removes the requirement that the alleged harm to the plaintiff involved bodily injury or property damage. This improves the bill, but the remaining requirement leaves a severe burden for people who have suffered harm at the hands of large institutions with vast resources, effectively barring them from forming class actions. For example, in a recent class action case against the Veterans Administration, several veterans sued for a variety of grievances centered on delayed claims. The requirement in this legislation

that plaintiffs suffer the same type of injuries might have barred these litigants from forming a class because each plaintiff suffered harms that were not the same.

Class actions have been an efficient means of resolving disputes. Making it harder to utilize class actions will add to the burden of our court system by forcing aggrieved parties to file suit in smaller groups, or individually.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide our input and urge you to keep these recommendations in mind as you continue to debate class action reform legislation. If the ABA can provide you or your staff with any additional information regarding the ABA's views, or if we can be of further assistance, please contact me or ABA Governmental Affairs Legislative Counsel, David Eppstein.

Sincerely,

THOMAS M. SUSMAN,
Director,
Governmental Affairs Office.

PUBLIC CITIZEN,
Washington, DC, May 13, 2015.

Re Oppose H.R. 26

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Judiciary Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR HONORABLE COMMITTEE MEMBERS: On behalf of Public Citizen's more than 350,000 members and supporters, we strongly urge you to oppose H.R. 526, the Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency Act (FACT Act).

The FACT Act invades the privacy of asbestos disease victims and will have the effect of delaying compensation for those suffering with lethal diseases like mesothelioma. Congress should act to protect these victims instead of opening the door for the asbestos industry to further escape accountability for poisoning the public and exposing trust claimants to scams, identity theft, and other privacy violations.

The dangerous product asbestos was once ubiquitous as insulation and flame retardant in buildings, homes and workplaces like naval vessels. The frightening reality is that an unknown amount of the cancer-causing substance is still present in our surroundings, but the asbestos industry does not have to disclose where and when it was and is being used.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention report that roughly 3,000 people continue to die from mesothelioma and asbestosis every year and some experts estimate the death toll is as high as 12,000–15,000 people per year when other types of asbestos-linked diseases and cancers are included.

Instead of helping these victims, H.R. 526 would put unworkable burdens on claims trusts. For example, the bill would impose a requirement for trusts to respond to any and all corporate defendants' information requests. Such a requirement would have the effect of slowing or virtually stopping the ability of trusts to provide compensation for victims. Since patients diagnosed with fatal asbestos-caused diseases like mesothelioma have very short expected lifespans, a delay in justice could leave victims' next of kin struggling to pay medical and funeral bills.

The FACT Act does nothing to improve the lives of those facing an asbestos death sentence through no fault of their own. The bill instead adds insult to injury and inexcusably invades the privacy of victims by requiring public disclosure of personal claim information, including portions of their social security numbers, opening the door to identity theft and possible discrimination.

Instead of the FACT Act's misguided push for ''transparency'' via asbestos trust claim information disclosures, an appropriate transparency standard would ensure that workers and consumers have all the information necessary to limit their potential exposure to the deadly substance. Specifically, companies should publicly disclose their activities related to the manufacture, processing, distribution, sales, importation, transport or storage of asbestos or asbestos-containing products. That's why Public Citizen supports Sens. Durbin and Markey's and Reps. DelBene and Green's Reducing Exposure to Asbestos Database Act (READ Act, S. 700/H.R. 2030) which would create an information portal for the public to learn about the many asbestos-containing products that are currently bought and sold in the U.S.A.

The real outrage is the double oppression of asbestos victims, and the real need for transparency is disclosure of past and ongoing asbestos exposures. Please oppose H.R. 526.

Sincerely,

LISA GILBERT,
Director, Public Citizen's Congress Watch division.

SUSAN HARLEY,
Deputy Director, Public Citizen's Congress Watch division.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, DC, January 5, 2016.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I am writing to express the strong opposition of the AFL–CIO to H.R. 1927, the ''Fairness in Class Action Litigation and Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency Act'' which is scheduled for consideration by the House of Representatives this week. This bill incorporates H.R. 526, the Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency Act (FACT Act), which would invade the privacy of asbestos victims by posting personal exposure and medical information online and create new barriers to victims receiving compensation for their asbestos diseases. The AFL–CIO urges you to oppose this harmful bill.

Decades of uncontrolled use of asbestos, even after its hazards were known, have resulted in a legacy of disease and death. Hundreds of thousands of workers and family members have suffered or died of asbestos-related cancers and lung disease, and the toll continues. Each year an estimated 10,000 people in the United States are expected to die from asbestos related diseases.

Asbestos victims have faced huge barriers and obstacles to receiving compensation for their diseases. Major asbestos producers refused to accept responsibility and most declared bankruptcy in an attempt to limit their future liability. In 1994 Congress passed special legislation that allowed the asbestos companies to set up bankruptcy trusts to compensate asbestos victims and reorganize under the bankruptcy law. But these trusts don't have adequate funding to provide just compensation, and according to a 2010 RAND study, the median payment across the trusts is only 25 percent of the claim's value. With compensation from these trusts so limited, asbestos victims have sought redress from the manufacturers of other asbestos products to which they were exposed.

The AFL–CIO is well aware that the system for compensating asbestos disease victims has had its share of problems, with victims facing delays and inadequate compensation and too much money being spent on defendant and plaintiff lawyers. We have spent years of effort trying to seek solutions to make the asbestos compensation system fairer and more effective. But the FACT Act does nothing to improve compensation for asbestos victims and would in fact make the situation even worse. In our view, the bill is simply an effort by asbestos manufacturers who are still subject to asbestos lawsuits to avoid liability for diseases caused by exposure to their products.

The FACT Act would require personally identifiable exposure histories and disease information for each asbestos victim filing a claim with an asbestos trust, and related payment information, to be posted on a public docket. This public posting is an extreme invasion of privacy. It would give unfettered access to employers, insurance companies, workers compensation carriers and others who could use this information for any purpose including blacklisting workers from employment and fighting compensation claims.

The bill would also require asbestos trusts to provide on demand to asbestos defendants and litigants any information related to payments made by and claims filed with the trusts. This would place unnecessary and added burdens on the trusts delaying much-needed compensation for asbestos victims. Such a provision allows asbestos defendants to bypass the established rules of discovery in the civil justice system, and provides broad unrestricted access to personal information with no limitations on its use.

Congress should be helping the hundreds of thousands of individuals who are suffering from disabling and deadly asbestos diseases, not further victimizing them by invading their privacy and subjecting them to potential blacklisting and discrimination.

The AFL–CIO strongly urges you to oppose H.R. 1927.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL,
Director, Government Affairs Department.

ASBESTOS DISEASE AWARENESS ORGANIZATION,
Redondo Beach, CA, February 4, 2015.

Re Opposition to the Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency Act of 2015 (H.R. 526)

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

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, JR.,
Ranking Member, House Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE AND RANKING MEMBER CONYERS: As both a mesothelioma widow and the President and Co-Founder of the Asbestos Disease Awareness Organization, I respectfully write to express my strong opposition to the Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency (FACT) Act of 2015, H.R. 526.

Asbestos is a known human carcinogen that causes deadly cancerous diseases. Asbestos-related diseases kill at least 10,000 Americans every year. Yet, it remains a major public health hazard that severely affects too many American families. Notwithstanding these lethal exposures, the 2014 U.S. Geological Survey World Report confirmed that although Asbestos has not been mined in the United States since 2002, the U.S. continues to import Asbestos to ''meet manufacturing needs.''

These same manufacturing interests who for years hid the dangers of their lethal Asbestos products, are now asking Congress—under the guise of transparency—to impose new time and cost-consuming requirements on the asbestos trusts, grant asbestos defendants new rights to infringe upon victims' privacy, and operate the trusts in a manner that will unduly burden asbestos victims and their families, without justification. I oppose the bill not only because it is both fundamentally unfair and discriminatory toward asbestos cancer victims, but because it is entirely one-sided, and seeks absolutely nothing in the way of increased transparency from the same industry that caused the largest man-made disaster in human history, and covered it up for years.

There is no justification for exposing families to the additional burdens set forth in H.R. 526. Information needed to verify the health of the trusts is already publicly available in a way that protects the privacy of the victims of asbestos disease and their families. And trusts established by asbestos companies undergoing reorganization effectively compensate current and future asbestos victims while allowing business operations to continue. Trusts are designed to decrease litigation and costs, yet the proposed reporting requirements contained in the FACT Act work contrary to that very purpose. Instead, the FACT Act grants asbestos companies the right to require from the trusts any information they choose, at any time, and for practically any reason. The resulting delay in compensation will gravely impact patients' pursuit of medical care, negatively affects all victims of asbestos exposure, and effectively limits the justice they deserve. Accordingly, I am strongly opposed to the FACT Act, which creates even greater burdens for patients and families to overcome during an already extremely difficult time.

I am extremely disappointed that recent Congressional legislative efforts have focused on ways to limit the litigation designed to compensate victims, when the most obvious way to limit the impact of asbestos exposure is through increased public awareness of the dangers posed, and prevention. Americans need legislation that will stop the continued import of asbestos into our country, and prevent the continued expanse of environmental and occupational asbestos-related diseases. As consumers and workers, Americans deserve transparency to prevent exposure to asbestos, not to penalize victims.

More than 30 Americans die each day from a preventable asbestos-caused disease. On behalf of the American citizens, we urge you to take the time to hear from the victims of asbestos exposure and consider legislation that will protect public health, not legislation designed only to delay and deny justice for victims of asbestos exposure.

Sincerely,

LINDA REINSTEIN,
President and Co-Founder,
Asbestos Disease Awareness Organization.

MILITARY ORDER
OF THE PURPLE HEART,
Springfield, VA, July 8, 2015.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CONYERS: As H.R. 526 ''FACT Act'' makes it way through the legislative process, the Military Order of the Purple Heart of the U.S.A. (MOPH) wishes to reiterate its firm opposition to this bill.

We are disappointed to see that our declaration of opposition in February of this year has not stopped this bill in its tracks. Have no doubt and make no mistake, the FACT Act will have a very burdensome and detrimental effect on the asbestos personal injury trust claims for veterans and their families who have been exposed to this deadly product. The Association of the United States Navy (AUSN) and American Veterans (AMVETS) recognize this as well and recently joined us in opposing this legislation.

On May 14th during the full Judiciary Committee mark-up of H.R. 526 ''FACT Act'', the legislation's author, Representative Blake Farenthold shared with the committee a list of eleven ''veterans organizations'' that support the FACT Act. It needs to be noted that none of the groups mentioned were a national veterans service organization such as the MOPH. In fact, the majority of the groups listed by the Representative are not recognized veterans service organizations at all.

The Military Order of the Purple Heart, of the U.S.A. is a Congressionally chartered national veterans service organization and is the only one that is exclusively made up of combat wounded Purple Heart veterans. We carefully consider each piece of veterans' related legislation to assure it is either truly beneficial or truly negative for veterans before we take an official position. We speak on behalf of our 45,000 members across the nation, not just a couple of hundred in a few states.

H.R. 526 is bad for veterans. The MOPH has been, and will continue to be, staunch advocates for our members and all veterans of the United States Armed Forces. We continue to oppose H.R. 526 and respectfully ask you to join us.

Respectfully,

J. PATRICK LITTLE,
National Commander.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, the reality is that the current screening practices for certifying which individuals may file a class action lawsuit are working. Currently, plaintiffs must meet, as I said earlier, rigorous threshold standards to proceed with a class action.

In fact, a 2008 study by the Federal Judicial Center found that only 25 percent of diversity actions filed as class actions resulted in class certification motions. In the cases I presided in, there were less than 25 percent. 9 percent settled and none went to trial.

Why must we begin this new year with yet another piece of legislation that is a solution in search of a problem?

In short, this ill-conceived and unneeded bill unnecessarily circumvents the Rules Enabling Act, the process established by the Congress to amend the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, making it more difficult for large numbers of injured parties to effectively seek redress in court and would place additional burdens on an already overloaded court system.

I should add that the Judicial Conference, the policymaking body for the Federal courts of this country, is currently considering changes to rule 23, which governs determination of whether class certification is appropriate, and the Supreme Court has agreed to hear cases where there are questions surrounding class certification, including Tyson Foods v. Bouaphakeo.

It would behoove us to allow these processes for examining and revising procedural and evidentiary rules to work as Congress intended.

The requirement in this bill that each proposed class member must prove he or she suffered an injury of the same type and scope of the injury of the named class representative effectively bars individuals who have suffered harm at the hands of large institutions with immense resources from forming class actions.

I am also highly concerned that the injury language included in this bill will exclude from the courts entire categories of lawsuits, most significantly, victims of discriminatory practices or civil rights violations seeking redress.

A commonsense reading of this provision, as I indicated, might well have excluded class actions such as Brown v. Board of Education. Brown served as a catalyst for the modern civil rights movement, ultimately leading to full equality for African Americans.

Under this legislation, class action plaintiffs must effectively prove the merits of their case as a condition of class certification, making most class actions nearly impossible to pursue.

A mechanism must exist to hold corporations and other entities accountable when they engage in systemic discrimination, unfair and deceptive practices, consumer fraud, and other wrongdoing that harms large numbers of people. This bill undermines this vital tool.

Let me give you an example, which is the cases brought against airbag deception that are currently being litigated and that we see much of in the news. If we were to look at scope of injury, some people were killed, and some people received minor injuries. Some people who had those airbags did not receive injuries.

But it seems logical to allow that all of the persons who had those automobiles should have an opportunity for corrective procedures, regardless of whether or not that was a wrongful death or whether or not there was an injury. The scope becomes nebulous when you look at it from the perspective of actual circumstances that we are confronted with sometimes in class actions.

H.R. 1927 also includes a provision—and this troubles me deeply and should trouble everybody that is in Congress and in this Nation—that would delay the work of asbestos compensation trusts. Formerly, the Furthering Asbestos Claim Transparency Act, section 3 of this bill, will shield the asbestos industry from accountability while exposing trust claimants to scams, identity theft, and other privacy violations.

This portion of the bill is similarly opposed by a number of groups that I have identified, including the Military Order of the Purple Heart, the Asbestos Disease Awareness Organization, and the Environmental Working Group, just to name a few.

For instance, the bill requires trusts to respond to any and all corporate defendants' requests for information. Ladies and gentlemen, that could take years. By that time, many of the complainants may very well have died. And what troubles me a lot is that the trust fund is making money.

It is similar to what automobile insurance companies do. When there is an automobile accident, if they think that there was harm perpetrated by their insured, they immediately establish a fund that would cover that liability. Then their lawyers go to work to not pay the claim at all and, next, to delay the claim.

The longer they keep it away from an ultimate settlement, the more money the insurance company makes. And they make enough money sometimes

to pay the claim that they could have settled or paid the claim of the injured victim in the first place.

□ 1300

The measure also requires public disclosure of personal claim information, including portions of those with asbestos-related diseases' Social Security numbers.

Interestingly, this legislation does not impose these same burdensome reporting requirements for the companies that exposed Americans to asbestos.

Despite its promise, this bill does nothing to improve judicial efficiency or reduce fraud in the court system and, instead, severely hampers justice for victims of corporate wrongdoing.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN), a good friend of mine.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today against another handout to corporate interests, this time needlessly limiting access to courts for American consumers and workers.

The bill we would consider under this rule is the second blow in a one-two punch for American families. We kicked off 2016 by defunding Planned Parenthood and, effectively, repealing the Affordable Care Act.

Now we are considering legislation that would limit class action lawsuits, and needlessly threaten the privacy of asbestos victims, as well as other victims of faulty product designs, negligence, and dangerous environmental occurrences.

The end goal is obvious: enable corporations to avoid both blame and accountability when they have harmed consumers or knowingly exposed workers to toxic chemicals.

I wish that I were more surprised, but I am not. The truth is clear in this bill. It is just the next step in Republican efforts to lift corporate interests above any level of scrutiny, endangering citizens and consumers in the process.

Our courts are a cornerstone of justice for everyday Americans. We need to find ways to expand, not restrict, access to our legal system for victims.

Class actions have cleaned up the environment after oil spills, banned cigarette ads aimed at children, and policed price-fixing on Wall Street, among many other things.

Other nations allow big corporations to run amok, harming people through dangerous products, fraud, and dishonesty, virtually unchecked. But here in the United States of America, class action lawsuits are a vital tool that hold even the very powerful accountable for their malfeasance.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to get to work on policies for the American people, not against them, and I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 1927.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), my good friend and former member of the Rules Committee; and we miss him.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the 114th Congress will be remembered as the Congress that tried and tried again to unravel the extraordinary and great achievements of that American President of a century ago, Theodore Roosevelt.

President Roosevelt was a Republican. He believed in capitalism, he believed in profit, he believed in commerce. But he understood something that this Congress seems to forget: The axiom that power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely, applies to Wall Street and to large corporations as much as it does to oligarchs and despots.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation does end any realistic opportunity for consumers who are hammered by corporate negligence or irresponsibility or outright deceit from joining together to get the justice they are entitled to by using the only practical means available to obtain it, the class action lawsuit.

Instead, this legislation would deny class action status to all consumers affected by the exact same corporate misconduct—say, faulty brakes—unless they suffered the identical injury, a broken arm, but not a broken leg.

In a case of current moment, of real corporate misconduct and actual deceit, Volkswagen lying about its emissions control and, really, fudging the numbers on its mileage, the 3,000 Vermonters and 11 million Americans would have to file individual suits unless each suffered the same exact economic loss.

What is the justification for building this barrier to access to the courts? There is none.

But the proponents of this legislation are advocating, idealistically and ideologically, the underpinning of so much other legislation for Americans who are seeking safety, who are seeking opportunity, who are seeking justice.

Think about it. Repealing the ACA, Affordable Care Act, with no replacement for those 17 million Americans who are now covered; unraveling Dodd-Frank, leaving Wall Street to its old ways that led to the collapse of the economy in 2008; denying Puerto Rico, at the last minute, the option that every other municipality or State has if there is a credit situation to go into bankruptcy, all in service of hedge fund billionaire investors from Wall Street.

Starving the FTC and the SEC of their budgets so that they are no longer able to provide protections to consumers and small investors that they are entitled to.

Teddy Roosevelt, capitalist that he was, would never have stacked the deck so high against everyday Americans.

You know, we are talking a lot in this country about income inequality that is real. We can debate the causes.

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

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

Mr. WELCH. But the reality is we are building a structure of inequality, bill by bill, brick by brick. Denying class action access to the courts for everyday Americans injured by similar or the same corporate misconduct is to deny them a basic American right.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to vote against this legislation and stand up for access to justice.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House of Representatives cast its 62nd vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

That we began the second session of the 114th Congress in this manner sends the regrettable, but undeniable message that it may be a new year, and we may have a new Speaker, but we are dealing with the same old majority Congress, intent on advancing partisan measures with little chance of becoming law.

H.R. 1927 will serve to close the courthouse doors to concerned and vulnerable citizens injured by large corporations.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up bipartisan legislation that will close a glaring loophole in our gun laws, allowing suspected terrorists to legally buy firearms. This bill would bar the sale of firearms and explosives to those on the FBI's terrorist watch list.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, a lot can be said, and I am so glad for the coming to the floor later. This will be debated, amendments will be offered. The House is in regular order doing what the House is supposed to be doing.

One thing that I would like to share is, as the previous speaker had talked about history—and I am currently, myself, reading a biography outtake on Theodore Roosevelt and his time in the Presidency and the things that he did—there is an amazing balance that he

struck for, basically, common people and victims.

I think that is exactly what we are doing here, because one of the things that the underlying bills do not do is they do not close the courthouse. They do not do the things that, if you look in history, as I pointed out in my opening statement, if you look at every time the Congress has taken up the class action issue, there has been the falling-of-the-sky phenomenon, that it is going to tear the courthouse down, nobody is going to get anything done.

The actual truth is the class action has increased and efficiency was found. And for the true victims, they find their compensation.

The courthouse that I have had the wonderful privilege of practicing in is a place where people find justice. It is not a place to be abused. It is not a place to sometimes take advantage of an open system. That is what we are doing here, and that is what I want people who read and understand this opportunity, because these are the same arguments that have been had before.

But, you know, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to come before this body, explore the differences between the Republican majority's vision for our country and that of this administration and those who share the President's view.

The Republican majority is fighting for a legal system that is victim-focused; a legal system that supports our veterans and ensures that those injured have their day in court and receive compensation.

A legal system full of fraud, abuse, and waste is a legal system ill-equipped to provide justice to victims.

The Republican majority is committed to making life better for all Americans. We have done that this week through reducing the regulatory burden on families and small businesses so we can jump-start our economy.

We have done that this week by sending to the President's desk a bill that rescinds ObamaCare so that we can get to work on restoring a patient-centered healthcare system, such as the Empowering Patients First Act proposed by my colleague, Dr. PRICE.

And let it be said, just as has been said over the centuries, doing the right thing over and over is still the right thing. And I believe if it is 62 times, it can be 62 more times, because this Congressman from the Ninth District of Georgia believes, as his constituents have found in the Ninth District, that ObamaCare is not for the people and needs to be gone and replaced with a patient-centered approach that we can do as a Republican majority.

You see, we have also sent to the President's desk a measure to stop Planned Parenthood from destroying our next generation of men and women and directing those funds to organizations that provide mammograms and true women's health care.

And we will continue to fight to keep our Nation safe from enemies, foreign and domestic, while preserving the sacred constitutional rights of all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and H.R. 1927.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 581 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS

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

SEC. 3. 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. 1076) to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to a known or suspected dangerous terrorist. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. 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. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1076.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1315

SUNSHINE FOR REGULATORY DECREES AND SETTLEMENTS ACT OF 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous remarks on H.R. 712.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 580 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. 712.

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

□ 1316

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. 712) to impose certain limitations on consent decrees and settlement agreements by agencies that require the agencies to take regulatory action in accordance with the terms thereof, and for other purposes, with Mr. BOST 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, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes. The gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 712, the Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015. H.R. 712 includes H.R. 1759, the All Economic Regulations are Transparent Act of 2015, or the ALERT Act, which the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform favorably reported on May 29, 2015.

We have had some good pieces of legislation that made their way through the process, and we really do appreciate the great work of Congressman RATCLIFFE.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015.

I want to thank Chairman CHAFFETZ and Chairman GOODLATTE for their hard work on this package of bills that will help push the government out of the way of the American people. I am especially grateful that the ALERT Act, which I introduced earlier this Congress, is included as title II of the bill.

The constituents that I represent in northeast Texas work hard every day to provide for their families and to contribute to their communities. But I can tell you from countless conversations that they are fed up with a Federal Government that has been invading every aspect of their lives. They are frustrated with unaccountable, unelected bureaucrats who create regulations that have the force of law, regulations that typically appear out of nowhere and bring with them huge price tags for the cost of compliance, often with little time to prepare and implement them.

In some cases, regulators are unforgiving to those who either can't or don't timely comply by imposing criminal penalties. Now, let's pause to think about that. Bureaucrats hammering otherwise law-abiding Americans with criminal penalties for regulatory violations at a time when the same administration is giving a free pass to millions of illegal aliens for breaking immigration laws, giving early release to tens of thousands of prisoners—violent criminals—and turning loose radical Islamic terrorists from Guantanamo. It is little wonder that my constituents are outraged.

And if it were up to this administration, the problem would get worse, not better. To underscore that point, we need only look at the Federal Register where agencies publish their mandates. That document contained 82,000 pages last year, meaning that this administration averaged more than 224 pages of new regulations every day of the year.

Americans have every right to demand to know what we are doing here in Congress to stop them from being crushed by this snowball of regulations.

Part of the answer should be that current law requires an update twice a year on Federal regulations being developed by Federal agencies. But guess what. Under this administration, these updates have either been late or not issued at all, and until now, there hasn't been a way to hold these unelected bureaucrats accountable.

My bill does just that. This bill forces the executive branch to make the American people aware of regulations that are coming down the track, and it prohibits any regulations from going into effect unless and until detailed information on the cost of that regulation—its impact on jobs and the legal bases for it—is made available to the public for at least 6 months.

Predictably, the President and others argue that this bill is too tough on regulators. But do you know what? I am here to fight for hardworking Americans, not for unelected Washington bureaucrats.

Mr. Chairman, ensuring that folks aren't steamrolled by new regulations should be a no-brainer. Transparency shouldn't be controversial, it shouldn't be optional, and it shouldn't be a partisan issue. That is why I was honored to introduce the ALERT Act and why I am grateful that it has been included in this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 712. This legislation represents yet another attack by House Republicans on critical public health, safety, and environmental protections. I oppose this unnecessary and potentially dangerous legislation in its entirety. However, I will focus my remarks today on title II of this bill, which is in the jurisdiction of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Title II, also known as the ALERT Act, is an attack on agency rulemaking that is inaccurately advertised as an effort to improve transparency. In fact, this bill explicitly prohibits the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs from taking into account benefits when providing estimated cumulative costs to proposed and final rules. That is not providing transparency. That is providing one side of the story.

The Coalition for Sensible Safeguards, which represents over 150 good government, labor, scientific, and health organizations, sent a letter opposing the ALERT Act when it was marked up in the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. The letter states:

''The requirements of the ALERT Act, which would delay important public protections and waste scarce government resources, fail to provide needed transparency improvements in the regulatory review process. Instead, the reporting requirements mandated under the ALERT Act would undermine transparency by generating cherry-picked data that seems calculated to provide a distorted picture of the U.S. regulatory system.''

The bill would also prevent a rule from taking effect until certain information is posted online for at least 6 months. The only exceptions to this requirement would be if an agency exempts the rule from the notice and comment requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act or if the President issues an executive order. This is an unnecessary roadblock that jeopardizes public health and public safety.

One example of a rule that would be affected by this bill is the recently published ATF regulation that closes a loophole that allowed individuals to avoid required background checks when purchasing some of the most dangerous weapons through trusts or legal entities. Under the bill, this rule could not take effect until certain information had been posted online by the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs for 6 months. That is 6 months, that delay, in putting commonsense gun safety procedures in place and would delay them.

Many of the disclosure requirements in this legislation are redundant. Agencies already publish regulatory plans twice a year. This bill would require agencies to provide monthly updates to

their regulatory plans. This is unnecessarily burdensome and would require agencies to divert already scarce resources to comply.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 712.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS). He is the author and lead sponsor of the underlying bill.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support today of H.R. 712, the Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act.

I would like to thank Chairman GOODLATTE, who will be coming along shortly, as my chairman on the Judiciary Committee for his support and work, and the Judiciary Committee staff. I would also like to thank the chairman of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, my friend, Mr. CHAFFETZ, a committee which I have served on that continues to do great work, along with the ranking member. It is good to be with you today.

This is legislation—to me, especially H.R. 712—that addresses a problem and has been passed by the House on three separate occasions to address sue and settle practices that serve special interests at the expense of the American people. This is something I have been dealing with since I have been in Congress because it goes to the heart of what I have spoken to many times about the Republican majority and our interest in fairness and our interest in making the court system work for people.

What this bill actually does is actually—the heart and the core of it—goes after sue and settle litigation, consent decrees, that are taken behind closed doors without, many times, those that are affected even having the ability to give input into those and then being affected by that.

So, if I had a problem with someone and I couldn't resolve it, I would just go to the agency, such as the EPA or others who may have sympathetic leanings, and I say, ''You are not doing what you are supposed to be doing.'' I threaten to sue. We get behind closed doors. We settle something. The judge makes a consent order, and then I take it back to the areas that are affected, and they have no input into that. That is just not fair, inherently not fair.

This bill simply is about transparency. To be against this bill is to be against transparency. To be against this legislation is to say that we believe it is okay to cut people out when they are affected.

Just to let you know how this is affected, between 2009 and 2012, 71 lawsuits were settled as sue and settle cases and directly led to the issuance of more than 100 new Federal Rules—100 new Federal Rules—out of consent decrees, including several with a compliance cost—listen to this. We want to talk about small business, we want to talk about local governments being burdened. Listen to this compliance cost: $100 million in excess.

This issue is not partisan. Cass Sunstein, President Obama's former regulatory czar, called the idea of reforming the sue and settle process excellent.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. He stated: ''In some cases, agencies don't really disagree but have refrained from acting in part because of political constraints.''

He is right. Agencies use sue and settle to skirt potentially political issues.

This is about fairness. This is about simplicity. This is a bill that is brought forward to take care of the American people and the burdensome regulations—not to stop it, but to simply get our country working again.

JANUARY 6, 2016.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The 250 undersigned groups strongly support efforts by the House of Representatives to make federal agencies more accountable to the American public and improve the transparency of agency actions. The federal rulemaking process was founded on principles of open government and public participation.

We are pleased, therefore, that the House is voting on a comprehensive regulatory reform bill, H.R. 712, the ''Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act,'' which would take important steps to stop the abusive practice known as ''sue and settle'' and give the public and affected parties a greater ability to know about potential rulemakings and to participate.

H.R. 712 embodies several major principles of accountability, transparency, and fairness, drawn directly from three regulatory reform bills:

Title I—the ''Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act.'' Behind closed doors, organizations and agencies enter into consent decrees or settlement agreements compelling the agencies to issue rules on an expedited timeframe. The states and the public are not given notice of the lawsuits, nor do they have a meaningful voice in the process, despite the adverse impact that rushed, sloppy regulations have on them. This title would improve the ''sue and settle'' process by requiring agencies to give early notice and take public comment on proposed settlement agreements obligating agencies to initiate a rulemaking or take other action on a specified timetable. These settlement agreements allow interest groups to commandeer an agency's agenda and regulatory priorities. The bill would allow affected parties to get notice of draft settlements and provide some opportunity to participate.

Title II—the ''All Economic Rules are Transparent (ALERT) Act.'' This title would require agencies to disclose rulemakings the agency plans to propose or finalize to OMB's Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA). OIRA would disseminate information about these planned rules to the public, including their estimated costs and benefits.

Title III—the ''Providing Accountability Through Transparency Act.'' This title would require federal agencies to notify the public of proposed rules each month by posting a brief, plain-English summary of each proposed regulation on regulations.gov.

Taken together, these reforms would help Congress to reassert control over federal regulatory agency actions that have become opaque, unaccountable, and often unfair. Congress must perform its critical role as overseer of the federal agencies.

The undersigned groups strongly support H.R. 712, the ''Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act,'' and its comprehensive approach to regulatory reform. We urge you to pass this important bill.

Sincerely,

Alabama: Alabama Forestry Association, Business Council of Alabama, Mobile Area Chamber of Commerce.

Alaska: Alaska Chamber, Greater Fairbanks Chamber of Commerce.

Arizona: Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Arizona Mining Association, Gilbert Chamber of Commerce, Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce, Lake Havasu Area Chamber of Commerce, Marana Chamber of Commerce, Tucson Metro Chamber.

Arkansas: Arkansas Independent Producers & Royalty Owners Association (AIPRO), Arkansas State Chamber of Commerce, Associated Industries of Arkansas.

California: American Concrete Pressure Pipe Association, California Asphalt Pavement Association (CalAPA), California Association of Boutique & Breakfast Inns, California Hotel & Lodging Association, Cerritos Regional Chamber of Commerce, Far West Equipment Dealers Association, Gateway Chambers Alliance, Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce, Milk Producers Council, Motorcycle Industry Council, Orange County Business Council, Plumbing-Heating-Cooling of California, San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce, San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership.

Colorado: Associated General Contractors of Colorado, Colorado Business Roundtable, Colorado Timber Industry Association, Home Builders Association of Northern Colorado, Western Energy Alliance.

Connecticut: Connecticut Business & Industry Association, Gasoline & Automotive Service Dealers of America, Inc.

Delaware: Rehoboth Beach-Dewey Beach Chamber of Commerce & Visitor Center.

Florida: Associated Industries of Florida, Florida Chamber of Commerce, Florida Transportation Builders' Association Orlando, Inc.

Georgia: Georgia Chamber, Georgia Mining Association, Georgia Paper & Forest Products Association, Southeastern Lumber Manufacturers Association.

Idaho: Associated Logging Contractors, Inc.—Idaho, Idaho Trucking Association.

Illinois: American Foundry Society, Greater Oak Brook Chamber of Commerce, ISSA—The Worldwide Cleaning Industry Association, Land Improvement Contractors of America (LICA), Mason Contractors Association of America, National Roofing Contractors Association, Non-Ferrous Founders' Society, North American Association of Food Equipment Manufacturers (NAFEM), North American Die Casting Association, Property Casualty Insurers Association of America, STI/SPFA, The Illinois Chamber of Commerce, Western DuPage Chamber of Commerce.

Indiana: Indiana Cast Metals Association (INCMA), Indiana Chamber of Commerce, Indiana Motor Truck Association.

Iowa: Ames Chamber of Commerce, Mason City Chamber of Commerce.

Kansas: Kansas Chamber of Commerce.

Kentucky: Greater Louisville Inc., Kentucky Chamber of Commerce, Kentucky Coal Association, Kentucky Forest Industries Association, Kentucky Petroleum Marketers Association.

Louisiana: Houma-Terrebonne Chamber of Commerce, Louisiana Association of Business and Industry (LABI), Louisiana Landowners Association, Louisiana Oil & Gas Association.

Maryland: Flexible Packaging Association, Maryland Asphalt Association, Inc., National Ready Mixed Concrete Association.

Massachusetts: Metro South Chamber of Commerce.

Michigan: AGC of Michigan, Associated Wire Rope Fabricators, Foundry Association of Michigan, Michigan Chamber of Commerce.

Minnesota: Associated General Contractors of Minnesota, Grand Rapids Area Chamber of Commerce.

Mississippi: Mississippi Petroleum Marketers and Convenience Stores Association, Mississippi Propane Gas Association.

Missouri: Equipment Dealers Association, Missouri Chamber, Missouri Grocers Association, Missouri Pest Management Association, National Corn Growers Association, Western Equipment Dealers Association.

Montana: Billings Chamber of Commerce, Kalispell Chamber of Commerce, Montana Chamber of Commerce, Montana Petroleum Marketers & Convenience Store Association.

Nebraska: Lincoln Chamber of Commerce, Nebraska Chamber of Commerce & Industry.

Nevada: Carson Valley Chamber of Commerce, The Chamber of Reno, Sparks, and Northern Nevada.

New Jersey: Morris County Chamber of Commerce, New Jersey Business & Industry Association, New Jersey Motor Truck Association, New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce.

New Mexico: New Mexico Cattle Growers' Association, New Mexico Wool Growers, Inc.

New York: Buffalo Niagara Partnership, North Country Chamber of Commerce, Northeastern Retail Lumber Association.

North Carolina: Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association, North Carolina Manufacturers Alliance.

North Dakota: Bismarck-Mandan Chamber of Commerce, Bismarck-Mandan Home Builders Association, Dickinson Area Builders Association, Forx Builders Association, Greater North Dakota Chamber, Home Builders Association of Fargo-Moorhead, Minot Association of Builders, North Dakota Association of Builders, Williston Area Builders Association.

Ohio: Cellulose Insulation Manufacturers Association, Forging Industry Association, Heating, Air-Conditioning & Refrigeration Distributors International (HARDI), Industrial Fasteners Institute, National Tooling and Machining Association, Ohio Cast Metals Association (OCMA), Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Ohio Forestry Association, Ohio Trucking Association, Precision Machined Products Association, Precision Metalforming Association, Youngstown/Warren Regional Chamber.

Oklahoma: Gas Processors Association, Greater Oklahoma City Chamber, Oklahoma Independent Petroleum Association, The State Chamber of Oklahoma, Tulsa Regional Chamber.

Oregon: Associated Oregon Industries, Associated Oregon Loggers, Inc., Klamath County Chamber of Commerce, Oregon Retail Council, Roseburg Area Chamber of Commerce, The Chamber of Medford/Jackson County.

Pennsylvania: Chester County Chamber of Business & Industry, Pennsylvania Chamber of Business and Industry, Pennsylvania Forest Products Association, Pennsylvania Foundry Association, Pennsylvania Independent Oil & Gas Association, Printing Industries of America, Schuylkill Chamber of Commerce, The Pennsylvania Corn Growers Association Inc.

South Carolina: Charleston Metro Chamber of Commerce, Myrtle Beach Area Chamber of Commerce, North Myrtle Beach Chamber of Commerce, CVB South Carolina Timber Producers Association.

South Dakota: Black Hills Forest Resource Association, Intermountain Forest Association.

Tennessee: Johnson City, TN Chamber of Commerce, National Cotton Council, Tennessee Cattlemen's Association, Tennessee Chamber of Commerce & Industry, Tennessee Paper Council.

Texas: American Loggers Council, Consumer Energy Alliance, Electronic Security Association (ESA), Laredo Chamber of Commerce, Longview Chamber of Commerce, McAllen Chamber of Commerce, Texas Association of Business, Texas Cast Metals Association, Texas Mining and Reclamation Association (TMRA), Texas Wildlife Association.

Utah: Salt Lake Chamber, Utah Mining Association.

Virginia: American Composites Manufacturers Association, American Feed Industry Association, American, Subcontractors Association, Inc., American Trucking Associations, American Wood Council, AMT—The Association For Manufacturing Technology, Automotive Recyclers Association, Brick Industry Association, Construction Industry Round Table (CIRT), Council of Industrial Boiler Owners, Global Cold Chain Alliance. Independent Electrical Contractors, Meat Import Council of America, National Association of Chemical Distributors, National Association of Convenience Stores, National Renderers Association, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, National Stone, Sand and Gravel Association, Outdoor Power Equipment Institute.

Petroleum Marketers Association of America, Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council, Truck Renting and Leasing Association, Virginia Chamber of Commerce, Virginia Forest Products Association.

Washington: American Exploration & Mining Association, Greater Yakima Chamber of Commerce, Washington Cattle Feeders Association, Washington Retail Association.

Washington D.C.: Agricultural Retailers Association, American Coatings Association, American Coke and Coal Chemicals Institute, American Council of Engineering Companies, American Forest & Paper Association, American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers, American Highway Users Alliance, American Iron and Steel Institute, American Petroleum Institute, American Public Gas Association, American Road & Transportation Builders Association, Associated Builders and Contractors, Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA) International, Independent Petroleum Association of America, Industrial Energy Consumers of America, Industrial Minerals Association—North America, Institute of Makers of Explosives, National Association of Home Builders, National Association of Manufacturers.

National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors, National Black Chamber of Commerce, National Council of Textile Organizations, National Federation of Independent Business, National Grain and Feed Association, National Industrial Sand Association, National Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association, National Mining Association, National Oilseed Processors Association, North American Meat Institute, SPI: The Plastics Industry Trade Association, Treated Wood Council, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, United States Hide, Skin and Leather Association, Vinyl Building Council, Vinyl Institute, Window and Door Manufacturers Association.

West Virginia: West Virginia Chamber, West Virginia Oil Marketers and Grocers Association.

Wisconsin: Greater Green Bay Chamber, Midwest Food Processors Association, Wisconsin Cast Metals Association, Wisconsin Grocers Association, Wisconsin Industrial Energy, Wisconsin Manufacturers & Commerce.

Wyoming: Petroleum Association of Wyoming, Wyoming Rural Electric Association, Wyoming Stock Growers Association.

ASSOCIATED BUILDERS AND CONTRACTORS, INC.,
Washington, DC, January 6, 2016.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of Associated Builders and Contractors (ABC), a national construction industry trade association with 70 chapters representing nearly 21,000 chapter members, I am writing in regard to the Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act (H.R. 712) introduced by Rep. Doug Collins (R–GA).

ABC supports increased transparency and opportunities for public feedback in situations where agencies promulgate rulemakings via consent decrees and settlement agreements, and opposes regulation through litigation. The Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act (H.R. 712) would promote enhanced openness and transparency in the regulatory process by requiring early disclosure of proposed consent decrees and regulatory settlements.

The practice of regulation through litigation (or ''sue and settle'' as it is sometimes described) is used and often abused by advocacy groups in order to initiate rulemakings when they feel federal agencies are not moving quickly enough to draft and issue these policies. Organizations routinely file lawsuits against federal agencies claiming they have not satisfied particular regulatory requirements, at which point agencies can opt to settle. When settlements are agreed to, they often mandate that rulemakings go forward and frequently establish arbitrary timeframes for completion—without stakeholder review or public comment. These settlements are agreed to behind closed doors and their details kept confidential. Agencies release their rulemaking proposals for public comment after the settlement has been agreed upon, but this is often too late for adequate and meaningful feedback.

H.R. 712 would require agencies to solicit public comment prior to entering into a consent decree with courts, which would provide affected parties proper notice of proposed regulatory settlements, and would make it possible for affected industries to participate in the actual settlement negotiations.

Thank you for your attention on this important matter and we urge the House to pass the Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act when it comes to the floor for a vote.

Sincerely,

KRISTEN SWEARINGEN,
Senior Director, Legislative Affairs.

SMALL BUSINESS & ENTREPRENEURSHIP COUNCIL,
Vienna, VA, January 4, 2016.

Hon. DOUG COLLINS,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE COLLINS: On behalf of the Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council (SBE Council) and its 100,000 members, I am writing to express our strong support for H.R. 712, the ''Sunshine and Regulatory Decrees and Settlement Act of 2015.'' SBE Council is grateful for your ongoing leadership in calling attention to and working to fix the sue-and-settle game played by special interests groups and federal government agencies. H.R. 712 is an important solution that will lift the veil on a process that is unjust and hurts small businesses.

Americans feel disconnected from a regulatory process that does not consider their

views or the real world impact of regulation. A recent survey conducted by our Center for Regulatory Solutions (CRS) found that 72% of Americans believe regulations are ''created in a closed, secretive process,'' with 68% saying that federal rules are created by ''out-of-touch'' people pushing a political agenda. As is the case with ''sue-and-settle,'' special interest groups conspire with federal agencies and file lawsuits against them alleging that an action has been unlawfully delayed or unreasonably withheld. In many cases, the outcome of these legal actions—the ''settle''—is excessive and unreasonable regulation.

Small business owners and their employees are hardest hit by these burdensome federal regulations, which, again, are the end product of a closed, one-sided process. In a report published by CRS, we document egregious ''sue-and-settle'' cases and their costly outcomes. It is unconscionable that federal agencies act in secret with the very special interests that favor giving them more power.

H.R. 712 would require federal agencies to publish and give notice of these actions, and provide the public with more rights in reviewing, participating in and commenting on them. As such, H.R. 712 provides the openness, fairness and access to the federal regulatory process that it currently lacks.

SBE Council is again pleased to support you and your colleagues in your efforts to advance this reform into law. Thank you for your leadership, and support of small business owners and entrepreneurs.

Sincerely,

KAREN KERRIGAN,
President and CEO.

INDUSTRIAL ENERGY CONSUMERS OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, January 4, 2016.

Re IECA Supports H.R. 712, the Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015.

Hon. DOUG COLLINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COLLINS: On behalf of the Industrial Energy Consumers of America (IECA), we support passage of H.R. 712, the ''Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015.'' The legislation would take important steps to stop the abusive practice known as ''sue and settle'' and give the public and affected parties a greater ability to know about potential rulemakings and to participate. The bill would help Congress to reassert control over federal regulatory agency actions that have become opaque, unaccountable, and often unfair. Congress must perform its critical role as overseer of the federal agencies.

IECA is a nonpartisan association of leading manufacturing companies with $1.0 trillion in annual sales, over 2,900 facilities nationwide, and with more than 1.4 million employees worldwide. IECA membership represents a diverse set of industries including: chemical, plastics, steel, iron ore, aluminum, paper, food processing, fertilizer, insulation, glass, industrial gases, pharmaceutical, building products, brewing, automotive, independent oil refining, and cement.

Mounting EPA regulatory costs and abuse of the legal system through actions such as ''sue and settle'' have made it very difficult for manufacturing companies to compete with global competitors, thereby impacting U.S. jobs. For example, while China's manufacturing jobs have increased by 31.5 percent since 2000, U.S. manufacturing jobs have declined by 21.6 percent. Furthermore, the 2014 U.S. manufacturing trade deficit stands at $524 billion and 70 percent of the deficit is with one country, China.

We thank you for your leadership on this important legislation and look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

PAUL N. CICIO,
President.

AMERICAN FUEL & PETROCHEMICAL MANUFACTURERS,
Washington, DC, January 7, 2016.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: The American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers (AFPM) writes in support of H.R. 1155, the Searching for and Cutting Regulations that are Unnecessarily Burdensome (SCRUB) Act of 2015, and H.R. 712, the Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015. AFPM is a trade association representing high-tech American manufacturers of virtually the entire U.S. supply of gasoline, diesel, jet fuel, other fuels and home heating oil, as well as the petrochemicals used as building blocks for thousands of vital products in daily life. AFPM members make modern life possible and keep America moving and growing as they meet the needs of our nation and local communities, strengthen economic and national security, and support 2 million American jobs.

The U.S. is in the midst of an energy and manufacturing renaissance that promises to increase our energy security and create high quality jobs for years to come. AFPM members are playing an important role in this renaissance as they continue to invest billions of dollars in facility upgrades needed to handle our increasing domestic production of oil and natural gas. In addition to bolstering economic growth, these investments ensure that American fuel and petrochemical manufacturers can continue to provide consumers with ample and affordable supplies of transportation fuels and other vital products. America's energy and manufacturing renaissance, however, is threatened by a maze of increasingly costly and unworkable federal regulations. Indeed, domestic manufactures face a total federal regulatory burden of at least $1.88 trillion, jeopardizing their global competitiveness and increasing costs to consumers.

H.R. 1155 and 712 would improve our broken regulatory process and mitigate some of the burdens on domestic manufacturers. AFPM specifically welcomes the regulatory ''cut-go'' provisions of H.R. 1155, which would create a mechanism for getting excessively complex, costly, and contradictory regulations under control. Additionally, H.R. 712 would significantly limit the growing abuses associated with the ''sue-and-settle tactic'' deployed by certain organizations.

Meaningful reform is critical for our country. We appreciate your leadership on this issue and urge the immediate passage of H.R. 1155 and 712.

Sincerely,

CHET THOMPSON,
President.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS,
January 7, 2016.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES: The National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), the largest manufacturing association in the United States representing manufacturers in every industrial sector and in all 50 states, urges you to support H.R. 712, Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015, introduced by Representative Doug Collins (R–GA).

Manufacturers and other stakeholders are often subject to significant federal regulatory actions mandated through consent decrees and settlement agreements. However, the public can be excluded from the promulgation of rules as agencies and litigants negotiate behind closed doors, determining when and how regulators must act.

Public participation and transparency in the regulatory process is a universal principle of sound rulemaking. H.R. 712 would enhance the regulatory process by increasing public participation in shaping rules before they are proposed. The bill would require agencies to provide timely and more relevant information to the public of lawsuits attempting to force regulatory action and to publish proposed consent decrees or regulatory settlements. Importantly, H.R. 712 would require agencies to consider public comments prior to entry of consent decrees or settlement agreements with the court.

Agency actions to develop significant regulations without public participation contradict the sound regulatory principles that are the foundation of our regulatory system and ensure fairness and due process for all affected entities. H.R. 712 would provide necessary transparency to the rulemaking process and preserve the ability of the public to engage with their government.

The NAM's Key Vote Advisory Committee has indicated that votes on H.R. 712, including procedural motions, may be considered for designation as Key Manufacturing Votes in the 114th Congress.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

ARIC NEWHOUSE,
Senior Vice President,
Policy and Government Relations.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), my distinguished colleague.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member, my friend from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

I join the ranking member in opposing the so-called Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act. Specifically, we take exception to the inclusion of the so-called All Economic Regulations are Transparent Act that would unnecessarily require agencies to provide monthly status updates on their plans to propose and finalize rules when they are already required to report twice a year.

Further, this legislation would prohibit agency rules from taking effect until the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs has posted certain information online for at least 6 months. So an agency might post, on its own, information about the cost of a proposed rule for a year, but if OIRA doesn't post the information for at least 6 months, the agency would be prohibited from moving forward.

□ 1330

Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member CUMMINGS and I have an amendment that will be considered shortly to strike the 6-month online posting requirement. Striking that provision would keep important agency rules protecting public health and safety from being needlessly delayed.

We have a Second Amendment that would exempt independent agencies. The bill as currently drafted would require agencies, such as the SEC and the

Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, to abide by these new reporting requirements. Of course, these and other related agencies are not required to submit their rules for such reviews precisely because they are independent agencies and are intended as such.

I urge my colleagues to support the Cummings-Connolly amendments, as well as the amendment offered by Mr. LYNCH that would require Federal agencies to provide an estimate of the benefits, as well as the costs, of proposed regulations.

Mr. Chairman, this bill may be couched in the guise of improving transparency, but let's be honest, its real intent is to erect barriers and significantly delay the regulatory process that protects the American people.

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

Last Congress, the ALERT Act—which is part of this bill now—passed the House twice with bipartisan support. Put simply, the ALERT Act provides regulatory transparency requiring Federal agencies to provide monthly updates on regulation expected to be implemented in the next year.

That shouldn't be controversial. As the bill's author, Mr. RATCLIFFE, indicated, transparency should not be a heavy lift. That is what we are trying to provide. But that transparency is lacking. If you talk to small businesses and large businesses, you talk to citizens, you talk to advocacy groups, they will all tell you to one degree or another that this is not necessarily crystal clear. They have had this problem and challenge. The Obama administration has shown a troubling tendency to minimize the amount of public attention.

The Fall 2015 Unified Agenda of Federal Regulations, a document disclosing regulations currently under consideration by Federal agencies, now contains more than 2,000 new regulations—2,000. By the administration's own estimates, 144 of those regulations are expected to cost the public more than $100 million each—each. Not just one—each. You have got a universe of 2,000 regulations coming your way, America—144 of those are going to cost you about $100 million apiece, and you don't even know what they are. We don't necessarily know what they are.

That is why we think there should be disclosure. That is why they call it the ALERT Act. It keeps the public informed about what Federal regulators are doing in their name and how much the regulations cost.

The bill requires the heads of Federal agencies to provide a monthly update, which is new. That seems reasonable. A monthly update to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs with clear information about each rule. OIRA is then required to publicly disclose on the Internet both the monthly updates and the annual review identifying the costs of each regulation. That seems fair. It seems balanced. It seems easy to me.

I appreciate Mr. RATCLIFFE and the good work that he has done bringing this to our attention and fighting for it.

I urge its adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Utah has 1 minute remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is the second antiregulation bill the Republicans have brought to the floor in 2 days.

Yesterday, we debated a bill that purported to cut bureaucracy by creating a $30 million commission.

Today, we are debating a bill that purports to provide transparency but, in fact, decreases transparency.

The bill directs the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs to publish the total cost of all rules proposed or finalized without counting any of the offsetting benefits. That is not transparency. That is misinformation.

The proponents of this bill want to focus exclusively on the costs of regulations because information about the benefits undercuts their narrative. The bill's focus on the costs alone ignores the enormous benefits that regulations can have. These benefits can be measured in terms of lives saved, injuries reduced, and even dollars gained.

In fact, the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs reported in October that the net annual benefits of major rules issued during the Obama administration from 2009 to 2014 is some $215 billion. Agency rules save lives, improve health and safety, and protect our financial markets.

The provisions in this bill that would prevent rules from taking effect until certain information has been made available on the Internet for 6 months are an unnecessary and potentially dangerous roadblock. We don't need an arbitrary 6-month delay in putting in place rules—like high chair and crib safety standards—that protect our children.

This bill is also unnecessarily burdensome. For example, this bill would require OIRA to provide a report on the number of rules and a list of each rule for which a resolution of disapproval was introduced in either the House or Senate under section 802 of the Congressional Review Act. Under this requirement, the legislative branch would be requiring the executive branch to report on the activities of the legislative branch. That is not transparency. That is a waste of agency resources.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to vote against this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

In conclusion, with all due respect, to suggest that it would be overwhelming to produce cost estimates and put them up on the Internet on a monthly basis, we are asking for transparency, but imagine the burden that is also put on the American people. Some of these may be really good ones. They may be really good regulations. But there may be some that they haven't quite researched and that other companies, organizations, individuals, nonprofits, suddenly have to reconfigure for. That takes some time. They need to know that things are coming. That I think is a reasonable thing to do.

I, again, appreciate what Mr. RATCLIFFE has been championing. I would urge the passage of this bill and the underlying bill as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

It has been years since Federal officials declared that the Great Recession had ended and recovery had begun. It has been years since the Obama administration took office, promising to deliver prosperity and security once more to our Nation.

We are now approaching American voters' next choice of leadership for the United States. The Obama administration seeks to assure us that times are better and times are safer.

Workers, small-business owners, and Main Street families across our Nation know better. America is still struggling to create enough new jobs and economic growth to produce the prosperity and security Americans need and deserve.

Unless Washington relents from adding unnecessarily to the nearly $2 trillion in annual costs that Federal regulation imposes on our economy, America's job creators and innovators will not be able to create the jobs and growth needed to produce a true new morning in America.

Today's bill contains three measures sure to help remedy this situation.

First, the bill offers strong reforms to attack a problem that lies behind many of the costliest new regulations Washington issues each year. That is the problem of sue and settle regulation.

Time and again, new, high-cost regulations are issued under consent decrees and settlement agreements that force Federal agencies to issue new rules. These decrees and settlements stem from deals between regulatory agencies and pro-regulatory plaintiffs. The plaintiffs seeking regulations sue and the agencies seeking help to regulate settle, gaining the force of a judge's gavel to impose their will on the economy.

Those to be regulated—our Nation's job creators—often do not know about these deals until the plaintiffs' complaints and the proposed decrees or settlements are filed in court. By then it is too late. Regulated businesses, state regulators, and other interested entities are unlikely to be able to intervene in the litigation. The court can

approve the deals before regulated parties even have an opportunity to determine whether new regulatory costs will be imposed on them.

Title I of today's legislation, the Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act, brings this abusive practice to an end. It assures that those to be regulated have a fair opportunity to participate in the resolution of litigation that affects them. It ensures that courts have all of the information they need before they approve proposed decrees and settlements. And it provides needed transparency on the ways agencies conduct their business.

Title II of the bill rests on the same principle of transparency. Even when new regulations are not forced upon them by judicial decree, Americans deserve to know what new regulations agencies plan to send their way. They deserve to know earlier and better what those new rules will look like, how much they will cost, and when they may be imposed.

Armed with this information, America's small businesses and families will be in a better position to respond to agency plans with better and more timely comments on proposed regulations, and they will be better and more timely able to bring to Congress' attention concerns about planned regulation they believe is unnecessary, too costly, or ineffective.

Title II of the bill, the ALERT Act, accomplishes just that. It reforms disclosure requirements for upcoming rules by requiring more details to be disclosed and by requiring the publication of monthly, online updates of information on the rules' schedules, costs, and economic effects, including jobs impacts.

Finally, title III of the bill, the Providing Accountability Through Transparency Act, helps to fix one of the most maddening things Main Street Americans and small-business owners across the Nation confront. Not only do Federal regulators issue too many regulations that cost too much, too often those regulations are impossible for an ordinary citizen to understand.

Title III offers a welcome remedy by requiring each agency to publish an online, 100-word summary of any new proposed regulation.

What a concept—state in clear, simple, and short terms for the American people just what Federal regulators propose to do. State it in terms that don't require help from a lawyer to understand. And state it online every time a new regulation is proposed.

All of the legislation in this bill is sure to help Americans who are besieged and bewildered by the flood of new regulations flowing every day from Washington's regulatory bureaucracy.

I thank Representatives COLLINS, RATCLIFFE, and LUETKEMEYER for introducing each piece of legislation the bill contains. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 712, the Sunshine in Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act.

This measure is comprised of three bills, each of which, from my perspective, is thoroughly flawed.

To begin with, title I of this bill, consisting of the text of the Sunshine and Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015, has a simple goal: to discourage the use of settlement agreements and consent decrees and to thereby prevent critical Federal regulatory actions from being implemented.

□ 1345

Title I accomplishes this goal by giving opponents of regulation multiple opportunities to stifle rulemaking. With respect to a civil action enforcing an agency's responsibility to undertake a regulatory action, such as to promulgate a rulemaking, title I essentially authorizes any third party who is affected by such regulatory action to intervene in that civil action, subject to rebuttal; to participate in settlement negotiations; and to submit public comments about a proposed consent decree or settlement agreement that agencies would then be required to respond to.

In addition, title I mandates that agencies provide for public comment on a proposed consent decree, and it requires agencies to respond to all such comments before the consent decree can be entered in court.

As a result, an agency would be forced to go through two public comment periods, one for the consent decree and one for the rulemaking that results from the consent decree, doubling the agency's effort and time before a regulation could be finalized.

Like nearly all of the anti-regulatory bills we have considered to date over the last two Congresses, this measure piles on procedural requirements for agencies and courts.

By delaying regulatory protections, title I jeopardizes public health and safety. This explains why a broad consortium of more than 150 organizations strenuously opposes this measure. These organizations include the Natural Resources Defense Council, the American Civil Liberties Union, the NAACP, the Sierra Club, and Earthjustice, among other groups.

Title II of H.R. 712 consists of the text of H.R. 1759, the All Economic Regulations are Transparent Act of 2015, or the ALERT Act of 2015. This measure would impose an arbitrary 6-month delay before virtually any new rule could go into effect with only limited exceptions.

Clearly, the bill fails to take into account a vast array of time-sensitive rules, ranging from the mundane, such as the many United States Coast Guard bridge closing regulations, to particularly critical regulations that protect public health and safety.

Another troubling aspect of title II is that it specifically prohibits the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs—the executive branch agency charged with policymaking for Federal regulatory agencies—from taking into account the benefits of regulations when providing total cost estimates for proposed and final rules. Thus, a regulation that costs only $1 but that results in $1 billion in benefits would only be reported as costing $1. Such a misleading and unbalanced report could hardly promote transparency.

Finally, title III, consisting of H.R. 690, the Providing Accountability Through Transparency Act of 2015, would require a notice of proposed rulemaking that is published in the Federal Register to include an Internet link to a plain language, 100-word summary of the rule.

As with the other provisions in H.R. 712, title III creates a further opportunity for opponents of regulation to slow down a proposed rulemaking, and rather than promoting transparency, title III could engender confusion about the substance of such rulemaking.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, on multiple occasions before, I have discussed the overwhelming burden of the regulatory state on American workers and employers. For the past year, it has been my primary objective, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law, to bring to light these burdens and their true costs on the lives of all Americans.

The burden of Federal regulations already amounts to 21 percent of the average company's payroll. How can employers plan for the future when the specter of new regulations, meaning additional costs, hangs over their planning? The regulatory process itself and some current government practices make this more difficult.

These bills are critical as we work to improve the regulatory process and to prevent misguided and damaging regulatory overreach. These pieces of legislation grant clarity and transparency to the regulatory process.

I spent the first part of my life working my way up the chain in manufacturing. I worked in a factory. When I became a manager, I saw the complex considerations that went into hiring, expansion, and whether we could keep the lights on.

We did not have a crystal ball to help us there. We had to look at our revenues and at our costs and make assumptions for the future. And, yes, current and future regulations played a role there, too.

That was over 30 years ago. Now the regulatory state and the burdens on business operators and on those who try to go into business have grown by frightening magnitudes.

This bill's sue and settle legislation will ensure that regulators and outside groups can no longer conspire to change or to implement regulations in secret or through judicial decree.

The transparency provisions of the ALERT Act reinforce these measures by mandating more frequent and detailed disclosures that will allow businesses to anticipate the hurdles they will face down the road.

To those Members who introduced these pieces of legislation, I thank them for their attention and effort in lessening the regulatory burdens on all Americans.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 712, the Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015.

Rather than bringing sunshine into the rulemaking process, it throws an after-midnight shade on this process. In fact, the Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act pulls the plug on regulations that are in place to protect the health, safety, and well-being of the people.

This misnomered legislation should be renamed the ''Bedtime for Consent Decrees and Settlements Act.'' Another great name is the ''Leave Volkswagen Alone Act.''

Title I of H.R. 712 imposes numerous burdensome procedural requirements on agencies and courts, requirements that are designed to hamstring and to ultimately prevent the use of consent decrees and settlements that ensure the enforcement of the law.

Proponents of this provision argue that it is necessary because Federal agencies collude with pro-regulatory plaintiffs to advance a mutually agreed-upon regulatory agenda through the use of consent decrees and settlement agreements.

According to my Republican colleagues, this so-called sue and settle litigation specifically allows agencies to skirt the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act to dictate the contents of an agency rulemaking or to bind agency action. Sadly, however, the majority has not put forth a single dust particle of credible evidence to support this claim.

To the contrary, consent decrees and settlement agreements are important tools in ensuring the timely compliance with statutory deadlines that have been put in place by Congress to protect the environment and the public's health and safety.

In fact, the Government Accountability Office, the GAO, reported in December of 2014 that there is zero evidence indicating that agencies collude with public interest groups in bringing these consent decrees, as the majority has often alleged.

In its report, the GAO referred to these lawsuits as ''deadline suits'' because they simply compel agencies to take statutorily required actions within a designated timeframe.

The GAO also found little evidence that deadline suits determine the substantive outcome of agency action because agency officials stated that they have not and would never agree to settlements in a deadline suit that finalize the substantive outcome of the rulemaking or declare the substance of the final rule.

Earlier this year, Amit Narang, a regulatory policy advocate for Public Citizen, also clarified during the legislative hearing on H.R. 712: ''All of the settlements scrutinized by GAO pursuant to the EPA's rulemaking authority under the Clean Air Act went through the public notice and comment process, allowing all members of the public an opportunity to comment on the rule before it is finalized.''

This finding confirms that there is no credible evidence supporting the proposition that Federal agencies engage in backroom deals with pro-regulatory groups in order to circumvent the EPA or to substantively bind the Agency in a subsequent rulemaking.

In the absence of actual evidence of collusion between Federal agencies and plaintiffs, H.R. 712 addresses a nonexistent problem through a series of requirements that are designed to undermine the rule of law by preventing the enforcement of statutes that have been passed by Congress to protect the public and that are designed to slow down agency action and bust the door wide open to almost anyone who wants to impede agency action by intervening in these actions.

Now, is it the working people, small-business owners, or retirees who are asking for this kind of relief from regulations that protect the health, safety, and well-being of them? No. It is not the people. It is the big corporations that want this legislation to pass.

For example, H.R. 712 would allow for nearly any private party to intervene in a consent decree, revealing the legislation's true purpose, which is to stack the deck in the industry's favor in order to avoid the enforcement of the law.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the only reason for the unprecedented delay in agency rulemaking—the so-called diminishing transparency of the regulatory process—is that my Republican colleagues have argued that regulatory transparency is not important with regard to public participation in the rulemaking process.

In a recent rulemaking process, millions of Americans commented on a single proposed rulemaking. It represented the largest public response in history to any request for public comment in a Federal rulemaking. Just last year alone, this extensive activity hardly suggests an agency process that is shrouded in secrecy and in need of reform.

□ 1400

So with there being no evidence that consent decrees and settlements are collusion between Federal agencies and pro-human interest groups, there simply is no need for this legislation.

I would ask my colleagues to vote against this, to vote it down.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LUETKEMEYER), who is one of the chief sponsors of this legislation.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for working with us on this piece of legislation.

If there is one thing that I hear most often from my constituents, it is the onslaught of Federal regulations to keep up, let alone interpret. Our constituents should not need a law degree or employ an army of consultants and accountants to understand the rules they are required to follow. Unfortunately, they do, which is why I am pleased the legislation we consider today addresses the lack of regulatory transparency and accountability.

Title III of H.R. 712, the Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015, includes language from a bill that I introduced earlier this Congress. That bill, the Providing Accountability Through Transparency Act, provides a bipartisan and commonsense reform to afford the American people straightforward and comprehensive access to rules proposed by our executive branch.

Since enactment of the Administrative Procedure Act in 1946, Federal agencies have been required to keep the public informed of proposed rules and regulations. This law has provided an avenue for the public to access rules and regulations drafted across government agencies. Nevertheless, given their technical nature, it can be extremely difficult to fully understand proposals unless one is an expert in that field.

To help address this issue and promote government transparency and accessibility, title III of the Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015 will require each Federal agency, when providing notice of a proposed rulemaking, to produce a Web link to a 100-word, plain-language summary of the proposal. Accordingly, this requirement will provide access to regulations in a more clear and consistent manner.

Moreover, this reasonable proposal has already proven its effectiveness in my home State of Missouri. After hearing from local school districts and administrators struggling to implement State regulations for Common Core, the State enacted a measure requiring

each agency to provide online-accessible, plain-language summaries of proposed State regulations. Since enactment, the statute has been an exceptional resource for Missouri localities, schools, organizations, and citizens. I think it would be just the same here for us here at the Federal level as well.

Just by looking at the daily copy of the Federal Register, which I just happen to have here from Monday, December 28, it is a 519-page copy.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. DOLD). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARINO. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. I thank the gentleman for the additional time.

Basically, we have got 518 rules in one day, 18 pages of rules in one day. I think it is important that our citizens have access to these rules in a way that they can understand and a form they can access.

I certainly urge its support. I thank the good chairman for his hard work on H.R. 712.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, my main concern with this bill is the provision that would prevent a new regulation from taking effect until it has been available online for at least 6 months after the already exhaustive public notice and comment period that is required of new regulations. This may be a well-intended procedure, but it could potentially harm the very people that are in need of protection under some of the rules being promulgated.

I know there is an exemption that may relate to health and safety that could include a Presidential action, but it requires us to know of an impending threat in order for that procedure to be utilized.

I am thinking about what happened in my own hometown of Flint, Michigan, where people cannot wait 6 months for the Lead and Copper Rule, for example, which is under review right now, to be modified. Due to mismanagement by the State government and the weakness in the Safe Drinking Water Act's Lead and Copper Rule, thousands of children in Flint, Michigan, have been exposed to dangerous lead. Lead exposure is not good for anyone, but it is particularly dangerous for young children.

According to the CDC, lead exposure is one of the most dangerous neurotoxins. It has wide-ranging impacts affecting IQ. There are behavioral implications. There are developmental implications for the central nervous system.

It is heartbreaking, then, to see, as a result of the failure to adequately supply support in regulation to drinking water programs, that levels of lead in my own hometown have poisoned children. Changes to the Lead and Copper Rule, which I have participated in and are underway right now, could have prevented this. Right now, as a matter of fact, those changes are pending.

If this legislation is passed, basically what we are saying to the people of Flint and other potential communities that could have lead exposure is that we have to wait another 6 months for that protection, 6 more months potentially of dangerous lead leaching into the pipes, going into the bodies of young children.

This notion that regulation is always wrong and always bad—I know that is not the position that is taken—but the effect of this legislation would be to slow down the regulatory process, very often regulations that need to be changed, need to be adjusted to provide essential protections to public health.

The notion that we are supposed to somehow know that an imminent threat is present and allow this expedited process that is anticipated in this legislation belies logic. They didn't know, until after blood levels showed increased lead levels in children, that such a problem existed.

When we know that there are necessary changes, when the EPA, through its process, as they have done with the Lead and Copper Rule, know that there are ways to improve the protection to kids, we ought to implement those regulations as soon as we possibly can.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, right now there is probably a group of folks down the street at a large oak table in a marble palace, nibbling on their $16 Federal muffins, drinking their lattes, typing on their new iPads regulations. They are the regulators. The very term brings fear and trepidation into the hearts of people who work for a living.

Meanwhile, 14 million Americans are sitting at their old kitchen table, drinking coffee from their Mr. Coffee pot with no job on the horizon.

Small-business owners constantly say that complying with government regulations is the biggest economic problem they face, even more so than the Federal income tax. Bear in mind that we have the highest corporate income tax in the world.

Some businesses pack up their bags and even move to places like China. Meanwhile, the U.S. regulators are putting businesses out of business.

Now, Congress created the regulators, so Congress needs to fix the problem with the regulators. H.R. 712, the Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015, takes a number of commonsense approaches and puts a check on the regulators.

Mr. Chairman, there are 175,000 pages of regulations. Do you really think we need that many regulations?

One of the most important provisions of this bill is it will require the executive branch to make semiannual and annual disclosures about planned regulations.

A lot of times, the regulators don't have any idea of the economic costs of their decisions and what they will have on the American economy. Many of them have never worked in private industry. They have never been to the States that they are trying to regulate. This bill will force the regulators to determine the cost of their actions before they take action.

These disclosures will help American job creators so they can plan for the impacts of the new regulations on their budgets, hiring, and operations.

I urge support of this logical piece of legislation. Congress needs to rein in and regulate the regulators.

And that is just the way it is.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), a member of the Judiciary Committee and chairman of the Small Business Subcommittee.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this bill and commend my colleague from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for his leadership on this very important issue.

We all know that small businesses are the foundation of our economy, creating 7 out of every 10 new jobs in the American economy. That is how many jobs are created by small businesses

Mr. Chairman, we also hear from small businesses from all over America, from our own congressional districts, that new and old regulatory burdens continue to make it more difficult for them to expand, grow, and create more jobs.

The Constitution gives us the duty in the House of Representatives to provide for the general welfare. If we allow this scheme of sue and settle litigation to continue suppressing economic and job growth, we are not doing our duty.

What is this sue and settle that we are talking about? Well, very quickly, it refers to when a Federal agency agrees to a settlement agreement in a lawsuit from special interest groups, oftentimes groups on the left, to create priorities and rules outside of the normal rulemaking process. The agency intentionally relinquishes statutory discretion by committing to timelines and priorities that often realign agency duties.

Now, when agencies enter into consent decrees or settlement agreements and agree to issue new regulations, the rulemaking process is shortchanged. As chairman of the Committee on Small Business, I am particularly concerned that agencies are not adequately analyzing the impacts of new rules on small businesses, as is required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act. That is existing law. This results in unnecessary and costly regulatory burdens and disproportionately impacts small businesses, the job generators of this country.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, when mankind first came upon this planet, I guess we were in caves and cavemen didn't have many rules. It was only the strong who survived. It was every man for himself. There were no morals about things, whether or not it is right or wrong. It is just a matter of your own personal survival. That was caveman thinking, and, unfortunately, we still have caveman thinking in the 21st century because we have a crowd that says that we should not have any rules of human conduct.

Isn't it a fact that America is what it is now because of the rules that have been put in place to foster prosperity and freedom? That is what our government has done. It has been government of, by, and for the people.

There has been a movement over the last 30, 40 years to turn people against government. This mantra is that government is too big, we don't need any rules to govern human conduct, let everything work itself out, and the free market system will make it rain for everybody.

Well, we have seen, after 30, 40 years of practicing that free market way of thinking, that it doesn't work. Here we are still trying to cut the rules that guarantee the health, safety, and well-being of working people, of small business, of elderly people, and children.

This is what this legislation is about, is gutting the rulemaking process. This is one of many attempts, incessant attempts, by my friends on the other side to try to cut government so that their friends in big business on Wall Street can make it rain for the rest of us. They don't make it rain for anybody but themselves. They put all of the profits in their pockets. They become billionaires. We have had a shift of wealth away from the middle class and working people in this country. Let's stop it from happening.

Oppose this misguided legislation, H.R. 712.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT), a member of the Judiciary Committee

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and also the committee I am on, Natural Resources. This has been an ongoing issue, particularly in Natural Resources, when we come to the sue and settle situation.

I appreciate my friend from Georgia pointing out that there are groups that don't want rules, that are just out for themselves. I, too, was against the Occupy Wall Street anarchy that was attempted.

□ 1415

I have never stood here in support of Wall Street. I fought the Wall Street bailout tooth and nail when friends on the other side of the aisle, many of them, were supporting it. Both sides of the aisle supported it. I am not standing here for Wall Street. I am standing here for fairness for American citizens across the country. That is what most people in both parties want. They want fairness.

Here is a report that the tactic of sue and settle ''reached a zenith in Fish and Wildlife's 2011 mega-settlement with the Center for Biological Diversity, WildEarth Guardians, and other green groups over the species act. That agreement allowed Fish and Wildlife to claim it must take action on some 750 species covered by 85 legal actions. The deal's immediate effect was to tee up 250 species for full protection, including sweeping 'critical habitat' designations that will restrict commercial or other use of millions of acres of private property.''

The problem is, when the judicial system is abused, and as a former litigator, judge, and chief justice, I know when litigants come before the court and they say, ''We have reached an agreement, and here it is,'' then the judge's hands are normally tied, sign off on the agreement; but when it is a sympathetic group wanting to take away private property rights from private property owners, when they themselves have done nothing to produce or make that land profitable, to do so unfairly without proper notice by going behind the landowner's back, filing a suit with a sympathetic agency like Fish and Wildlife, having the agreed judgment signed, and then all of a sudden the most affected people were not given notice, they have their property rights taken away.

I realize there were groups like Occupy Wall Street that don't want anybody having private property rights. Look, the Pilgrims tried it. It doesn't work when you just have a socialist system, share and share alike, because when you pay people the same thing to work and not work, then eventually people quit working.

This bill is about fairness. What is wrong with giving notice to all of the people involved and letting them participate? That is the right thing to do.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am ready to close, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Members, H.R. 712, the Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act, would establish a 6-month moratorium on new regulations, with limited exception, significantly delaying the rulemaking process by which agencies ensure that Americans are protected from serious harm, such as dirty air and water and unsafe products and reckless behavior by large financial institutions.

Not surprisingly, the White House has already issued a strong veto threat. The administration warns that H.R. 712 would undermine critical public health and safety protections, introduce needless complexity and uncertainty in agency decisionmaking, and interfere with agency performance statutory mandates.

There is simply no basis to support this ill-conceived legislation. Accordingly, I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in opposing H.R. 712.

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

Mr. MARINO. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim that this bill will make it too hard for Washington bureaucrats to regulate and too cumbersome for Washington agencies to tell the American people what the agencies are up to. You might say they are claiming that this bill creates so much sunshine on our new regulations that Washington's regulators will get sunburned if the bill is enacted.

In the Obama administration's pen and phone era of encroaching on Americans' liberties, that much new sunshine is a good thing. In the Obama administration's era of regulatory dictates that crush new jobs and prevent higher wages, the new sunshine is desperately needed.

A central reason why the Obama administration has failed to deliver prosperity and security to our Nation is the administration's unprecedented avalanche of new and costly regulations. This regulatory onslaught is the big reason why we have just concluded 8 years of zero real wage growth for America's workers and families. It is a critical reason why 94 million Americans above the age of 16 are out of the workforce. It is an unmistakable reason why we are still missing the almost 6 million more new jobs Americans would have had if the so-called Obama recovery had just been as strong as the average recovery since World War II.

This bill combats the Obama administration's regulatory assault on jobs and wages with commonsense measures we all should support. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this bill to help deliver new jobs and better wages to America's workers and families.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 712, the Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act. Rather than a good-faith effort to improve our regulatory process, this bill would add unworkable new requirements on federal agencies that could impede critical efforts to safeguard public health, the environment, and other national priorities.

I was pleased, however, that this bill includes provisions from the Providing Accountability Through Transparency Act (H.R. 690), which I introduced with my colleague Rep. LUETKEMEYER. This bipartisan proposal would ensure that new federal rules include a brief, plain-language summary so that the public can better understand the proposed action. While I cannot support H.R. 712, I hope that we can continue to work across the aisle on this commonsense initiative that will enhance public understanding of important federal efforts in public health, consumer rights, environmental protection, and other areas.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of the Rules Committee Print 114–37. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 712

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 ''Sunshine for Regulations and Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2016''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—SUNSHINE FOR REGULATORY DECREES AND SETTLEMENTS

Sec. 101. Short title.
Sec. 102. Definitions.
Sec. 103. Consent decree and settlement reform.
Sec. 104. Motions to modify consent decrees.
Sec. 105. Effective date.

TITLE II—ALL ECONOMIC REGULATIONS ARE TRANSPARENT

Sec. 201. Short title.
Sec. 202. Office of information and regulatory affairs publication of information relating to rules.

TITLE III—PROVIDING ACCOUNTABILITY THROUGH TRANSPARENCY

Sec. 301. Short title.
Sec. 302. Requirement to post a 100 word summary to regulations.gov.

TITLE I—SUNSHINE FOR REGULATORY DECREES AND SETTLEMENTS

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Sunshine for Regulations and Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2016''.

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

In this title—

(1) the terms ''agency'' and ''agency action'' have the meanings given those terms under section 551 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) the term ''covered civil action'' means a civil action—

(A) seeking to compel agency action;

(B) alleging that the agency is unlawfully withholding or unreasonably delaying an agency action relating to a regulatory action that would affect the rights of—

(i) private persons other than the person bringing the action; or

(ii) a State, local, or tribal government; and

(C) brought under—

(i) chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code; or

(ii) any other statute authorizing such an action;

(3) the term ''covered consent decree'' means—

(A) a consent decree entered into in a covered civil action; and

(B) any other consent decree that requires agency action relating to a regulatory action that affects the rights of—

(i) private persons other than the person bringing the action; or

(ii) a State, local, or tribal government;

(4) the term ''covered consent decree or settlement agreement'' means a covered consent decree and a covered settlement agreement; and

(5) the term ''covered settlement agreement'' means—

(A) a settlement agreement entered into in a covered civil action; and

(B) any other settlement agreement that requires agency action relating to a regulatory action that affects the rights of—

(i) private persons other than the person bringing the action; or

(ii) a State, local, or tribal government.

SEC. 103. CONSENT DECREE AND SETTLEMENT REFORM.

(a) PLEADINGS AND PRELIMINARY MATTERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In any covered civil action, the agency against which the covered civil action is brought shall publish the notice of intent to sue and the complaint in a readily accessible manner, including by making the notice of intent to sue and the complaint available online not later than 15 days after receiving service of the notice of intent to sue or complaint, respectively.

(2) ENTRY OF A COVERED CONSENT DECREE OR SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.—A party may not make a motion for entry of a covered consent decree or to dismiss a civil action pursuant to a covered settlement agreement until after the end of proceedings in accordance with paragraph (1) and subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2) of subsection (d) or subsection (d)(3)(A), whichever is later.

(b) INTERVENTION.—

(1) REBUTTABLE PRESUMPTION.—In considering a motion to intervene in a covered civil action or a civil action in which a covered consent decree or settlement agreement has been proposed that is filed by a person who alleges that the agency action in dispute would affect the person, the court shall presume, subject to rebuttal, that the interests of the person would not be represented adequately by the existing parties to the action.

(2) STATE, LOCAL, AND TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS.—In considering a motion to intervene in a covered civil action or a civil action in which a covered consent decree or settlement agreement has been proposed that is filed by a State, local, or tribal government, the court shall take due account of whether the movant—

(A) administers jointly with an agency that is a defendant in the action the statutory provisions that give rise to the regulatory action to which the action relates; or

(B) administers an authority under State, local, or tribal law that would be preempted by the regulatory action to which the action relates.

(c) SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATIONS.—Efforts to settle a covered civil action or otherwise reach an agreement on a covered consent decree or settlement agreement shall—

(1) be conducted pursuant to the mediation or alternative dispute resolution program of the court or by a district judge other than the presiding judge, magistrate judge, or special master, as determined appropriate by the presiding judge; and

(2) include any party that intervenes in the action.

(d) PUBLICATION OF AND COMMENT ON COVERED CONSENT DECREES OR SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days before the date on which a covered consent decree or settlement agreement is filed with a court, the agency seeking to enter the covered consent decree or settlement agreement shall publish in the Federal Register and online—

(A) the proposed covered consent decree or settlement agreement; and

(B) a statement providing—

(i) the statutory basis for the covered consent decree or settlement agreement; and

(ii) a description of the terms of the covered consent decree or settlement agreement, including whether it provides for the award of attorneys' fees or costs and, if so, the basis for including the award.

(2) PUBLIC COMMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An agency seeking to enter a covered consent decree or settlement agreement shall accept public comment during the period described in paragraph (1) on any issue relating to the matters alleged in the complaint in the applicable civil action or addressed or affected by the proposed covered consent decree or settlement agreement.

(B) RESPONSE TO COMMENTS.—An agency shall respond to any comment received under subparagraph (A).

(C) SUBMISSIONS TO COURT.—When moving that the court enter a proposed covered consent decree or settlement agreement or for dismissal pursuant to a proposed covered consent decree or settlement agreement, an agency shall—

(i) inform the court of the statutory basis for the proposed covered consent decree or settlement agreement and its terms;

(ii) submit to the court a summary of the comments received under subparagraph (A) and the response of the agency to the comments;

(iii) submit to the court a certified index of the administrative record of the notice and comment proceeding; and

(iv) make the administrative record described in clause (iii) fully accessible to the court.

(D) INCLUSION IN RECORD.—The court shall include in the court record for a civil action the certified index of the administrative record submitted by an agency under subparagraph (C)(iii) and any documents listed in the index which any party or amicus curiae appearing before the court in the action submits to the court.

(3) PUBLIC HEARINGS PERMITTED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—After providing notice in the Federal Register and online, an agency may hold a public hearing regarding whether to enter into a proposed covered consent decree or settlement agreement.

(B) RECORD.—If an agency holds a public hearing under subparagraph (A)—

(i) the agency shall—

(I) submit to the court a summary of the proceedings;

(II) submit to the court a certified index of the hearing record; and

(III) provide access to the hearing record to the court; and

(ii) the full hearing record shall be included in the court record.

(4) MANDATORY DEADLINES.—If a proposed covered consent decree or settlement agreement requires an agency action by a date certain, the agency shall, when moving for entry of the covered consent decree or settlement agreement or dismissal based on the covered consent decree or settlement agreement, inform the court of—

(A) any required regulatory action the agency has not taken that the covered consent decree or settlement agreement does not address;

(B) how the covered consent decree or settlement agreement, if approved, would affect the discharge of the duties described in subparagraph (A); and

(C) why the effects of the covered consent decree or settlement agreement on the manner in which the agency discharges its duties is in the public interest.

(e) SUBMISSION BY THE GOVERNMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For any proposed covered consent decree or settlement agreement that contains a term described in paragraph (2), the Attorney General or, if the matter is being litigated independently by an agency, the head of the agency shall submit to the court a certification that the Attorney General or head of the agency approves the proposed covered consent decree or settlement agreement. The Attorney General or head of the agency shall personally sign any certification submitted under this paragraph.

(2) TERMS.—A term described in this paragraph is—

(A) in the case of a covered consent decree, a term that—

(i) converts into a nondiscretionary duty a discretionary authority of an agency to propose, promulgate, revise, or amend regulations;

(ii) commits an agency to expend funds that have not been appropriated and that have not been budgeted for the regulatory action in question;

(iii) commits an agency to seek a particular appropriation or budget authorization;

(iv) divests an agency of discretion committed to the agency by statute or the Constitution of the United States, without regard to whether the discretion was granted to respond to changing circumstances, to make policy or managerial choices, or to protect the rights of third parties; or

(v) otherwise affords relief that the court could not enter under its own authority upon a final judgment in the civil action; or

(B) in the case of a covered settlement agreement, a term—

(i) that provides a remedy for a failure by the agency to comply with the terms of the covered settlement agreement other than the revival of the civil action resolved by the covered settlement agreement; and

(ii) that—

(I) interferes with the authority of an agency to revise, amend, or issue rules under the procedures set forth in chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, or any other statute or Executive order prescribing rulemaking procedures for a rulemaking that is the subject of the covered settlement agreement;

(II) commits the agency to expend funds that have not been appropriated and that have not been budgeted for the regulatory action in question; or

(III) for such a covered settlement agreement that commits the agency to exercise in a particular way discretion which was committed to the agency by statute or the Constitution of the United States to respond to changing circumstances, to make policy or managerial choices, or to protect the rights of third parties.

(f) REVIEW BY COURT.—

(1) AMICUS.—A court considering a proposed covered consent decree or settlement agreement shall presume, subject to rebuttal, that it is proper to allow amicus participation relating to the covered consent decree or settlement agreement by any person who filed public comments or participated in a public hearing on the covered consent decree or settlement agreement under paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (d).

(2) REVIEW OF DEADLINES.—

(A) PROPOSED COVERED CONSENT DECREES.—For a proposed covered consent decree, a court shall not approve the covered consent decree unless the proposed covered consent decree allows sufficient time and incorporates adequate procedures for the agency to comply with chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, and other applicable statutes that govern rulemaking and, unless contrary to the public interest, the provisions of any Executive order that governs rulemaking.

(B) PROPOSED COVERED SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS.—For a proposed covered settlement agreement, a court shall ensure that the covered settlement agreement allows sufficient time and incorporates adequate procedures for the agency to comply with chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, and other applicable statutes that govern rulemaking and, unless contrary to the public interest, the provisions of any Executive order that governs rulemaking.

(g) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Each agency shall submit to Congress an annual report that, for the year covered by the report, includes—

(1) the number, identity, and content of covered civil actions brought against and covered consent decrees or settlement agreements entered against or into by the agency; and

(2) a description of the statutory basis for—

(A) each covered consent decree or settlement agreement entered against or into by the agency; and

(B) any award of attorneys fees or costs in a civil action resolved by a covered consent decree or settlement agreement entered against or into by the agency.

SEC. 104. MOTIONS TO MODIFY CONSENT DECREES.

If an agency moves a court to modify a covered consent decree or settlement agreement and the basis of the motion is that the terms of the covered consent decree or settlement agreement are no longer fully in the public interest due to the obligations of the agency to fulfill other duties or due to changed facts and circumstances, the court shall review the motion and the covered consent decree or settlement agreement de novo.

SEC. 105. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This title shall apply to—

(1) any covered civil action filed on or after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) any covered consent decree or settlement agreement proposed to a court on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—ALL ECONOMIC REGULATIONS ARE TRANSPARENT

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''All Economic Regulations are Transparent Act of 2016'' or the ''ALERT Act of 2016''.

SEC. 202. OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION RELATING TO RULES.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 6, the following new chapter:

''CHAPTER 6A—OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION RELATING TO RULES

''Sec. 651. Agency monthly submission to office of information and regulatory affairs.

''Sec. 652. Office of information and regulatory affairs publications.

''Sec. 653. Requirement for rules to appear in agency-specific monthly publication.

''Sec. 654. Definitions.

''SEC. 651. AGENCY MONTHLY SUBMISSION TO OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS.

''On a monthly basis, the head of each agency shall submit to the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (referred to in this chapter as the 'Administrator'), in such a manner as the Administrator may reasonably require, the following information:

''(1) For each rule that the agency expects to propose or finalize during the following year:

''(A) A summary of the nature of the rule, including the regulation identifier number and the docket number for the rule.

''(B) The objectives of and legal basis for the issuance of the rule, including—

''(i) any statutory or judicial deadline; and

''(ii) whether the legal basis restricts or precludes the agency from conducting an analysis of the costs or benefits of the rule during the rule making, and if not, whether the agency plans to conduct an analysis of the costs or benefits of the rule during the rule making.

''(C) Whether the agency plans to claim an exemption from the requirements of section 553 pursuant to section 553(b)(B).

''(D) The stage of the rule making as of the date of submission.

''(E) Whether the rule is subject to review under section 610.

''(2) For any rule for which the agency expects to finalize during the following year and has issued a general notice of proposed rule making—

''(A) an approximate schedule for completing action on the rule;

''(B) an estimate of whether the rule will cost—

''(i) less than $50,000,000;

''(ii) $50,000,000 or more but less than $100,000,000;

''(iii) $100,000,000 or more but less than $500,000,000;

''(iv) $500,000,000 or more but less than $1,000,000,000;

''(v) $1,000,000,000 or more but less than $5,000,000,000;

''(vi) $5,000,000,000 or more but less than $10,000,000,000; or

''(vii) $10,000,000,000 or more; and

''(C) any estimate of the economic effects of the rule, including any estimate of the net effect that the rule will have on the number of jobs in the United States, that was considered in drafting the rule. If such estimate is not available, a statement affirming that no information on the economic effects, including the effect on the number of jobs, of the rule has been considered.

''SEC. 652. OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS PUBLICATIONS.

''(a) AGENCY-SPECIFIC INFORMATION PUBLISHED MONTHLY.—Not later than 30 days after the submission of information pursuant to section 651, the Administrator shall make such information publicly available on the Internet.

''(b) CUMULATIVE ASSESSMENT OF AGENCY RULE MAKING PUBLISHED ANNUALLY.—

''(1) PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER.—Not later than October 1 of each year, the Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register, for the previous year the following:

''(A) The information that the Administrator received from the head of each agency under section 651.

''(B) The number of rules and a list of each such rule—

''(i) that was proposed by each agency, including, for each such rule, an indication of whether the issuing agency conducted an analysis of the costs or benefits of the rule; and

''(ii) that was finalized by each agency, including for each such rule an indication of whether—

''(I) the issuing agency conducted an analysis of the costs or benefits of the rule;

''(II) the agency claimed an exemption from the procedures under section 553 pursuant to section 553(b)(B); and

''(III) the rule was issued pursuant to a statutory mandate or the rule making is committed to agency discretion by law.

''(C) The number of agency actions and a list of each such action taken by each agency that—

''(i) repealed a rule;

''(ii) reduced the scope of a rule;

''(iii) reduced the cost of a rule; or

''(iv) accelerated the expiration date of a rule.

''(D) The total cost (without reducing the cost by any offsetting benefits) of all rules proposed or finalized, and the number of rules for which an estimate of the cost of the rule was not available.

''(2) PUBLICATION ON THE INTERNET.—Not later than October 1 of each year, the Administrator shall make publicly available on the Internet the following:

''(A) The analysis of the costs or benefits, if conducted, for each proposed rule or final rule issued by an agency for the previous year.

''(B) The docket number and regulation identifier number for each proposed or final rule issued by an agency for the previous year.

''(C) The number of rules and a list of each such rule reviewed by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget for the previous year, and the authority under which each such review was conducted.

''(D) The number of rules and a list of each such rule for which the head of an agency completed a review under section 610 for the previous year.

''(E) The number of rules and a list of each such rule submitted to the Comptroller General under section 801.

''(F) The number of rules and a list of each such rule for which a resolution of disapproval was introduced in either the House of Representatives or the Senate under section 802.

''SEC. 653. REQUIREMENT FOR RULES TO APPEAR IN AGENCY-SPECIFIC MONTHLY PUBLICATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), a rule may not take effect until the information required to be made publicly available on the Internet regarding such rule pursuant to section 652(a) has been so available for not less than 6 months.

''(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The requirement of subsection (a) shall not apply in the case of a rule—

''(1) for which the agency issuing the rule claims an exception under section 553(b)(B); or

''(2) which the President determines by Executive order should take effect because the rule is—

''(A) necessary because of an imminent threat to health or safety or other emergency;

''(B) necessary for the enforcement of criminal laws;

''(C) necessary for national security; or

''(D) issued pursuant to any statute implementing an international trade agreement.

''SEC. 654. DEFINITIONS.

''In this chapter, the terms 'agency', 'agency action', 'rule', and 'rule making' have the meanings given those terms in section 551.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for part I of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 5, the following:

''6. The Analysis of Regulatory Functions 601

''6A. Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs Publication of Information Relating to Rules ..... 651''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) AGENCY MONTHLY SUBMISSION TO THE OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS.—The first submission required pursuant to section 651 of title 5, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall be submitted not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and monthly thereafter.

(2) CUMULATIVE ASSESSMENT OF AGENCY RULE MAKING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 652 of title 5, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect on the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) DEADLINE.—The first requirement to publish or make available, as the case may be, under subsection (b) of section 652 of title 5, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall be the first October 1 after the effective date of such subsection.

(C) FIRST PUBLICATION.—The requirement under section 652(b)(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall include for the first publication, any analysis of the costs or benefits conducted for a proposed or final rule, for the 10 years before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) REQUIREMENT FOR RULES TO APPEAR IN AGENCY-SPECIFIC MONTHLY PUBLICATION.—Section 653 of title 5, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect on the date that is 8 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE III—PROVIDING ACCOUNTABILITY THROUGH TRANSPARENCY

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Providing Accountability Through Transparency Act of 2016''.

SEC. 302. REQUIREMENT TO POST A 100 WORD SUMMARY TO REGULATIONS.GOV.

Section 553(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2) by striking ''; and'' and inserting ''.'';

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) the internet address of a summary of not more than 100 words in length of the proposed rule, in plain language, that shall be posted on the internet website under section 206(d) of the E-Government Act of 2002 (44 U.S.C. 3501 note) (commonly known as regulations.gov);''.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 114–388. 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. MARINO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 114–388.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), and I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 16, line 5, strike the comma after ''chapter 6''.

Page 16, after line 10, strike the table of sections for chapter 6A of title 5, United States Code, as inserted by section 202(a) of the bill, and insert the following:

''651. Agency monthly submission to Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs.

''652. Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs publications.

''653. Requirement for rules to appear in agency-specific monthly publication.

''654. Definitions.

Page 16, line 11, strike ''**SEC. 651. AGENCY MONTHLY SUBMISSION TO OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS.**'' and insert ''**§ 651. Agency monthly submission to Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs**''.

Page 16, line 19, strike ''following year'' and insert ''12-month period following the month covered by the monthly submission''.

Page 17, line 19, strike ''for which'' and insert ''that''.

Page 17, line 20, strike ''the following year and has issued'' and insert ''the 12-month period following the month covered by the monthly submission and for which the agency has issued''.

Page 18, line 17, strike ''rule. If such estimate is not'' and insert ''rule, or, if no such estimate is''.

Page 18, line 22, strike ''**SEC. 652. OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS PUBLICATIONS.**'' and insert ''**§ 652. Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs publications**''.

Page 19, line 8, insert after a comma ''shall publish''.

Page 19, line 9, strike ''for the previous year the following:'' and insert the following: ''the following, with respect to the previous year:''.

Page 22, line 1, strike ''**SEC. 653. REQUIREMENT FOR RULES TO APPEAR IN AGENCY-SPECIFIC MONTHLY PUBLICATION.**'' and insert ''**§ 653. Requirement for rules to appear in agency-specific monthly publication**''.

Page 22, line 21, strike ''**SEC. 654. DEFINITIONS.**'' and insert ''**§ 654. Definitions**''.

Page 23, line 2, strike the comma after ''chapter 5''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 580, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

I offer this amendment with my colleague, Chairman CHAFFETZ, as a manager's amendment to the bill. The amendment makes a small number of revisions in the nature of technical and conforming changes to clarify revisions that state deadlines, reformat section nomenclature and headings, and improve typography or grammar.

The amendment constitutes an agreement reached between the Committee on the Judiciary and the other committee of jurisdiction, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 114–388.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In the table of contents of the bill, insert after item pertaining to section 302 the following:

TITLE IV—GENERAL EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN RULES

Sec. 401. Exemption of certain rules, and consent decrees or settlement agreements, from the provisions of this Act.

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

TITLE IV—GENERAL EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN RULES

SEC. 401. EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN RULES, AND CONSENT DECREES OR SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS, FROM THE PROVISIONS OF THIS ACT.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not apply in the case of a rule that the Director of the Office of Management and Budget determines would result in net job creation and whose benefits exceeds its cost, or a consent decree or settlement agreement pertaining to such a rule. In the case of such a rule, consent decree, or settlement agreement, the provisions of law amended by this Act shall apply as though such amendments had not been made.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 580, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity to speak in support of my amendment to H.R. 712.

H.R. 712 would significantly delay and possibly stop the Federal rulemaking process by making it easier for regulated industries and well-funded

antiregulatory entities to delay or prevent agency action and prohibiting any rule from being finalized until certain information is posted online for 6 months.

This assault on the regulations is based on the false premise that Federal regulation stifles economic growth and job creation. My amendment confronts this fallacious assumption by excepting from H.R. 712 all rules that the Office of Management and Budget determines would result in net job creation.

As with many other deregulatory bills we have considered this Congress, the proponents of H.R. 712 argue that it will grow the economy, create jobs, and increase America's competitiveness internationally, but we cannot pretend that this politicized legislation is about economic growth or American prosperity.

As I have noted during the consideration of each of the antiregulatory bills that we have considered in the 114th Congress, there is simply no credible evidence in support of the reiteration of so-called job-killing regulations undermining economic growth. Zero. The latest report from the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that unemployment has fallen to 5 percent despite Republican obstruction of everything that Democrats have put forward that would grow the economy.

While there is more work to do to grow the economy and help our Nation's middle class, there have been 69 straight months of private sector job growth. That is 13.7 million private sector jobs created amidst a regulatory system that is pro-worker, pro-environment, pro-public health, and pro-innovation.

And to those who would brush aside these strong employment figures, the Department of Labor has also reported that claims for unemployment benefits have dropped to the lowest levels in over 40 years.

While I would submit that regulations passed during the Obama administration have had a largely positive effect on sustainable economic growth, the reality is that there is little correlation between regulations and the economy.

Don't just take my word for it. Take the word of the San Francisco and New York Federal Reserve Banks, which found zero correlation between employment and regulation. Take the word of The Washington Post, which gave two Pinocchios to industry estimates of the cost of regulations earlier this year. Take the word of the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service, which has debunked claims that regulations have a trillion-dollar cost to the economy.

Mr. Chairman, we need real solutions to help real people, not another thinly veiled handout to large corporations. I ask that my colleagues support my amendment to protect jobs.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I share the gentleman's concerns about the impact of regulations on jobs, but I submit that the right way to address that concern is to join me in supporting the bill.

The bill includes transparency requirements sure to increase public pressure on agencies to make sure that contemplated new regulations do not have unnecessary, adverse impacts on job creation. To exempt regulations from that pressure would make our regulatory system less protective of jobs, not more. Indeed, the gentleman's amendment would give the executive branch a powerful incentive to manipulate its jobs impact and cost-benefit analyses to give false impressions that avoid the requirements of the bill.

□ 1430

The amendment also puts the cart before the horse. It offers carve-outs from the bill based on factors that cannot be determined adequately before important analytical requirements in existing statutes and executive orders governing the rulemaking process are applied in the first place.

Specific provisions in the bill—for example, judicial review provisions in title I for proposed consent decrees and settlement agreements—are designed to protect the proper application of those analytical requirements.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, they talk about all of the regulations that have been promulgated during the Obama administration as if the Obama administration is the only administration that has promulgated rules of conduct.

Certainly we have had rules associated with the unveiling of the very successful Affordable Care Act. There were a lot of rules put into place to prevent insurance companies from taking advantage of people.

Preexisting conditions are outlawed. All of these are regulations that were associated with the Affordable Care Act. We have parents being able to keep their kids on their insurance up to the age of 26 and no discrimination between men and women.

Those were rules that have stimulated jobs in America because 22 million people who did not have access to the healthcare system now have access to it. More jobs have arisen because of that. That is a direct result of regulations.

The same thing with Dodd-Frank, which protects people from Wall Street overreach. Those rules have created opportunities for small businesses to come in and start creating real jobs in America.

So rules are good for our society. This legislation cuts that ability to create wealth for everyone else. So I would ask that this amendment be approved by my colleagues.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, the arguments on both sides have been creative, at the very least, but I would like to bring to everyone's attention an article by the National Association of Manufacturers, which is in very simple figures.

This is a survey of manufacturers: ''What would you do with funds currently allocated to Federal regulatory compliance?'' Sixty-three percent said they would invest. 22 percent said they would invest in employee initiatives, creating jobs.

I ask my colleagues to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CUMMINGS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 114–388.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 16, strike the table of sections for chapter 6A of title 5, United States Code, as inserted by section 202(a) of the bill, and insert the following:

''651. Agency monthly submission to Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs.

''652. Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs publications.

''653. Definitions.

Page 22, strike line 1, and all that follows through line 20. amend the table of contents accordingly.

Page 22, line 21, strike ''**SEC. 654. DEFINITIONS.**'' and insert ''**§ 653. Definitions**''.

Page 24, strike line 8 and all that follows through line 12.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 580, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

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

My amendment, cosponsored by Government Operations Subcommittee Ranking Member GERRY CONNOLLY, would strike the 6-month moratorium on rules imposed by the bill.

Title II of this bill prohibits an agency rule from taking effect until 6

months after agencies submit information the bill requires to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs and that office posts this information on the Internet.

Under the bill, if the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs fails to post any of the required information, a rule would be prohibited from taking effect. This is an arbitrary moratorium.

The bill allows for only two exceptions. One exception is if the agency exempts a rule from the notice and comment requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act. The other exception is if the President issues an executive order requiring a rule to take effect.

This bill covers all agency rulemakings, including rules needed to protect our health, safety, and our environment. For example, this bill would cover rules like the one recently published by the Department of Justice that clarifies who is responsible for reporting to law enforcement that a gun has been lost or stolen in transit.

Our country doesn't need an unnecessary 6-month delay in putting in place a commonsense safety rule like this one. The bill's 6-month moratorium exposes this bill for what it really is, which is a way to delay agency rules. My amendment would remove this provision in the underlying bill.

I urge all Members to adopt my amendment.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, as Federal regulatory agencies attempt to pile more and more regulatory burdens on America's struggling workers, families, and small businesses, the least we can ask is that they be transparent about it.

What could be more transparent than requiring them on a monthly basis, online, to update the public with realtime information about what new regulations are coming and how much they will cost?

Once they have that information, affected individuals and job creators will be able to plan and budget meaningfully for new costs they may have to absorb. If they are denied that information, they will only be blindsided. That is not fair.

Title II of the bill makes sure this information is provided to the public. To provide a strong incentive to agencies to honor its requirements, title II prohibits new regulations from becoming effective unless agencies provide transparent information online for 6 months preceding the regulation's issuance.

The amendment seeks to eliminate that incentive. Without an incentive like that in existing law, what have we seen from the Obama administration? Repeated failures to make disclosures required by statute and executive order, including the administration's year-long hiding of the ball on new regulations during the 2012 election cycle.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, again, I would urge Members to vote in favor of this amendment. Again, we have a situation here where this 6-month moratorium is another way of blocking the rulemaking process.

I think it is very unfortunate in this time. I think, if we are talking about transparency, we need to be transparent about why we have this moratorium. The fact is that it is an effort to stop important rulemakings from taking place.

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

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I have some information I would like to bring to the attention of the Members. It is a document from Investor's Business Daily. It is a very simple statement, but it is a very large fact: If we had a Reagan-paced job recovery, we would today have at least 12 million more Americans working.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 114–388.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 18, line 12, strike ''and''.

Page 18, line 21, strike the period and insert ''; and''.

Page 18, after line 21, insert the following:

''(D) any estimate of the benefits of the rule.

Page 20, after line 21, insert the following:

''(E) The total benefits of all rules proposed or finalized, and the number of rules for which an estimate of the benefits of the rule was not available.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 580, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

My amendment would improve title II of H.R. 712 to ensure that the effectiveness of agency regulations are not solely evaluated by the basis of the cost to industry.

Rather, the primary importance of agency rulemaking to the improved health, safety, and security of the American people demands that we also consider the significant benefits of agency regulations in analyzing whether or not they contribute to protecting the public and promoting the general welfare.

In particular, my amendment would require Federal agencies to provide an estimate of the individual benefits of a proposed regulation, just as H.R. 712 currently requires them to report individual regulatory costs.

This amendment would also require the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs to include the total benefits of proposed and final agency rules in the annual report that it would be required to issue under H.R. 712.

In its current form, the underlying bill expressly provides that the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs must publish only the total cost of all proposed and finalized agency rules without reducing the cost by any offsetting benefits in its calculation of the cumulative cost of agency regulations.

Not surprisingly, the Coalition for Sensible Safeguards has issued a formal opposition letter to the language that is included as title II of H.R. 712. The Coalition is an alliance of over 150 businesses, consumer protection, labor, environmental, and good government groups that includes the American Sustainable Business Council and its 200,000 member businesses.

According to the Coalition: ''This bill's one-sided focus on regulatory costs provides a highly distorted picture of the value of critical safeguards that all Americans depend on . . . By focusing exclusively on regulatory costs, this bill gives the misleading impression that regulations are an inescapable drain on the American economy.''

The recent draft report of the costs and benefits of major Federal regulations issued by the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs in October 2015 serves to further illustrate the transparency that is lacking when we only consider the costs associated with an agency regulation.

Among its principal findings, the report provides that, from October 2004 through September 2014, spanning both Republican and Democratic administrations, Federal agencies estimated the aggregate benefits of major Federal regulations to range between $216 billion and $812 billion. In stark contrast, the approximate annual cost of major Federal regulations ranges between $57 billion and $85 billion.

Importantly, several Clean Air rules promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency's Office of Air and Radiation have significantly high estimated benefits that are attributable to the reduction in public exposure to air pollutants.

According to the report, the Clean Air Fine Particle Rule of 2007 had benefits ranging from $19 billion to $167 billion per year. These regulatory benefits would not be considered under H.R. 712.

Other health and safety rules were similarly identified as having a sizable benefit on the American people. Patient safety rules that address dietary supplement oversight, medical error, and safety requirements for long-term care facilities had estimated benefits between $13 billion and $17 billion per year.

Transportation-related safety rules designed to reduce the risk of injury and death associated with airplane, vehicle, and train travel had estimated benefits of between $16 billion and $28 billion per year. These regulatory benefits would not be considered under H.R. 712, as currently drafted.

Mr. Chairman, if our goal is to maximize transparency in the regulatory process, we can't simply give the American people and this Congress one side of the story.

Rather, full transparency and informed decisionmaking require that our analysis does not only include the regulatory costs, but also the extent to which an agency bill improves and protects the health, safety, and security of the American people. My amendment would ensure that this was the case.

□ 1445

Mr. Chairman, it is the primary mission of every Federal agency to protect the American public from harmful and developing situations, whether we are talking about a new prescription painkiller on the market that the FDA finds to be highly addictive, or an emerging financial practice that the Securities and Exchange Commission determines is predatory on American consumers, or dangerous materials that the Environmental Protection Agency deems to be an imminent public hazard.

That public mission is severely undermined if the merits of an agency regulation are evaluated solely on the basis of costs to the industry and at the expense of the significant benefits to the American people.

Again, in closing, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARINO. I welcome the gentleman's belief that new regulations can actually create benefits. I also share the gentleman's interest in ensuring that the public ultimately knows what those benefits are.

The bill, however, does nothing to restrict or prevent the publication of information about the benefits of new rules. It is intended to address what has been lacking in administration publications about new rules: accurate, real-time information about the true nature, timing, and cost of new rules.

That information is essential to those who must bear the burden of the rules so that they can plan, hire, and budget consistent with impending new legal requirements.

Furthermore, the gentleman's amendment would needlessly expose new regulations to the bill's enforcement provisions, delaying promulgation of beneficial rules simply because pre-promulgation statements and expected benefits were lacking.

Mr. Chairman, I constantly spend time in my district in factories because I came from manufacturing, talking to small-business people, and the number one issue concerning their livelihoods and others is overregulation crushing jobs for middle class Americans.

As a result, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part A of House Report 114–388.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 18, line 14, insert after ''including'' the following: ''the imposition of unfunded mandates and''.

Page 20, line 19, insert after ''or finalized,'' the following: ''the total cost of any unfunded mandates imposed by all such rules,''.

Page 22, line 24, insert after ''section 551'' the following: '', and the term 'unfunded mandate' has the meaning given the term 'Federal mandate' in section 421(6) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 658(6)).''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 580, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, this amendment to title II, the ALERT Act, ensures that agencies and OMB's Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, OIRA, report the cost of unfunded mandates imposed through the regulatory process.

Federal agencies can advance government initiatives without using Federal taxpayer dollars by issuing regulations that pass compliance down to State and local governments and to private businesses. These costly mandates make it harder for companies to hire and for cash-strapped States, counties, and cities to keep streets safe and parks clean.

My amendment requires agencies to include in their monthly reports to OIRA whether rules in the pipeline impose unfunded mandates, and requires OIRA to include in its annual cumulative assessment of new regulations the total cost of unfunded mandates imposed by the Federal Government.

This amendment will not unduly burden agencies' regulatory work, as it requires only that they be transparent in their imposition of unfunded mandates on State and local governments and private businesses.

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

I rise in opposition to this amendment. This amendment would further increase the duplication and burden of the underlying bill.

Agencies are already required to perform an analysis, under the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, of whether a proposed rule imposes an unfunded mandate on State, local, or tribal governments, or the private sector.

This amendment would require agencies to report to the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs every month on any unfunded mandate estimates for proposed rules. This amendment would be a backdoor way to get the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs to review unfunded mandate assessments by independent agencies.

Currently, independent agencies are exempt from the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act. This amendment would require independent agencies to conduct unfunded mandate assessments and submit them to OIRA. This would jeopardize the independence of these agencies, which is so very important.

I oppose the underlying bill, and I oppose this amendment, which does not improve the bill.

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I strongly support her amendment.

Over the past several decades, the accumulation of unfunded mandates issued by the Federal Government to State and local governments, tribes, and the private sector has become an alarming concern.

This amendment will throw an early and needed spotlight on proposed new unfunded mandates as Federal agencies

begin the process of considering them. Hopefully, once they are informed of them in time, by the amendment, those who would otherwise have to bear the burden of unfunded mandates will be better armed to fend off their unjust imposition.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time with the right to close.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned in the debate last night on a similar amendment, unfunded mandates are frequently overlooked in the debates about regulatory reform. However, these decisions have real costs and real effects on the individuals, families, and communities we each represent.

While my amendment is a small change, it ensures that costs passed down to businesses, State and local governments are reported.

I thank my colleagues for their consideration and ask for their support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, again, I think I have stated very clearly why we oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part A of House Report 114–388.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of the Jackson Lee amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 22, line 14, strike ''an imminent'' and insert ''a''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 580, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 712 imposes a 6-month moratorium before a rule can take effect, unless the rule either:

(1) qualifies under the Administrative Procedure Act's exception for notice and comment, which applies ''when the agency for good cause finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of the reasons therefore in the rules issued) that notice and public procedure thereon are impractical, unnecessary, or contrary to public interest;'' or

(2) if the President issues an executive order determining that the rule is necessary because of an imminent threat to health or safety or other emergency, necessary for the enforcement of the criminal laws, necessary for national security, or issued pursuant to any statute implementing an international trade agreement.

The amendment simply strikes ''imminent'' from H.R. 712, so that a rule that prevents a threat to health or safety or other emergency would qualify under the bill's exception.

As the Coalition for Sensible Safeguards—an organization representing more than 150 labor, scientific, research, good government, faith, community, health, environmental, and public interest groups—observes, the bill's moratorium will put on hold for 6 months ''the benefits of critically needed regulations, whether measured in lives saved, environmental damage averted, or money saved.''

This 6-month delay would be in addition to the already time-consuming process by which rules are promulgated.

Why should a rule intended to protect public health and safety be held up for 6 months simply because the anticipated harm the rule addresses is not imminent? Shouldn't we look to try to foresee what is going to happen?

That is what this amendment will enable, if this legislation passes. I will ask my colleagues to support this very much commonsense amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Title II of the bill contains transparency requirements that are long overdue. To make sure that agencies comply and conduct their business in the sunshine, it prohibits an agency from entering a new regulation into effect unless the agency makes the disclosures the bill requires for at least 6 months before the regulation's published effective date.

Nevertheless, to provide flexibility where it is needed, the bill allows exceptions to the prohibition. For example, it grants a general exception for rules that do not require notice and public comment pursuant to the Administrative Procedures Act's ''good cause'' exception. By statute, this exception includes situations where taking the time for notice and comment would be ''contrary to the public interest.''

In addition, the bill provides for a specific exception when a rule is needed to respond to an imminent threat.

The amendment seeks to widen the latter exception, but it goes too far. It would allow any health or safety rule, including environmental rules, that an agency self-styles as responsive to an emergency, to evade the title's reasonable disclosure requirements with ease.

A mere 6 months of disclosure to the public is not unreasonable in the absence of an imminent emergency. The courts, moreover, can be relied upon to interpret the imminency requirement so as not to delay unduly the effective dates of needed, true emergency rules.

And, in any event, the bill's exception for rules qualifying for the APA's ''good cause'' exception to notice and comment is adequate to provide for any remaining need. So I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, opposition is premised upon the notion that we just can't trust a Federal employee who is charged with overseeing the protection of Americans through the rule process. We don't believe, on the other side, that a person can be conscientious and dutiful about trying to help people.

Instead, they want to make it such that you can't issue a rule. You will gum up the process by extending it out for so long—another 6 months—despite the fact that the rule, as foreseen by a Federal employee—and it has gone through the notice and comments part of the Administrative Procedure Act, which has worked for decades. You just simply don't want government to issue a rule that can protect people.

Why? Because it gets in the way of some big corporations' profits. That is what this is really all about, protecting profits at the expense of the health, safety, and well-being of the people. We don't trust a government worker to be able to provide good service to the people by promulgating rules that protect people.

□ 1500

It is crazy, but that is what we are dealing with.

I would ask that the very reasonable Jackson Lee amendment be favored by my colleagues in this body.

Please vote ''yes.''

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to say to the gentleman from Georgia that it is entirely reasonable that regulations proposed to protect the people, as he notes, should be known by the people before they are put into effect because they may decide it is not the way they want to be protected. All this legislation does is make sure that they have adequate notice of proposed regulations that could have an impact on their jobs, on their family, on their health, and on their safety.

Government bureaucrats don't always get it right. We have learned that the hard way. I think it is very important that this amendment be defeated and that the underlying notice requirement in the bill that will benefit the general public be preserved. I oppose the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. CUMMINGS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in part A of House Report 114–388.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 22, line 24, insert before the period the following: '', except that the term 'agency' does not include an independent establishment as defined in section 104''.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 580, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

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

My amendment is cosponsored by Government Operations Subcommittee Ranking Member GERRY CONNOLLY. Our amendment would exempt independent agencies from the unnecessary, burdensome, and potentially dangerous provisions of this legislation.

This bill would prohibit an agency rule from taking effect until the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs posts certain information on proposed and final rules on the Internet for at least 6 months. The bill only allows for two exceptions. One exception is if the agency exempts a rule from the notice and comment requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act. The other exception is if the President issues an executive order requiring a rule to take effect.

This bill covers all agency rulemakings, no matter how important. When applied to independent agencies, it is particularly dangerous. Independent agencies are supposed to regulate industries without the risk of political interference on their rulemaking. They are not required to obtain approval for their rules from the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs.

Under this bill, a rule issued by an independent agency could be delayed if the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs fails to comply with the requirements of the bill. That means this bill would give the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs the ability to delay a rule issued by an independent agency. That may be an unintended consequence, but it is a serious one that could affect our Nation's financial markets, health, and safety.

One independent agency that would be affected by this rule is the Consumer Product Safety Commission. The CPSC recently proposed a safety standard for high chairs. The CPSC reports that over a 4-year period, an estimated 10,000 injuries occurred that were related to high chairs. H.R. 712 could delay rules like these high chair standards. That is simply unacceptable. Our amendment would exempt independent agencies like the Consumer Product Safety Commission from the bill.

I urge my colleagues to adopt our amendment.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Title II of the bill, the ALERT Act, contains needed transparency requirements so that hardworking Americans who bear the cost of new regulation at least know in realtime what is coming and what it will cost them to comply. Just like ordinary executive agencies, independent agencies should provide this level of transparency about the new regulations they are preparing.

Why should the public not have the right to know as much about what the Securities and Exchange Commission is planning to impose as it knows about what the Environmental Protection Agency plans? Why shouldn't the public know as much about how the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau plans to regulate new car loans as it knows about how the Department of Transportation plans to regulate new car designs?

The bill strengthens and protects the public's right to know. The amendment would allow independent agencies to hide the ball at the public's expense, and so I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

The amendment was rejected.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House Report 114–388 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. CUMMINGS of Maryland.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. LYNCH of Massachusetts.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 242, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

AYES—175

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

NOES—242

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

NOT VOTING—16

Chu, Judy
Cleaver
DeLauro
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Miller (MI)
Nugent
Palazzo
Rush
Sires
Smith (WA)
Titus
Webster (FL)

□ 1541

Messrs. CALVERT, WHITFIELD, ZINKE, MARINO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. BRADY of Pennsylvania, CLYBURN, Mses. SCHAKOWSKY, LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. MCNERNEY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr Chair, on rollcall No. 7, the Johnson of Georgia Amendment No. 2, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CUMMINGS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) 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 174, noes 244, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]

AYES—174

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

NOES—244

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

NOT VOTING—15

Chu, Judy
Cleaver
DeLauro
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Miller (MI)

Nugent
Rush
Sires
Smith (WA)
Titus
Webster (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1546

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) 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 180, noes 235, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

AYES—180

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

NOES—235

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

NOT VOTING—18

Chu, Judy
Cleaver
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Miller (MI)
Nugent
Rokita
Rush
Sires
Smith (WA)
Titus
Walker
Webster (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1550

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 241, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

AYES—173

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sinema
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez

Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—241

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

NOT VOTING—19

Chu, Judy
Cleaver
DeLauro
Jackson Lee
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Lewis
Miller (MI)
Nugent
Rush
Sherman
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (WA)
Titus
Webster (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1553

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) having assumed the chair, Mr. DOLD, 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. 712) to impose certain limitations on consent decrees and settlement agreements by agencies that require the agencies to take regulatory action in accordance with the terms thereof, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 580, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Kelly of Illinois moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 712, to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 1, amend the table of contents for the bill by inserting after the item pertaining to section 302 the following:

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. No delay of any rule, consent decree, or settlement agreement that prevents gun violence.

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. NO DELAY OF ANY RULE, CONSENT DECREE, OR SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT THAT PREVENTS GUN VIOLENCE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall not apply in the case of any rule, consent decree, or settlement agreement that pertains to protecting Americans from gun violence, particularly in school zones or other sensitive areas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. 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.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment is a simple, straightforward, commonsense improvement that I believe both sides of the aisle can agree would help protect American children from the threat of violence.

If my amendment passes, it would ensure that men and women that we represent and their children will have the peace of mind of knowing that this Congress can cast aside partisan differences to vote to protect families and communities from senseless gun violence.

That is because my amendment would exempt this bill to any regulation that would protect Americans, particularly young children, from gun violence in school zones and other sensitive areas.

If an agency proposes a solution that would improve the health, safety, and well-being of Americans, especially children, by limiting gun violence, it is simply unconscionable to throw obstacles in the way to stymie that solution.

I don't see how this Congress, whose Members were entrusted by families in our home districts to defend their right to life, liberty, and happiness, can argue that we did all we could to defend these rights, yet vote against responsible proposals that aim to protect life and preserve liberty and promote happiness.

□ 1600

How can we in good conscience allow this body to pass this bill as is? How can we allow good community safety solutions to get bogged down when we can amend this bill to keep gun violence from ringing out in our classrooms and playgrounds? How can we turn a blind eye to regulations that charge us to act now to keep our children from being victimized by violence and say that the responsible thing to do is to sideline it for 6 months for additional review?

We cannot allow our children to be sitting ducks for half a year. Far too many times we hear about a child the same age as your son, your daughter, or grandchild falling victim to a stray bullet fired by a criminal, someone who should not have been able to purchase a gun but found a way through loopholes in our laws.

Or we hear about young women who are victims of domestic violence and are killed by their former partner who, despite a violent past, was able to legally purchase a firearm.

On Tuesday, President Obama announced a number of executive actions

to address our Nation's gun violence epidemic. Specifically, the President's actions expand Federal background checks and improve mental healthcare reporting to ensure guns stay out of the hands of dangerous individuals.

I am not asking for you to vote based on your feelings for the President, but I want to pose this to you: If there were a 6-month waiting period before a regulation ensuring that the dangerously mentally ill are unable to purchase a firearm went into effect, how many innocent lives would be lost? How many men, women, and children would be killed? How many more Newtowns, how many more Auroras, and how many more Charlestons would occur? How many more of my young constituents in Chicago and Riverdale would I lose to gun violence after being shot by a stray bullet on their way home from school?

I support policies that are thorough and measured, but I cannot support policies that prevent health and safety regulations, especially those that ensure the well-being of children from immediately being enforceable.

I have come to this floor countless times to advocate for commonsense gun legislation. We must act. My amendment will improve the bill by putting the health, safety, and well-being of our Nation's children first. It will ensure that Congress works with President Obama and allows his executive actions to start saving lives immediately. I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, the American people have waited too long for relief for us to delay in the face of this procedural motion. Now is the time for action, not parliamentary gimmicks.

We are 7 years into the Obama administration. Real unemployment is still a massive problem. America's labor force participation is still near record lows, yet instead of helping by getting out of the way, the Obama administration and Washington's entrenched regulatory bureaucracy day after day pile new burden after new burden on the backs of workers, American families, and small-business owners.

The total cost of Federal regulations is poised to zoom past $2 trillion per year as the Obama administration furiously works to get out the door all the regulations it can in its last year in office. If that $2 trillion were a nation's economy, it would be one of the top 10 economies in the world.

Mr. Speaker, the Investor's Business Daily reports that we have just concluded 8 years of zero real wage growth for America's workers and families. That means zero wage growth for the entire Obama administration.

What about jobs? We would have created almost 6 million more jobs if the so-called Obama recovery had just been as strong as the average recovery since World War II.

America's workers and families cannot afford for Washington to continue to sacrifice the Nation's prosperity and ability to generate jobs so the regulatory bureaucracy can expand into every nook and cranny of our lives. Nothing in this bill prevents emergency regulations or otherwise unduly delays needed regulations.

Vote against this motion to recommit. Vote for this bill.

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 171, noes 244, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

AYES—171

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

NOES—244

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
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
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder

Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—18

Bishop (GA)
Chu, Judy
Cleaver
Connolly
DeLauro
Gutiérrez
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Miller (MI)
Nugent
Rush
Sires
Smith (WA)
Titus
Webster (FL)

□ 1611

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The House has embarked on its first lengthy vote series of this session, and the Chair will take this time to reiterate the rules and policies on the length of votes.

The rules establish 15 minutes as the minimum time for electronic voting in the ordinary case and 5 minutes and 2 minutes as the minimum time in other cases when Members are already in or near the Chamber in response to an earlier vote.

Members should attempt to come to the floor within the 15-minute period as prescribed by the first ringing of the bells.

Members are further reminded that the standard policy is to not terminate the vote when a Member is in the well attempting to cast a vote. Other efforts to hold the vote open are not similarly protected.

As a point of courtesy to each of your colleagues, voting within the allotted time would help with the maintenance of the institution.

The Chair appreciates the Members' attention to this matter.

Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 244, noes 173, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

AYES—244

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

NOES—173

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

NOT VOTING—16

Chu, Judy
Cleaver
DeLauro
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
McDermott
Miller (MI)
Nugent
Rush
Sires
Smith (WA)
Titus
Webster (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK) (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1620

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SEARCHING FOR AND CUTTING REGULATIONS THAT ARE UNNECESSARILY BURDENSOME ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 580 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. 1155.

Will the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) kindly take the chair.

□ 1622

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. 1155) to provide for the establishment of a process for the review of rules and sets of rules, and for other purposes, with Mr. SIMPSON (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, January 6, 2016, a request for a recorded voted on amendment No. 10 printed in part B of House Report 114–388 offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 114–388 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. CUMMINGS of Maryland.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island.

Amendment No. 8 by Ms. DELBENE of Washington.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. CICILLINE of Rhode Island.

Amendment No. 10 by Mr. POCAN of Wisconsin.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for each electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 239, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]

AYES—174

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

NOES—239

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
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
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
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—20

Chu, Judy
Cleaver
Coffman
Davis, Rodney
DeLauro
Gowdy
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
LaMalfa
Miller (MI)
Nugent
Rush
Sires
Smith (WA)
Stivers
Titus
Webster (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1626

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. CUMMINGS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) 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 172, noes 244, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

AYES—172

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai

Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—244

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

NOT VOTING—17

Chu, Judy
Cleaver
DeLauro
Gowdy
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
LaMalfa
Miller (MI)
Nugent
Rush
Sires
Smith (WA)
Titus
Webster (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1630

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 241, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

AYES—176

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

NOES—241

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
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
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
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—16

Chu, Judy
Cleaver
DeLauro
Gowdy
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Miller (MI)
Nugent
Rush
Sires
Smith (WA)
Titus
Webster (FL)

□ 1633

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. DELBENE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE) 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 176, noes 239, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]

AYES—176

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

NOES—239

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

NOT VOTING—18

Chu, Judy
Cleaver
DeLauro
Grijalva
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Miller (MI)
Nugent
Rice (NY)
Roe (TN)
Rush
Sires
Smith (WA)
Titus
Webster (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1637

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 244, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

AYES—173

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

NOES—244

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)

Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
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
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—16

Chu, Judy
Cleaver
DeLauro
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Lewis
Miller (MI)
Nugent
Rush
Sires
Smith (WA)
Titus
Webster (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1640

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. POCAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 245, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

AYES—173

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

NOES—245

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
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
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—15

Chu, Judy
Cleaver
DeLauro
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Miller (MI)
Nugent
Rush
Sires
Smith (WA)
Titus
Webster (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1644

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, 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. 1155) to provide for the establishment of a process for the

review of rules and sets of rules, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 580, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were 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. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CICILLINE. I am opposed to the bill in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Cicilline moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 1155, to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 29, line 21, insert after ''Code'' the following: '', except for a special rule''.

Page 29, insert after line 24 the following:

(6) SPECIAL RULE.—The term ''special rule'' means a rule that pertains to prohibiting discrimination by Federal contractors or subcontractors on the basis of sex, sexual orientation, or gender identity, and requires such contractors or subcontractors to take affirmative measures to prevent discrimination on those bases from occurring.

Mr. CHAFFETZ (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 Utah?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, this bill will immediately proceed to final passage here on the floor, as amended.

This amendment is very simple. It would exempt from the requirements of the underlying bill a rule prohibiting discrimination by Federal contractors or subcontractors on the basis of sex, sexual orientation, or gender identity, and require such contractors to take affirmative measures to prevent discrimination on those bases from occurring.

This amendment is consistent with the executive order signed by President Obama on July 21, 2014, that added sexual orientation and gender identity to the list of protected categories covered by Federal contractors—protections that were originally put in place by President Lyndon Johnson, a leader who did so much to advance equality in our country.

Today, while we have made great strides in terms of marriage equality, members of the LGBT community still face significant discrimination in employment as well as a variety of other important areas of life.

As many of my colleagues are aware, it is still legal in most States to fire a qualified person from a job that they are performing well simply because of their sexual orientation or gender identity.

Today, in many places across the country, a gay couple can get married on Saturday, post pictures online on Sunday, and get fired from their jobs or kicked out of their apartments on Monday. This is contrary to everything this country stands for, including the principle of equality upon which our country was founded.

I would like to point out, contrary to the sentiments of the American people, a majority of Americans, nearly 70 percent, support antidiscrimination laws to protect LGBT individuals. Unfortunately, there are those who would continue to stand in the way of full equality for all Americans, who think that it is okay that hardworking men and women simply trying to support their families suffer discrimination because of their sexual orientation or gender identity.

That is why it is important to support the President in his effort to protect the LGBT community from discrimination in Federal contracting.

Just as businesses should not be able to discriminate based on race, ethnicity, gender, or disability, no entity that benefits from government money should be able to discriminate based on sexual orientation or gender identity.

The underlying bill we are discussing today would hinder the implementation of these nondiscrimination efforts, putting everyday Americans at risk of losing their jobs based on nothing more than who they are.

I am reminded of the story of Carter Brown, a young man from Texas who had built a thriving career in real estate in Dallas, Texas. Carter had received three promotions in 2 years, was earning a great salary and loved his job. But when he was outed as transgender by a colleague, Carter found himself harassed, ostracized, and ultimately fired from his job, and there was absolutely nothing he could do, because he was not protected under the law.

Carter bravely told his story earlier this year in the Lyndon Johnson Room of the Capitol Building as we announced the introduction of the Equality Act, which would place important protections for the LGBT community throughout our Federal Code.

The Equality Act would ensure that members of the LGBT community are protected from discrimination in areas of employment, credit, housing, education, Federal funding, jury service, and public accommodations. I am very proud that 171 of my colleagues in the House have joined in this effort and cosponsored this bill, and I urge the rest of my colleagues to sign on as well.

But until full equality is passed into Federal law, at the minimum, we should ensure that Federal money is not being used to discriminate against LGBT Americans by companies who receive Federal contracts. That is why I urge my colleagues to support this motion to recommit and ensure equality in our Federal contracting. Our Federal Government should not be used to promote or tolerate discrimination. It is contrary to the founding principles of our great country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you to vote in support of this motion to recommit.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) is one of my favorite people. We get to serve on a committee together, and we have done other things together. He is a genuine human being who puts forth his heart, and I personally appreciate it, as I know he cares deeply and passionately about this body and the work that he does.

I also want to thank Mr. JASON SMITH, who has put forward a very important bill, something that I think is a reasonable, commonsense approach to deal with regulations of the past. There is no prohibition about putting regulations forward, but going back and looking, taking a scrub, if you will, and looking at past regulations, what this bill does is it simply creates a bipartisan commission—bipartisan—to go back and look at these, and they produce a report. That report comes to Congress, it has to pass both bodies, and it has to get the signature of the President. That is a very reasonable thing to do. So I urge ''no'' on this motion to recommit, ''yes'' on the passage.

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. CICILLINE. 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 581; and adopting House Resolution 581, if ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 239, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

AYES—178

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

NOES—239

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

NOT VOTING—16

Chu, Judy
Cleaver
DeLauro
Fleming
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Miller (MI)
Nugent
Rush
Sires
Smith (NE)
Smith (WA)
Titus
Webster (FL)

□ 1703

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 245, noes 174, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

AYES—245

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

NOES—174

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah

Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Chu, Judy
Cleaver
DeLauro
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Miller (MI)
Nugent
Rush
Sires
Smith (WA)
Titus
Webster (FL)

□ 1709

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. 1927, FAIRNESS IN CLASS ACTION LITIGATION ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 581) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1927) to amend title 28, United States Code, to improve fairness in class action litigation, 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 236, nays 176, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 21]

YEAS—236

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
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
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zinke

NAYS—176

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

NOT VOTING—21

Chu, Judy
Cleaver
Costa
Davis, Rodney
DeLauro
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Love
Miller (MI)
Nugent
Palazzo
Royce
Rush
Sires
Smith (WA)
Titus
Webster (FL)
Westmoreland
Zeldin

□ 1716

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 176, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 22]

AYES—234

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
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
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zinke

NOES—176

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

NOT VOTING—23

Brady (TX)
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cleaver
Comstock
Costa
DeLauro
Johnson, E. B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Love
Miller (MI)
Nugent
Royce
Rush
Sires
Smith (WA)
Titus
Webster (FL)
Westmoreland
Yoho
Zeldin

□ 1726

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 22, I was unavoidably detained on official business and missed the vote. The vote was on H. Res. 581, the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1927, the Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act of 2015. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

MOMENT OF SILENCE TO MOURN THE 11 LIVES LOST IN MISSISSIPPI'S DISASTROUS WINTER STORM

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

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am joined today by Congressmen THOMPSON, HARPER, and PALAZZO, all from Mississippi.

We rise to mourn the 11 lives that were lost in Mississippi due to severe weather over the Christmas holiday. We had 11 deaths and 57 injuries reported in Benton, Coahoma, Marshall, and Tippah Counties, which are two of our four districts.

On Governor Bryant's request, President Obama issued a major disaster declaration for the State of Mississippi. The Presidential disaster declaration makes Federal assistance available to eligible individuals and business owners in designated areas.

As I visited the impacted areas, I was saddened by the amount of destruction, of the loss of property, and, most importantly, of the loss of life; but I was uplifted by neighbors helping neighbors, by friends helping friends, and by strangers helping strangers. That is the strength of Mississippi: The people who come together to help each other in times of need.

I cannot begin to imagine the sense of loss felt by the families who were affected. We ask our colleagues to join us in continuing to lift them up in prayer.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for a moment of silence.

MOURNING THE 11 LIVES LOST IN MISSISSIPPI'S DISASTROUS WINTER STORM

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. KELLY) indicated, Mississippi was hit very hard with tornadoes. There were 11 deaths, and there was significant damage. We have received a disaster declaration.

I want to pay a special tribute to our system of disaster response, which worked. Federal, State, and local officials came together and responded just like the textbook said they should. Nowhere have we received any complaints about help not being available.

So if there is any good that we can talk about coming from such a disaster, it is this: The system that Congress put together for government to respond to its citizens in the time of disaster worked during this particular disaster in Mississippi.

□ 1730

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state for the RECORD how I would have voted on rollcall votes 7 to 23 that I missed today because I was detained in my district on official business:

On rollcall vote No. 7, I would have voted "aye," the Johnson amendment.

On rollcall vote No. 8, I would have voted "aye," the Cummings-Connolly amendment.

On rollcall vote No. 9, the Lynch amendment, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 10, the Jackson Lee amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall vote No. 11, I would have voted "aye," Messrs. Cummings-Connolly amendment.

On rollcall vote No. 12, I would have vote "aye," Democratic motion to recommit on H.R. 712.

On rollcall vote No. 13, I would have voted "no" on passage of H.R. 712, Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015.

On rollcall vote No. 14, I would have voted "aye" on the Johnson amendment.

On rollcall vote No. 15, I would have voted "aye" on the Cummings-Connolly amendment.

On rollcall vote No. 16, I would have voted "aye" on the Cicilline amendment.

On rollcall vote No. 17, I would have voted "aye" on the DelBene amendment.

On rollcall vote No. 18, the Jackson Lee amendment offered by Mr. CICILLINE, I would have voted "aye."

And on rollcall vote No. 19, I would have voted "aye." This is on H.R. 1155, the SCRUB Act of 2015.

On Thursday, January 6, I was unavoidably detained in my congressional district attending

to my representational duties and thus not present for rollcall Votes 7 through 23. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

1. On rollcall 7 I would have voted "aye." (Johnson (GA) Amendment to H.R. 712, Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015).

2. On rollcall 8 I would have voted "aye." (Cummings/Connolly Amendment to H.R. 712, Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015).

3. On rollcall 9 I would have voted "aye." (Lynch Amendment to H.R. 712, Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015).

4. On rollcall 10 I would have voted "aye." (Jackson Lee/Johnson (GA) Amendment to H.R. 712, Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015).

5. On rollcall 11 I would have voted "aye." (Cummings/Connolly Amendment to H.R. 712, Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015).

6. On rollcall 12 I would have voted "aye." (Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 712, Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015).

7. On rollcall 13 I would have voted "no." (On Passage of H.R. 712, Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015).

8. On rollcall 14 I would have voted "aye." (Johnson (GA) Amendment to H.R. 1155, SCRUB Act of 2015).

9. On rollcall 15 I would have voted "aye." (Cummings/Connolly Amendment to H.R. 1155, SCRUB Act of 2015).

10. On rollcall 16 I would have voted "aye." (Cicilline Amendment to H.R. 1155, SCRUB Act of 2015).

11. On rollcall 17 I would have voted "aye." (DelBene Amendment to H.R. 1155, SCRUB Act of 2015).

12. On rollcall 18 I would have voted "aye." (Jackson Lee/Cicilline Amendment to H.R. 1155, SCRUB Act of 2015).

13. On rollcall 19 I would have voted "aye." (Pocan Amendment to H.R. 1155, SCRUB Act of 2015).

MINNESOTA'S FARMING FATHER

(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 celebrate Oliver Kelley, who was born on this day in 1826. Kelley, a native Bostonian, realized that Minnesota was a land of great opportunity and moved there in 1849.

Although he had no experience farming, Kelley became a ''book farmer'' and everything that he first learned about agriculture, he got from reading. Kelley's thirst for knowledge, great intuition, and progressive methods allowed his farm in Elk River to thrive.

In 1864, Kelley became a clerk for the U.S. Bureau of Agriculture. Through his work, he recognized the importance of agriculture to our Nation and, in 1867, helped found the National Grange, a society and advocacy group for rural America.

Oliver Kelley's role in agriculture led to his induction into the National Agricultural Center and Hall of Fame in 2006.

The Kelley farm remains an important part of our community. Today, it is a historical property that teaches thousands of Minnesota school kids about agriculture.

Minnesotans are certainly grateful for Kelley's efforts, which have largely contributed to agricultural success in our country, and we are proud to have his legacy maintained in Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District.

CELEBRATING WILLIAM ''BILL'' RAY

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the life of an extraordinary man, William ''Bill'' Ray.

Bill laughed often, and he loved much. His charm and gentlemanly character won the respect of many people in my community.

Bill worked in my district office as a community liaison and caseworker for 13 years. You know what? He made a difference in people's lives. He was genuinely interested in people and things, from the Boy Scouts to Native Americans and to veterans. He knew how to find the best in others, and he gave the best of himself.

Bill loved his wife, Rhonda, and their son, Jeffrey, with all of his heart and soul. He loved his country and our military. He was a true patriot. Bill was noble in character, genuine in spirit, and very kind of heart.

Rhonda, Jeffrey, you have my deepest condolences on the passing of your husband and father. I am blessed to have known him and to have worked with him.

PRO-LIFE MOVEMENT

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, 54 million, that is the number of lives that have been cut short in our Nation by abortion over the 43 years since the Supreme Court's infamous Roe v. Wade decision. That is 54 million children who were never given the chance to experience the world around them, and 54 million human beings who were denied the natural and inalienable right to life that our Founding Fathers enshrined in the Declaration of Independence.

As a father, I have watched my son grow from his first sonogram to a very active 2-year-old. He looks to me for protection, for guidance, for comfort. So too do society's most innocent and vulnerable count on us to defend them.

During his visit to the U.S. in 1987, now-Saint Pope John Paul II remarked: ''The ultimate test of your greatness is the way you treat every human being, but especially the weakest and most defenseless ones.''

I believe we must reach out to mothers in distress, as well as the child that they are bearing. There are few more vulnerable and defenseless than the unborn.

On the 22nd of this month, hundreds of thousands of Americans will arrive here in our Nation's Capital for the annual March for Life. I look forward to joining them as we work toward that day when our great Nation will recognize the right to life for all Americans, especially our unborn children.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, mothers and children from Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador come to this Nation for protection. They are running from certain death, rape, and persecution in their own country.

This administration has deported more immigrants than any other in the history of the United States. We were told that violent criminals would be targeted. Yet, mothers and children are being deported. Not only do these raids tear families and neighborhoods apart, they waste taxpayer dollars that should be used on other priorities.

We spend $14,000 per mom and $14,000 per child when they are chased down and deported. Some are sent to their country to their death.

So let's focus on real threats to our Nation. Let's focus on working with all of our Western Hemisphere neighbors and work to solve the Central American refugee crisis together.

ON THE RIGHTS OF PERSONS

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

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, for those who haven't been in the House Chamber, surrounding the inside of this beautiful building are effigies of great philosophers and lawgivers that have influenced the founding of our Nation. One of those, to my right, is that of Sir William Blackstone.

Now, Blackstone had great influence upon our Founders, especially that of Thomas Jefferson. In fact, it was Blackstone who influenced the three enumerated rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. Speaker, let me read from Blackstone's Commentary, the very document which influenced Thomas Jefferson to make life the very first right that is given by government.

Blackstone said: ''Life is the immediate gift of God, a right inherent by nature in every individual; and it begins in contemplation of law as soon as an infant is able to stir in the mother's womb.''

That is one of the foundations of this Nation, that life begins at conception.

And our Founding Fathers understood that it was a great philosophy and that is when the protection of law begins.

On January 22, 1973, we departed from that philosophy with the decision of Roe v. Wade. Since then, over 57 million American lives have been taken because of that decision. Mr. Speaker, that number is equivalent to the population of Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Kentucky, South Carolina, Louisiana, and Tennessee. That one decision, Mr. Speaker, has not only figuratively, but literally changed the landscape of America.

EAST NICOLAUS HIGH SCHOOL

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, before the holiday break, I rose to congratulate the East Nicolaus High School Spartans from Sutter County for advancing to the CIF Division VI–AA football championship game. At that time, they were about to make a 500-mile trip to San Diego to face Coronado, a school four times their size.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say that the Spartans may have been the underdogs in the game, but that didn't matter to them. On December 28, they won the championship game 16–6. Quarterback S.J. Brown threw for a touchdown and rushed for another. Donovan Switalski had 25 carries for 135 yards. On defense, quarterback Eddie Herrera intercepted two passes.

Those are great individual efforts. As a former lineman for the University of California Bears, I know it takes a full team to pull out a win like this and also a coach.

I congratulate Coach Travis Barker and the entire East Nicolaus team for making Sutter County and the entire Third Congressional District very proud.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION BILL

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, when the House sends the budget reconciliation bill to the President this evening, he has a chance to help hardworking American taxpayers by signing it and saving taxpayers over $500 billion over the next 10 years.

It does that in two ways. First, it repeals most of the unaffordable ObamaCare program, which has raised the cost of health insurance and health care for millions and millions of hardworking Americans. It also removes all Federal taxpayer funding from Planned Parenthood, the largest abortion provider in the country, which receives over half a billion taxpayer dollars a year and does 330,000 abortions a year. In fact, it is the largest abortion provider in America. Instead of funding the largest abortion provider in America, we direct those funds to over 10,000 community health centers.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the President agrees and saves hardworking American taxpayers billions of dollars.

DEFENDING THE SECOND AMENDMENT

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

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, any constitutional lawyer should know that Congress is supposed to write the laws and the executive branch is supposed to follow them, as written. Implementing more gun control through executive fiat is not what is needed, and it is not what is legal.

Enforcement of the current law is what is needed by this executive, and it is what this President should be doing. Instead, for example, he lets prisoners out of jail to contribute to the violence.

Mr. Speaker, the right to self-defense is God-given. It is vital in order to protect people and property against criminals, and it is a hedge against tyrants, and it shall not be infringed.

To those who would challenge these rights, Mr. Speaker, I leave you with these words: ''A well-regulated militia necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.''

BORN ALIVE SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson, whose words marked the beginning of this Nation, said: ''The care of human life and its happiness, and not its destruction, is the chief and only object of good government.''

Yet, Mr. Speaker, 43 years ago, our Supreme Court mandated abortion on demand in America, and 57 million innocent little American babies have since been slaughtered before seeing the light of day in this, the land of the free and the home of brave.

Mr. Speaker, this House passed the Born Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act months ago to protect helpless children who survive abortion and are born alive. Yet at this very moment, that bill to protect born-alive children languishes in the United States Senate for lack of six Democrat votes and a veto threat by Barack Obama.

It is time for the President of the United States and each Senator and all of us, as Americans, to ask ourselves in our own hearts if this is who we truly are.

□ 1745

WE MUST SPEAK UP FOR THE INNOCENTS

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sad heart that I rise today to speak for those whose lives have been tragically cut short in the wake of Roe v. Wade. A staggering 57 million innocent girls and boys have been aborted in this country since that horrible decision 43 years ago. Roe v. Wade remains one of the most heinous acts of judicial activism in the history of the United States.

As a father of five and a grandfather of three, I know that every child is a wonderful gift from God. Our country was founded upon the sacred truth that all deserve the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The perverse belief that an unplanned child does not possess the same value as that of any other child should have no place in our society. There may be unplanned children, but there is no such thing as an unwanted child.

Later this month, thousands of pro-life patriots will come to Washington to peacefully march in support of life and against the national disgrace that is abortion. I am pleased to be among those fighting against this greatest human rights injustice of our time. We must continue to pray, and we must continue to speak up for the innocents who cannot speak for themselves.

57 MILLION INNOCENT LIVES LOST

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

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise today in memory of the 43rd anniversary of the Supreme Court's tragic decision in Roe v. Wade. Since Roe v. Wade, we have lost 57 million innocent lives. May God rest their souls. That is an astounding and absolutely heart-numbing loss.

Countless lives have been impacted by abortion. Each one of those 57 million children had a future destroyed by abortion.

Even Norma McCorvey, the plaintiff known as Roe, revealed in 1995 that she had, in fact, become pro-life and is now a vocal opponent of abortion and the abortion industry.

Mr. Speaker, the sanctity of human life must be protected. We have a duty to protect the lives of all Americans, especially the most helpless and innocent of all, the unborn.

I stand with the thousands of Americans who will soon gather on The Washington Mall to serve as the voice of 57 million unborn babies whose lives were tragically taken through abortion.

REMEMBERING SENATOR BUMPERS

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week the State of Arkansas lost a giant in the political world. Dale Bumpers, a former Governor and Senator, had served the State of Arkansas for many decades.

As an intern for Arkansas' junior Senator at the time, David Pryor, I first met Senator Bumpers in 1986. His service to his fellow Arkansans began in the Fourth Congressional District, where he returned home to Charleston to serve as city attorney after the Marines and law school.

He went on to serve on the local school board before mounting multiple successful bids for statewide office. Charleston Public School District is not only known for producing stellar graduates and for the Tigers' powerhouse football program, but for heeding Dale Bumpers' advice in 1954 and becoming the first public school in the former Confederate States to desegregate.

His decades of public service were about serving others, not prestige or power. In his autobiography, Dale said it was his father who encouraged him to enter public service, calling it a noble profession.

As we remember Senator Bumpers, I can think of no nobler act than serving others. I appreciate Dale Bumpers' example and his servant's heart.

CORPUS CHRISTI TROOP 3 CELEBRATES 100 YEARS OF SCOUTING

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Boy Scout Troop 3 in Corpus Christi, Texas, that is celebrating 100 years of Scouting.

The Scouts is a wonderful organization for our youth. It teaches them new things. It helps them build self-esteem, learn teamwork, self-sufficiency, and the importance of helping others.

From the beginning of Troop 3 in 1916, the Scouts have always been of service to our community and the country. During World War I, members of the troop sold war bonds. After the devastating 1919 hurricane, the Scouts of Troop 3, along with National Guard units, went door to door to compile an accurate list of casualties.

The Scouts have contributed many hours of service throughout our community. During the hurricane, they did mosquito control and distributed foods and blankets.

Today Troop 3 continues to be active in community service projects completed and many have benefited from the service projects completed by Eagle Scout candidates in the troop.

On this upcoming 100th anniversary, Troop 3 can take pride in its traditions and contributions to our community. Troop 3 and the First United Methodist Church of Corpus Christi, Texas, are a great asset to our community, our State, and our country.

THE PRO-LIFE MOVEMENT IS ALIVE AND WELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUM). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. 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 our Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, since 1973, at least 58 million unborn children have been killed by abortion, a staggering loss of children's precious lives, a death toll that equates with the entire population of England.

Despite this staggering loss of children's lives and the sad fact that President Obama is using stealth, deception, and coercive power of the State to promote abortion violence, including the massive public funding of abortion on demand in ObamaCare, the pro-life movement is alive and well and making serious, significant, and sustained progress.

Yesterday Congress passed landmark legislation to end taxpayer subsidies for Planned Parenthood, and special thanks go to Speaker RYAN, Majority Leader MCCARTHY, Chairman PRICE, and others in leadership for crafting this lifesaving legislation.

In this Congress alone, powerful pro-life measures have passed, including the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, and the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

On the State level, 282 pro-life laws have been enacted since 2010, including laws to stop dismemberment abortions, require a 72-hour waiting period, and to provide informed consent.

With the March for Life only a couple days away, pro-lifers are more determined, faith-filled, and hope-filled than ever.

Millennials are overwhelmingly pro-life. As the former head of the pro-abortion group NARAL observed, after witnessing a recent pro-life march, the March for Life, she said: I just thought, my gosh, they are so young. There are so many of them, and they are so young.

Public opinion polls concur that more Americans, especially women and young people, are pro-life. Seventy-one percent of the millennials opposed taxpayer funding for abortion, 69 percent of the women. Fifty-nine percent of women favor a limit on abortion at at least 20 weeks when the unborn child is capable of feeling pain. The Gallup Poll has found that Planned Parenthood's favorability rating among women has dropped 24 points in the last two decades alone.

A few minutes ago, Mr. Speaker, Speaker PAUL RYAN enrolled H.R. 3762, sponsored by Dr. PRICE, a bill to roll back much of ObamaCare and to defund Planned Parenthood. Yes, the President, President Obama, the abortion President, is all but certain to veto that bill to defund Planned Parenthood, and I just have to say, Mr. Speaker, How sad is that? The President has everything, but, sadly, there is no room, no empathy for the babies who will be exterminated. That is tragic. Hopefully he will have a change of heart at some point in his career, and hopefully it will be within weeks.

I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, 43 years ago the Roe v. Wade decision resulted in the death of 57 million Americans; 57 million unborn children lost their lives, over a million children per year. It is an amazing statistic.

Louisiana has traditionally ranked as one of the most pro-life States in the Nation. We have some amazing organizations that are doing great work to educate our citizens about the pro-life movement, organizations like Louisiana Right to Life and Louisiana Family Forum. The head of the Family Research Council is a constituent of our district.

There is one particular pro-life advocate that I would like to call out, Dr. Al Krotoski, who recently passed away, in fact, just on January 1 of this year. He literally gave his life to advocating for pro-life causes. His knowledge, his scientific background with his Ph.D., his M.D., and his master's in public health shaped him and helped him to shape pro-life policy in the State of Louisiana. He was a phenomenal example of pro-life advocates for our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I just want to make note that Dr. Al set an amazing example for our State, an amazing example on the sanctity of life and respecting life. But it is important that, as we move forward, we also respect life after birth. We respect life in terms of some of the initiatives that we are going to be working on this year: criminal justice reform and the War on Poverty.

I really appreciate the opportunity to participate in this Special Order tonight. I want to thank you for organizing this. I want to remind folks, over a million lives a year lost as a result of this decision.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for his very eloquent comments.

I would like to now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and also thank him for setting up this Special Order tonight and his leadership in his years in Congress and the pro-life movement.

Life is the most precious gift we are given. The youngest and most vulnerable among us are a blessing. We must never stop working to protect them.

Unfortunately, 2015 brought renewed attacks on life, and horrific new events came to light that showed us just how important this fight is. Videos were released exposing Planned Parenthood's barbaric practices. The things we saw being discussed and done in these videos were appalling. They underscore why we must continue to do everything we can to uphold the sanctity of life.

I am proud that today we are sending down to the President a piece of legislation that will defund Planned Parenthood. I am proud of the work this House has done to bring attention to this issue and advance the cause of life.

I have been honored to count myself among those who are in this fight, but we can never rest on our work to protect the unborn. Together, we must work to ensure that the terrible practices of Planned Parenthood come to an end and that life is valued, cherished, and always protected.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank Chairman SHUSTER for those excellent comments.

I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. I want to thank my friend and colleague for his great leadership in this cause of life.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my others here with deep concern as we are now at 43 years since the Supreme Court determined, unimaginably, that there exists in our country some broad right for the abortion of a child in the womb.

That decision literally came after 21 States had already enacted laws limiting abortion for over 100 years. In fact, the first of these laws was adopted in Connecticut in 1847, 21 years before the ratification of the 14th Amendment, which is the very amendment on which Roe v. Wade is based. In his dissent, Justice Rehnquist noted that, due to this history, the High Court was forced to create a right that was unknown to the Framers of the 14th Amendment.

□ 1800

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we correct this wrong-headed decision made by the court 43 years ago. It is for this reason that I personally introduced the Sanctity of Human Life bill, H.R. 426, which defines life beginning at conception.

I would certainly ask my colleagues to join in cosponsoring this bill so that 43 years from now we are celebrating the right to life rather than another 57 million unborn Americans lost to abortion.

I thank the gentleman for his stance on this.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for his leadership and for his bill.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), the co-chair of the Congressional Pro-Life Caucus. I thank him for his leadership and for standing up so courageously for life.

Mr. LIPINSKI. I thank Representative SMITH for all of his work and leadership on the issues of life and protecting people at all stages of life.

As the Democratic co-chair of the Pro-Life Caucus, I stand here as a Democrat who believes that we need to have laws in our Nation to protect the vulnerable, those who can't protect themselves. No one is more vulnerable in America today than a child in the mother's womb. No one is in more need of protection. We must continue to fight to provide that protection.

We do have our young men and women who are our new pro-life generation. They understand the dangers that they faced to their own lives when they were in their mother's womb.

I look forward to continuing to work with all of them and with my colleagues here in the House to bring us to the day where all life in our Nation is protected by our laws, from conception to death. Only then will our Nation truly stand up for life and all that our Nation was founded upon.

I thank all my colleagues for their work on this issue.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank Mr. LIPINSKI for those very fine comments.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. I thank Congressman SMITH and Congressman LIPINSKI for their leadership in the Pro-Life Caucus. I thank Congressman SMITH for his active involvement in promoting life not only here in America, but all over the world.

Someone once said: Tell a lie long enough and it becomes the truth. That statement, sadly, is often true, but the lie is still a lie. Roe v. Wade was such a lie. It didn't offer freedom. It didn't offer opportunity or choice. It offered death and a diminished life, to boot.

I will never forget the conversation with my wife over 40 years now in the hospital recovery room when she had just given birth to our first child. She said to me in that recovery room, with tears in her eyes: ''Wow, I have just added a life to the world.

That is why pro-life and pro-women go hand in hand. She is the only being designed and capable to bring new life into the world. It is a God-given gift. We honor and celebrate that gift. We who are pro-life honor her for that.

Let's give all that we can to honor and encourage our citizens to know the truth of the Psalmist who said: ''Behold, children are a gift of the Lord; the fruit of the womb is a reward.'' And that is the truth.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank Mr. WALBERG for his very excellent remarks, but also for that very personal story. That is very, very touching.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Again, I want to add my admiration to Mr. SMITH for all his years of hard work for the pro-life movement here in this country and around the world and for holding this Special Order tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the right to life for every unborn child. During my tenure in the Ohio General Assembly and now as a Member of Congress, I have consistently supported pro-life legislation and I have been unwavering in my belief that we must be vigilant in protecting the sanctity of human life.

Over the past year, we have seen an unprecedented and callous disregard for life through the series of undercover videos that illustrate Planned Parenthood's involvement in the sale of fetal tissue. That is why I have supported legislative measures to end such unspeakable acts and to prevent any Federal funds going to any entity that performs abortions.

At a time when pro-life values are often marginalized, I want to reassure my constituents that I will remain steadfast in my support for legislation that defends the sanctity of life and that I will continue to stand for those without a voice.

I also want to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to those who work tirelessly day after day, year after year, to defend the right of life, and to the hundreds of thousands who will be here for the Right to Life March this month. I applaud them and thank them.

Again, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for all of his years of hard work.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this most important human rights issue of our time.

I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

Mr. ROUZER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank him for his leadership on this very important issue.

As we near the 43rd anniversary of the Roe v. Wade Supreme Court decision, there is a sad truth to be told: More than 57 million innocent lives have been terminated through abortion since that landmark ruling.

To put that in perspective, that is more than five times the population of my home State of North Carolina. Again, that is more than five times the population of North Carolina. That is a sobering number.

In God's word, it is written that life begins at conception. Recent advances in science support that fact. It is our moral obligation to fight for and protect the lives of those who cannot

speak for themselves, the lives of those who are no different than our own.

As millions of Americans prepare to travel here to Washington, D.C., to participate in the annual March for Life, my prayers are with them. I am proud to stand with them in their commitment and dedication to the pro-life cause.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), a very strong and outspoken supporter of the right to life.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I, too, would like to add my thanks for the passion and the commitment he has made to the right-to-life movement and the protection of the unborn—both he and his wife—not just here in the United States, but around the world. I have seen that happen.

But we are here tonight. It is hard to stand in America's House and think that we have to debate an issue that is so basic to who we are not as Republicans or Democrats, but as human beings.

In the district that I represent, the biggest county is Erie County. In Erie County, there are 278,443 people, human beings. In 2014, abortions performed by Planned Parenthood ended the potential lives of 324,000 human beings.

It is stunning here in America's House and in the United States of America, where we recoil at any action around the world where there is loss of life, especially when it happens violently and at the hands of people who have absolutely no regard for human life. We still shudder that Adolph Hitler was able to eliminate 7 million Jews.

We have ended the lives of 57 million Americans that could be here today. We lost their lives. We lost their potential. We lost their value. The hypocrisy that drips from the people's House—America's House—when we have to stand and debate the right to life, the right of the unborn, and think that somehow this is an argument that we must win. This is something that never ever should have happened, not in America, not on our watch, not in our time.

On January 22, hundreds of thousands of pro-life Americans will come to the Nation's capital. They will be little noted by the media, but they will be here. They come every year. They come here every year with one purpose and one purpose only, and that is to protect the lives of the unborn.

When, America, will we stand up and take the responsibility for the heinous activity that we have allowed to happen on our watch?

I thank my colleagues and I thank the gentleman for his passion and dedication to the lives of the unborn. We will never ever walk away from this responsibility to right a horrible wrong in the chapter of human history.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank Mr. KELLY for his very strong statement.

More people now recognize, especially through ultrasound, that birth is an event, not the beginning of life. Increasingly, because the methods of abortion are so horrific—literal dismemberment of the baby, chemical poisoning—people are waking up. Abortion is violence against children and injurious to women.

Again, I thank the gentleman for his commitment to life.

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this year's March for Life marks the 43rd anniversary of Roe v. Wade, the Supreme Court decision that invented a constitutional right to abortion on demand. Justice Byron White dissented in the case, calling what the majority had done an ''exercise in raw judicial power.''

The March for Life draws thousands of people from across the Nation every year. The marchers come by foot, by car, by train, by plane.

Why, Mr. Speaker, does this issue refuse to go away? I suggest because it goes to the heart of who we are and whether we will live up to the principles of our Nation's founding documents.

Mr. Speaker, this issue touches the conscience of everyone. It can be difficult to discuss and it is painful to be reminded of it.

Everyone in this Chamber, everyone listening to this talk, was at one point in his or her life an unborn child. The March for Life speaks to this truth and speaks to the obligation of society to defend the defenseless. May this Nation rediscover the value of everyone, and may we continue to work for the day when all are protected.

Mr. Speaker, if I might take a moment to recognize the work of my colleague, Mr. SMITH, who came to this House in 1980—35 years ago—and from that day has been fighting this fight.

I am reminded, Mr. Speaker, of another statesman two centuries ago, William Wilberforce, who served in the Parliament of Britain. He was first elected there in 1780 and came to the cause to fight for the abolition of slavery in 1787, when he took on the cause with his colleagues of conscience.

It took them 20 years, Mr. Speaker, to abolish the slave trade in the British Empire with the Slave Trade Act in 1807, and their work did not end. He continued his work for decades.

He had to retire from Parliament in 1826, but consider that time that he put in to fighting the slave trade. They finally abolished slavery in the British Empire in 1833, and William Wilberforce learned that Parliament had the votes to pass that just days before his death.

This is a fight that goes on. Sometimes justice takes time.

In 1896, the Supreme Court ruled separate, but equal, is okay. It took 58 years, Mr. Speaker, for them to correct that injustice in Brown v. Board of Education. Fifty-eight years.

It has been 43 years since the injustice of Roe v. Wade, but this fight will continue. We will continue to work for the protection of all human life, for justice will not sleep forever.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank Mr. ROTHFUS very much for his leadership and for his very eloquent remarks.

William Wilberforce reminds us all that, through prayer, fasting, tenacity, and the pursuit of justice, he really was able to stop the slave trade.

Thankfully, in this Congress, we have so many leaders—men and women on the pro-life side—who stand up boldly and effectively, and we will win this.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON), my good friend and colleague.

□ 1815

Mr. OLSON. I thank my friend from the Garden State for allowing me to join this very important Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, 43 years ago, an activist, liberal Supreme Court decided Roe v. Wade and turned a penumbra, a shadow in our Constitution, into the legal right to privacy, which became the right to terminate innocent life.

Since then, we have seen a decline in the value of human life in America. There is increased violence in our streets. Planned Parenthood staff discuss the harvesting of baby parts. There is an erosion of moral fabric that stems from a lack of respect for life. It stems from Roe v. Wade.

Americans expect instant gratification with no consequences for their own actions.

The Catholic Church's newest saint, Mother Teresa, once said: ''It is a poverty to decide that a child must die so you may live as you wish.'' I stand with Mother Teresa and all who value the sanctity of life, and will fight, continue to fight every effort to give a voice to the voiceless before their lives are taken.

All life is precious. All life is precious.

I thank my friend.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you so very much, Pete, for those very moving remarks.

I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING), who is the prime sponsor of the Health Care Conscience Rights Act, along with DIANE BLACK and JEFF FORTENBERRY.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, CHRIS SMITH, for all of the years of service in this area of pro-life and pro-family, not just domestically, but around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for everything he does, and the blessings that he has provided to us.

Also, Mr. Speaker, children are a joy to every mother and father. My wife and I share this joy, both as parents and as grandparents.

As a matter of fact, I have seen all three of my grandchildren through ultrasound, before they were born, very

early in gestation, watched them move, watched them suck their thumbs. I fell in love with each and every one of them right there before they were born. Certainly, if I can love them before they are born, God loves them and knows them before they are born.

As a matter of fact, in Jeremiah 1:5, it says that God knows us before we are formed in our own mother's womb.

The value of human life, however, isn't quantified through parental sentimentality. Children, including developing babies, the nascent life within a mother, are endowed by our Creator with the same unalienable rights as you and I have, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Good public policy will reflect this understanding and protect the lives of the unborn, those who are today's children and tomorrow's leaders.

Mr. Speaker, as we approach the anniversary of the devastating 1973 U.S. Supreme Court decision that sanctioned the genocide—yes, the genocide—of 57 million children, I implore my colleagues and my fellow countrymen to stand for life.

America's children, born and yet unborn, are our heritage and our future.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you, Dr. FLEMING. Thank you for your leadership on so many issues, including the conscience rights issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Thank you, Congressman SMITH. It is an honor, as always, to join you this evening on this Special Order. I have told you before and I will tell you again, thank you for your leadership. I believe our efforts, though not fully successful, your efforts have saved many lives in this country.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House voted to stop Federal funding from going to the evil abortion provider Planned Parenthood. It was another commonsense step in the many that our pro-life movement has made in our long, 43-year fight following the barbaric ruling of Roe v. Wade by an unelected, unaccountable U.S. Supreme Court.

Tragically, it has been said 57 million innocent babies have lost their lives to abortion since that woeful, woeful decision.

I have said it before and I will say it again, I am eternally grateful that the birth mothers of my wife and I's four adopted children chose life.

On January 21, one of those children, my daughter Rebecca, will arrive on a bus in Washington, D.C., along with dozens of her classmates from Benedictine College, in Atchison, Kansas, to again participate in the National March for Life the following day.

On that day, I will be joining thousand of Kansans in Topeka as we march, pray, speak, and celebrate the gift of our life in our State's capital. I am proud of our efforts, and I hope my colleagues will join me in demonstrating their dedication to the sanctity of all human life, whether it be in the home State or here in our Nation's Capital.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his exemplary leadership on this fundamental issue.

I rise today on the 43rd anniversary of Roe v. Wade to remember the more than 50 million unborn lives we have lost in the decades since this Supreme Court decision was handed down.

As a father of four young children, I can speak for millions of parents I know when I say that Jenny and I, we really fell in love with our children before they were born. It is this unwavering love for my own children and for others' children that led me to the pro-life movement.

Each year, thousands of fellow Hoosiers travel to our Nation's Capital to peacefully march for life and to celebrate the sanctity of life at all stages.

My experience working at the Crisis Pregnancy Center in Bloomington, Indiana, provided, I think, unique insight into some of the steps we can take to bring our love to bear, so that we might bring about changes in the law and restore, in this country, a culture of life.

This year, we work with renewed purpose, with the force of public opinion firmly behind us. We know what happened last year. It will be hard to ever forget. We witnessed an outpouring of rage when Planned Parenthood's activities were uncovered. For the first time, millions had to confront, in living color, the callous disregard for human life exhibited by Planned Parenthood's employees and its procedures, unimaginable procedures, procedures that shocked the public conscience.

I heard from folks back home, countless Hoosiers, and they responded with complete clarity. No one, they said, should be forced to violate their conscience so abortion providers like Planned Parenthood can continue to operate. That just won't stand.

It is why our first order of business this year was to cut off taxpayer funding that involves every single American taxpayer and the practices of the Nation's largest abortion provider. As promised, we sent the President a bill defunding Planned Parenthood.

Now, to the Hoosiers who join me this year in marching for life, know that we will remain vigilant in our efforts to protect innocent life and the rights of conscience of the American people.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you so much, Mr. YOUNG, and thank you, as a new and very rising star leader in our efforts to defend life. Your eloquence is greatly appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to honor the memory of the millions of babies that have been killed by abortion in the 43 years since the Supreme Court's poorly reasoned, and I wrote down here appalling, but I heard one of my colleagues use the word barbaric, and I think that is the right word, barbaric ruling in Roe v. Wade.

There are those who argue that life begins at birth. They are wrong. Life begins at conception. Anyone who has seen a precious baby in the womb on a sonogram cannot help but agree with me on this.

One of the most moving events of my life was when I went with my wife and saw the first sonogram picture of my first daughter, Morgan. I still have the videotape of that. A printout is in my memory box in Corpus Christi. It was one of the most moving experiences.

You know, I know lots of Members of Congress, a lot of them are here today, and they feel the same way as I do, that human life is something special, something sacred, and it begins at conception.

But, unfortunately, there are not enough of us to override a Presidential veto of the legislation like we passed in this House defunding Planned Parenthood. There are not enough of us to get a constitutional amendment to the States saying that life begins at conception.

But we have got to continue to fight. It is our duty, it is our moral duty, to defend the unborn.

It has been 43 years since Roe v. Wade. It is my prayer it is not another 43 years before America comes to its senses and respect for life, all life, becomes the law of the land again.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman from Texas for, again, a very eloquent statement, and my hope is that people are listening.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

Mr. FLORES. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, not only for yielding, but also for the many decades you have spent of trying to protect the lives of our Nation's and, indeed, the world's most vulnerable.

Mr. Speaker, soon we will mark the 43rd anniversary of Roe v. Wade, a decision that has irreparably damaged our Nation for generations and will continue to do so until it is reversed.

Since the Supreme Court decision, as you have heard earlier, America has lost 57 million defenseless and innocent lives, while millions more have been deeply hurt.

Fortunately, the movement to protect and defend life has made meaningful progress in the last year. The U.S. House of Representatives recently passed protections for unborn children, after 20 weeks, which is something the majority of Americans support.

Yesterday, the House passed landmark pro-life legislation that paves the way to transfer Federal funds from those who would kill children, unborn children, to thousands of community healthcare centers that provide true comprehensive health care for women.

Later this month, thousands from across the country will stand in front of this building to support life in our Nation's largest peaceful protest.

We will continue to work and pray with hope and resilience, to give a voice to the voiceless, to advocate for those who cannot advocate for themselves, and to protect our Nation's most vulnerable.

As I close, I would ask all Americans to continue to pray for our country, and for our unborn children, and for those who reach out and try to protect those unborn children.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

And I want to thank Mr. FLORES again for another very moving speech on behalf of the most basic human right, the right to life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 24 minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA), my friend and colleague.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. SMITH, thank you for yielding, and also thank you for your amazing leadership on year after year putting this in front of the people and highlighting—or lowlighting—just what this has been.

It is probably very mind-boggling for many Americans to contemplate that this has been going on for 43 years, since the Supreme Court ruling, out of whole cloth, Roe v. Wade. And it must be very mind-boggling when we remind Americans that at this time over 57 million abortions have been performed since that.

We know that over 7 million have been performed by Planned Parenthood—7 million—making them the largest abortion provider in the country.

□ 1830

Yet you will hear Planned Parenthood argue that it is a tiny part of what they provide as far as what they might deem to be women's health services. If it is such a minor part of what they do, then maybe they ought not be demanding and asking for government funding. Indeed, that was taken care of this week in the measure that was sent to the President's desk. We will see what the President decides to do with that.

With Planned Parenthood providing 323,000 abortions just in 2014 and receiving $550 million in taxpayer funding, we see that this is a wrong that is mind-boggling to most Americans as well.

With the sending of that bill to the President, it is going to make a strong statement that this House and this Senate can take action on something that many people, when they pay attention, find to be quite abhorrent. Instead, there are alternatives out there that this legislation has provided that will allow women's health to be funded and taken care of at many other centers. Even Planned Parenthood can participate if they choose at some point to not be an abortion provider.

The key here is that women's health will be served and that with the information and with the decisions they made being fully informed on that, we can see many less abortions happen in this country as well as the moral fiber and integrity of this country held up by not doing such an abhorrent thing in so many cases.

So I commend Mr. SMITH and all those fellow warriors out there who will be marching for life not only coming up soon this year, but they are out there every year battling for the cause to turn America back around into a place that is a little more moral and actually does care about women, their health, and their mental well-being when this decision has been put upon them.

So, to my colleague, thank you once again for allowing me here tonight with this because it is very important that we remember just how heinous this is and how people need to be informed about that, pause, and take time to see what this really means for America and our own well-being. Thank you.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Doug, thank you very much for your excellent remarks reminding us that Planned Parenthood alone is directly responsible for killing 7 million unborn babies. That is a staggering loss of lives killed by one organization. So thank you for your leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, SEAN DUFFY.

SEAN offered legislation late last year that would have protected States that decided to defund Planned Parenthood. It passed overwhelmingly, and I want to thank him for his leadership as well.

Mr. DUFFY. I appreciate the gentleman from New Jersey yielding. I am grateful for his powerful advocacy for the unborn in his whole tenure here in Congress. You have been a true leader and an inspiration for some of us who have come after you.

I have been in this institution for 5 years. Over the course of that 5 years, I have heard many of my liberal friends and a lot of friends from the Congressional Black Caucus talk about how there is targeting and unfair treatment of African Americans in the criminal justice system. I have heard them.

In Financial Services, I hear them talk about how big financial corporations target African Americans and minorities. As I turn on my TV, I listen to Black Lives Matter talk about how police and law enforcement are targeting African Americans and minority communities.

I hear a lot in this institution from minority leaders about how their communities are targeted. But what I don't hear them talk about is how their communities are targeted in abortion.

Here are some stunning facts. The African American community is 15 percent of the country as a whole but accounts for 40 percent of the abortions. Fifteen percent of Americans, 40 percent of the abortions. In New York City, the most recent statistic is that African American women had more abortions than live births.

There is a targeting going on in a lot of spaces and a lot of places, and it is going on in the abortion industry. And my liberal friends, Congressional Black Caucus Members, talk about fighting for the defenseless, the hopeless, and the downtrodden. There is no one more hopeless and voiceless than an unborn baby, but their silence is deafening. I can't hear them. Where are they standing up for their communities, advocating and fighting for their right to life?

Black lives matter. They do. Indian, Asian, Hispanic, and White, all those lives matter. We should fight for all life, including the life of the unborn.

We have talked about this a lot of times. In 2 weeks, there is going to be an amazing march that takes place right here at the Capitol, and you are going to see tens of thousands of people come out and support life. You are not going to see the national media cover this. They are going to ignore tens of thousands of people.

Just think how powerful that rally is going to be when you have Reverend Al Sharpton standing on the stage talking about how he is going to fight for his community and his unborn babies and all the Congressional Black Caucus standing behind him saying: Do you know what? We are going to fight for these defenseless and voiceless little babies in our community that are being targeted.

And just think if our President who sheds a tear for violence goes to the West Wing and sheds a tear for the unborn. I can only hope and pray.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Martin Luther King's niece Alveda King has had two abortions. She made one of the most passionate comments and speeches I have ever heard when she said: How can my uncle's dream survive if we murder the children? She is now pro-life. She says: The other co-victim in every abortion besides the baby is the mom. And she is a victim herself.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, PETER ROSKAM, a great leader on pro-life, first in the legislature in Illinois, and now here in Washington.

Mr. ROSKAM. Thank you, Mr. SMITH, for your leadership.

I just want to paint a picture for you and take you to a scene about a year ago now. It was a Sunday in Chicago. I was invited to be a speaker at the March for Life in downtown Chicago. I got to the speech a little bit early and nobody was there. I was looking around, and all I saw was a small gaggle of pro-abortion protesters. They looked quite pathetic, actually. There were not very many of them. They looked angry. They had signs that were quite ugly. I won't repeat the phrases that were on the signs. It was quite a pathetic sight. I was observing them,

and I was kind of waiting for the event to happen.

Then I heard something. I started to hear music, and it was a really good sound. I heard the music, and the music grew, and it became more dynamic and louder and louder and louder and more exciting. Then thousands of pro-lifers came around the corner. It was a sight to behold. These were young people. They had balloons. They had yellow and white balloons. They had beautiful posters of little babies. There was a joy to them.

I looked at the contrast between these two images. You have got young, dynamic, vibrant, and joyful—and pathetic on the other side. I thought to myself that if I needed any convincing—I don't—I am convinced by the witness of these people. I choose to be with the joyful people.

So now where are we in history? We are 43 years into this. We are 43 years into the scandal of Roe v. Wade, and yet we were told, the country was told, in 1973 when this decision came down, that this was all settled, that this was all done, and that there is nothing more to be done about it. It is Supreme Court doctrine, and those of you who are opponents, you need to get over your opposition and just move along, thank you.

But there was something that was unsettling, not just about the juris prudence, but about the underlying moral claim upon which Roe v. Wade was built, and that was that it was built on a lie. The lie was that there is nothing significant in a mother's womb when she is pregnant. That, of course, is not just a lie, it is an absurdity.

So what has happened over the past 43 years? Science is our friend. More people are coming to understand—even nonscientific people. They see the ultrasounds. You have heard testimony from people who say: That is a life; that is a baby; that is a person; that is a boy; that is a girl; and that is worthy of my defending that little child.

So the scandal of the Planned Parenthood videos are actually a seminal moment, I think, in this great debate that is underway, because what you have noticed is there are not very many people that were defending the Planned Parenthood videos. Even people that purport to be pro-choice basically said: I didn't sign up for that.

But yet that is exactly what abortion is. The Planned Parenthood videos took the mask off of the scandal of abortion and said that when you dehumanize, when you say something doesn't matter, then you can do anything you want to it. That is the scandal of the Planned Parenthood videos.

So what is happening now is that there is a growing recognition among Americans—many of whom probably haven't thought much about this question for a long, long time—but now the provocative nature of those videos forces them to have to deal with this and reconciling their own understanding of science, their own deep feelings, and their humanity with the recognition of what is the nature of this thing that is going on? They say: Do you know what? I think I am leaning toward the pro-life side.

We clearly see this in the data. Younger voters are much more pro-life. Why is that? They recognize the truth of the science, and they understand the nature of the humanity, and they understand spiritually, actually, what is going on.

I was sent to Congress by a lot of pro-life people. I was sent to Congress by pro-life people that placed their confidence in me. I am here to thank them, to bear witness, and to encourage them as they go out for the March for Life in Chicago or the March for Life in Washington or the March for Life anywhere. I say thanks be to God for these people who have been faithful and true regardless of what the world has said about them. History will exonerate the pro-life movement.

Mr. SMITH, I thank you for your time and your faithfulness.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you very much, PETER. Those were outstanding comments about right to life and history as well, and we will prevail over time. So I want to thank you.

I would like to now yield to the gentleman from Georgia, AUSTIN SCOTT.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. CHRIS, I too want to thank you for your work on this issue. You are certainly one of the most passionate people I have seen on this issue in my years.

I was thinking about what I might say, and my wife sent me a text. To follow up on what Mr. ROSKAM was saying, she asked me if I could FaceTime. So I stepped into the room, and I FaceTimed with my wife and our beautiful little 10-month-old daughter.

In 1973, the state-of-the-art technology was the walkie-talkie. I can't help but believe that the Court ruling would be totally different if a 3–D ultrasound picture like I got to see of my baby when she was 20 weeks old were put on the screen and a judge got the opportunity to say, ''What do you call that?''

Five fingers, five toes, eyes, ears, lips, nose—you can see them. You can see the hair. The technology is continuing to prove what many of us in this country have known all along, and that is that life begins at conception and that God has given value to each and every single life.

I just want to take 1 more minute to say thank you to the men and women that get up every morning and that work at our pregnancy care centers and help encourage those young mothers and those young families to have the child, to love that child, and to understand that it is a gift from God. There is no telling how many men and women have been saved because of those volunteers at our pregnancy care centers throughout this country. So I want to say thank you to them.

I want to say thank you to the people at the National Right to Life and, in my State, Georgia Right to Life and Georgia Life Alliance for the work that they have done to continue to educate people on that.

I want you to know this fight continues. This is a stain on our country. It is a sin that God is not going to allow us to get away with. We as a nation need to accept that life begins at conception, and we as Congress have a responsibility to do everything that we can to protect it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you so much for those comments. I couldn't agree more that the megatrend in society is to embrace the unborn. It is the ultrasound technology—the window to the womb—that has made the difference. So thank you for your outstanding comments.

I would like to now yield to the gentleman from Ohio, STEVE CHABOT, the prime sponsor of the partial-birth abortion ban. It is one of the most hideous methods of abortion and has awakened many Americans to the violence that is inherent in every abortion. STEVE CHABOT is the man who wrote that law.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership. CHRIS SMITH has been in a leadership position on this issue since before Henry Hyde. He took up the mantle for Henry. So thank you for doing that, CHRIS. We appreciate that greatly.

□ 1845

I have got a birthday coming up in a couple of weeks. It happens to be on January 22, which is the day that that horrific decision—the Roe v. Wade decision—was issued by the United States Supreme Court.

On my birthday now, I can't help but think about all those who are not among us because their mother made a different decision than my mom made almost 63 years ago. Because of that decision, those little innocent unborn children aren't with us.

My district is Cincinnati. We have had some of the original founding leaders of the pro-life movement there, especially Dr. Jack and Barb Willke, who passed away within the last couple of years. But they were the leaders. The torch has been taken up by people like Paula Westwood, who now heads up Cincinnati's Right to Life.

As Mr. SMITH mentioned, we have made some progress. I was honored to have been able to play a role in passing the ban on partial birth abortion, which is now the law of the land, as well as the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act.

When we consider the reprehensible practices of organizations like Planned Parenthood and what goes on there in their facilities all across America, it shows that we have a long way to go. As discouraging as it can get sometimes, we must never give up, never give up in our fight to protect the most innocent among us, the unborn.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Thank you very much, Chairman CHABOT.

Chairman CHABOT also is the full committee chairman of the Small

Business Committee and has done yeoman's work on behalf of the unborn since he has been here, which is for a very long time.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend, Mr. SMITH, for all his work on this issue.

When I was a young boy unable to read and my mother would read stories from the Bible, it was so enlightening. As I began to read in elementary school and read the Bible for myself, I was always so perplexed to read that there were generations thousands of years ago that devolved and degenerated to the point that they would sacrifice their own children on the alter to avail other idols.

It appeared clear that there is not much that is more despicable to God, and it makes sense for anyone who believes there could be a God that there could be nothing more despicable than the taking of innocent life.

That is what you find in the Bible. It may have been allowed to go on for generations for years. But when the wrath came, it was judgment that was truly ungodly.

Since 1973, the realization that here in America we have been sacrificing the most innocent—before they could even be capable of saying a lie, stealing, any wrong whatsoever, their lives are taken away from them.

And then to further realize that you have some legislators that have fought to prevent children that were attempted to be aborted, that were born alive—they fought to let them die even after they are born alive. Then you realize one such legislator now has been voted into the White House. It is a bit scary, where we are in America.

I know there are some that say: You are a man. You can't complain about the sacrifice of unborn children on the alter of inconvenience.

I am not a slave, never have been, but I would hope that, if I were alive 200 years ago, I would have stood with John Quincy Adams, I would have stood with the abolitionists, to say: How can we expect God to keep blessing America when we are treating our brothers and sisters with chains and bondage?

Well, I am alive today. We need to stop the sacrifice of the most innocent and the most helpless among us. Our judgment will be coming one way or another.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my friend for his eloquent remarks.

I just want to conclude, Mr. Speaker.

Some day future generations will look back on America and wonder how and why such a seemingly enlightened society so blessed and endowed with education, advanced science, information, wealth, and opportunity could have failed to protect the most innocent and the most inconvenient.

History will not look favorably on today's abortion culture. I do believe we must replace it and work tirelessly to replace it with a culture of life.

Modern medicine and scientific breakthroughs, especially the widespread use of ultrasound, has shattered the pernicious myth that unborn children are mere blobs of tissue and that abortion is anything but an act of violence.

A few years ago I met with Linda Shrewsbury, an academic and African American with a degree from Harvard, who spoke and said:

''The lies that brought me to that day and its sorrowful aftermath are crystal clear in my mind—falsehoods and deceptions that concealed the truth about abortion. Lies planted in my thinking by clever marketing, media campaigns and endless repetition led to a tragic irreversible decision—the death of my first child.''

''At age 20, I had no inkling of the mental and emotional darkness I was about to enter.''

''After spending many years in denial, I did eventually find healing. When I understood and rejected distortions about fetal development, doublespeak about choice, rights, planned and wanted children, I understood the reality and victimhood of my aborted child. I understood the absence of moral bases for choosing to 'dis-entitle' an innocent human being of life. When I embraced truth, truth set me free and I finally gained inner peace.''

We believe that there are two victims in every abortion: the unborn baby and the mother. Linda Shrewsbury found peace. We need to protect women from the violence of abortion, as well as babies.

I yield back the balance of my time.

CHILD CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, a couple of decades ago support for child care fell under conservative attack. At the time, the argument went that offering low cost or free child care to working families would create an incentive for women to leave their homes and their traditional roles as caretakers.

That argument attempted to capitalize on panic about the collapse of the so-called traditional families. But to be honest, I don't think it ever had teeth in the first place.

The reason most women left home to enter the workforce, the real reason that countless women work today, is to make ends meet. In an economy that is built to work for corporations and their CEOs, working families have found themselves trying to stretch every dollar.

The leadership of this House seems content to keep that struggle going. It is time to take a second look at policies that will help our middle class. It is time to stand up for high-quality child care, accessible and affordable for every family, and a childcare workforce that earns the pay they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make something very clear. This is neither an isolated problem, nor is it one with limited impact. This is the new normal. In addition to outrageous costs, limited access to quality child care and pre-K means stunted development for children and further division between those with means and those without.

If you have got the resources, child care that costs more than the median rent isn't a big deal. If you have got the resources, child care that costs more than tuition at a public college across more than half of the country isn't a big deal.

If you have got the resources, you can give your child a leg up with pre-K and child care that sets them up for academic success, higher wages, and better jobs and careers.

If you don't have these resources because you are working minimum-wage jobs or your wages have been flat for years or you are one of the hundreds of thousands of Americans still unemployed, leaders in Congress say: Well, too bad about that. That is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, the average cost of child care for a family with an infant and a 4-year-old is $17,755. In my State of New Jersey, the average cost for the same family would be $21,000.

That price tag is outrageous, and it probably has quite a bit to do with why only 35 percent of pre-school-age children are currently enrolled in pre-K programs despite the benefits that pre-K offers.

Ninety percent of brain development happens before the age of 5. Every dollar invested in early childhood education returns in public benefits. There are few better ways we can spend our money.

Mr. Speaker, there is one more reason we are making this a priority. The teachers responsible for our youngest minds earn salaries that cannot cover the expenses of their own families. While first grade teachers earn roughly $45,000 annually, pre-K teachers earn only $27,000.

These men and women hold one of the most important roles in our society and make some of the greatest impacts on our kids. They deserve pay that matches the value they offer.

This issue has waited long enough for attention from this Nation's leaders. It is time for Congress to make sure that every family has access to child care and early childhood education.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS).

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in calling for our fellow Members of Congress to come together to assist hardworking families and children.

We need to act together to provide parents and caregivers with the resources necessary to ensure that every family has access to safe and affordable child care.

Specifically today, I am speaking out for the over 157,000 children in the foster care system who are 5 years old or younger.

Congress must face two important facts. The cost of child care is having a detrimental impact on working families, and it is our children who suffer as a result.

In my home city of Los Angeles, it is estimated that an annual income of nearly $74,000 is necessary to secure a modest, yet adequate, standard of living for a two-parent, two-child family.

In reality, some of the neighborhoods I represent have a median household income of less than $28,000 a year, which translates to more than $45,000 below what is needed for a modest standard of living.

To make up this difference, far too many working families, especially single-parent families, are forced to put their children into inadequate child care, which is often what they can afford.

After a baby is born, too many mothers and fathers must immediately return to work in order to pay bills, and one of those bills becomes skyrocketing childcare costs.

In fact, there are many children who wind up in the foster care system because their parents have left them unsupervised because they had to make a choice: stay home because they didn't have child care or go to work and leave those children unattended. When parents make that decision, they can wind up then losing custody of their children to the foster care system.

Last January President Obama took a bold step to support children and working families by proposing to expand access to high-quality child care for low-income families.

In partnership with States, this investment will help over 1 million additional young children over the next decade by supporting States' efforts to build up the supply of quality child care available to low-income families.

One way to solve the childcare needs of working families is to arrange for someone other than parents to care for children. My home State of California has taken a different approach.

For over a decade, California has offered paid family leave to help working families stay at home to take care of a new child. This law is not only helping mothers bond with their newborn children, but it is also enabling more and more men to take time off work when a child is born, ensuring that more fathers stay involved with their children's lives.

□ 1900

We can say we support families, but to truly put families first, Congress needs to come together to provide effective paid family leave to mothers and fathers when a baby is born.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank the gentlewoman from California for all of the advocacy she represents for those young people, those children, who are most vulnerable to us.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), who is the sponsor of the Progressive Caucus' universal childcare resolution.

Ms. BONAMICI. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I also thank the gentlewoman from California for her wise remarks and for her leadership, especially on issues facing foster children in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to discuss a very important issue that affects many families across the country, and that is the need for affordable, quality child care and to encourage all of my colleagues to cosponsor House Resolution 386. This resolution, which I introduced in July, with the support of 27 original cosponsors, affirms the commitment of Congress to put high-quality child care within the reach of every hardworking family, regardless of how much one earns.

Mr. Speaker, access to high-quality child care is essential to the well-being of children and families. Really, when we think about our economic future and about the quality of life in our communities, these are such important issues. I will share with you a real story.

Deondre is a 9-year-old boy in Oregon who understands this issue well. He shared this experience with his childcare provider, Ms. Renee, who takes care of him and his brother while his mother goes to school and works.

Deondre said: ''My mom works and goes to school. Sometimes she is done by 6:30, but, other days, she is not done until midnight... Ms. Renee,'' he says, ''picks both of us up from school, makes us dinner, helps us with homework, and puts us to bed.''

Mr. Speaker, Deondre's story is just one example, but it illustrates the critical role that childcare providers play in children's lives, and it emphasizes the value of high-quality child care for working parents.

It is pretty clear, though, that our policies have not kept pace with our changing family structure and with our evolving workforce. In more than 60 percent of the married couples with children in the United States, both parents are working. In more than 40 percent of households, mothers are the sole or primary breadwinners for the families, and 34 percent of children are living with an unmarried parent. Access to affordable, quality child care is critical to the stability of families and to the communities across the country.

Childcare costs also affect children's well-being and the local economy. In Washington, D.C., for example, families pay more than $20,000 each year, on average, for a child's care; and in many States, including in my home State of Oregon, the cost of child care exceeds in-State tuition at public universities. We hear a lot about how rising tuition costs create barriers to accessing postsecondary education, and this, too, is a critical issue. I know many of my colleagues in both the House and the Senate—frankly, on both sides of the aisle—are eager to curb the cost of college to enable more students to get a higher education. Yet, in many places, the cost of caring for our infants often outpaces the cost of earning a university diploma.

Mr. Speaker, we need to be addressing the soaring costs of child care with the same urgency with which we seek to rein in college costs. Just as shutting students out of college has tremendous economic consequences, the fact that families must spend a growing share of their incomes on child care also comes with consequences. This is going to require some long-term thinking, and we have to really look into our future as to what this investment means for our families.

Sadly, but not surprisingly, low-income families tend to be the hardest hit by the rising costs of child care. Some families with limited means spend about 40 percent of their household incomes on child care, and some estimates suggest that the inability of employees to find reliable child care costs companies billions of dollars in lost output. We see some companies now having on-site child care—and that is great—but they are few and far between.

The high cost of child care is truly an issue of equity. When families are forced to make sacrifices to care for young children, these sacrifices disproportionately fall upon women and people of color. A recent Pew Research study found that, over the last 15 years, the cost of child care has likely contributed to an increasing number of mothers who have to put their careers on hold. Of course, there is nothing wrong with parents who choose to stay home with their children—absolutely not, when that is their choice—but for many parents in low-income households, leaving jobs to care for children is not a choice. These parents cannot afford to work and pay for child care.

What do they do?

Before childcare costs became unaffordable, more mothers were joining the workforce, were pursuing careers, and were contributing to the financial stability of families. Additionally, the childcare field primarily employs women, many of whom are underpaid—probably most of whom are underpaid. In fact, a new Economic Policy Institute study found that childcare workers are approximately twice as likely as other workers to live below the poverty line.

When I went to college years ago, I had a friend who ran the childcare center at the university. He made a comment to me once that really stuck with me. He said that people pay more per hour to park their cars in the parking garage than they do to have them look after their children. Now, that is unacceptable. It is important to pay childcare workers well so we can recruit and retain great people to take care of our children, who are the next generation. Very few workers receive healthcare coverage or pension plans or any kind of retirement security. For many childcare workers who have children themselves, the cost of child care for their own children is truly out of reach.

For many of our country's minority households, affordable child care is not only expensive, it is hard to find. The gap in wealth between White and Black households is the largest it has been in several decades. To exacerbate these challenges, low-wage jobs frequently have nontraditional schedules, which makes accessing high-quality child care especially difficult.

Mr. Speaker, many families are caught in this financial trap of working parents who are struggling and who are doing their best. They are trying to make ends meet in the face of rising costs and stagnant wages, but they are forced to choose between leaving the workforce to care for their children, which can push their families closer to poverty, and handing over their paychecks to cover the cost of child care, which has a similar result on their household finances.

In reality, there is no easy solution for these distressed families—distressed and stressed, I might add. More than 60 percent of young children attend child care so that their working parents can earn a living. At the same time, child care costs more than $10,000 a year in many places—here in D.C., it is even more—and it too often rises faster than household incomes; but the problems caused by unaffordable child care extend beyond family finances.

High-quality early childhood education produces many benefits for children that continue well into the future, and this is that long-term investment that I am talking about. Children who access these programs see long-term benefits, including success in school, improved employment outcomes, and good health. When families can't access those high-quality childcare programs, their children may lose access to some of the benefits of early learning, like developing literacy and teamwork skills.

Congress does have a role to play in addressing these problems, and this is one of the most important investments we can make in our future. We must advance these existing programs that are effective at supporting working families and that are preparing children for success down the road.

Head Start is an example of one such program. It serves, roughly, a million low-income people—more than 12,000 in my home State of Oregon. For each of these children and families, Head Start provides a quality early childhood education and increases access to health insurance, housing assistance, and job training. If you have never visited one of your Head Start facilities in your district, I encourage you to do so. They are really working hard to engage the families and to really get that early learning.

The benefits of Head Start for families and children are well-documented. Last year, more than 200,000 families in Head Start received job training and adult education services, and studies show that children in Head Start are better prepared for kindergarten and that they make gains in learning and in social-emotional development. Preschool Development Grants, including a new program that just passed recently as part of the Every Student Succeeds Act, will help States to improve access to early childhood education programs.

Ultimately, Mr. Speaker, Congress needs to do its part to promote universal prekindergarten programs. On a related note, my State of Oregon is instituting full-day kindergarten next year, and Congress should consider how it can support similar efforts in other States.

Also, Federal child nutrition programs, including the Child and Adult Care Food Program, increase children's access to nutritious meals. We expect children to learn and to do well and to thrive, but if they are hungry, they can't do that, Mr. Speaker. The Child and Adult Care Food Program can help to deflect some of the childcare costs that are passed down to parents while also encouraging healthy eating habits and supporting children's development.

I have introduced the Early Childhood Nutrition Improvement Act. This is a bipartisan bill that makes commonsense, positive changes to the Child and Adult Care Food Program. This bill will encourage more childcare providers to participate in the program, which, in turn, means that more American children will receive nutritious meals and that more childcare providers will receive support to provide those meals—again, getting a good, healthy start for those kids in our communities.

The Early Childhood Nutrition Improvement Act also authorizes childcare providers to offer additional healthy meals or snacks. Many working families rely on full-day care, but the Child and Adult Care Food Program only supports two meals a day. A child who is in care all day—sometimes until 8 p.m. or even later—needs to get a nutritious meal in the evening. That is good for kids, it is good for families, and it is good for our future.

Prekindergarten and child nutrition programs are examples of how the Federal Government and we in Congress are playing an important and effective role in supporting working families and in investing in better outcomes for those families in the future; but, Mr. Speaker, we certainly could be doing more. Congress should promote fair work schedules, paid time off for parents and caregivers, which my State just did at the State level, and higher wages for working families, including for people who work in the childcare field.

I want to add, Mr. Speaker—and my colleague from California mentioned this—that many moms now go back to work within 2 weeks of giving birth. For those women here who are listening and who have given birth, you know how challenging that is for families. Twenty-five percent of women in this country go back to work 2 weeks after giving birth. We are the only industrialized country in the world that does not offer paid leave for women who have children. We need to change that and get a better start for our kids, for our moms, and we need to respect those working families.

As we continue to pursue efforts to make child care affordable for all families, I encourage my colleagues to cosponsor H. Res. 386. Let's show our support for our country's childcare workforce, its children, its hardworking families, and the future of our families and our country.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank the gentlewoman from Oregon very much for her work, for her resolution, and for her advocacy.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Let me thank the gentlewoman who has organized this Special Order.

There is no greater cause that could be the focus of our attention in this august body than that of future generations of Americans. Too much time is focused on the next election, so I want to thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey for focusing the House today on the next generation.

Mr. Speaker, with certainty, we know that early childhood, quality daycare, and early education are the fundamental building blocks. We as a nation are competing with countries like China and India, which have very populated nations. We need to make sure that every single American child has the ability to rise up to his potential so that our Nation can remain number one in the world.

I serve on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies. In the last couple of weeks, we have done our work and have passed the appropriations bill, and, this year, we have made some progress. I first want to talk about the good news.

□ 1915

We did appropriate $2.7 billion for the Child Care and Development Block Grant, and we increased it over last year, FY15, by $326 million. Now, that is the good news. The problem, of

course, is that we still are a far cry away from providing for every family that will be eligible opportunities at affordable child care.

Let me give you a ''for instance'' closer to home. I represent the birthplace of our democracy, Philadelphia. I think it is one of the greatest cities in the world. We spent about $300 million this year on Head Start and childcare activities, almost all of it Federal money; $190 million are coming out of the Child Care Block Grant I referenced earlier, some $300 million. We are only providing for 33 percent of the families in Philadelphia who would be eligible for child care through this effort. So we need to do more.

Hopefully, the city and the State will be partners in this effort, but our Nation has to see this, as President Nixon once said, as a national imperative, that is, that we have a national interest in every one of these children living up to their potential.

Now, 2 years ago, in a series done by WHYY and NewsWorks, they focused on child care. They told this story on one occasion about a young lady by the name of Queen Muse who was getting her degree from La Salle University, taking graduate courses. She was working very, very hard. She was rising at a very early hour to drop off her young daughter at a family member's home because she couldn't afford appropriate child care and affordable child care.

Now, here is someone doing what we want them to do, getting a college education, getting a graduate degree. We need to be doing more to provide those early rungs on the ladder of opportunity for those who are in the early stages of family formulation and, in some cases, who are raising children as single parents. So there is much more that we can do.

In Philadelphia, we have a system that, even though not perfect, is working very well. I know through CCIS out on Greene Street in northwest Philadelphia, there is an opportunity where families and parents can get access to quality child care, federally funded as a contractor with the Urban League. Again, we need to do more, and that is why I came here to the floor this evening.

Now, I know that the Nation is preparing for the President's town meeting on guns tonight, and that is another issue related to families and family safety. We totally support the President's efforts in that regard, and I am going to work with the administration as a member of the Appropriations Committee to help fund those gun safety activities.

In terms of child care, this is about families also, and making sure that the youngest among us have every opportunity to learn and to grow. In fact, we know through the work we have done on brain science now that, as the Congresswoman from New Jersey says, this is the period of time in which the brain is like a sponge. It can learn almost anything. We should be doing so much more in our early childhood efforts, in our childcare efforts to develop the language skills and the reading skills for these young people as the basic building blocks for their lifelong education

So I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and much more importantly, I thank her for her extraordinary leadership on the most important issue in our Nation, and that is the preparation of future generations of American leaders.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his wise words and the wisdom that has come with this experience.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey for her continued leadership as she brings those of us in the Congressional Progressive Caucus to the floor to speak on issues of concern for the American people.

Let me also thank the gentlewoman from Oregon for her leadership. I am delighted to be an original cosponsor of her very important legislation that is championed by the Congressional Progressive Caucus that is really demanding and calling for high quality, guaranteed, affordable, and accessible child care for every American family and a strong childcare workforce that is paid a living wage, at least $15 an hour, and has a voice on their job.

I have alongside of me just a picture of children that may be any child here in America, happy and smiling. Mr. Speaker, that is why we are standing on the floor of the House today, because as Americans and as Members of the United States Congress it is our responsibility to be able to provide for the happiness and smiling of our children.

So I tell a story, as I begin my remarks, on the importance of this Special Order and the importance of child care. Just a few years ago in my area in Houston, parents got a call that no parent wants to receive. These were parents of little children, and they got a call to come rushing to their daycare center. They were rushing because their daycare center was on fire.

The tragedy is a young woman who had this business, whose family gave her this business so that she could have something to do and an income, had stepped away and went to a store and left little children under the age of 5 alone by themselves while a boiling pot of some form of food was on the stove. What happened was obviously that the pot caught fire and babies lost their lives, babies who could not move or help each other. She came rushing back with great remorse and emotion, but those babies were gone.

That is the story of child care, Mr. Speaker. It is so very important that every child has the potential for greatness, and that is why child care is so important. In today's economy, the need for child care is a reality for the vast majority of families, but most working parents can't afford it, even while childcare teachers are not even paid enough. Childcare teachers are struggling themselves and can't provide for their own children. Low wages and a lack of benefits lead in the high turnover.

In the instance of childcare centers across America, many of them are unregulated. Additionally, parents are struggling. On average, center-based child care for two children can cost more than rent or mortgage in every State. No one who works hard should have the downside as they care for other's children to not be able to care for theirs.

In 2011, 49 percent of children ages zero to 4 with employed mothers were primarily cared for by a relative, their father, grandparents, sibling, other relative, or mother, primarily because they could not afford other sources. Center-based care was 26 percent. Grandparents was 21 percent. Other relatives was 6 percent.

Over 8 million children live in a single-parent household. Seventy-six percent of these single-parent households were employed. Sixty-seven percent of women in the workforce had a child under the age of 6. Thirty percent of women work at night and have a child under the age of 5. Twenty-nine percent of children in need of child care have multiple arrangements for child care that can include relatives or skilled childcare services. Sixteen percent of children in need of childcare services live in poverty.

The high cost of child care, the cost of full-time infant care across the United States in 2012 ranged from $4,600 to $20,000. Mr. Speaker, that is more sometimes than a part-time worker makes or even a full-time worker makes. That is saying to the American people, to women, to fathers, and to grandparents that we do not care about your children. The cost of full-time care for a 4-year-old ranged from $3,900 to $15,000, and the cost of before- and afterschool programs ranged from $1,950 to $10,000.

It is important, as we stand on the floor today, to make this statement: that guaranteed child care is really a necessity. It is a right. Why? Because I remember the Declaration of Independence, though not the Constitution, that talks about the pursuit of happiness. What more pursuit of happiness is there than to ensure that the children who are pictured here on this poster board have the right and opportunity to quality child care and for parents to not have that very devastating call, the call a parent who is doing everything they can to provide for the family to rush away from their job because their babies had died in a raging fire because an unregulated childcare provider left to go shopping while a food pot was burning on the stove?

Recently, the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services began

a ''Don't Be in the Dark Campaign'' to educate the parents about the dangers of placing children in unregulated child care in Texas. The importance of regulated child care becomes unavoidably clear when one considers the fact that 13 children died in unregulated care. In 2006, 18 children died in unregulated care in the State of Texas.

In order to stop deaths like this, we need universal care, we need quality care, we need teachers and workers who love what they are doing as they do, but are paid a livable wage, $15, so they too can provide for their families.

Unfortunately, safe and affordable child care is not available as much as it should be in the State of Texas. Many working parents rely on State-subsidized care to meet their needs. In 2007, the Statewide waiting list for subsidized care was 17,000 in January, and it moved to 46,000 in October.

So it is important to note, for example, in Austin, it costs about $43 a day to provide for full daycare for a toddler. However, the State will only pay a small amount.

So this is a very important Special Order. It is to reinforce the fact that our obligation is to safely secure our children and to include our children in the constitutional rights, if you will, of providing for them the sense of a quality of life that is worthy of them as the future of our Nation.

I join with my colleagues in speaking about and supporting this resolution, but I also join with them to support the full funding of Head Start. Many times we will see that those who were a part of Head Start, in fact, Head Start was very important to their growth and their progress.

I also want to include these agencies in my community, AVANCE and Neighborhood Centers, and say that if we had the universal access to child care, many faith institutions and others could be part of regulated, certified, clean child care that could be made more reasonable for those working parents who work very odd hours and work into the night and early morning and need the kind of around-the-clock child care that is so necessary.

So I want to thank Congresswoman WATSON COLEMAN for her leadership, and I leave this podium again by saying every child in America is precious. Even as we hear those discussing issues of choice and issues that sometimes women have to make, we know that we love our children. Why don't we, as the children are here, as they are toddlers and infants and growing up, make sure that no child goes longing for love, for food, for resources, and no child goes longing for quality child care.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for her leadership and her commitment to every child in this country.

I yield to my colleague from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), who is ever vigilant and diligent as it relates to preparing, educating, and ensuring our better generations to come.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN for her leadership on all of these issues, particularly education.

There is a growing bipartisan understanding that in order for our Nation's children, especially those in low-income communities, to fulfill their potential and succeed in college and career, that we must expand access to affordable, high-quality, early learning opportunities.

Decades of research shows that properly nurturing children in early years of life supports enhanced brain development, cognitive functioning, and emotional and physical health. Research has also shown that one investment that leads to better educational outcomes, stronger job earnings, and lower crime rates is quality early learning programs. These programs help prevent and reduce achievement gaps for low-income students and create long-term benefits for our Nation, such as lower crime rates, lower teen pregnancy rates, and higher high school graduation rates.

□ 1930

Yesterday I attended a screening of the documentary ''The Raising of America,'' which explained the challenges working families have in raising children and helping them succeed. Even though there is nearly universal understanding of the importance of high-quality, early-learning opportunities, many families are not able to afford or access these opportunities. As the documentary clearly explained, working families are more productive than ever, but our Nation lacks the Federal policies that these families need in order to better balance their work and family responsibilities.

For example, unpredictable, unstable schedules place an undue burden on working families, impacting their ability to maintain child care. We are among the richest nations in the world. The United States is the only such nation that does not provide paid leave to families to invest time in early development of their children. The United States doesn't even provide universal access to quality, affordable child care. This is simply unacceptable.

The Democrats on the House Committee on Education and the Workforce have been working with our colleagues in the Democratic Caucus on a working families agenda. This agenda supports families by giving them the tools that they need to better balance work and family.

The working families agenda calls for commonsense policies, such as paid sick leave, paid family leave, and access to universal, high-quality child care to help balance work and family responsibilities. In addition, it supports increased wages by calling for an increased minimum wage and legislation to reduce discrimination in the workforce.

But access to high-quality child care is an integral part of the working family's agenda. In the recently passed spending bill, we increased funding for the Child Care and Development Block Grants by $326 million. This increase is a strong, positive step in the right direction, but we must build on this effort.

That is because over 20 States cannot serve all of the eligible families, and some States aren't even accepting eligible participants to sign up on their wait list. Now, we are not talking about whether the child is eligible or not or whether they receive it, but whether a child can even be placed on a wait list to hope for funding.

If we want parents to work and we want children to be able to determine their futures, if we want strong and stable families, we must provide these families with access to high-quality child care and other early-learning opportunities. These efforts are a national priority, and all children deserve the opportunity to reach their full potential.

Again, I want to thank you for your leadership for bringing this issue to a Special Order.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Congressman, thank you for taking your time and sharing with us.

We are all familiar with the phrase, ''putting your money where your mouth is.'' Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago we voted for a bill to fund government programs and extend tax cuts. While that bill was an important step forward compromise, it was far from perfect. It put our environment at risk by selling petroleum overseas and made countless tax breaks for multinational corporations and special interests permanent. Although it did extend programs like the child tax credit, it didn't do nearly enough to protect working families or ensure a bright future for our Nation. We are in a new year, and we have got a chance for a fresh start, so let's make affordable child care part of that new start.

Mr. Speaker, I want to switch gears now and discuss an equally important topic that those in control of this House have tried to ignore, a topic that the President took action on this week.

Gun violence is one of the greatest challenges this Nation faces. Over the past 10 years, we have lost more than 100,000 people to guns. Millions more have been victims of assaults, of robberies, and of other crimes where a gun was involved, and many of the individuals in possession of these weapons shouldn't have had them in the first place.

Three years since Newtown, just over a month since San Bernardino and Colorado Springs, and with the dark memories of shootings of every scale in every city hovering over us constantly, it is time for change. Gun violence in the United States runs the gamut of motivations—from mental illness, to religious extremism, to political extremism, to disastrous accidents—but they all involve a firearm.

Many of these incidents are suicide, but they are all linked by the simple fact that they involve a firearm because in the United States of America a group of ideologues have hidden behind misguided readings of the Constitution and make guns available to everyone imaginable, even folks on the terrorist watch list.

The reality is that gun violence is an epidemic, and the NRA, along with those who blindly follow it, are deeply out of touch. When another tragedy strikes, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle reliably call for moments of silence right here on the floor. While I support remembering victims, I cannot support silence where action is needed. Silence, Mr. Speaker, is what keeps weapons on our streets. Silence is the reason we have lost friends, sons, daughters, brothers, and sisters. Silence is why we are the only developed nation in the world with this problem.

The President has put forward a set of executive actions that make sense at the most basic level, from strengthening background checks and bolstering enforcement to improving mental health services and research on gun safety. The simple, commonsense measures President Obama announced this week will save countless lives.

It is now up to us here in Congress to take the baton. Mr. Speaker, it is common sense that someone who is not allowed to fly because they are a suspected terrorist shouldn't be able to get a gun. It is common sense to ensure a standard uniform background check before someone can purchase a weapon. It is common sense that you should have to present identification to buy bullets, and it is time for our colleagues to stand up for common sense.

As the President said, we need to do it with the fierce urgency of now.

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

GUN VIOLENCE AND GUN CONTROL IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOST). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey, and I thank her for guiding us over the past couple of minutes dealing with an important issue.

Let me quickly move us forward because, in just a few minutes, the President of the United States will join with a number of Americans on a very important townhall meeting dealing with the question of this very important issue of gun violence.

Today I rise as the ranking member of the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, but I rise also, as my colleague, as a member of the Congressional Progressive Caucus that has been at the leadership. I thank both Chairman GRIJALVA and Chairman ELLISON for their leadership and the opportunity for this time.

Again, much was made of the fact that the President, in his last term, or his last year, sought to take on this very complicated issue. Much was made of the fact that the President chose gun violence as something that he took a personal and emotional interest in.

Let me be very clear. There is never a time that is too short a time to confront the horrors of gun violence in this country. Let me give you simply an example of what we face not with adults who have confronted each other with a gun, but toddlers who are getting shot on a weekly basis. For example, a 2-year-old in South Carolina found a gun in the backseat of the car he was riding in and accidentally shot his grandmother, who was sitting in the passenger's seat.

I found at least 43 instances this year of somebody being shot by a toddler 3 or younger. In 31 of these 43 cases, a toddler found a gun and shot himself or herself. These stories are emotional and they are real. In one instance, a 3-year-old managed to wound both of his parents with a single gunshot at an Albuquerque motel. Shootings by toddlers have happened in 24 States so far this year.

There is a story that comes to mind dealing with a little boy, a loving little boy in Kentucky who accidentally shot his 2-year-old sister to death. Why? Because someone gave him a gun made by a manufacturer who made guns for children.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not here to make moral judgments. That is something that I would not do, give a child that is 5 years old a gun. But what I am here to speak to is how we can come together, those who advocate and use guns, those who believe in open carry, those who believe in concealed weapons, those who believe in rifle shooting and deer hunting. All of that is part of the American way. There is no angst with that.

What I am saying and what the President is saying with a tearful, emotional plea that he made just a few days ago is that we in America can do better. The Constitution says we can do better. The Declaration of Independence says we can do better. The First Amendment clearly provides us the access and the rights of free speech and movement, and the Second Amendment is clear that we do have a right to bear arms.

Many of us historically believe that that was, of course, an amendment put in place to protect the beginning Founding Fathers and Mothers, if you will, in these early Colonies and to make sure that they were not overrun by the British. But it is still a standing amendment, and it takes a procedure for it to be undermined, which is the argument that I make for those who continuously raise the fact that the President and those of us who believe in gun safety or gun regulation—which is not controlled—are, in fact, trying to diminish the Second Amendment. We are not.

But what we are trying to do is to do as the President has suggested: keep guns out of the wrong hands through background checks. For example, unfortunately, the tragedy in South Carolina, Charleston, South Carolina, where a crazed individual wanted to provoke a race war, worshipped with nine parishioners at Mother Emanuel Church, sat and prayed with the pastor, a distinguished senator, and those other loving saints, then sprayed bullets and killed nine of them, that individual had items in his background that should have warranted him not getting a gun.

But what happened under law? The storekeeper, the gunshop owner, after 3 days when that particular affirmation or approval had not come, he gave the gun anyway. Foolish. It is so very foolish. There should be an extensive requirement that there is a background check when you are buying a gun on the Internet or other places we are exchanging guns.

The President recognizes those kind of loopholes and wishes to avoid those kind of loopholes. The ATF is making clear that it doesn't matter where you conduct business—from a store, at a gun show, or over the Internet—if you are in the business of selling firearms, you must get a license and conduct background checks. It baffles me why some people have said that won't make any difference. Yes, it will, because a lot of times in gun shows people who are here to do wrong are, in fact, going to be taking any easy way to get guns.

Let me cite you an example. I always hear that those cities who have rigid gun laws, it doesn't matter. This is the argument I get from my friends in the NRA, and I call them my friends because I hope one day we will sit down at the table of engagement and collaboration because that is the American way.

Let me give you the statistics that make sense. New York has strong gun laws, and Governor Cuomo implemented some stronger gun laws after certain tragedies occurred in his State. But here are the statistics that argue and refute and extinguish the argument of the NRA: 70 percent of the guns recovered by police in New York State in 2013 originated out of the State. The gun laws in New York are working, but because of their neighbors, they are suffering. That is why we need to have a regulated system that doesn't take people's guns away, but provides the safety and security that the American people determine.

I didn't say, Mr. Speaker, that 70 percent of the guns found in the hands of law-abiding citizens were from out of State. I said 70 percent of the guns that the New York City, NYPD, that has a

great deal of respect across this Nation as one of the top accredited law enforcement agencies, 70 percent of those that they found were black-market guns coming into that State from elsewhere. That is a tragedy.

I will tell you for sure that some of those guns were used to maim and kill and to fight in gun battles in the streets because we allow the kind of selling of guns without background checks and people going off and getting gun sales in the back of cars. We know that that has happened.

ATF has finalized a rule to require background checks for people trying to buy some of the most dangerous weapons and other items through a trust corporation or other legal entity. Whatever we might say, I don't believe that it is relevant for us to have the AK–47s just walking up and down the street, even if you want to say you believe in open carry.

□ 1945

Also, overhauling the background check system to make it more effective and efficient. It is worth noting how many background checks are done. Make this 24 hours, 7 days a week. Maybe that would have prevented, I think, the tragedy in South Carolina. Make our communities safe from guns. Call on U.S. Attorneys to explain to people about gun safety.

When I was on the Houston City Council, I introduced the first gun ordinance in a city—that gun safety ordinance is in place today—which was to hold parents responsible for children getting guns and shooting someone. Why? Because those guns should have been secured. There is nothing unconstitutional about regulating and saving the lives of children.

Also, introducing 200 new ATF agents. I am very proud that Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY and myself—and we invite my colleagues to join in this legislation—introduced legislation that would, in fact, provide for 200 additional Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearm and Explosive agents and investigators to enforce gun laws. This is the very same thing that Republicans have been talking about. It is H.R. 4316. I invite my colleagues to join in that legislation to make a difference in the lives of so many.

Let me say that, in addition, we want to make sure that we are highlighting the importance of receiving complete criminal history records and criminal dispositions. We want our States to be collaborative. Send to us the accurate records of those who perpetrate a crime in your community. That is making this particular background check more effective. We are going to do the heavy lifting 24 hours, 7 days a week with better technology.

Make our communities safe, as I said. Teach about gun safety. Increase mental health treatment and reporting. We are talking about $500 million. The President needs our collaboration.

I am very glad that we have also introduced, along with Congresswoman BASS, the authority to authorize funding to increase access to mental health care treatment in order to reduce gun violence.

In the aftermath of the President's speech, I heard all of this talk about how we should be getting involved in gun violence and we should be talking about gun violence. I heard one Presidential candidate saying that we should be looking for the criminally ill. Well, what do you think this is?

The President is asking for help from the ATF, and now he is asking for grants and the resources to deal with the criminally ill or those who are suffering from mental health issues and to stop them from committing gun violence, the very circumstance that occurred with respect to the horrificness of Sandy Hook.

And as I hold up this poster board—the individual ultimately took his life and the life of his mother—can we imagine these babies that lost their lives? In fact, we understand that some of those law enforcement officers could barely stand up as they went in and looked at the carnage. Certainly, that individual was known to have suffered from some form of mental illness. There should have been an intervention there.

The President is asking for resources to help us with those who are suffering from mental health issues. He wants the Social Security Administration, as indicated, to begin a rulemaking process to include information about beneficiaries who are, in fact, suffering from mental health needs.

This is not an invasion of privacy. This is information. This is not knocking on the door of those who are suffering from mental health concerns. But it is helping us be more effective if that individual seeks to purchase a gun.

We want to shape the future of gun safety technology. The President directed the Departments of Homeland Security—which I am on—Defense, and Justice to conduct or sponsor research. Guns can be more safe. If a child gets a gun in their hand, there can be more detail to pulling that trigger.

The little boy that shot his sister, there was one bullet left in that gun. The parents didn't know it. It was left in a corner. He picked it up. It was his toy gun. He is a child.

We need to be able to be responsive and start boxing each other and get around the same circle of improvement. Keeping guns out of the wrong hands through background checks is what the President has offered.

Then, of course, we need to work to make our communities safe from gun violence by hiring 230 additional NICS examiners and other staff to assist with processing mandatory background checks.

I think I mentioned the mental health resources that I think are so very important. I would also suggest that we ensure federally that people keep their guns safe. It is very crucial that we insist that guns are safe.

Let me also indicate that Mr. CLYBURN has a very important initiative—he represents the district where the tragedy occurred in South Carolina—to get rid of this 3-day check and to make sure that everyone has a background check, no matter what is occurring.

Let me finish, Mr. Speaker, with indicating the gun-related homicides in this country. The rate of gun-related homicides in the U.S. is far higher than that of other large and affluent countries. Are they any less stronger than we are? We have the highest number of homicides done by guns.

We have Italy, Taiwan, Canada, Spain, Germany, Australia, the United Kingdom, France, South Korea, and Japan. Even with the terrorist activities, they are way below America. And you can see here the 353 mass shootings in America in 2015. All of those are by guns.

If you are too dangerous to fly, you are too dangerous to buy a gun in America. I have the no-fly for foreign terrorists. But, more importantly, we had legislation that Mr. KING sponsored, I believe, and others that just simply said: If you are on the no-fly list, you can't have a gun.

I want to find common ground, but most of all, I want to save lives. Here today I am saying to my colleagues that we are not saving lives if we are not sitting at the table of involvement.

I will include in the RECORD a whole list of legislative initiatives about gun storage and safety devices and firearms transfer reporting, which is similar to what happened in South Carolina, where this gentleman got a gun—effectively, he would not have been approved—also, one on establishing a select committee on gun violence and gun violence research—these are by other Members—also, recognizing gun violence is a public health emergency, and coming back to allow the Centers for Disease Control to finally do research on the impact of gun violence.

GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION LEGISLATION & LEGISLATIVE SUPPORT

1. H.R. 4315 (Rep. Jackson Lee)—Mental Health Access and Gun Violence Prevention Act-authorizes $500 million for mental health treatment access and to assist in the reporting of relevant disqualifying mental health information to the FBI's background check system NICS.

2. H.R. 4316 (Rep. Jackson Lee)—Gun Violence Reduction Resources Act—authorizes the hiring of 200 additional ATF agents and investigators for enforcement of existing gun laws.

3. H.R. 47 (Rep. Jackson Lee), Gun Storage And Safety Devices For All Firearms Act, a bill directing the Attorney General to enforce that any firearm transferred to a person who is not a licensed importer, licensed manufacturer, or licensed dealer must provide a secure gun storage or safety device.

4. H.R. 3125 (Rep. Jackson Lee), Accidental Firearms Transfers Reporting Act, a bill directing the Federal Bureau of Investigations to report to Congress semiannually the number of firearms transfers resulting from the failure to complete a background check within 3 business days, and the procedures followed after it is discovered that the firearm transfer has been made to an ineligible person.

5. H.R. 3051 (Rep. Clyburn, James, SC–6) Background Check Completion Act: a bill to eliminate the requirement that a firearms dealer transfer a firearm if the national instant criminal background check system has been unable to complete a background check of the prospective transferee within 3 business days.

6. H. Res. 467 (Rep. Thompson, Mike (CA–5) Establishing the Select Committee on Gun Violence Prevention, responsible for issuing a final report and recommendations, including legislative proposals within 60 days of its establishment.

7. H.R. 3926 (Rep. Honda, Michael, CA–17) Gun Violence Research Act, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for better understanding of the epidemic of gun violence.

8. H.R. 224 (Rep. Kelly, Robin, IL–2) the Recognizing Gun Violence as a Public Health Emergency Act: To help us learn more about the true public health impact of domestic gun violence, and provide us with the data we need to make sound recommendations to make our communities safer.

9. H.R. 225 (Rep. Kelly, Robin, IL–2) Firearm Safety Act of 2015: to amend the Consumer Product Safety Act to remove from the definition of ''consumer product'' the exclusion for any article sold by a manufacturer, producer, or importer that would be subject to a firearms sales tax under the Internal Revenue Code for pistols, revolvers, and other firearms, including shells and cartridges, thereby permitting the Consumer Product Safety Commission to issue safety standards for such articles.

10. H.R. 226 (Rep. Kelly, Robin, IL–2) Keeping Guns from High Risk Individuals Act: A bill to amend the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act to prohibit the sale or disposition of a firearm or ammunition to any person knowing or having reasonable cause to believe that such person: has been convicted of a crime of violence in the previous 10 years; is under age 25 and has been adjudicated as an adult as having committed a crime of violence; has been convicted on 2 separate occasions in any period of 3 consecutive years in the last 10 of an offense that has the possession or distribution of alcohol or a controlled substance as an element; or has been convicted of stalking. And further prohibits any such person from shipping or transporting in interstate or foreign commerce, or possessing in or affecting commerce, any firearm or ammunition; or receiving any firearm or ammunition which has been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce.

11. H.R. 1217 (Rep. King, Peter, NY–2) Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act of 2015: A bill to amend the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act to reauthorize for FY2016–FY2019 the grant program for improvements to the criminal history record system, and establishes the National Commission on Mass Violence to study the availability and nature of firearms, including the means of acquiring firearms, issues relating to mental health, and the impacts of the availability and nature of firearms on incidents of mass violence or in preventing mass violence.

12. H.R. 2767 (Rep. Johnson, Henry C. ''Hank,'' Jr., GA–4), Airport Security Act of 2015: Directs the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to establish a program to prohibit all but specified authorized individuals from possessing a firearm at a covered airport, including any individual who enters the airport, or exits public transportation at it, for air travel, meeting another individual, picking up cargo, or employment.

13. H.R. 3497 (Rep. Engel, Eliot, NY), Protect Law Enforcement Armor (PLEA) Act: To ban the sale of the FN Five-seveN and other armor-piercing handguns and ensure new weapons like it stay off our streets.

14. H. RES. 520 (Rep. Lawrence, Brenda, MI–14), Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Federal firearms laws should be rigorously enforced, that all appropriate measures should be taken to end the flood of unlawfully purchased firearms into our communities, and that adequate resources should be provided to accomplish such purposes.

15. Member, Gun Violence Prevention Task Force

16. Panelist, Congressional Roundtable on Gun Violence in Communities of Color and Combating 'Bad Apple' Gun Dealers

17. Congressional Letter, urging major news broadcasters to raise greater awareness to the high number of casualties by guns that occur every day by broadcasting a list of names and photos of victims in every state.

18. Congressional Letter, requesting a meeting with the United States Attorney General, Loretta Lynch, to discuss alternate gun crime and violence prevention policies.

19. Congressional Letter, requesting Executive Action by President Barack Obama to clarify what it means to be 'engaged in the business' of selling guns in order to prevent unlicensed sellers from engaging in the sale of guns without background check.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. If we don't stand together, then the long litany of children that have died by gun violence, Mr. Speaker, will continue.

The only thing that will stop this is for us to recognize that we have gun deaths, gun deaths by justified homicide and criminal homicide, mass shootings, mental health shootings with guns, and suicide, guns and domestic violence.

The only thing that will happen is that it will continue. Does anyone want this kind of massacre to continue at the hands of someone using a gun?

Some of the aspects of what the President has presented—background checks, mental health resources, ATF, FBI—200 more—if we join together, I can assure you America can find her comfortable place in the sun with a wonderful Constitution and democracy, where all of us, no matter what our philosophy, what our political party, can come around the issue of saving lives.

I am pleased to join my colleagues of the Congressional Progressive Caucus in this important Special Order on universal child care and gun violence in America.

I would like to thank Congresswoman BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN for convening this evening's Special Order and for her dedicated leadership on critical issues impacting children and working families, including this evening's topic of universal childcare and gun safety.

As we turn to the topic of gun violence in America, I would also like to thank President Obama for his leadership and for helping to bring this issue to the forefront of our national priorities.

Gun violence in America can no longer be swept under the rug, ignored or irrationally justified.

We are in a state of national crisis and it is time to act.

Upon taking office, every Member of Congress makes a solemn pledge: to protect and defend the American people.

This is the most important oath we take as elected officials—and, to honor this promise, we must do everything in our power to stem gun violence in our nation.

Yet, after another mass shooting and countless acts of gun violence in communities across our country every day, House Republicans are still unwilling to act to stop gun violence and save lives in American communities.

The Democrats have been calling for an immediate vote on the bipartisan King-Thompson Public Safety and Second Amendment Rights Protection Act to strengthen the life-saving background checks that keep guns out of the wrong hands.

This Congress has a moral obligation to do our part to end the gun violence epidemic.

Now is the time for Republicans to join Democrats in protecting the lives of Americans by taking common sense steps to save lives.

The Administration has announced two new executive actions that will help strengthen the federal background check system and keep guns out of the wrong hands.

I have introduced two bills that will hopefully enhance these executive actions and support the President's recently announced action on gun violence.

H.R. 4315—Mental Health Access and Gun Violence Prevention Act—authorizes $500 million for mental health treatment access and to assist in the reporting of relevant disqualifying mental health information to the FBI's background check system NICS.

H.R. 4316—Gun Violence Reduction Resources Act—authorizes the hiring of 200 additional ATF agents and investigators for enforcement of existing gun laws. The President included these specific requests in yesterday's announcements and these bills respond to those requests.

Additionally, the Department of Justice (DOJ) is proposing a regulation to clarify who is prohibited from possessing a firearm under federal law for reasons related to mental health.

And the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) is issuing a proposed regulation to address barriers preventing states from submitting limited information on those persons to the federal background check system.

Ending gun violence in America requires a comprehensive approach—we must come together and work towards this common goal.

Too many Americans have been severely injured or lost their lives as a result of gun violence.

While the vast majority of Americans who experience a mental illness are not violent.

However, in some cases when persons with a mental illness does not receive the treatment they need, the result can be tragedies such as homicide or suicide.

We must continue to address mental health issues by:

Supporting expanded coverage of mental health services and enhanced training and hiring of mental health professionals; and

Continuing the national conversation on mental health to reduce stigma associated with having a mental illness and getting help; and

We must also continue to do everything we can to making sure that anyone who may pose a danger to themselves or others does not have access to a gun.

The federal background check system is one of the most effective ways of assuring that

such individuals are not able to purchase a firearm from a licensed gun dealer.

To date, background checks have prevented over two million guns from falling into the wrong hands.

The Administration's two new executive actions will help ensure that better and more reliable information makes its way into the background check system.

The Administration, however, has acknowledged the need for collective action and continues to call upon Members of Congress to pass common-sense gun safety legislation and to expand funding to increase access to mental health services.

I too call upon my colleagues to come together and pass legislation that will help stop the loss of innocent lives.

While we have made some progress in strengthening the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS), which is used to run background checks on those who buy guns from federally licensed gun dealers to make sure they are not prohibited by law from owning a firearm, we must do more.

I am a strong supporter of a right of privacy and I am particularly sensitive and protective of patient privacy rights.

I support the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act that was passed by Congress in 1996, and includes privacy protection for medical records, which includes mental healthcare information.

However, there are specific areas under federal law that allow the disclosure of medical information to authorities, and in these instances there should be an agreement that when a person poses a threat to themselves or others (as determined by a court or adjudicative authority with the medical and legal knowledge and authority to make a determination that a person poses a threat to themselves or to others) should not be allowed to purchase a fire arm.

Technology that could be deployed to access court records and arrest records as they relate to mental health and violent behavior should not rely upon a list that may become outdated or could be used in ways that are not consistent with the intent of enhancing gun safety.

The ability to access information that is accurate and available for the limited purpose of affirming or rejecting a request to purchase a firearm without indicating the source of the decision or the reason for the rejection would still protect privacy rights while also protecting the public.

The president's proposal on mental health and gun violence is to enforce the laws already in place.

Under a federal law enacted in 1968, an individual is prohibited from buying or possessing firearms for life if he/she has been "adjudicated as a mental defective" or "committed to a mental institution."

A person is "adjudicated as a mental defective" if a court—or other entity having legal authority to make adjudications—has made a determination that an individual, as a result of mental illness: 1) Is a danger to himself or to others; 2) Lacks the mental capacity to contract or manage his own affairs; 3) Is found insane by a court in a criminal case, or incompetent to stand trial, or not guilty by reason of lack of mental responsibility pursuant to the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

A person is "committed to a mental institution" if that person has been involuntarily committed to a mental institution by a court or other lawful authority. This expressly excludes voluntary commitment.

It should be noted, however, that federal law currently allows states to establish procedures for mentally ill individuals to restore their right to possess and purchase firearms (many states have done so at the behest of the National Rifle Association, with questionable results).

It is undoubtedly true that people who are a danger to self and/or others because of mental illness should be prohibited from owning firearms.

It is less clear, however, how to tailor new policies to better protect the American public while at the same time avoiding the stigmatization of Americans with mental illness.

Any strategy to address the lethal intersection between guns and mental illness should focus of the key facts:

On average, more than 100,000 people in America are shot in murders, assaults, and other crimes.

More than 32,000 people die from gun violence annually, including 2,677 children under the age of eighteen years old.

Suicide is the leading cause of gun related deaths in America.

60 percent of deaths by guns in America are the result of individuals using these weapons as a means to commit suicide.

Some of these deaths might have been prevented if there were adequate background checks.

Each year hundreds of law enforcement officers lose their lives to gun violence been shot to death protecting their communities.

Millions of guns are sold every year in "no questions asked" transactions and experts estimate that 40 percent of guns now sold in America are done so without a background check.

National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) was created in 1998 to require potential gun buyers to pass an instant screening at the point of purchase.

Ensures that purchasers are not felons, domestic abusers, mentally ill, etc.

NICS has blocked sales to more than 2 million prohibited people.

NICS stops 170 felons and 53 domestic abusers from purchasing guns every day.

The most serious issue facing NICS is the "private sale loophole".

This allows anyone who is not a federally-licensed dealer to sell guns without a background checks.

An estimated 40% of gun transfers—6.6 million transfers—are conducted without a background check.

Armslist.com is the largest online seller of firearms.

66,000 gun ads are posted by private sellers on a given day, 750,000 per year.

Nearly 1/3rd of gun ads on Armslist.com are posted by high-volume unlicensed sellers (approx. 4,218 people).

High-volume sellers posted 29% of the gun ads.

High-volume sellers posted 36,069 gun ads over 2 months.

This would equate to around 243,800 guns each year by unlicensed sellers.

50% were familiar with federal laws but decided they didn't apply to them.

1/3rd of "want-to-buy" ads are posted by people with a criminal record.

More than 4 times the rate at which prohibited gun buyers try to buy guns in stores.

Approximately 25,000 guns are in illegal hands.

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

AUTONOMY VERSUS RELATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I was listening to a talk show one day when a 13-year-old girl called in. She was confused. At that tender age, to put it mildly, she talked about how she had been walked all over by her peers and subjected to the exploitation of an older man. She had no sufficient sense of self-possession to know that she had been used. She had no community support, no adult around her to protect her.

The radio commentator was aghast. But, sadly, Mr. Speaker, this was another troubling example of a culture of exploitation that is raging all around us today.

However, Mr. Speaker, there is a bit of light on the horizon. In a few weeks, tens of thousands of young people from around the country will assemble around this Capitol to deliver a simple message.

These young people are saying this: They will no longer tolerate the indifference. They will no longer tolerate a culture of exploitation. They will no longer tolerate the darkness of the abortion industry.

They are members of the generation that have witnessed firsthand the devastating consequences when wrong ideas take hold in a society, when the smartest people in the land—the Supreme Court Justices—are misguided and do not value all lives, when certain industries profit from pain.

These young people are saying that women deserve better than abortion. They are saying that children should be welcome, no matter how hard the circumstances. They are saying that no one should be abandoned. There should be no choice between a child and that child's mother.

Mr. Speaker, it is understandable that many people are reluctant to enter into arguments about abortion. It is difficult. It is painful. So many people have experienced this individually or with family members. But we have to be honest.

Mr. Speaker, if you look behind me at the dais here, you can see the words "peace," "liberty," and "justice." We have these words all around our Nation's capital, our Nation's monuments.

But, in truth, we cannot find peace in a society that does not protect its most innocent lives. We cannot find liberty when we are indifferent to one another and simply turn away when a woman

faces difficulty. We cannot claim justice for all when we throw away the innocent unborn life.

Mr. Speaker, I want to delve for a moment into the deeper reasons for these divisions over abortion and the deeper reasons why we have such a caustic debate.

For those of us who are pro-life, it can be hard, frankly, to understand why everyone just doesn't see our perspective. But I believe that much of the ugliness surrounding the abortion debate hinges upon the competing values of personal autonomy versus relational responsibility, once again, personal autonomy versus relational responsibility.

Of course, working hard, making something of yourself, refusing to let difficult circumstances overcome you, are all hallmarks of a well-ordered life essential to an individual's progress as a person.

But, Mr. Speaker, rugged individualism can lead to rugged isolationism, crushing the vitality of the human heart and leading to loneliness, hopelessness, and ultimately despair.

And could it be, Mr. Speaker, that the confusion surrounding abortion is the loss of an understanding of the dignity of each person as they are set in the environment of a community?

On this deeply painful topic of abortion, the primary community in question is, first and foremost, the unique bond between a mother and her child, followed by the bond of the extended family and extended community.

All politics—all life—Mr. Speaker, is ultimately founded on relationships. Happiness depends upon social life, on interdependency. A healthy society depends upon stable and healthy relationships for promoting sustainable values and our greater ideals.

But because of cultural confusion, we establish a false choice. Is it a woman's right to choose or is it a child's right to life? This should not be a consideration in the broader community that is committed to bonds of solidarity.

Sadly, I believe, we have lost sight of the degree to which the logic of radical autonomy, severed from foundational principles that order human relations, namely, in charity, have created the circumstances in which we now find ourselves.

Individuals who are alone so often become disassociated from mutuality and community. Decades upon decades of this cultural conditioning leaves us with an aggregate understanding that our strength is only found in ourselves. No wonder a young woman, scared, alone, or abandoned feels such pressure to abort.

Mr. Speaker, during last year's historic papal visit to the United States, Pope Francis highlighted the need for what I call social conservation.

□ 2000

At its root, social conservation is the answer to the widespread longing in all of our hearts, that longing for a culture of meaning, of purposefulness.

Pope Francis promoted universal human values, the importance of society, the primacy of the family, the dignity of work, the responsibility of people to properly steward the natural environment, and the sanctity of all life, especially the poor, the elderly, those who are marginalized, and the unborn.

This holistic approach of Pope Francis does not fit our political class distinctions, which rage all around us in this body. So this is not a Democrat or Republican issue, it is about the protection of persons and how we build a truly healthy society.

Children in the womb are vulnerable, precious members of their families. We must defend them, not in isolation, but as a part of the social fabric upon which our shared future as a people depends.

Now, some abortion advocates charge that defenders of the unborn are pro-life only until birth of the child; that the pro-life position is a part of a grotesque fiction called the war on women. That is a very painful accusation.

In the end, I wish we could rise above this, because I believe everyone should agree that the choice between radical autonomy as a justification for abortion, versus relational responsibility, is a false choice. To be pro-life is to be genuinely pro-child, pro-woman, and pro-family.

No matter how hard the circumstances, we should all be loving enough, caring enough, and we certainly have resources enough to protect both the mother and her child.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to look for ways to reframe this entire debate, to look for some light. Maybe there will continue to be deep philosophical differences over the question, but maybe there is some common ground.

A spectrum of policy proposals could more effectively build wider coalitions, I believe, in the pro-life debate, advancing cultural conversion instead of cultural war. Initiatives could include an assault on the scourge of coercion, which forces many women, including young girls, to have an abortion at the hands of an uncaring boyfriend or unscrupulous doctor.

Can't we find it in ourselves to attack this injustice? I would like to believe we can.

What about incentives for businesses to provide better pregnancy and new parenthood assistance, including maternity and paternity leave? Some of my colleagues speaking before me mentioned some of these proposals. No woman should be forced to choose between a paycheck and her child.

Other ideas could be adoption, enhanced adoption facilities, countermeasures against workplace pregnancy discrimination, classifying pregnancy as a qualifying event for health insurance, initiatives for responsible fatherhood.

That is not my idea, that is President Obama's idea. In fact, I commended him for that because he raised it in the State of the Union, as I recall, about 2 years ago.

Finally, I think we should channel money from the abortion facilities which are receiving America's taxpayer dollars, which most Americans disagree with, by the way, toward nurturing pregnancy health centers, and there are many beautiful examples of this all around the country.

By pursuing these policy proposals, maybe we shift the cultural understanding that it is not a choice between radical autonomy—I can only find strength in myself, me, as an individual, I am alone, abandoned, no matter how much I need others—and a relational responsibility that we all have for one another.

Let's elevate this idea of that relational responsibility of interdependency within community because we are living in a shattered society.

Nothing else is working, Mr. Speaker. We are in an age of anxiety and a time of growing threat to the family, the very basis of the strength of this great Nation.

Now, more than ever, compassion should be our first principle.

Abortion is violence. Abortion is not health care. Abortion is a false choice that no one should ever be forced to make.

Let's elevate the ideal of motherhood, protect it, nurture it, respect it, provide for it, celebrate it, the genius of the feminine, and the beauty of all life.

Mr. Speaker, in a few short weeks, these young people who will, by the thousands, tens of thousands, crowd around this Capitol, they are really telling us one simple truth: Love them both, just love them both.

I yield back the balance of my time.

PROTECTING OUR SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, it was New Year's Eve in Blanchard, Oklahoma. Eighteen-year-old mother Sarah McKinley, alone with her 3-month-old son, heard a ruckus at the door. Two men were outside trying to break it down. Grabbing her baby and barricading the door with her sofa, she immediately called 911.

In the frantic and desperate situation that followed, it became clear that law enforcement would not arrive in time to prevent the assault by armed intruders. She informed the dispatcher that she had a shotgun, and asked if it was all right to shoot the intruders, should they make their way inside.

Wisely, the dispatcher told Sarah: ''I can't tell you to do that, but you do what you have to do to protect that baby.''

Sarah already knew what she might have to do, and hoped against hope

that law enforcement, while responding quickly, would arrive in time.

When the armed intruders broke down the door, 24-year-old Justin Martin climbed over the couch and was greeted with a shotgun blast to the chest. While his accomplice ran for his life, Sarah had saved hers and her baby's.

Eight weeks ago, 88-year-old Arlene Orms was at home alone in Miami, Florida, when an intruder kicked in her door. Orms responded by retrieving a .25-caliber pistol, but fired it at the home invader, prompting the criminal to flee.

Following the incident, Orms' neighbors expressed absolute support for her actions, with one telling a local media outlet: ''You have to do something. You have to protect yourself.''

Arlene Orms, like most Americans, inherently understands that you have the right to defend your life, your property, and your liberty.

The right to keep and bear arms is as fundamental to our freedom as any other inalienable right we enjoy as Americans. This right is God-given, as much as the freedom of religion, and to exercise worship, the freedom to assemble and express, the freedom to own property, and to protect our privacy.

As such, serious-minded individuals must have serious deliberation on any attempt to alter these fundamental American rights that are embodied in the Bill of Rights, inalienable, not granted by government.

In a time where Americans face uncertain threats from terrorists at home, most Americans clearly understand why we must preserve the right to defend ourselves, our families, and our property.

For those who would refuse their right to defend themselves, they have the freedom to do so. They do not have the freedom to make that decision for others.

In terms of human behavior, our survival instincts are inherent. The Creator of the universe did not make human beings with fangs, claws, quills, or odors for their self-defense. Instead, he gave them their intelligence and, by extension, their hands, to fashion implements to protect their lives.

While the President is certainly welcome to choose not to defend himself, as is his right, it is not his right to prohibit others from protecting their lives and property.

The President has histrionically compared his gun control agenda with the advancement of women's suffrage rights and the elimination of slavery, chiding Republicans for their lack of advancement of the human race.

If we look historically, rather than histrionically, it was Republicans who eliminated slavery and embraced Republican activist Susan B. Anthony, the women's suffragist, to get voting rights for all women, where his party had stood in the way.

The President can no more rewrite history than he can rewrite the Constitution. While he may be a constitutional scholar, he needs to be schooled on constitutional history. From Madison, Hamilton, Jefferson, and Adams, all the way to the Supreme Court decisions with Heller and McDonald, this inalienable right has been affirmed in defense of its articulation in the Bill of Rights.

While the President complains of congressional inaction on the right to keep and bear arms, it can no more take action to deny this right than it could deny a free press, a free religious expression, or property rights to individuals.

Congress will not act to destroy the Bill of Rights, and we will stand in the way of any executive who will not uphold the Constitution of the United States.

Still, the administration presses forward with passion and conviction, convincing Americans that the threat is so grievous, the injury is so great, that Americans must act to inhibit our liberty. We are told that mass shootings are on the rise and gun deaths are out of control and the worst among developed nations.

But before America signs up to eliminate one of her inalienable rights, let's deliberate with a sober mind. The President and his party would report outrage if conservatives suggested that the First Amendment must be scrapped because of such abuses as libel, hate speech, religious bigotry and sit-ins, warranted necessary commonsense reforms to the first of our enumerated freedoms embodied in the Bill of Rights.

Americans recognize that we must face the unpleasantness of abuse of these rights on occasion to secure its inviolable status.

Not the same, some may say. We are talking about outrageous loss of life and injury and it must stop, they claim.

Since when did our security become substitute for our liberty? Americans for 240 years, rather, have sacrificed to secure it.

And the simple truth is, the facts supporting this liberal gun control call to give up an essential American liberty have been widely and unfairly distorted. According to the Centers for Disease Control, 199,756 people lost their lives to firearms in 2014. But on examination, only 15,000 of that number were homicide. That is only 8 percent of the total. The vast majority, over 68 percent, were accident-related, and even that has steadily declined in recent years.

□ 2015

Suicides accounted, sadly, for most of the remainder at 21 percent

But the truth about gun homicides is that you are as likely to die from malignant neoplasm of the esophagus as you are to violent homicide with a firearm. You are twice as likely to die from the result of a fall. You are 2½ times more likely to die by accidental poisoning.

Still, while these incidents are tragic, and many beyond the scope of civilized thinking, we cannot substitute emotion for examination. Contrary to those most vocal—and most funded—voices on this issue, we are not the most violent civilized country on the planet. In fact, according to data compiled from the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, the United States ranks in the bottom half of homicides worldwide among civilized or uncivilized nations.

Still, the President often touts Europe as a commonsense model for better policy and security. A remarkable seven European countries have higher overall per capita homicide rates than the United States. Where is that news flash? Disarming law-abiding citizens as a solution to curtail those that break the law does not necessarily make people safer, but it certainly makes them more defenseless. On our own shores, we can find an example of this line of thinking by examining the most violent cities in America. They are most likely to be ones with the strictest gun laws.

If gun control advocates ignore this body of evidence, as they are wont to do, they will explore ways to eliminate this essential right in America through other means. We often see them turn to the false assertion that the Second Amendment was never intended for individuals—remarkable, considering that James Madison insisted on enumerating inalienable individual rights into the body of the Constitution before he accepted the compromise to secure them through an amending process known as the Bill of Rights. Like all of our Framers and Founders, he understood common or natural law and its roots in the English Bill of Rights of 1689, and it guaranteed the individual right to bear arms.

All of our constitutional Framers would have relied heavily on Sir William Blackstone's thought on law and liberty. This brilliant jurist secured complete influence among every colonial attorney and all of our Founding Fathers with his Commentaries on the Law published in 1765. He was explicit in his assertion that to secure individual life, liberty, and property, it was necessary ''to the right of having and using arms for self-preservation and defense.''

It comes as no surprise then, in the language of common and natural law so clearly understood in the context of the time that the Second Amendment would be so highly placed in the order of individual rights at number two.

Gun control advocates argue the amendment was only for militias, not individual people. Despite that argument being struck down for 225 years in Supreme Court rulings to include the most recent cases of Heller and McDonald in 2008 and 2010, it is instructive to see what the Framers said themselves about the meaning of people and militias.

Richard Henry Lee wrote in Federalist Number 18, that brilliant group

of papers known as the Federalist Papers that argued for our Constitution: ''A militia when properly formed are in fact the people themselves. To preserve liberty, it is essential that the whole body of the people always possess arms and be taught alike, especially when young, how to use them.''

In fact, when one examines the First and Third through the 10th original amendments, it is difficult to interpret any other meaning than that they apply to individuals. The Second Amendment is no exception. The Supreme Court has always agreed.

The famous 14th Amendment, during Reconstruction after Black Americans were freed from slavery—you know, that famous amendment that is the most referred to—guarantees equal protection under the law for all American citizens. It started out, and most Americans are not aware of this, as a Second and Fourth Amendment issue.

The Southern Democratic Party lawmakers were nullifying individual liberty with their State Black Code laws which deprived Black Americans of their right to liberty, property, and to keep and bear arms as they attempted to defend their homes. Republicans fought back against these lawmakers and then led the fight to pass legislation addressing the issue in 1868. Democratic President Andrew Johnson vetoed the bill. Congress overrode it and then secured their rights forever in the 14th Amendment to the Constitution.

In fact, the Supreme Court has determined with clarity that the constitutional individual right of Americans to bear arms is guaranteed on Federal enclaves such as Washington, D.C., with the Heller v. District of Columbia decision. In McDonald v. Chicago, the Supreme Court in 2010 held that the individual right extends to keeping and bearing arms to all States and territorial jurisdictions.

Okay. Fine, you say. But there is no reason why people need military-style firearms. Those need to be banned. The Framers of the Constitution and the Supreme Court, strangely, to those who would have this way of thinking, would disagree.

In 1939, United States v. Miller, Justice Holmes speaking for the Court in the case where one Mr. MILLER asserted he had a constitutional right to bear a sawed-off shotgun without paying a special exemption tax of $200, the Supreme Court held that no such right existed on the grounds that sawed-off shotguns of the very short length Mr. MILLER possessed were not suitable as a military-type firearm if needed for common defense—a paraphrase, not a quote.

1997, Printz v. United States, Justice Clarence Thomas, our most recent treatment of the Second Amendment prior to the late Supreme Court decisions, stated that they reversed the District of Columbia's invalidation of the National Firearms Act enacted in 1934. In Miller, we determined the Second Amendment did not guarantee a citizen's right to possess a sawed-off shotgun because the weapon had not been shown to be of ''ordinary military equipment'' that could ''contribute to the common defense.''

Ban military rifles you say? Throughout our history, they have been guaranteed as an essential portion of the defense of our liberty, our homes, and our lives.

What about the terrorist watch list? Nobody on the terrorist watch list ought to be able to own a firearm. The terrorist watch list is only on suspicion—no court, no rule of law, no jury of your peers. It is on suspicion for surveillance, and it can be done bureaucratically and administratively. In fact, we have had several Members of Congress, such as my colleague from Alaska, DON YOUNG, who was falsely and inadvertently put on the terrorist watch list. Under this line of thinking, his Second Amendment rights would be removed.

Well, we can't have these terrorists coming here and then being able to buy a firearm. They can't. People do not understand 18 U.S. Code. They don't understand the law. If you are a nonresident legal alien, you cannot possess, purchase, or receive a firearm. It is the law. There are only very small rare exceptions for that, such as if you were approved for a specialized hunting trip or maybe you were armed security for a head of state, for example.

Well, what about that gun show loophole? Businesses shouldn't be able to sell firearms without a background check. News flash: You cannot sell a firearm under a business license without a background check. If you do so, whether you are on your property or off your property at a gun show, you are committing a felony and with strict sentencing laws often that are minimum sentences of 10 years or more.

Well, what about Internet sales? You can go online and you can just order a rifle, and they will ship it to your home—again, false. People do not understand the law.

The United States Postal Service and our commercial carriers do not allow shipping of firearms except under licensed dealers. The only exception to that would be if you had an original manufacturer's warranty and you ship it directly back to the manufacturer under their license, and they will receive it and send it only directly back.

As the only Member of Congress who owns a firearms manufacturing business, I know about what I speak. If someone in another State were to try to order a firearm off of our Web site, it would never get shipped to their home or I would go to prison. Instead, we tell that person: You need to get the local firearms licensee in your area to send a certified copy of your license to us, and they are in a form where we can recognize what is a real license. When we receive that, we will ship it to him, they will do the check, and you will fill out forms and you can receive your firearm. That is the way the law works.

So all of this outrage from my colleagues on the liberal left of trying to fix things, the law already exists. It is like saying that we need to do something about murder. We need to make some laws to stop murder. Maybe they will quit doing that. Oh, we already have those laws, and people still commit crime.

Therein is where we need to focus. Target the abusers, not the law-abiding American citizen, and do not target the Republic of the most incredible constitutional form of law the world has ever known.

Serious people decline to trivialize any right expressly addressed in the Bill of Rights. A government that abrogates any of the Bill of Rights with or without majority approval forever acts illegitimately and loses the moral right to govern the Republic. This is the uncompromising understanding reflected in the warning that America's gun owners will not go gently into these utopian woods.

While liberals and gun control advocates will take such a statement as evidence of their belief in the backwater, violent, and untrustworthy nature of the armed American citizens, we gun owners hope that liberals hold equally strong conviction about their printing presses, their Internet blogs, and their television cameras. The Republic depends upon the fervent devotion to all of our fundamental rights. That is the oath that we take, and no President's tears will ever shake us from the defense of that Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RUSH (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of attending to family member's medical procedure.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3762. An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 2002 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 8, 2016, 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:

3879. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-234, ''Plaza West Disposition Restatement Temporary Act of 2015'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3880. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-235, ''Foster Care Extended Eligibility Temporary Amendment Act of 2015'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3881. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-236, ''Local Jobs and Tax Incentive Act of 2015'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3882. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-233, ''Athletic Field Naming and Sponsorship Amendment Act of 2015'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3883. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-232, ''Closing of Franklin Street, N.W., Evarts Street, N.W., and Douglas Street, N.W. in Square 3128, S.O. 13-09432, Act of 2015'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3884. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-231, ''Early Learning Quality Improvement Network Amendment Act of 2015'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3885. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-230, ''Closing of a Portion of Washington Avenue, S.W., and Portions of Ramps 5A and 5B to Interstate 395, and Transfer of Jurisdiction of the Closed Portions of Washington Avenue, S.W., and Ramps 5A and 5B to Interstate 395, and of Portions of U.S. Reservation 729, S.O. 14-16582A and 14-16582B, Act of 2015'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3886. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-229, ''Closing of a Public Alley in Square 70, S.O. 15-23283, Act of 2015'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3887. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-228, ''TOPA Bona Fide Offer of Sale Clarification Amendment Act of 2015'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3888. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Rancocas Creek, Centerton, NJ [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0423] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received December 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3889. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Rich Passage, Manchester, WA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0943] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3890. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Unknown substance in the vicinity of Kelley's Island Shoal, Lake Erie; Kelley's Island, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0994] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3891. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Celebration Fireworks; Lake Erie, Cleveland, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0833] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3892. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Dredging, Rouge River, Detroit, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0835] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3893. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Safety Zone; Mad Dog Truss Spar, Green Canyon 782, Outer Continental Shelf on the Gulf of Mexico [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0512] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3894. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; 520 Bridge Construction, Lake Washington, Seattle, WA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0570] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3895. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Intermedix IRONMAN 70.3 Event, Savannah River; Augusta, GA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0604] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received December 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3896. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0251; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-200-AD; Amendment 39-18330; AD 2015-23-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3897. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-1048; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-055-AD; Amendment 39-18332; AD 2015-23-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3898. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; ATR-GIE Avions de Transport Regional Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0682; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-074-AD; Amendment 39-18329; AD 2015-23-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3899. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Viking Air Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3073; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-017-AD; Amendment 39-18334; AD 2015-24-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3900. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0627; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-002-AD; Amendment 39-18337; AD 2015-24-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3901. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; REIMS AVIATION S.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3398; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-031-AD; Amendment 39-18328; AD 2015-16-07 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3902. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0490; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-018-AD; Amendment 39-18322; AD 2015-23-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3903. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Zodiac Aerotechnics (Formerly Intertechnique Aircraft Systems) [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0927; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-172-AD; Amendment 39-18325; AD 2015-23-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3904. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1266; Directorate Identifier

2014-NM-151-AD; Amendment 39-18327; AD 2015-23-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3905. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0932; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-205-AD; Amendment 39-18326; AD 2015-23-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3906. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-6546; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-179-AD; Amendment 39-18338; AD 2015-24-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3907. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0346; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-010-AD; Amendment 39-18324; AD 2015-23-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3908. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0929; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-218-AD; Amendment 39-18323; AD 2015-23-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3909. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31046; Amdt. No.: 3669] received December 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3910. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31047; Amdt. No.: 3670] received December 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3911. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31049; Amdt. No.: 3671] received December 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3912. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31050; Amdt. No.: 3672] received December 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3913. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of the Class E Airspace for the following New York Towns; Elmira, NY; Ithaca, NY; Poughkeepsie, NY [Docket No.: FAA-2015-4514; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AEA-9] received December 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3914. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0928; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-040-AD; Amendment 39-18333; AD 2015-24-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3915. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the Office's current estimates of the discretionary spending limits for each category in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 904(f)(1); Public Law 99-177, Sec. 254 (as amended by Public Law 112-25, Sec. 103); (125 Stat. 246) (H. Doc. No. 114—90); to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

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. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 653. A bill to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Freedom of Information Act), to provide for greater public access to information, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114–391). 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 Mrs. RADEWAGEN (for herself and Mr. MOULTON):

H.R. 4340. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the Office of Government Contracting and Business Development of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 4341. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve transparency and clarity for small businesses, to clarify the role of small business advocates, to increase opportunities for competition in subcontracting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Oversight and Government Reform, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DELANEY (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 4342. A bill to impose sanctions on persons that transfer to or from Iran advanced conventional weapons or ballistic missiles, or technology, parts, components, or technical information related to advanced conventional weapons or ballistic missiles; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, the Judiciary, and 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. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 4343. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, with respect to bikeshare projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. POMPEO (for himself, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 4344. A bill to require a report on the military dimensions of Iran's nuclear program and to prohibit the provision of sanctions relief to Iran until Iran has verifiably ended all military dimensions of its nuclear program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. BORDALLO (for herself, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 4345. A bill to expand the eligibility of individuals from Micronesia, Marshall Islands, and Palau for participation in National Service Programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4346. A bill to require the Governor of each State that receives a grant under the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program to certify to the Attorney General that under the laws of that State there is no statute of limitations for any offense under the laws of that State related to sexual assault, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 4347. A bill to amend the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act to extend the provisions of that Act to cover a debt collector who is collecting debt owed to a State or local government, to index award amounts under such Act for inflation, to provide for civil injunctive relief for violations of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BABIN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PERRY, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. BUCK, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. CHABOT,

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HARPER, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. WALKER, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. BOST, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PALMER, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. RENACCI):

H.R. 4348. A bill to require reciprocity between the District of Columbia and other States and jurisdictions with respect to the ability of individuals to carry certain concealed firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 4349. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish an institution for mental diseases bed registry program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PALAZZO (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. YOHO, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. STEWART, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H. Res. 582. A resolution condemning and censuring President Barack Obama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

167. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to Resolution No. 5, requesting the Congress of the United States call a convention of the States to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN:

H.R. 4340.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause I of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the ability to enact legislation necessary and proper to effectuate its purposes in taxing and spending.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 4341.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this provision pursuant to Clause I of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the ability to enact legislation necessary and proper to effectuate its purposes in taxing and spending.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 4342.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 4343.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 7 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. POMPEO:

H.R. 4344.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 4345.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4346.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause.

By Mr. MEEKS:

H.R. 4347.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 4348.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 4349.

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; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States''

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 381: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 465: Mr. HARDY and Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 653: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 814: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 868: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 870: Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 901: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 969: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 1062: Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 1086: Mr. WENSTRUP.
H.R. 1147: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
H.R. 1192: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 1197: Mr. GRIFFITH and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 1211: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 1247: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1258: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 1475: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 1552: Mr. BEYER, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 1797: Ms. BASS.
H.R. 2013: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 2043: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 2218: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 2257: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 2283: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2300: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 2302: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 2380: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 2404: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 2521: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 2613: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 2646: Mr. PITTENGER.
H.R. 2740: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2800: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
H.R. 2894: Mr. RUIZ.
H.R. 2957: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 3036: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 3126: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 3185: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 3222: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 3299: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 3316: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 3514: Mr. KEATING and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 3516: Mr. HOLDING.
H.R. 3535: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 3643: Mr. WELCH and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 3662: Mr. FLORES, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. POMPEO.
H.R. 3677: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 3679: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3722: Mr. GIBBS and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 3785: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 3793: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3808: Mrs. COMSTOCK and Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 3865: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 3936: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.R. 3960: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 4144: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 4162: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 4172: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 4177: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 4247: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 4257: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 4262: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 4279: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 4281: Mr. BRIDENSTINE and Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 4290: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. PIERLUISI.
H.R. 4298: Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 4314: Ms. GABBARD and Mr. ABRAHAM.
H.R. 4319: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 4336: Mr. HURD of Texas, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. COFFMAN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. HUDSON, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. BOST, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. FINCHER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SALMON, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DOLD, Ms. GRANGER, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.J. Res. 59: Mr. CULBERSON.
H. Con. Res. 75: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H. Con. Res. 88: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.
H. Con. Res. 105: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. RENACCI.
H. Res. 54: Mr. HIMES.
H. Res. 374: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. BERA, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H. Res. 386: Mr. FATTAH.
H. Res. 432: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Ms. LEE.
H. Res. 506: Ms. ESHOO.
H. Res. 548: Mr. FOSTER.
H. Res. 551: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. HIGGINS.
H. Res. 567: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. KLINE.
H. Res. 569: Mr. FATTAH.
H. Res. 571: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. RIGELL.
H. Res. 575: Mr. VELA, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. PRICE

of North Carolina, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. HOYER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HONDA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GALLEGO, Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. DELAURO.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REMEMBERING DOUG WALKER

HON. SUZAN K. DelBENE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 2016

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor the life and legacy of my friend Doug Walker, who passed away on December 31, 2015, on Granite Mountain near Snoqualmie Pass.

It is this wild, rugged landscape that lured Doug to Washington state and stoked his creativity, energy, and passions for more than four decades.

A gifted mathematician with an insatiable fondness for climbing, he established strong roots in the community. The impact he—along with his wife Maggie—had on our community and the many charitable causes to which he gave his time and wisdom is unparalleled.

A true champion for conservation, he cared deeply about protecting the North Cascades most treasured lands. But his greatest passion was broadening the constituency for conservation, and he worked tirelessly to ensure that all people—especially youth and those in underserved communities—could access the outdoors.

Doug will be remembered and missed by so many whose lives he touched, with his incredible spirit and generosity. His legacy of inspiring others to experience and protect the outdoors lives on.

I ask unanimous consent to submit for the RECORD a recent Seattle Times editorial commemorating Doug's life.

REMEMBERING A TECH, ENVIRONMENTAL AND PHILANTHROPIC ROLE MODEL: DOUG WALKER

(The Seattle Times, January 5, 2016)

The loss of software pioneer and philanthropist Doug Walker, who died in a mountain accident, is a blow to the region.

But it's also an opportunity to remind people—especially the flood of tech workers moving to the Puget Sound region—about the character and values of those who built the local industry and became universal role models.

Walker, the co-founder and longtime chief executive of business-software company WRQ, created much more than technology, jobs and wealth.

WRQ was known for the quality of life it provided to employees as much as it was for software that increased productivity.

As a second act, he helped build a new vehicle for philanthropy, a giving platform, that continues to channel the expertise and compassion of others who have done well in the tech industry.

Long after WRQ was sold and merged with a local competitor, Attachmate, Walker continued to work on his third act, serving as a national leader in wilderness preservation and access.

Walker was a lifelong outdoorsman who chose the University of Washington for graduate school in the 1970s because of its natural surroundings. Between adventures, he learned programming and consulted on business computing systems.

At the start of the PC era in 1981, he and friends pooled $500 to start WRQ, which became one of the nation's largest private software companies. It helped establish Seattle's leadership in enterprise software, which drew other entrepreneurs and companies to the area.

WRQ thrived in part because Walker, the longtime chief executive, made it a great place to work. Before Google's free food and Facebook's hot tubs, WRQ had perks like kayak parking on Lake Union.

Later, Walker and his wife, Maggie, cofounded Social Venture Partners, a global nonprofit that encouraged thousands to share wealth and expertise with worthy causes. SVP helped establish Seattle as a hotbed of highly engaged philanthropy.

Walker led by example with ''a uniquely powerful style . . . simultaneously passionate, pointed, warm and sophisticated in supporting the causes that he felt were important,'' said Tony Mestres, who joined SVP while at Microsoft and now heads the Seattle Foundation.

That level of engagement and generosity has been a hallmark of Seattle's earliest and most successful tech entrepreneurs.

Walker is a great example of why that tradition should continue. He is remembered not for how much money he accumulated but by how broadly he shared his gifts, both financial and intellectual.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 2016

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to have my votes recorded on the House floor on Wednesday, January 6, 2016. Had I been present, I would have voted against the previous question for H. Res. 579 (Roll Number 2), H. Res. 579 (Roll Number 3), the previous question for H. Res. 580 (Roll Number 4), and H. Res. 580 (Roll Number 5). I would have also voted against H.R. 3762 (Roll Number 6), which agreed to the Senate amendment.

HONORING THE EAST NICOLAUS HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL TEAM

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 2016

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, before the holiday break, I rose to congratulate the East Nicolaus High School Spartans from Sutter County for advancing to the CIF Division VI–AA Football Championship game. At that time, they were about to make a 500-mile road trip to face Coronado, a school four times their size.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say that the Spartans may have been underdogs in that game, but that didn't matter to them: on December 28, they won the championship game 16–6. Quarterback S.J. Brown threw for a touchdown and rushed for another. Donovan Switalski had 25 carries for 135 yards. And on defense, cornerback Eddie Herrera intercepted two passes.

These were great individual efforts, but as a former lineman for the Cal Bears, I know that it takes a full team effort to pull off a win like this. I congratulate Coach Travis Barker and the entire East Nicolaus team for making Sutter County and the entire 3rd Congressional District proud.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE WEST ORANGE-STARK MUSTANGS

HON. BRIAN BABIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 2016

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the West Orange-Stark Mustangs for winning their third state title in school history on December 18, 2015 at NRG Stadium in Houston, Texas.

This is no easy task, especially in Texas. It is a testament to the incredible resiliency, passion, commitment and hard work displayed by these young men. I would like to personally recognize each one of them and their coaches by entering their names into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I would also like to wish each one of them continued success on and off the football field.

Players: Keyshawn Holman, Jackson Dallas, Kentavious Miller, Dominic Tezeno, Justin Brown, Malick Phillips, Mandel Turner-King, Payton Robertson, Malacci Hodge, Jarron Morris, Kaleb Ramsey, Ronald Carter, Melech Edwards, Jeremiah Shaw, Quinton Chargois, Jay'len Mathews, Tokeba Hughey, Keion Hancock, Ja'Vonn Ross, Torrien Burnett, Aric Cormier, Demorris Thibodeaux, Tyshon Watkins, Jamarcus Joulevette, Ryan Baham-Heisser, Cory Skinner, Jr., Steven Tims, Ryan Ragsdale, Tristen Scott, Jalen Powdrill, Te'Ron Brown, Paul Ivory, Morris Joseph, Bobby Rash, Keddric Gant, Rashaad Carter, Ja'Qualan Coleman, Ledarian Carter, Rufus Joseph, Jr., Thomas Wallace and Blake Robinson.

Athletic Director/Head Coach: Cornel Thompson; Defensive Coordinator: Mike Pierce; Offensive Coordinator: Ed Dyer; Assistant Coaches: Del Basinger, Terry Joe Ramsey, Joseph Viator, Jacoby Franks and Stephen Westbrook, Randy Ragsdale, Shea Landry; Athletic Trainer: Shannon Scott; Student Trainers: Cruz Hernandez, Chad Dallas, Cassidy Wright and Jared Dupree.

Go Mustangs.

RECOGNIZING THE 37TH ANNUAL DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. MEMORIAL BREAKFAST

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 2016

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate the birth of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and reflect on his life and work, we are reminded of the challenges that democracy poses to us and the delicate nature of liberty. Dr. King's life and, unfortunately, his untimely death, remind us that we must continually work to secure and protect our freedoms. In his courage to act, his willingness to meet challenges, and his ability to achieve, Dr. King embodied all that is good and true in the battle for liberty.

The spirit of Dr. King lives on in the citizens of communities throughout our nation. It lives on in the people whose actions reflect the spirit of resolve and achievement that will help move our country into the future. I am honored to rise today to recognize several individuals from Indiana's First Congressional District who will be recognized during the 37th Annual Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Breakfast on Saturday, January 16, 2016, at the Genesis Convention Center in Gary, Indiana. The Gary Frontiers Service Club, which was founded in 1952, sponsors this annual breakfast.

The Gary Frontiers Service Club will pay tribute to local individuals who have for decades selflessly contributed to improving the quality of life for the people of Gary. This year, William ''Billy'' Foster and Mozell Hayman will be honored with the prestigious Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Drum Major Award for 2016. Additionally, several individuals will be recognized as Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Marchers at this year's breakfast, including Tammi Davis, Reverend Chet Johnson Sr., Danita Johnson Hughes, Ph.D., and Reverend Mathew Whittington. Finally, Reverend Curtis Whittaker, CPA, was selected as the 2015 Yokefellow of the Year.

Though very different in nature, the achievements of each of these individuals reflect many of the same attributes that Dr. King possessed, as well as the values he advocated. Like Dr. King, these individuals saw challenges and faced them with unwavering strength and determination. Each one of the honored guests' greatness has been found in their willingness to serve with ''a heart full of grace and a soul generated by love.'' They set goals and work selflessly to make them a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in commending these honorees, as well as the Gary Frontiers Service Club officers, President Oliver J. Gilliam, Vice President James Piggee, Recording Secretary Linnal Ford, Financial Secretary Sam Frazier, and Treasurer/Seventh District Director Floyd Donaldson, along with Clorius L. Lay, who has served as Breakfast Chairman for sixteen years, and all other members of the service club for their initiative, determination, and dedication to serving the people of Northwest Indiana.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 182ND ANNIVERSARY OF CHERRY HILL UNITED METHODIST CHURCH

HON. DAVID A. TROTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 2016

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 182nd anniversary of Cherry Hill United Methodist Church.

When Cherry Hill United Methodist Church first began meeting in 1834, it consisted of only a few pioneer families in their log cabins on the circuit of an itinerant preacher. In 1848, members of the church raised $600 to construct the beautiful gothic-style brick building that stands today. Since then, the building has been expanded to accommodate the growth in attendance and to support a full parsonage, but it retains its original structure and colorful stained glass windows.

In its 182 years of existence, the church has been a boon to the Cherry Hill community. Over the years, it has often been the setting for community dinners and social gatherings. Today, Cherry Hill United Methodist Church members serve the community through their dedication to providing low income children with school supplies and winter coats, their work with Habitat for Humanity, and their support for the ''First Step'' domestic violence shelter.

Thank you, Cherry Hill United Methodist Church for your service, and my sincere congratulations on your 182nd anniversary.

TRIBUTE TO EMILY ANN ROBERTS

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 2016

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, my District spans a large area of East Tennessee, including parts of the Smoky Mountains in the heart of Appalachia.

This region has a rich history of country music.

Recently, one of my constituents, Emily Ann Roberts, rose to stardom on the national stage after placing second on the NBC television show The Voice.

Emily wowed judges during her audition with a version of Lee Ann Womack's ''I Hope You Dance,'' earning her the admiration of show host and singer Blake Shelton.

From there, she spent months competing each week with dozens of other contestants.

During the show's run, Emily even made the iTunes Top 10 several times and climbed to 21 on the country Billboard chart for her rendition of The Judds' song ''Why Not Me.''

I have had the privilege over the years to get to know Dolly Parton. Emily was very excited when Dolly made an appearance on the show to help coach her.

It was certainly a favorite moment for me and East Tennessee viewers.

Emily told the Knoxville News Sentinel, ''That's such a once in a lifetime thing. I've grown up surrounded by her influence . . . when she hugged me, she said 'I love my little hometown girl' and then she leaned back and she said 'I'm so proud of you.' ''

During the show's finale, Emily stood live in front of millions of viewers and sang with Ricky Skaggs. She was a symbol of East Tennessee graciousness when she hugged her fellow competitor after the results were announced.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt we will hear Emily's beautiful voice for many years to come, and she will find continued success in music.

I call her inspirational journey to the attention of my colleagues and other readers in hopes that it inspires many more young people to reach for the stars.

K–9 ZERO CAMDEN COUNTY POLICE

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 2016

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of K–9 Officer Zero of the Camden County Police Department for his achievements, contributions, and service to the people of New Jersey.

Zero, a Czech Shepherd, joined the Camden County Police Department in 2007. Zero was instrumental to keeping streets safe and sniffing out illegal drugs, but he became a local legend from his ability to find and rescue missing children. Soon he was a local celebrity, known throughout the community for his powerful sense of smell and his friendly demeanor around kids. His personable attitude made him the poster dog for the police force and an essential part of the force's public relations community outreach efforts.

Alongside his handler, Lieutenant Zsakhiem James, Zero quickly shattered the K–9 record for most criminal apprehensions in New Jersey. By the end of his career, he apprehended 68 criminals. On December 29th, 2015, our local hero died of natural causes in the home of his friend and partner, Lieutenant James.

Mr. Speaker, Officer Zero will be remembered for the lives he saved and the unity he brought to the community. His service sets the bar for all K–9 units and I join Lieutenant James, the Camden County Police Department and the residents of Camden County in thanking Zero for his lifetime of service.

IN RECOGNITION OF FRED EATON

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 2016

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Fred Eaton for his twenty years of service with Comcast and his commitment to expanding access to media across Southeast Michigan.

A native of Chicago, Fred attended the University of Illinois in Champaign-Urbana where he majored in Radio and Television. After college, Fred went to work for southern Illinois' Mt. Vernon Register-News, writing articles by day and rewriting them for the evening news by night. It was during this time that Fred pioneered advances in the ''Eyewitness News'' format.

Fred moved to Michigan with his wife, Mary, and daughter, Virginia, taking up an editor post at the Adrian Daily Telegram. Always generous with his time and expertise, Fred consulted for the Lenawee County Democratic Party before going on to serve the public interest working with Congressman John Dingell. It was no surprise to any when Comcast asked Fred to be their man in Southeast Michigan. As the company has grown, so too has Fred's engagement in the community.

During his time with Comcast, Fred has been involved with numerous community organizations. He has served as a board member of The Guidance Center and the International Association for Organ Donation, as a founding member of Everybody Ready! and as chairman of the Great Start Collaborative for Wayne County. Fred has also served on the boards of the Southern Wayne County Regional Chamber of Commerce, the American Arab Chamber of Commerce, and the Ann Arbor/Ypsilanti Chambers of Commerce. Our communities have been truly enriched by Fred's commitment.

When there was a need some place, Fred was always the first to say ''how do we help?'' An event didn't feel complete if Fred wasn't there. Most striking was his outlook on life—always smiling, always positive and always seeing the glass half full. He is leaving our community, and his departure will create a hole in many hearts.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today to honor Fred Eaton for his service to our community. I thank him for his leadership and wish him many years of happiness ahead of him.

COMMEMORATING THE INAUGURATION OF MR. HARVEY GODWIN JR. AS CHAIRMAN OF THE LUMBEE TRIBAL COUNCIL

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 2016

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the inauguration of Mr. Harvey Godwin Jr. as Chairman of the Lumbee Tribal Council, which is being held at the University of North Carolina at Pembroke's Givens Performing Arts Center on January 7, 2016.

After his inauguration as Chairman of the Tribal Council, Chairman Godwin has the honor of leading the Lumbee Tribe, which is headquartered in North Carolina's 8th Congressional District. The Lumbee Tribe is the largest tribe east of the Mississippi River with over 55,000 members, and is the ninth largest tribe in the United States.

Prior to his election as Chairman of the Lumbee Tribal Council, Chairman Godwin has been an active member of the Moss Neck community as a business leader and public servant. Chairman Godwin started his own business in the community, Two Hawk Employment Services, and currently serves on the Robeson Community College Foundation Board of Directors and the Lumber River Workforce Development Board. He also has previously served as the President of the Lumberton Rotary Club and was a past member of the Lumberton Area Chamber of Commerce's Board of Directors.

This is an exciting moment for Chairman Godwin and the entire Lumbee Tribe as they celebrate the beginning of a new era in the Tribe's already proud history. Since coming to Congress in 2013, I have taken great pride in representing the Lumbee Tribe and I look forward to continuing this close relationship under Chairman Godwin.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in congratulating Mr. Godwin on his election as Chairman of the Lumbee Tribal Council and wishing him well as he begins this new role.

INTRODUCTION OF THE BIKESHARE TRANSIT ACT

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 2016

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, America is in the middle of a bikeshare revolution: 13 new bikeshare systems launched in 2014 and 11 more launched in 2015, bringing the national total to approximately 80. More than 10 million people rode a bikeshare bicycle last year. Systems are opening in large metropolitan regions like Washington, DC and New York, as well as smaller communities like Dayton and Boise. The increased commercial investment around bikeshare stations and networks drives economic development in these communities.

Some of these existing bikeshare programs received federal monies to get off the ground, but the lack of an established funding source has proved an impediment to other projects across the country. Since the term ''bikeshare'' is not defined in U.S. Code or described by law as a form of transit, bikeshare systems and transportation officials alike now operate in a gray area. Congress needs to act to clarify that bikeshare projects are eligible for federal funding, providing certainty to investors, business owners, and commuters.

That is why today I am introducing the Bikeshare Transit Act. This legislation will eliminate this gray area by defining bikeshare in statute and making bikeshare systems eligible to receive funding to enhance related public transportation service or transit facilities. They will also be listed as an eligible project under the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program.

Additionally, the Bikeshare Transit Act will allow federal funding to be used for acquiring or replacing bikeshare related equipment and the construction of bikeshare facilities.

The Bikeshare Transit Act will remove significant barriers facing new bikeshare projects as well as those existing bikeshare programs applying for federal funding. This legislation underscores that bikeshare programs drive economic development and are an important part of America's transportation system.

IN RECOGNITION OF COMMISSIONER A.J. RIVERS

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 2016

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to extend my personal congratulations and best wishes to an exceptional public servant and outstanding citizen, Commissioner A.J. Rivers, on the occasion of his retirement as City Commissioner of Cordele, Georgia.

When Mr. Rivers was elected City Commissioner in 1972, he became the first African American elected to city-wide office in Cordele. Since that time, he has served his community zealously and with unparalleled commitment.

Commissioner Rivers served our nation with honor and distinction in World War II from 1943 to 1946. He graduated from the Holsey-Cobb Institute in Cordele in 1947. He worked for North Carolina Mutual Insurance Company for 53 years—35 of those years in management and 18 years in agency. He was certified as an Instructor for Insurance Courses by the State Insurance Commissioner's Office in 1983.

Beyond his duties and responsibilities as a public servant, Commissioner Rivers has also dedicated his personal life to serving his community. He has served as a Scout Master; Westside Chairperson of the American Cancer Society; Westside Chairperson of the American Red Cross; President of the 8th District of the Georgia Municipal Association in 2006; President and Corporate Board Member of Big/Brother Big Sister of South Georgia in 2006; and President of the Gillespie Development and Day Care Center for 17 years. He is a member of the American Legion; NAACP; Cordele Community Advancement Council; Crisp County Chamber Executive Committee; and Board of Directors for River Valley Regional Commission, among many other community and professional organizations. Notably, Commissioner Rivers is the Founder and President of the Historical Awards Committee. Always a mentor to those who worked and lived around him, Commissioner Rivers possesses the rare quality of humble leadership.

Throughout his career, Commissioner Rivers has been recognized for his commitment and leadership in the community. His awards and accolades include the 8th District Community Award from the Georgia Municipal Association in 1994; the USDA Rural Development Steadfast Award in 2002; and the Distinguished Citizen of the Year Award from the Cordele Lions Club in 2014.

Commissioner Rivers' Christian faith has always instilled within him a desire to positively shape the community in which he lives. As a lifetime member of Mount Calvary Baptist Church, he regularly incorporates his faith into his commitment to public service.

After retirement, Commissioner Rivers will enjoy spending time with his wife, Vera, and their four children, six grandchildren, and seven great-grandchildren. Commissioner Rivers has accomplished much in his life, but none of it would be possible without the love and support of the family he cherishes so dearly.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in extending our sincerest appreciation and best wishes to Commissioner A.J. Rivers upon the occasion of his retirement from an outstanding career spanning 44 years as City Commissioner of Cordele, Georgia.

TROOPER ELI MCCARSON, NEW JERSEY STATE POLICE

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 2016

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of fallen New Jersey State Police Trooper Eli McCarson for his extraordinary sacrifice and exemplary service to the citizens of New Jersey and the United States.

Trooper McCarson's dream was to serve his community as a member of the New Jersey State Police. His perseverance was finally rewarded in February 2015 when he graduated from the State Police Academy at the top of his class with honors. Unfortunately on December 17th, after just ten months on the force, Trooper McCarson was killed in a tragic car accident in the line of duty. His untimely death left behind his loving family—including his wife Jordan McCarson—and a grateful community.

Mr. Speaker, Trooper Eli McCarson's life reminds us that the men and women who serve and protect our communities put their lives on the line every day to protect us. I join with my community and all of New Jersey in honoring the achievements and selfless service of this truly exceptional young man.

HONORING MR. ROBERT JOHNSON, CIVIL RIGHTS ACTIVIST FROM GRENADA, MS

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 2016

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the late Mr. Robert Johnson of Grenada, MS, a beloved civil rights activist and renowned public servant. He has been remembered by many as a fighter for justice, freedom and equality for all and a pillar of his community.

Johnson was born to the late Finley and Catherine Johnson on June 17, 1948, in Grenada, MS. The sixth of seven children, Robert learned the value of hard work and sacrifice. He attended Grenada High School where he played football and attended Alcorn State University on a full athletic scholarship.

In 1966, the Meredith March against fear would change the path in which Robert Johnson would take his life. Robert came back to Grenada to join the Civil Rights Movement and worked to establish and protect voting rights in Mississippi. He was the local youth leader of the Grenada County Freedom Movement. Through his work with the Grenada County Freedom Movement, he helped make the nation aware of the threats, intimidation, and lawlessness being inflicted upon Black people in the town.

He joined the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) as a Field Project Director and worked with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and Dr. Ralph David Abernathy to continue SCLC programs in Grenada. His work with SCLC led him on organizing efforts across the country and even in Africa.

In 1971, he was jailed for refusing to be drafted into the military and was sentenced to five years but was released on a full pardon in 1972 by President Gerald Ford after serving eighteen months of the sentence.

Johnson continued his activism with the SCLC which led him to Covington, GA, where he met his wife Mary. They were married in November of 1974 and were later blessed with two sons, Cleon and Marcus.

Robert began working for the Metro Atlanta Transit Authority as a bus operator and in 1985 began attending Mt. Ephraim Baptist Church. He and his family joined Mt. Ephraim soon after. Robert Johnson served as a trustee on the Official Board for a number of years. In 2002, he was ordained as a deacon. Around this time, Robert was honored along with Rev. Dr. Joseph Lowery, and other grassroots workers of the Civil Rights Movement with a trip to Durban, South Africa where they met South African activist and president, Nelson Mandela.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing a special individual, Mr. Robert Johnson—a devoted servant of his community, a fighter for justice and equality for all people, a founder of the Grenada County Freedom Movement, and consummate family man. He will be missed by all those who know and love him.

HONORING UNC PRESIDENT TOM ROSS

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 2016

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a good friend and a devoted public servant, Tom Ross, who retired this month as President of the University of North Carolina system.

My wife Lisa and have known Tom and his wife Susan for many years. His son Tommy served in my office, making a major contribution to the development of the House Democracy Partnership. I have long admired Tom's dedication to the university, and I am very grateful for his service to our state.

A graduate of the UNC-Chapel Hill law school, Tom answered the call to serve as the UNC system's President in 2011, in the midst of some of the greatest financial challenges that the university has faced in its history. UNC not only overcame these challenges; it has thrived thanks to Tom's perseverance and strategic vision.

During his time at UNC, Tom made it easier to transfer from North Carolina community colleges to the four-year UNC institutions, expanding nontraditional students' access to higher education. He has focused effectively on the access of active-duty military and veterans to the system and on enhancing their chances to succeed. He has carefully overseen the selection of 11 new university chancellors, guaranteeing another generation of exceptional leadership for the system's 16 constituent universities.

Perhaps most importantly, Tom has led the university through economic adversity, protecting its mission and securing its financial footing. Compared to the beginning of Tom's tenure, UNC system graduation rates have risen 18 percent while spending per degree has dropped 15 percent—remarkable achievements that reflect Tom's leadership.

Tom's life has been dedicated to public service. He came to UNC from Davidson College, his alma mater and one of the nation's leading liberal arts colleges, where he served as President from 2007 to 2011. At Davidson, he implemented the Davidson Trust, a new initiative designed to fully eliminate student debt through grants and student employment. This innovative program has helped ensure that Davidson graduates do not face a financial burden as they begin their careers. He also oversaw a period of exceptional growth at Davidson, in part inspired by the on-campus career of Stephen Curry, who has gone on to become the NBA MVP and a global superstar. I suppose it's true that success begets success.

Before his tenure at Davidson, Tom was President of the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation, which provides tens of millions of dollars annually in grants to organizations devoted to economic empowerment. Tom also spent 17 years as a judge on North Carolina's Superior Court, directed the state Administrative Office of the Courts, and led the North Carolina Sentencing and Policy Advisory Committee, where he oversaw the development and implementation of new sentencing guidelines for non-violent offenders.

I cannot fail to note that Tom is leaving the presidency of UNC prematurely. The Board of Governors last year made an unexpected, unexplained decision to request his resignation, while acknowledging that his stewardship had been exemplary. This leaves little doubt that the decision was based on the fact that Tom does not share the Board's partisan loyalties. This was not only shabby treatment of an outstanding public servant; it also set a dangerous precedent for a university system that for most of its history has been free of this sort of political manipulation.

Tom has handled this difficult situation with characteristic dignity and grace. His final contribution as president may be one of his most important: to help us move beyond this episode in a way that avoids recrimination, protects the university's integrity, and builds on the many achievements of the past five years.

Lisa and I wish Tom well as he transitions to teaching and prepares for future endeavors. With Susan's unfailing support, he has made lasting contributions to our state's judicial system, nonprofit sector, and private and public higher education. He leaves our University stronger in important ways, despite the difficult economic and political environment in which he was called to lead. And he still has much to give. I am pleased to join thousands of North Carolinians in thanking him for his tireless service and in anticipating his contributions yet to come.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL EXTENDING ELIGIBILITY FOR NATIONAL COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS TO CITIZENS OF THE FREELY ASSOCIATED STATES

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 2016

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that would enable citizens of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of Palau, and the Republic of the Marshall Islands, collectively referred to as the

Freely Associated States (FAS), who reside in the United States to participate in National Community Service (CNS) programs, including AmeriCorps. This bill provides parity for citizens of the FAS who are able to join our military, receive federal student aid to further their education, and eligible to participate in other federal social programs.

The inability for FAS citizens to participate in CNS programs has had a direct impact on individuals residing in my home district of Guam. Last year, several FAS citizens who are studying at the University of Guam and enrolled in the AmeriCorps program were removed from the program because they were found to be ineligible under the citizenship guidelines. Despite having already begun working with their assigned service organizations, these individuals were forced to find alternate accommodations through the local Guam Legislature, which appropriated local funds to cover expenses that would have otherwise been provided through the Centers for National and Community Service. I believe that this was a great injustice to these individuals, who wanted to help the people of Guam and who serve as role models for others in our community.

I believe that FAS citizens who reside in the U.S. should be allowed to participate in national service programs, just as they are able to serve our nation in military service or obtain federal student aid to further their education. My bill would specifically amend the National and Community Service Act of 1990 to include citizens of the FAS who are residing in the U.S. in the list of qualified individuals, in addition to U.S. citizens or nationals, or lawful permanent residents of the United States. The bill will ensure that any FAS citizen in the U.S. who wants to participate is not denied the opportunity to make our community better. If we can allow FAS citizens to serve in our military and protect our way of life it is only fair that we allow them to serve our local communities through community service. As we work to make the Compacts more sustainable for the affected jurisdiction, I believe that this is a good way to continue our commitment to improving our relationships with these nations.

I thank my colleagues, Congresswoman TULSI GABBARD and Congressman KILILI SABLAN for their support of this bill. I look forward to working with them to move this bill through the legislative process and having it enacted into law.

TRIBUTE TO STUART O. WITT

HON. STEPHEN KNIGHT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 2016

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of a man who dedicated his life to the continued advancement of American aerospace.

Witt was born in Bakersfield, California and raised on the Scodie Ranch in the Kern River Valley. He graduated from Cal State Northridge in 1974, from the Naval Aviation Schools Command in 1976 and from the Naval Fighter Weapons School (TOPGUN training) in 1980. He is also a 1996 graduate of the University of Maryland's Center for Creative Leadership.

Upon graduating college, Witt embarked on a storied military career in the Navy, where he spent time as an F–14 Tomcat pilot based on the U.S.S. *John F. Kennedy* and as an FA–18A Hornet project pilot at the Naval Air Warfare Center in China Lake, CA. After the Navy, Witt continued to fly professionally for nearly nine years as an engineering test pilot on the B–1B, F–16C and F–23. In 1993 he joined Computer Technology Associates, where he managed a $100-million contract as Executive Vice President.

Since 2002, Witt was CEO and General Manager of the Mojave Air & Space Port, which lies just outside of my district, where he was the defining factor in making that Port the crucial institution that it is today. In addition to his efforts at Mojave, Witt also served as the Chairman of the Commercial Spaceflight Federation (CSF) from 2012–2014 where he worked tirelessly to promote the development of commercial human spaceflight and to bring about a 21st century space age for America.

I have worked with Stu on multiple occasions to develop legislation that would allow the commercial space industry to innovate and expand in the state of California, and can attest to his skills as a pioneer and leader. His legacy will be felt by space lovers, entrepreneurs, and explorers for generations.

IN DEFENSE OF SECOND AMENDMENT FREEDOMS

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 2016

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, throughout this president's time in office, he has worked to undermine the 2nd Amendment freedoms of law-abiding Americans. It's no surprise that he would begin his final year exactly the same way.

The new unilateral actions announced by the president will do little to make our communities safer. But they could infringe on the rights of Americans to protect themselves and their families.

These unilateral actions are only an attempt to distract from the career failings of an ineffective president. In fact, most of them are about strictly enforcing our existing laws—something this president has repeatedly failed to do.

The Second Amendment is a founding principle of our Republic. I assure my constituents that I will continue to stand strong against any infringement.

SHERIFF CHARLES BILLINGHAM, CAMDEN, NEW JERSEY

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 2016

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sheriff Charles H. Billingham of Camden County, New Jersey for his achievements, contributions, and service to the people of New Jersey and the United States of America.

Sheriff Billingham started his 34-year career as a patrolman in Gloucester City, New Jersey. Recognized for his talent and positive demeanor, he quickly rose through the ranks from patrolman to sergeant where he supervised and managed the daily activities of a patrol platoon. He moved to the Washington Township Police Department, which put him back on patrol again. His dedication earned him the respect from his fellow officers and he soon rose to the rank of chief of police. During his time as chief of police in Washington Township he focused many of his efforts on community outreach through educational programs including crime prevention, issues concerning youths, domestic violence, and drug awareness such as ''project aware'' and D.A.R.E.

In 2007, after serving as a councilman and Mayor of Gloucester City for nearly 4 years, he was elected Sheriff of Camden County. He brought with him the same ''can do attitude'' he had displayed throughout his career. As sheriff, he continued to focus on educating and incorporating the police into the community. In fact, his tenure saw a tremendous rise in community engagement and a plummeting crime rate. Moreover, his work ethic never wavered, even as he approached retirement he continued to energetically and enthusiastically protect our community. During his final days as sheriff while out on patrol during a routine traffic stop, he personally arrested three fugitives, and confiscated illegal weapons and a substantial amount of illegal drugs. A lifelong family man, he is now retiring to spend more time with his wife Marion and their two sons, Chuckie and Michael.

Mr. Speaker, Sheriff Billingham is a great American who exemplifies the selfless dedication of law enforcement officers throughout the country. I join Camden County and all of New Jersey in wishing him a happy retirement and thanking him for his outstanding service.

SUPPORTING TAIWAN'S DEMOCRATIC ELECTIONS AND RIGHT TO SELF-DETERMINATION

HON. TED LIEU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 2016

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition and support of our close ally Taiwan as it prepares to conduct free, fair and democratic presidential elections. On January 16, 2016, the Taiwanese people will go to the polls in a tremendous display of the core democratic principle of self-determination.

This year, we celebrated the 41st anniversary of the passage of the Taiwan Relations Act, a law that has helped foster a deep bond between the U.S. and our ally in the Pacific. As the only Member of Congress born in Taiwan and as a member of the Congressional Taiwan Caucus, I am encouraged by our strong bilateral relations and the broad bipartisan support for Taiwan that exists in Congress today, and I look forward to expanding that relationship even further with the newly-elected president.

I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Taiwan a successful democratic and independent election.

H.R. 712 AND H.R. 1155

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 2016

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this week, the House considered H.R. 712, the Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act, and H.R. 1155, the SCRUB Act, pieces of legislation with the primary purpose of dismantling and undermining the federal rulemaking and regulatory process. I voted against both of these bills.

Throughout my career, as an administrator and policymaker at the local, state, and federal levels, I have often seen the value of common-sense regulations that save lives. I have also seen the challenges associated with cumbersome regulations that are difficult to comply with.

There are ways to make some regulations more efficient and easier to navigate, but we must do so in a way that protects public health, maintains our environmental protections, and ensures fair market interactions. These bills, however, are far from the mark

They both would implement a ''cut-go'' approach that would require every new rule to come with the removal of another, even in cases of emergency or imminent harm to public health. This approach is absurd. Regulations often build on each other, evolving and sometimes rapidly responding to emerging challenges, and this type of restriction will only threaten the process and undermine the ability of agencies to effectively protect public health, public safety, the environment and more.

The Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act, through its barriers to consent decrees, through its imposition of a moratorium on implementation until a rule is available online for six months, and through its requirement that all rules be summarized in 100 words online, regardless of how complex, only adds additional, unnecessary burdens on the rulemaking process, without actually improving it.

The underlying assumption behind these bills is that regulations are unwelcome and burdensome on communities and the economy. I frequently, however, hear from industry in my community and around the country about the importance of many government regulations, in equalizing the playing field and setting important guidelines based on science that allow them be good actors in their communities.

There are certainly outdated regulations, and there is always room for greater efficiencies, and the creation of more performance based, flexible regulatory processes. These bills however, will not get us closer to that goal, and are dangerous to public safety, to health and the environment.

IN MEMORY OF THE HONORABLE DALLAS THEODORE YATES

HON. AL GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 7, 2016

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to honor the memory of a godly and enterprising soul from Florida: my uncle, the Honorable Dallas Theodore Yates.

Mr. Yates, affectionately known as ''Uncle Dallas,'' was born in Caryville, Florida on September 22, 1919. From a young age, he was a person of deep and abiding faith, giving his life to Christ at the age of eight while attending Saint Mary's African Methodist Episcopal (A.M.E.) Church. In 1951, Uncle Dallas would go on to help establish the Gregg Chapel A.M.E. Church in Fort Walton Beach, Florida. Later, he moved to south Florida with his wife, Jane Eva Davis Yates, where they reared their children: Phyllis Rose Bryant Gilley, Raymond Lawrence Bryant, Sr., Harold Dwight Yates, Dallasteen Joy Yates and Jeffrey Arles Yates. There, in 1957, he entered into Christian fellowship with New Bethel A.M.E. Church. Over the course of his tenure at the church, he held the positions of Trustee Board Chairman Pro Tempore, Steward Board Chairman Pro Tempore, District Steward, as well as Annual Conference Delegate, all while giving generously to support the church's maintenance and services. In 1998, after many years of faithfully serving the Lord, he became a ''licensed Exhorter of the word of God.''

Throughout his life, he was known for his entrepreneurial spirit and industrious nature. While living in Fort Walton Beach, Florida as a young man, he owned and operated the ''Chicken in the Basket Restaurant'' and was the co-owner of the ''Silver Cab Company'' with his brother Charlie Yates. He also owned and developed residential properties in the city. In 1962, he moved to Indian River County, Florida and became the first black law enforcement officer and Deputy Sheriff in the county. He is said to have been known for his professionalism and ability to deescalate situations. In the 1970s, after honorably serving Indian River County, he and his wife established D & J Citrus Inc., a fruit harvesting and packing company. He also established the Yates Supermarket, which was family-owned and operated into the 1980s.

I am blessed to have the opportunity to pay tribute to the memory of an exceptional man: my uncle, the Honorable Dallas Theodore Yates, who, despite facing what many would describe as insurmountable obstacles, accomplished his dreams of becoming a businessman and a trailblazer in law enforcement, while remaining a man of faith until his passing on December 30, 2015 at the age of 96.

Mr. Speaker, I shall remember Uncle Dallas as a devoted husband, a dedicated father, and a mentor who provided me with a sense of direction, which has led me to the Congress of the United States of America.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m., on Monday, January 11, 2016.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 10 public bills, H.R. 4340–4349; and 1 resolution, H. Res. 582 were introduced. **Pages H175–76**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H176–77**

Report Filed: A report was filed today as follows:

H.R. 653, to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Freedom of Information Act), to provide for greater public access to information, and for other purposes, with an amendment (H. Rept. 114–391). **Page H175**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative LaHood to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H105**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:11 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H113**

Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act of 2015—Rule for Consideration: The House agreed to H. Res. 581, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1927) to amend title 28, United States Code, to improve fairness in class action litigation, by a recorded vote of 234 ayes to 176 noes, Roll No. 22, after the previous question was ordered by a yea-and-nay vote of 236 yeas to 176 nays, Roll No. 21. **Pages H117–23, H152–53**

Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2015: The House passed H.R. 712, to impose certain limitations on consent decrees and settlement agreements by agencies that require the agencies to take regulatory action in accordance with the terms thereof, by a recorded vote of 244 ayes to 173 noes, Roll No 12. **Pages H123–45**

Rejected the Kelly (IL) motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 171 ayes to 244 noes, Roll No. 11. **Pages H143–45**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114–37 shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. **Page H133**

Agreed to:

Marino amendment (No. 1 printed in part A of H. Rept. 114–388) that includes a small number of revisions in the nature of technical and conforming changes to clarify provisions that state deadlines, reformat section nomenclature and headings, and improve typography or grammar; and **Page H135**

Foxx amendment (No. 5 printed in part A of H. Rept. 114–388) that requires monthly reporting of unfunded mandates by agencies to OIRA; requires reporting of unfunded mandates imposed in OIRA's annual cumulative assessment of agency rule making. **Pages H138–39**

Rejected:

Cummings amendment (No. 7 printed in part A of H. Rept. 114–388) that sought to exempt independent establishments from the requirements of Title II of the bill; **Page H140**

Johnson (GA) amendment (No. 2 printed in part A of H. Rept. 114–388) that sought to insert an exception for any rule, consent decree, or settlement

agreement that the Director of the Office of Management and Budget determines would result in net job creation and whose benefits exceeds its costs (by a recorded vote of 175 ayes to 242 noes, Roll No. 7); **Pages H135–36, H140–41**

Cummings amendment (No. 3 printed in part A of H. Rept. 114–388) that sought to strike section 653 as created by Title II of the bill (Requirement for Rules to Appear in Agency-Specific Monthly Publications) (by a recorded vote of 174 ayes to 244 noes, Roll No. 8); **Pages H136–37, H141–42**

Lynch amendment (No. 4 printed in part A of H. Rept. 114–388) that sought to amend Title II of H.R. 712 by requiring federal agencies to provide an estimate of the benefits of proposed regulations; also require the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs to include the total benefits of proposed and final agency rules in the annual cumulative assessment of agency rule making required by the bill (by a recorded vote of 180 ayes to 235 noes, Roll No. 9); and **Pages H137–38, H142**

Johnson (GA) amendment (No. 6 printed in part A of H. Rept. 114–388) that sought to clarify that the exception to the rule should take effect in the event that there is a threat to health or safety or other emergency and not only when such threat is imminent (by a recorded vote of 173 ayes to 241 noes, Roll No. 10). **Pages H139–40, H142–43**

H. Res. 580, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 712) and (H.R. 1155), was agreed to yesterday, January 6th.

Announcement by the Chair: The Speaker addressed the Members on matters of decorum in the House. **Page H145**

SCRUB Act of 2015: The House passed H.R. 1155, to provide for the establishment of a process for the review of rules and sets of rules, by a recorded vote of 245 ayes to 174 noes, Roll No. 20. Consideration began yesterday, January 6th. **Pages H145–52**

Rejected the Cicilline motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a recorded vote of 178 ayes to 239 noes, Roll No. 19. **Pages H150–51**

Rejected:

Johnson (GA) amendment (No. 4 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–388) that was debated on January 6th that sought to strike title II of the bill, eliminating the legislation's regulatory ''cut-go'' process, which requires that agencies eliminate rules identified by the Regulatory Retrospective Review Commission prior to issuing a new rule (by a recorded vote of 174 ayes to 239 noes, Roll No. 13); **Page H146**

Cummings amendment (No. 6 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–388) that was debated on January 6th that sought to exempt independent establishments from the requirements of the bill (by a recorded vote of 172 ayes to 244 noes, Roll No. 14); **Pages H146–47**

Cicilline amendment (No. 7 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–388) that was debated on January 6th that sought to exempt rules made by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from the additional provisions of the legislation (by a recorded vote of 176 ayes to 241 noes, Roll No. 15); **Page H147**

DelBene amendment (No. 8 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–388) that was debated on January 6th that sought to create an exemption from regulatory ''cut-go'' requirements in the case of an emergency (by a recorded vote of 176 ayes to 239 noes, Roll No. 16); **Page H148**

Cicilline amendment (No. 9 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–388) that was debated on January 6th that sought to provide that the term ''rule'' has the meaning given in section 551 of title 5, United States Code, except for a special rule as made by the Secretary of Homeland Security (by a recorded vote of 173 ayes to 244 noes, Roll No. 17); and **Pages H148–49**

Pocan amendment (No. 10 printed in part B of H. Rept. 114–388) that was debated on January 6th that sought to exempt from the bill rules put forth by the FDA for the purposes of consumer safety (by a recorded vote of 173 ayes to 245 noes, Roll No. 18). **Page H149**

H. Res. 580, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 712) and (H.R. 1155), was agreed to yesterday, January 6th.

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and fifteen recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H140–41, H141–42, H142, H142–43, H144–45, H145, H146, H146–47, H147, H148, H148–49, H149, H151, H151–52, H152, and H152–53. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

Committee Meetings

ACQUISITION REFORM: EXPERIMENTATION AND AGILITY

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Acquisition Reform: Experimentation and Agility''. Testimony was heard from Lieutenant General Michael E. Williamson, USA, Principal Military Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Acquisition, Logistics and Technology);

Sean J. Stackley, Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research, Development and Acquisition); and Richard W. Lombardi, Acting Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Acquisition).

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee On Foreign Affairs: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 1797, the ''End Neglected Tropical Diseases Act''; H.R. 3662, the ''Iran Terror Finance Transparency Act''; and H.R. 4314, the ''Counterterrorism Screening and Assistance Act of 2016''. The following bills were ordered reported, as amended: H.R. 4314 and H.R. 1797. H.R. 3662 was ordered reported, without amendment.

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ACQUISITION REFORM ACT: EXAMINING REMAINING CHALLENGES

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Transportation Security held a hearing entitled ''Transportation Security Acquisition Reform Act: Examining Remaining Challenges''. Testimony was heard from Steven Wallen, Director, Explosives Division, Science and Technology Directorate, Department of Homeland Security; Jill Vaughan, Assistant Administrator, Office of Security Technologies, Transportation Security Administration, Department of Homeland Security; Michele Mackin, Director, Office Acquisition and Sourcing Management, Government Accountability Office; and a public witness.

DOCUMENT PRODUCTION STATUS UPDATE

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Document Production Status Update''. Testimony was heard from Julia Frifield, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State; Jason Levine, Director, Office of Congressional, Legislative, and Intergovernmental Affairs, Office of Personnel Management; Peter J. Kadzik, Assistant Attorney General for Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice; Tamara Fucile, Associate Director for Legislative Affairs, Office of Management and Budget; and Tia Johnson, Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security.

ATTENTION NEEDED: MISMANAGEMENT AT THE SBA—THE ADMINISTRATOR RESPONDS

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Attention Needed: Mismanagement at the SBA—The Administrator Responds''. Testimony was heard from Maria Contreras-Sweet, Administrator, Small Business Administration.

BUSINESS MEETING

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Full Committee held a business meeting to consider a Member access request. The request for access to certain Committee documents made by Representative Thompson of California was granted.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JANUARY 8, 2016

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Readiness, hearing entitled ''Effects of Reduced Infrastructure and Base Operating Support Investments on Navy Readiness'', 8 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Research and Technology; and Subcommittee on Oversight, joint hearing entitled ''Cyber Security: What the Federal Government Can Learn from the Private Sector'', 9 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

2 p.m., Monday, January 11

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 5 p.m.), Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of Luis Felipe Restrepo, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, with a vote on confirmation of the nomination, at approximately 5:30 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, January 8

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Consideration of H.R. 1927—Fairness in Class Action Litigation Act of 2015 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Babin, Brian, Tex., E15
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr., Ga., E17
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E17, E20
Bordallo, Madeleine Z., Guam, E18
DelBene, Suzan K., Wash., E15
Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E16
Duncan, John J., Jr., Tenn., E16
Garamendi, John, Calif., E15
Green, Al, Tex., E20
Hudson, Richard, N.C., E17
Kind, Ron, Wisc., E15
Knight, Stephen, Calif., E19
Lieu, Ted, Calif., E19
Marchant, Kenny, Tex., E19
Norcross, Donald, N.J., E16, E18, E19
Price, David E., N.C., E18
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E18
Trott, David A., Mich., E16
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E16

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.fdsys.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.