United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 13, 2016 No. 8

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Friday, January 15, 2016, at 11 a.m.

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 13, 2016

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

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

We give You thanks, merciful God, for giving us another day.

As You make available to Your people the grace and knowledge to meet the needs of the day, we pray that Your spirit will be upon the Members of this people's House, giving them the richness of Your wisdom.

Bless the Members of the majority party as they gather these next days. May they, with those who accompany them, travel safely and meet in peace.

Bless also the minority party as they prepare for their own gathering. May these days be filled with hopeful anticipation.

May the power of Your truth and our faith in Your providence give them all the confidence they must have to do the good work required for service to our Nation. Give all Members the strength of purpose and clarity of mind to do those things that bring justice and mercy to people, and maintain freedom and liberty for our land.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. FOXX 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 five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

MORE EMPTY WORDS AT STATE OF THE UNION

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the past 7 years, President Obama has given us 47,625 words of meaningless rhetoric. Last night's State of the Union address was more of the same empty words.

President Obama has never adequately focused on what really matters in this country: keeping America safe and defending our cherished freedoms.

Instead, he wants to maintain the status quo and continues to promote top-down, one-size-fits-all Federal dictates that stymie economic growth. It is clear he doesn't understand the solutions that will get our Nation back on track with the American people, not Washington bureaucrats.

President Obama promised hope and change, but his failed agenda has brought the wrong kind of change, and many North Carolinians are losing hope.

Fortunately, Republicans are committed to restoring confidence in America and empowering her people to make their own decisions and pursue their own dreams.

HONORING KOREAN AMERICAN DAY

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

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Korean American Day and to honor the 2 million Korean Americans across this country. January 13 is a day of celebration not just for the Korean Americans across this country; it is a celebration of America.

113 years ago, 102 men, women, and children traveled from the Korean Peninsula and landed in Hawaii. Since their arrival, the Korean American community has enriched and strengthened our Nation's society, culture, Armed Forces, economy, politics, education, and arts.

From serving in high-level posts in our government to making strides in entrepreneurship and medicine, Korean Americans continue to leave an indelible mark in our Nation's history and makeup. So to the Korean Americans

across this great Nation, including those in my district, our Nation honors and celebrates you.

HONORING ETHAN EDELMAN

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

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of United States Army veteran Ethan Edelman of Highlands Ranch, Colorado.

Ethan Edelman served for 3 years in the United States infantry. His military service included a combat tour of duty in Afghanistan. His personal awards include the United States Army Commendation Medal, the Army Achievement Medal, and the Army Good Conduct Medal.

Like so many other veterans before him, Ethan Edelman served his country with honor, with dedication, and with courage.

Ethan Edelman left the United States Army to enroll as a student at Metropolitan State University in Denver, Colorado.

Last year, Ethan Edelman, tragically, took his own life on Veterans Day, a day that carries so much emotion for those of us who have served this great Nation in uniform.

Ethan Edelman will always be remembered for his service to this country. He will forever be missed by his family, his friends, and by the soldiers who served by his side in combat.

RECOGNIZING GABRIELLA MELENDEZ, TORIANA CORNWELL, AND SHANIYLAH WELCH

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, three students from the Hamlin Park Academy—Gabriella Melendez, Toriana Cornwell, and Shaniylah Welch—will participate in the Fourth Annual State of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math Address hosted by the White House.

After months of planning, fundraising, and research, these three bright women partnered with Western New York STEM Hub to develop and fine-tune their experiment, ''Tumor Growth in Microgravity,'' which earned them the nickname ''Spud Launchers.''

Through collaborative efforts with NASA, these spud launchers will test the ability of potatoes to grow in microgravity, toward the goal of learning about how plants might grow on other planets.

Their experiment won the national competition held by the Student Spaceflight Experiments Program and will be conducted abroad at the International Space Station this year.

These three young women are role models to all of the bright young minds in our community. Their success is a result of their curiosity and their hard work. It is a testament to their families, the Buffalo Public Schools system, Western New York STEM Hub, and, most importantly, their teachers.

CONGRATULATING VINCENT ''ZIPPY'' DUVALL

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

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my friend Vincent ''Zippy'' Duvall on his election yesterday as president of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Zippy is a third-generation farmer from Greene County, Georgia, and has been a Farm Bureau member since 1977. For the past 9 years, he has served as president of the Georgia Farm Bureau, while producing poultry, cattle, and hay on his family farm.

I am so proud to have Zippy and his wife, Bonnie, as constituents of the Tenth District of Georgia. He has done an extraordinary job serving as the voice of agriculture in Georgia, and I can think of no better leader than Zippy Duvall to serve as the new president of the American Farm Bureau.

KOREAN AMERICAN DAY

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

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Korean American Day, a day that commemorates the first Korean immigrants to arrive in the United States on January 13, 1903. On that day, the S.S. *Gaelic* brought 56 men, 21 women, and 25 children across the Pacific Ocean from Korea to America in search of a better future.

On Korean American Day, our Nation celebrates a community that has made tremendous contributions to this country. Since 1903, the Korean American population has grown to almost 2 million and has become intricately woven in the fabric of our country.

Korean Americans have made contributions in all aspects of American life. They are our servicemembers, our doctors, businessmen, teachers, and community leaders. They are our neighbors and, most importantly, our friends.

For centuries, Korean immigrants and their descendants have helped build America's prosperity. Their culture enriches our lives in so many ways as they uphold the important values of community, hard work, and family that make America strong.

I am proud to be a part of New York State, which has the second largest Korean American population in the U.S. I am honored to join my colleagues and friends in celebrating all that the Korean Americans have done for our great Nation.

SMALL BUSINESS HURT BY FEDERAL OVERREACH

(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, last night the President said that he is finally ready to work with us here in Congress. Today we will send him a measure blocking the EPA's waters of the United States power grab, a proposal rejected by both Houses of Congress, two Federal courts, the Government Accountability Office, and many States.

The EPA's plan would grant jurisdiction over fully 95 percent of my home State of California, allowing an unaccountable Federal agency to insert itself into land use decisions once again across our State.

Mr. Speaker, the President spoke glowingly of small business America last night. Between waters of the United States, his rejection of health options plans for Americans, and forcing minimum wage proposals upon small businesses and their employees, small businesses don't have a chance. They don't have a chance to survive and thrive in this country.

If the President really wants to work with Congress in a constructive way, he can start today by rejecting the waters of the United States policy that is hurting small businesses, farms, and ranches, and actually help us build the water supply we need in California and the Western States.

TIME FOR THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT TO TAKE ACTION

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, well, the lights and the heat are on at the Malheur National Wildlife Refuge, illegally occupied by ultra rightwing, antigovernment extremists. But you have to wonder if the lights are on or anybody is home down there at the Justice Department. Hello? I don't think there is anybody there.

I believe that this illegal occupation, this destruction of Federal property, was directly emboldened by the fact that the father of the two leaders, Cliven Bundy, stood down the government 2 years ago when he owed $1 million.

Other ranchers pay their grazing fees, and he refuses to do it. He was grazing in areas that were prohibited. He stood down the government at the point of a gun, and he is still illegally grazing.

Nobody—nobody—at the Justice Department has seen fit to lift a finger against him. There is no ongoing prosecution. They haven't put a lien on his cattle.

He celebrated the anniversary of the takeover and said: This is how it is done.

Now his sons are replicating that in my State of Oregon, where we abide by the laws. Yes, we disagree over a lot of Federal policies, but we abide by the laws.

It is time for the Justice Department to take some action. Wake up down there.

RECOGNIZING LYNNEL RUCKERT

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, when building a strong team, you need a strong leader. Lynnel Ruckert has been that strong leader.

As my chief of staff, Lynnel has also been an ally and a friend since the very first day I arrived in Congress. Whether it has been the whip team, the Republican Study Committee, or Louisiana's First Congressional District, under her guidance, strong leadership, and relentless drive, Lynnel played a crucial role in delivering countless conservative victories for both our country and Louisiana.

I wouldn't be where I am today without Lynnel Ruckert. I am and will forever be grateful for Lynnel's dedication and unwavering commitment to our Team Scalise family.

Every day, she made the extra effort to bring a little Louisiana to Washington. We call it lagniappe. There was not a day that went by where she didn't wear a fleur-de-lis or some other symbol of our great State of Louisiana that we both love.

Lynnel, you will be truly missed. I wish you, Kyle, and the whole Ruckert family all the best as you enter this new, exciting chapter in your life back home in Louisiana.

□ 0915

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE SEATTLE SEAHAWKS

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today to congratulate the fans of the Seattle Seahawks.

You see, I talked with my good friend Congresswoman SUZAN DELBENE and told her that the Minnesota Vikings were for sure going to beat the Seahawks.

She said: Well, if you really believe that, why don't you agree to come down to the House floor if they don't, and I will come down to the House floor if they do.

For three quarters, I was right, Mr. Speaker. The Vikings shut the Seahawks out completely. But in the fourth quarter, through luck—and this is the real skill of the Seahawks, by the way—the center throws one over the head of the quarterback.

The quarterback runs 20 yards back. It looks like he is just going to fall on it, but he picks it up, finds an open man, hits him, and then the guy almost scores, and then, on the next play, they do.

Then, after that, the leading rusher in the NFL, A.P.—Adrian Peterson—drops a pass and fumbles it and then they get the ball and kick a field goal. We are now 9–10.

Even still, the Vikings were about to win, Mr. Speaker, but the lucky, lucky Seahawks saw our excellent field goal kicker miss one, although he has been making them all year long.

So I am here to congratulate the Seahawks as the luckiest team in the NFL.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 583, I call up the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 22) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency relating to the definition of ''waters of the United States'' under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia). Pursuant to House Resolution 583, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S.J. RES. 22

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''Clean Water Rule: Definition of 'Waters of the United States' '' (80 Fed. Reg. 37054; June 29, 2015), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on S.J. Res. 22.

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

There was no objection.

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

The question of what is and is not waters of the United States has been the subject of debate for many decades. The reason this question is so important and contentious is because, if water or land is Federal, it is subject to regulation by the Federal Government.

The Clean Water Act was originally intended as a cooperative partnership between the States and the Federal Government, with the States being primarily responsible for the elimination and prevention of water pollution and the oversight of waters within their borders.

This successful partnership has given rise to monumental improvements in water quality throughout the Nation since the Clean Water Act's enactment in 1972 because not all waters need to be subject to Federal jurisdiction.

Following the Supreme Court's decision of SWANCC and Rapanos, determining the appropriate scope of jurisdiction on the Clean Water Act has been confusing and unclear. Both the regulated community and the Supreme Court called for a rulemaking that would provide this needed clarity. The EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers voluntarily undertook a rulemaking to respond to the need for clarity, and that is when things went terribly wrong.

If the agencies had taken the time to consult with the States and local governments and to actually listen up front to the issues that our States, counties, cities, and townships are facing, the agencies would not have had to admit to Congress in multiple hearings that their proposed rule created confusion and uncertainty, but they did not take this time for consultation.

If the agencies had followed the proper rulemaking process, we wouldn't have had a proposed rule that cut corners on the economic analysis, used incomplete data, and took a cursory look at the economic impacts of the rule on just one of the many regulatory programs under the Clean Water Act, but they did not follow the rulemaking process.

If the agencies had done things right, the substantive comments filed on the rule would not have been nearly 70 percent opposed to the rule.

If the agencies had done things right the first time, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure wouldn't have had to respond to the more than 30 States and almost 400 counties which requested the EPA withdraw or significantly revise the proposed waters of the United States rule and move H.R. 1732, a bill the House passed in May of 2015 that was a bipartisan bill, that would have sent the rule back to the agencies so they would go through the correct process.

If the agencies had properly developed the rule in a joint fashion, the Army Corps of Engineers would not have been cut out of the process and would not have had to send last-minute letters through the chain of command that questioned decisions that were being made in the final rule and that pointed out multiple issues that would make the rule nearly impossible to implement and legally questionable.

If the agencies had actually set out to clarify jurisdiction and not to simply gift themselves unlimited discretion to regulate whatever they wanted,

they would not have needed to have conspired to influence and skew the public comments during the open rulemaking process or to promote and justify an agenda that the majority of States opposed and have sued to stop.

Recently, the Government Accountability Office issued a legal opinion related to its investigation of the EPA regarding the waters of the United States rule that drastically increases the agencies' authority at the expense of the States.

The GAO's findings are plain and simple: The EPA broke the law. By using social media tactics, the GAO called ''covert propaganda'' and ''grassroots lobbying,'' the EPA undermined the integrity of the rulemaking process and violated the trust of the American people.

The agencies simply did not do things right. In fact, they did things very, very wrong. And now we have a rule on the books that is reflective of a completely flawed process.

Today the waters of the United States rule goes far beyond merely clarifying the scope of the Federal jurisdiction under Clean Water Act programs. It vastly expands Federal power. The clarity this rule provided is simple: Everything is Federal.

The rule misconstrues and manipulates the legal standards announced in the SWANCC and Rapanos Supreme Court cases, effectively turning those cases that placed limits on the Federal Clean Water Act jurisdiction into a justification for the agencies to expand their assertion of Federal authority over all waters and wet areas nationally.

The agencies chose to write many of the provisions in the proposed rule vaguely in order to give Federal regulators substantial discretion to claim Federal jurisdiction over most any water or wet area whenever they want.

This vagueness will continue to lead the regulated community without clarity and certainty as to their regulatory status and leaves them exposed to citizen lawsuits and massive government fines.

In addition, since many of these jurisdictional decisions will be made on a case-by-case basis, they will give the Federal regulators free rein to find jurisdiction.

This rule, in essence, establishes a presumption that all waters are jurisdictional and shifts the burden to prove they are not to the property owners and to others in the regulated community. This rule will set a very high bar for the regulated community to overcome.

The administration even explicitly acknowledged that it wants maximum discretion in its Statement of Administration Policy for H.R. 1732, stating that it opposed the bill because it would constrain the agencies' regulatory discretion.

The rule undermines the successful Federal-State partnership and erodes State authority by granting sweeping, new Federal jurisdiction to waters never intended for regulation under the Clean Water Act.

In justifying the need for this rule, the agencies claimed that massive amounts of wetlands and stream miles are not being protected by the States and that this rule is needed to ''protect'' them.

Yet, the agencies continue to claim that no new waters would be covered by the rulemaking, which raises the question of how the rule can protect these supposedly unprotected waters without vastly expanding Federal jurisdiction over them. The agencies are talking out of both sides of their mouths.

The reality is that States care about and are protective of their waters, and wetlands and stream miles are not being left unprotected.

More than 30 States have sued the Federal Government over this rule. Who can blame them? States and local governments and the regulated community all repeatedly expressed concern that the agencies have cut them out of the process and have failed to consult with them during every step in the development of this rule.

The agencies engaged in a flawed process from the beginning, ignoring their State and local partners and ignoring each other, and gifted themselves virtually limitless authority over land in this country that could contain water.

Furthermore, they broke the law by illegally influencing both the public comment period and lobbying against congressional efforts to get them to change their course.

S.J. Res. 22 halts this appalling overreach by the executive branch. The stakes are simply too high not to act.

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

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

We are ultimately here because of a failure by the United States Congress to act. The last time Congress revisited the Clean Water Act was in 1987. There are very few Members here today who were elected at that time.

The reason we have the Clean Water Act is that—I remember a time when I was young when the Cuyahoga River caught fire because of industrial waste and when the Willamette River in my State was an open sewer because it was a convenient place to dump your municipal human waste.

It was a disaster for our country, and we decided to deal with that problem under Republican leadership, which we did quite successfully. But now we realize it is a little more complicated than just keeping out the point source pollution from industrial waste and/or municipal waste.

There are other threats to our clean water, one of the most precious things we have. Read the CIA documents or the planning by the Pentagon. Wars will be fought over water. We can't sully this precious resource, and I think there is pretty substantial agreement on that. The question is: What, where, and how do we protect the waters of the United States?

This is incredibly confusing. We have a split Supreme Court, with contradictory decisions out of the Supreme Court, and we are now, today, living under Bush-era guidance regarding the Clean Water Act.

That unfortunately is described by people from the extremes of the debate—from the American Farm Bureau Federation to the Natural Resources Defense Council—as totally unworkable, inconsistent, incomprehensible, and it provides no certainty to farmers or to conservationists or to developers or to anybody else. That is what we are living under. We are living under those rules today.

Here is a quote from the American Farm Bureau:

> A hodgepodge of ad hoc and inconsistent jurisdictional theories, which, ultimately, will result—and is resulting—in increased delays and costs to the public at large.

That is what we are living under because this new rule, which the House today will act to overturn, is not in effect. What is in effect today is Bush-era guidance.

If this legislation were to pass and become law, which it won't because the Senate has already failed to muster a veto-proof majority over there on this issue—so this is all kind of a show—the provisions of this resolution or disapproval are so broad that all of the work that went into constructing this new rule could not be replicated in any manner.

Essentially, we would be stuck forever unless we change the law, and Congress hasn't acted on the Clean Water Act for 30 years. Unless we change the law, we would be stuck forever with an ad hoc, inconsistent hodgepodge of jurisdictional theories, which are resulting in increased delays and costs to the public at large. That is the ultimate result, were this to pass and become law.

Now, I will admit that the administration caused a good deal of the problem here today. The rule, as initially promulgated by the EPA, was, I would say, turgid at best, and it caused incredible confusion. It seemed to have jurisdictional theories, et cetera, et cetera, very much like the Bush rule.

There was an uproar from Members of Congress, farmers, developers, and conservationists. Everybody had concerns about their initial rule. So what did they do? They went out and they listened. They had a massive number of comments to which they meaningfully responded, and then they found a few areas where they did make major improvements.

Do I think it is a perfect rule? No. But the courts will decide where it is adequate or inadequate, and then that would give direction to a future Congress to actually act and do its job on the Clean Water Act. That would be desirable.

It does deal with roadside ditches. There are huge concerns about roadside ditches. A good change. It has the explicit exemption of municipal separate storm sewers from the Clean Water Act. Again, that was the confusing part of their first rule.

It permanently exempts groundwater and water-filled depressions related to fill or gravel mining activities. There is a huge concern with gravel extraction activities in my State.

Also, a litany of erosional features, artificial ponds, and artificially irrigated areas were exempted from the Clean Water Act, which very explicitly and clearly benefit farmers and developers.

□ 0930

In fact, this subject came up at our joint hearing on this issue. Senator INHOFE brought this up. This was subjected to the Clean Water Act regulatory process. They wanted to turn this into a warehouse facility to develop the land. It is very marginal at best as farmland.

Army Assistant Secretary Darcy confirmed, upon a question from me, that, in fact, under her new rule and guidance, this property would be exempt; but under the Bush rule, it isn't. So they can't develop it under the Bush rule, but they could develop it under the new rule, which we seek today to overturn.

So this new rule is an improvement. Is it perfect, no. In fact, I think the courts might find it wanting in a number of ways, which would require further action by Congress. To merely say we reject it, we want to live under the Bush rule—which everybody hates and says doesn't work—forever doesn't make a lot of sense. Also, acting here today, when the Senate has already made it clear that they don't have a veto-proof majority, shows that we are wasting time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, just for a little bit of clarity, H.R. 7232 that was passed out of the House, it was to rescind this proposed rule and for the agencies to start over. That is actually the position of the American Farm Bureau. They do not support this proposal. They want to start over and get a rule that does have clarity.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S.J. Res. 22, the resolution of disapproval for the waters of the United States rule. The ranking member pointed out that the Bush rule creates tremendous uncertainty. He is correct, absolutely correct. We need to make sure we change it.

This rule that the President has put forward has 32 States that have filed lawsuits against it. Thirty-two States have said: no, this doesn't work.

For decades, the Federal regulators worked as partners with the States to significantly improve water quality across this country. Those situations that the ranking member talked about that happened 40 and 50 years ago aren't happening today. The States have worked very closely with the Federal Government to make sure that we have clean water, that we are protecting that precious resource we have.

Now, I will say right up front, because I know someone is going to call me out on it, the Governor of Pennsylvania did not file a lawsuit. Well, he is a liberal Democrat who has an extreme environmental agenda. He doesn't really care about the farmers of Pennsylvania, nor does he care about the building industry in Pennsylvania. This Governor is wrong on this issue.

Again, 32 States have said ''no'' to this rule. The Federal Government shouldn't be regulating every drop of water. Again, Pennsylvania, like every other State, is supposed to bear primary responsibility for regulating the waters within its own borders, but that will change when the EPA and the Corps of Engineers blatantly ignore Pennsylvania and the other 49 States, the limits of the Federal jurisdiction published in this rule.

The gentleman knows full well, across this country, there are protests going on, and also in the State of Oregon. The Federal Government, again, has an overreach, keeps pushing out there. This rule will be the same thing. The Federal Government will push out and reach out and do things that weren't intended to be in the law.

Just about every wet area in the country is open to Federal regulation under this rule. Jobs will be threatened, the rights of landowners and local governments will be trampled. That is the frustration out in America today. The Federal Government keeps pushing, pushing, pushing, and doing things that really don't have a significant impact on the environment or other areas of their jurisdiction, and they cause great harm to individuals out there. So that is why there is tremendous frustration in this country today.

There are clear problems with this rule. Again, the administration basically concocted this proposal in a vacuum. Pennsylvania and the other States were asked about this rule. As I said, 32 States have filed suit against it. That is significant. That is almost three-quarters of the States that have said ''no'' to this rule. That is a prime example, again, of why Americans are sick and tired of this.

Every day I hear from farmers, homebuilders, small businesses, and others in my district. Some farmers have said they won't be able to pass on their family farm because of the cost associated with this power grab. As I said, I have no doubt that is what is going to happen. This will continue to expand if we don't stop it here today and send a strong message to the President to, as the subcommittee chairman said, take this rule back.

Let's start over. Let's include the States in the development of this rulemaking. The EPA and the Corps need to listen to the States as partners as they have done for many, many years

Just last night, the President of the United States stood on this House floor and talked about the need for eliminating rules that are on the books. Well, how about let's not put rules on the books that are going to cause great harm and great damage to many sectors of the economy, to many American people. This is a time when the President can show us that those words last night weren't hollow, that they were meaningful, and that he wanted to reach across the aisle. Here is a chance.

There were a number of Senators on the other side of the aisle who voted for this. The last couple of times we have passed WOTUS bills here in the House, we have had bipartisan support. Here is an opportunity for us to work together.

Again, last night we listened to the President. We heard him say some words, some words good. Again, if they are not willing to listen to the Congress on this issue, the very first order of business after he stood there last night and talked about, as I said, the need to reduce rules, as I said, how about let's not put a rule in place that is going to cause great harm to this country.

The Congressional Review Act was put in place for just this very purpose. This is an opportunity for us to all join and do exactly what the ranking member has asked for, certainty in the rule. Reject President Bush's rulemaking. Let's put a rule in place the States can support and the American people can support

I urge all Members to support S.J. Res. 22.

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

Well, the chairman and I have established a good record of working together. I would love to get a commitment here to work together, to go through a full reauthorization of the Clean Water Act and clarify these many issues, what we want to protect and what we want to be excluded from the jurisdiction. The Congress has the authority to do that. I think we should undertake that. It would be very difficult.

To say that repealing this rule, which does have some clarifications of the Bush rule—that would return us to the Bush-era regulations, a hodgepodge of ad hoc and inconsistent jurisdictional theories that are resulting in an increase in delays caused to the public at large, doesn't seem like a good result. So unless we choose to act and clarify the law, that is what we are going to be stuck with.

Under this resolution, absent another specific action by Congress, they can't use any of the work that went into developing this rule or the data. It can't

be substantially the same. We would have to further authorize them to begin a new rulemaking.

There was unprecedented public comment, 207 days of public comment. There were 1 million comments received. There were 400 public meetings. There was a special consultation process for the States and local officials. Now, my State and the State of Pennsylvania apparently were pretty satisfied with that. There are other States that weren't, but maybe they didn't go to the meetings.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to S.J. Res. 22, the Congressional Review Act disapproval resolution on the EPA and Corps of Engineers clean water rulemaking.

I thank my ranking member, PETER DEFAZIO, for his strong advocacy and dedicated leadership in protecting the waters of the United States.

Congress has a long history in supporting the Clean Water Act. Back in 1972, Congress overrode President Nixon's veto of the Clean Water Act, demonstrating bipartisan support for the Federal regulation of our Nation's waters.

The message was very clear: Human health would no longer take a back seat to big business. We need to protect our people. Never mind business, agriculture, and some others, what about the people who drink the water and use it for everyday purposes?

Now, more than 40 years later, we are set to vote to overturn the clean water protection rule, a rule that for the first time in over a decade provides clarity for regulated parties and protection for our Nation's rivers and streams.

What message are we sending out today? Clearly, we are not telling the American people that what water the American people have left is not worth protecting.

Mr. Speaker, when developing the clean water protection rule, the administration went to unprecedented lengths to engage with stakeholders, including ranchers, farmers, and municipalities. They held over 400 stakeholder meetings on the rule and reviewed close to a million public comments on the rule. I say public, because the public was also partly commenting on this.

It is evident that EPA and the Corps wholeheartedly considered these comments and concerns because many of the clean water rule's reforms benefit industry, agriculture, and municipalities. These reforms include limiting permits for ditches and municipal storm water sewers and codified exemptions for certain agriculture, construction, and mining activities.

Let us not forget that farmers and developers alike call the Clean Water Act's current—I am talking again about the current one—regulatory process ad hoc, inconsistent, and costly.

The rule we are attempting to overturn would keep the old Bush administration-era confusing regulations in place and potentially prohibit the President and his future successors from developing a clean water rule in the future.

As we stand here today, I can't think of one good reason to pass this resolution. The same groups that asked for this rule actually benefited from the rule, but they are now asking us to do away with that rule. The only thing I can surmise is that those who oppose this rule would oppose any rulemaking that did not drastically limit the application of the Clean Water Act or, to put it another way, these groups are simply opposed to the Clean Water Act entirely.

In California, 99.2 percent of the population gets its water from drinking water systems that rely on water bodies protected by this rule. With numbers like that on the line, intervening now is simply reckless.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to join me in strong opposition to the resolution.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. GIBBS and certainly the entire committee, Chairman SHUSTER and others, for their work on this issue.

I rise today in strong support of this legislation. I certainly appreciate clean water.

However, the EPA's waters of the U.S. rule, or WOTUS, is one of the largest abuses of executive power in modern history and poses a significant threat to America's economy. Under the rule, the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers will have the power to dictate land use decisions and farming practices of agricultural producers and businessowners all across the country.

To give you an idea of the scope of the overreach and to illustrate why my colleagues from urban districts should also be concerned about this rule, I want to share with you an example of EPA and the Army Corps' abuse in Douglas County, Nebraska, with a population of over 500,000, in my home State. The President also happens to be visiting this county today.

In 2005, the county began the process of submitting the proper environmental permit applications needed to extend a section of road about 1 mile. The project was designated as having the lowest level of environmental impact. However, construction is not slated to begin until at least 2019.

Why the delay? There is a small ditch which runs adjacent to the proposed project. Within the ditch, there is a small rut about 6 to 8 inches wide and no more than an inch deep. It has no ordinary high water mark, and there are no wetland plants growing in the ditch. However, the Corps declared this ditch a water of the United States, costing the county thousands of dollars and numerous years.

This was never the intent of Congress when the Clean Water Act was passed. The act clearly limits Federal jurisdiction to navigable waters. In fact, the term ''navigable'' appears more than 80 times in the Clean Water Act. There is no way one can tell me that an inch-deep ditch is a navigable water.

Congress has a responsibility to guard against these bureaucratic power grabs by executive agencies. This is why I introduced the companion bill to this legislation immediately after the rule was finalized. My resolution gained more than 70 cosponsors, with supporters from both sides of the aisle.

Thanks to the expedited procedures established under the Congressional Review Act, after we vote on this legislation the bill will proceed immediately to the President's desk. My hope is the President will listen to the American people and roll back this new rule.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 19½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 16 minutes remaining.

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

The gentleman just made an excellent point. It is absolutely unbelievably stupid and absurd that that ditch should have held up a needed project in an urban area, but that is because of the Bush rule, the rule that today we are saying should be in place indefinitely or perhaps forever.

□ 0945

That ditch is specifically exempt under the newly adopted rule, which has been suspended by litigation. If the gentleman wants to deal with the ditch problem, it has been dealt with. Unfortunately, the courts have put a stay on it. But now the gentleman wants to throw out the new rule, which would exempt ditches like that, and go back to the Bush era rule, which is what caused that problem—cause and effect.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, please, Members, vote ''no'' on this resolution. It is a very bad idea. What is happening here, for the folks listening, is that the EPA has come up with a rule that is going to strengthen protections for drinking water for 117 million people.

Our Republican colleagues have brought forth a resolution to disapprove of the rule, leaving people vulnerable to the status quo. This comes out to about one in three Americans across the country and perhaps one in five Minnesotans in my home State.

Now, I am critically concerned about all of America—I am a U.S. Congressman—which leads me to the situation in Flint. The fact is that, by clarifying that waters are protected under the Clean Water Act, the rule would reduce the amount of pollution entering major rivers and waterways. This would mean less corrosive water, which is part of

what led to the water crisis being seen in Flint, Michigan, right now.

When the highly corrosive water of the Flint River passes through Flint's service pipes, it leaches lead out of the pipes and into residents' drinking glasses, bathtubs, and swimming pools. The water crisis in Flint reminds us that failure to step up and protect our water supply puts the lives of the public in danger. Eight thousand children are now facing poisoning because of this nasty situation.

In Flint, residents were forced to pay for water that was poisoning them, by an unelected emergency manager. A mother and Flint resident, Lee Ann Walters, started bathing her children with bottled water, as she learned that her children were showing signs of lead poisoning and that the lead levels in her tap water were seven times higher than the minimum safety standard. The entire city has been exposed to dangerous lead levels, including as many as 8- to 10,000 children.

If this does not compel us to stand up and fight for clean water, I don't know what will. We absolutely need to say ''no'' to this resolution that would expose us to dirty water.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to go back down memory lane just a second. My good friend from Oregon, when we were debating H.R. 1732, the bill that said let's stop this rule and work up a rule that will bring clarity, he said that was a bipartisan-supported bill. But the gentleman said we didn't need to pass H.R. 1732 because whenever the rule comes out, we have the Congressional Review Act to take care of the problem. That is what we are doing today.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, Congress gave the EPA jurisdiction over navigable bodies of water large enough to support ship traffic. This EPA rule takes control over virtually every body of water in the United States, including many agricultural and drainage ditches, ornamental lakes, and small creeks and streams on private property.

Now, in 2010, Mr. Oberstar introduced a bill to grant them this power, and the Pelosi Congress refused to pass it; so the EPA simply decided to seize that power anyway.

This not only threatens to upend 150 years of State water and property rights laws, it also presents us with a grave challenge to our Constitution. If it is allowed to stand, this rule means that Congress' exclusive legislative powers have now passed unrestricted to the executive, including the power to repeal existing laws that guarantee to States supremacy over their own waters and the power to amend laws to seize vast new executive authority in direct defiance of this Congress.

This rule must not stand. It cannot stand.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my ranking member and the chair of the committee for their diligence in running this committee and overseeing some of the most important legislation for our Nation.

The Clean Water Act is the key Federal law used to protect our Nation's waters and ensure that millions of Americans have access to clean water. The resolution of disapproval being considered today would block the implementation of important administrative reforms aimed at clarifying key components of this Clean Water Act. These reforms include considerations on how we define tributaries to traditionally navigable waters and sets out clear exclusions to the definition of waters of the United States, among other changes that will help streamline the regulatory process.

Countless municipalities, businesses, and industry stakeholders have expressed concern around the confusing and outdated regulations established under the Bush administration. In fact, more than a million public comments submitted to EPA and the U.S. Corps of Engineers have contributed to the formulation of this final rule. The final rule would provide much-needed predictability and clarity for these groups, and that has got my attention.

In my home State of Texas, 43 percent of the residents get their drinking water from sources that rely on small streams protected by the most recent Clean Water Act and rule. The rule also restores protections to more than 12,000 miles of streams that feed into Texas' drinking water sources. Further delaying the implementation of this rule will continue to have a dramatic impact on my State of Texas and other States around the country.

I see a number of immediate problems with this resolution. For one, S.J. Res. 22 would block any future administration from ever clarifying the regulatory confusion related to the Clean Water Act unless Congress authorizes a new rule. In my opinion, that does not bode well for our ability to protect such an essential resource as clean water for Americans.

Thankfully, President Obama has already expressed his intention to veto this resolution if it were to reach his desk. Based on a vote on this resolution in the Senate last year, Congress lacks the support to override a veto.

This resolution is simply another attempt by this Congress to block this administration from carrying out its regulatory duties to protect Americans. I do not think that there is a single Member of this House who would disagree that access to clean water is absolutely essential for our well-being and health.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Here we are, dedicating even more time to consider legislation that would block our ability to protect important waterways and wetlands from pollution.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution amounts to nothing more than a misguided direction. No one thinks that any American should be subjected to a questionable quality of water. For this reason, I would urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this resolution.

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

I am hearing a lot of comments made about the comment period. I just want to reiterate that, of the substantial comments made, 70 percent of them were opposed to the rule.

I think what is even more important and needs to really be made clear here, the Government Accountability Office, the GAO, did an investigation, and they said the EPA broke the law because they used covert propaganda through social media to skew the comments and biased them to their agenda.

This creates a huge problem for me because this violates the integrity, goes to the integrity of the comment period. The reason we have a comment period is for stakeholders—in this case, States, farmers, developers—and a whole array of different people to have the ability to put comments in, and it's up to the Agency to make the best rule possible that will work for everybody and protect the environment.

The GAO said they broke the law, so we need to make that clear. The comment period was flawed, and that is why we need to pass this bill and resend it.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, we are here today because the Supreme Court in 2001 and again in 2006 determined that the EPA and the Corps of Engineers' definition of waters of the United States was too broad, and it directed them to narrow that rule, that definition, to bring it into compliance and within the four corners of the law.

This poster here indicates the absurdity of what we are dealing with. Clearly, you wouldn't have folks out on a kayak in a field fishing. It is simply nonsensical. That is what we are facing today.

The EPA and the Corps of Engineers didn't come back and say, ''We are going to reduce the footprint. We are going to reduce the area that is now subject to the jurisdiction of the Corps under waters of the U.S.'' They came out with a rule that actually expanded it. They came out with a rule that the cost of compliance didn't decrease, as you would expect, based upon the rulings of the Supreme Court. The cost of compliance grew, and there were many reports about discourse within the Corps of Engineers and the EPA in regard to the approach that is being taken today. This is simply absurd to come in and attempt to regulate snow melt and drainage and things like that.

Mr. Speaker, in my home State of Louisiana, we drain about 42 percent of the contiguous landmass of North America. It is one of the largest watersheds in the world. You can't take a definition of waters of the U.S. and try and apply it to Arizona and Louisiana. Waters of the U.S. is our State, based upon this definition. Much of the area of south Louisiana would be subject to this.

So what does this mean? It means it is an infringement upon our private property rights: homes, businesses, land that we bought, that we own. We can't have the Federal Government come in and grow jurisdiction beyond the scope of the law.

I want to be clear. I am not talking about paving all the wildlands and open lands that we have in the United States. We certainly want to protect the environment, want to protect our water quality. But the irony here is that this is the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the EPA involved.

In my home State of Louisiana, we have the greatest rate of coastal wetlands loss in the United States, which I want to make note, Mr. Speaker, is the fault of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. It is their fault. The greatest rate of wetlands loss in the United States, their fault. Then here they are standing up saying: We want to protect the environment and be good stewards of the environment, and we are going to grow the jurisdiction of this amendment.

This is absurd. This is not antienvironmental. This is simply complying with the law, and this rule clearly goes beyond the scope of the law. You are not going to see scenarios like this because it is absurd. That is what we are facing today.

What is going to happen is this rule is once again going to be thrown out by the Supreme Court. It is once again going to be thrown out. But what Americans are going to face between now and when this is thrown out is they are going to be facing additional scrutiny. They are going to be facing the additional cost of compliance. They are going to face the additional encroachment and infringement upon their private property rights.

It is wrong. This isn't antienvironmental. This is within the four corners of the law.

I strongly urge you to support this resolution.

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

I would like to refer back to the chairman's trip down memory lane. If he recalls the circumstance, we had not yet seen the revised rule. The initial rule, many of us had objected to, and we hadn't seen the revised rule. The majority wanted to stop the revised rule, again, sticking us with the Bush-era guidance. I guess they are in love with the Bush-era guidance, which everybody from the Farm Bureau to Natural Resources Defense Council hates and says doesn't work. The gentleman from Louisiana just referenced that.

In the interim, we will be under these really contradictory and unworkable rules of the Bush era. Congress should act to update the Clean Water Act, and then we can have a vigorous debate over what areas we want to cover and what areas we don't want to cover and perhaps get a little more clarity.

Today we are here because they have promulgated a rule. It is substantially different from the draft rule, and they made clear that many of the things that were discussed in the interim—it is going to regulate my bird bath, my pond on my farm, the puddles on my farm, the ditches on my farm; it is going to preempt land use—all of those things are specifically addressed in the final rule, which we want to override, and they are exempt.

□ 1000

It does not change exemptions for agriculture. It doesn't regulate erosional features.

I am not going to read all the specific language, but it is all right here. The ditch issue in the urban area we heard about earlier is solved under this, but it is still a problem today under the Bush-era rule, which is still the law of the land because the new rule was stayed by the courts. And now we want to kill it.

So we don't want to fix the ditch issue, I guess, and live forever under the Bush-era rule. It doesn't regulate land use. If it did the things the people on the other side were saying, I think you would find 85, 90 percent of the Members of this House would be voting for this resolution of disapproval. The fact is it doesn't do those things and we have very specific references to demonstrate that.

And then, on this issue of the illegal actions, again, I was getting emails and phone calls from people saying, my bird bath; my pond; my puddles; my roadside ditches. The forest industry is saying our roadside ditches.

Well, those things are all exempt now. But these things were out there, and the EPA was trying to educate people and say: Here is what is in. Here is what is out. And they find the weeniest of little, stupid violations.

This isn't like lawbreaking. They used Thunderclap to actually tell people a few things about this rule. They forgot to put on a disclaimer. Oh, someone should go to jail for that. The right-wing nuts occupying the Malheur National Wildlife Refuge and Cliven Bundy violating Federal law, owing us a million dollars and not paying for grazing like other people, they shouldn't be prosecuted. In fact, the chairman referenced those nuts earlier.

I find it offensive and insulting to say that there is some sort of protest that relates to this discussion on the floor of the House by right-wing extremists who have taken over illegally and are destroying Federal property in my State.

And then, secondly, they had another violation beyond using Thunderclap. They had a link that went to someone else's site. And on that someone else's site, they were advocating for the rule. Wow. These are lawbreakers. These are the lawbreakers we want to go after.

This administration doesn't go after any lawbreakers, from Wall Street criminals under the collapse or these right-wing extremists in the West. I discussed that earlier in a 1-minute speech on the floor.

But the point here is that we have much better clarification now. The courts are going to rule whether this is adequate or inadequate, whether Congress needs to act further, whether the rule needs to be revised.

We should let that process go forward. That would give us some direction because we don't seem to be able to initiate on our own a reauthorization of the Clean Water Act and have a fair debate over what we want to cover and not cover. But the default action—repealing this rule, doing nothing—binds us to the Bush-era rule indefinitely.

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

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

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear. It was the Government Accountability Office investigation that said the EPA broke the law. Regardless of how you interpret what they said, they broke the law. I think that goes to the integrity of the whole rulemaking process, that that is a dangerous precedent, moving forward.

We had the talk about this rule brings clarity. Yes, it does bring clarity because it pretty much makes everything under water all under Federal jurisdiction. It is like going from the frying pan into the fire.

That is why the American Farm Bureau and a whole host of other entities and almost two-thirds or three-quarters of the States have sued or are opposed to that.

So we need clarity. That is why Congress needs to commit to work to fix that. But this rule, going forward, is more obtrusive and is a big problem. Like I said, it does mean that everything is under Federal jurisdiction.

There has been a lot of discussion about ditches. They exempted ditches, but they put five exemptions to put it back in. One I really like says that, if water in a ditch eventually flows out of that ditch and into a tributary—which they expanded the definition of tributaries into navigable waters—it is not exempt.

So tell me where in the United States there is a ditch that has water that doesn't eventually flow into waters of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S.J. Res. 22, which vacates this overreaching and, frankly, unnecessary

waters of the U.S. rule. It prevents the EPA and the Corps of Engineers from moving forward.

I think the problem that has made itself real prevalent—and the chairman just talked about this as well—is it is not what is on the top line. It is what is on the exemption line.

You can talk about whatever you want to talk about, but the problem I come to with this—because we have been dealing with this in my part of the world—and I appreciate the previous speaker from Louisiana talking about the watershed there—is that I am from northeast Georgia, where we are in the foothills of the mountains.

So, in the bottom, you have the creeks, the tributaries. We have Lake Lanier, the Chattahoochee River, Lake Hartwell. We have a lot of areas that fall here.

What is interesting to me—and what my friend from across the aisle basically said—and what is offensive to me is to come to a place and say that, just because we are going to work on a Clean Water Act, we are going to work on a reauthorization, we take it from Congress and say that people downtown in cubicles who do not know my district and who understand that they have an agenda to push will make rules and make regulations that affect the livelihood of people.

When you take it from Congress, where it should be, that is offensive. I agree with my friend. It should be here. But we have seen a pattern in the last 7 years that, if it is not moving fast enough in Congress, go around it. That is not possible. The Constitution is not something you can forget every once in a while.

Now, you can make arguments all day long. You can call it whatever you want to call it. I call it just plain dumb. Common sense, as my grandma told me one time, is not common. I see that in Washington all the time, especially in agencies.

We talk about why this is confusing. We had the EPA director sitting in committee last year asked these very questions about the rule. She answered them one way, and at the very same time, back in my district, the Ninth District of Georgia, they were being told a completely opposite answer.

Where she would say it is not affected, they would say: Oh, it is affected. They knew because they understood their district, and the Agency workers in the district understood what was going on.

So you can have this argument all you want. This needs to be vacated. As previously said, the courts have already made a statement on this. This is an overreach. This is a policy choice.

And I am sorry. The executive branch is to carry out the law, to work within the confines of the court ruling, not to determine that they have pins on their chests and that they are elected by the people that they represent. They are to follow the law.

If we need to continue on the Clean Water Act and to make arguments to say that, if you are against this, you want dirty water, you want bad pollution, you are against this, that is just a straw man that needs to be burned down and buried.

We are looking for commonsense regulation. We are looking for stuff that makes sense. I have a gentleman in my area whose land—100 acres—is his main asset. When you take these rules and set them on top of it and he has 18 usable acres, from dry ditches and gullies, that is a problem.

Don't hand me this, that this is going to destroy the world. Don't hand me this from the red hills of north Georgia, where just years ago it was the farmers and those who knew that living off the land meant conservation, who turned those red clay hills into green, lush farms. Don't tell me that Washington needs to be the one to tell them how to do conservation and to know what to do with a dry ditch on their land. This is ridiculous.

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

It would be interesting if the gentleman invited the EPA to come out and look at that farmer's land. I think they would find that he is exempt and he isn't down to 18 acres. There are misunderstandings.

And, also, the gentleman did say something about the courts have already ruled. The courts haven't ruled. That is the problem. It is going to be 2 years before they get to the merits on this rule. And so they essentially have stayed the new rule from going into effect. So we don't have ditch exemptions.

It would be interesting to contrast the existing Bush rules—which will be in place for at least another 2 years—to the new rules and have someone come out and consult with that farmer and say: Actually, you are kind of screwed here because of the Bush rules. But if we had these new rules, we could just tell you to go ahead and farm on those 100 acres. On previously converted cropland, ditches are exempt. You have the agricultural exemptions. But sorry, you are stuck with something written in the Bush era.

That is the effect of Congress not acting. And I would agree with the gentleman. The fact is we should act and we could act. The gentleman has jurisdiction over the committee which could reauthorize the Clean Water Act.

It has not been reauthorized since 1987, which is why we are squabbling over administration interpretation of the Bush administration—I hate to have to be talking about George Bush—and the Obama administration as opposed to Congress having at some point done its job to reauthorize and clarify the Clean Water Act in those intervening 28 years.

I am not aware of any plans. The chairman has told me the agenda for the coming year, but rewriting the Clean Water Act and debating the merits and demerits of certain protections is not on that agenda, to the best of my knowledge.

So the effects of what the courts have done is to stick us with the Bush-era rules for 2 more years, and the effect of what we are doing here would actually stick us with the Bush-era rules indefinitely. Pick your poison.

The bottom line is we are doing a disservice to the country by not getting these commonsense exemptions in place as soon as possible.

I have a number of letters from groups too numerous to reference that I will include in the RECORD. Being cochair of the House Craft Brewers Caucus, there is a very strong representation by the craft brewing industry because of their concerns about the need for clean water to make good beer.

AMERICAN SUSTAINABLE BUSINESS COUNCIL,
Washington, DC, January 11, 2016.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 250,000 businesses, and more than 325,000 entrepreneurs, executives, managers and investors we represent, the American Sustainable Business Council (ASBC) urges you to vote against the Congressional Review Act (S.J. Res. 22) overturning the EPA's Clean Water Rule.

Clean water is good for business, and companies like the ones we represent know it. They need it for their operations and for the overall health of their communities. Repealing this rule would not protect economic growth; it would put it at risk.

The EPA's rule comes out of a broad desire among all stakeholders, following the Supreme Court's rulings in 2001 and 2006, to clarify what the EPA's jurisdiction is under the Clean Water Act. This ruling is based on sound science, and does not expand the agency's power under the Clean Water Act, only clarifying of what bodies of water it protects.

Of greatest concern to us, however, is the argument that this rule will jeopardize economic growth. From our experience, the real risk to our economy comes when clean water protections no longer exist, and businesses lose control over a crucial input in food and beverage production, tourism, manufacturing, and any number of industries.

The EPA's rule gives the business community more confidence that clean water sources, including streams and rivers, are protected, and removes uncertainty surrounding the agency's authority to protect our waterways. This is good for the economy, and vital for businesses that rely on clean water for their success.

The business community was given ample opportunity to share its concerns and inform the EPA of the rule's potential impact during the months-long comment period—as evidenced by the more than 1 million comments submitted during that time—and the EPA had abundant time to take any concerns into account and use them to improve the rule.

Clean water remains a necessity for so many American industries, from agriculture to manufacturing to tourism to food and drink production. And it's what businesses across the political spectrum want—national, scientific polling from the American Sustainable Business Council found 80% of small business owners favored rules protecting upstream headwaters, as the EPA's rule would do, and 71% said that clean water protections are necessary to ensure economic growth.

Congress needs to let this rule stand, not create more uncertainty for American businesses. We urge you to vote against Congressional Review Act (S.J. Res. 22). American businesses are relying on you to keep this

rule intact and ensure they can rely on this most crucial resource.

Sincerely,

RICHARD EIDLIN,
Vice President of Policy and Campaigns.

JANUARY 11, 2016.

Re Hunters and anglers strongly oppose S.J. Res. 22 invalidating the final Clean Water Rule

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned sportsmen and conservation organizations strongly oppose Senate Joint Resolution 22, which the House of Representatives may vote on this week and would invalidate the final Clean Water Rule. This important rule clarifies Clean Water Act jurisdiction in a manner that is both legally and scientifically sound.

This joint resolution is an extraordinary and radical action to overturn a fundamental, once-in-a-generation final rule that is critical to the effective implementation of the 1972 Clean Water Act, and that was adopted following an exhaustive public rulemaking process. The resolution would overturn a rule that finally resolves longstanding confusion and debate, promotes clarity and efficiency for regulatory programs promoting river health, and preserves longstanding protections for farmers, ranchers, and foresters.

By using the Congressional Review Act, this joint resolution not only wipes out the final Clean Water Rule but also prohibits any substantially similar rule in the future. It locks in the current state of jurisdictional confusion and offers no constructive path forward for regulatory clarity or clean water. America's hunters and anglers cannot afford to have Congress undermine effective Clean Water Act safeguards, leaving communities and valuable fish and wildlife habitat at risk indefinitely.

This joint resolution dismisses the voices of the millions of Americans, including businesses that depend on clean water, who support the new rule and are eager to reap its benefits. The agencies engaged in a very transparent and thorough multi-year rulemaking process that included over 400 stakeholder meetings and an extended public comment period that produced over one million comments. Nearly 900,000 members of the public commented in support of the Clean Water Rule. A recent poll found that 83 percent of sportsmen and women think the Clean Water Act should apply to smaller streams and wetlands, as the new rule directs.

The Clean Water Rule clearly restores longstanding protections for millions of wetlands and headwater streams that contribute to the drinking water of 1 in 3 Americans, protect communities from flooding, and provide essential fish and wildlife habitat that supports a robust outdoor recreation economy. The sport fishing industry alone accounts for 828,000 jobs, nearly $50 billion annually in retail sales, and an economic impact of about $115 billion every year that relies on access to clean water. The Clean Water Rule will translate directly to an improved bottom line for America's outdoor industry.

Opponents claiming the rule goes too far and protects water too much have filed a barrage of nearly identical legal challenges in numerous district and appellate courts across the country. On October 9, 2015, the 6th Circuit Court of Appeals temporarily stayed the Clean Water Rule nationwide. The Clean Water Rule and those who oppose it will have their day in court.

Meanwhile, we want Congress to know that despite these legal challenges, conservationists across the nation are steadfast in our support for the Clean Water Rule. After nearly 15 years of Clean Water Act confusion, further delay is unacceptable to the millions of hunters and anglers eager to have their local waters fully protected again. We are confident that, when the dust settles in the courts, the Clean Water Rule will withstand challenges saying it protects our water too much.

The Clean Water Act has always been about restoring and maintaining the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation's waters. It is bedrock support for America's more than 40 million hunters and anglers and for the 117 million Americans whose drinking water depends on healthy headwater streams.

We thank all of the members of Congress who stand with America's sportsmen and women to block attempts to derail the rule, and ask you to reject S.J. Res. 22 and any other legislative action against the rule that may follow this year.

Sincerely,

American Fisheries Society, American Fly Fishing Trade Association, Backcountry Hunters and Anglers, International Federation of Fly Fishers, Izaak Walton League of America, National Wildlife Federation, Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, Trout Unlimited.

LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS,
Washington, DC, January 12, 2016.

Re Oppose extreme attack on clean water, S.J. Res. 22

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The League of Conservation Voters (LCV) works to turn environmental values into national priorities. Each year, LCV publishes the National Environmental Scorecard, which details the voting records of members of Congress on environmental legislation. The Scorecard is distributed to LCV members, concerned voters nationwide, and the media.

LCV urges you to vote NO on S.J. Res. 22, the Congressional Review Act ''Resolution of Disapproval'' of the Clean Water Rule. This radical legislative measure would threaten critical clean water safeguards for the waterways that millions of Americans depend on for drinking water by permanently blocking the Environmental Protection Agency's and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' final Clean Water Rule.

Since two confusing Supreme Court decisions over a decade ago, millions of acres of wetlands and thousands of miles of streams that contribute to the drinking water of one in three Americans have been left vulnerable to toxic dumping and destruction. After an extensive and thorough process, the final Clean Water Rule provides clarity and certainty on the waters covered under the Clean Water Act. These waterways serve as habitat for wildlife, guard against flooding, filter pollution, and help provide the clean water that our families, communities, and economy depend on. The Clean Water Rule enjoys wide support from businesses, conservationists, sportsmen, farmers, state and local leaders, and the public, including the over 800,000 people who weighed in during the comment period and 80% of voters from all sides of the political aisle.

S.J. Res. 22 is an extreme dirty water resolution that would not only stop the Clean Water Rule, but would prohibit the agencies from developing any ''substantially similar'' measure in the future. This vague and harmful language could prevent the agencies from ever issuing rules that establish protections for the waters covered by the Clean Water Rule, leaving our streams, wetlands, lakes, and rivers vulnerable to pollution for generations to come.

We urge you to REJECT S.J. Res 22 a dangerous bill that would block the Clean Water Rule and jeopardize the waterways our children and grandchildren drink, swim, and play in. We will strongly consider including votes on this bill in the 2016 Scorecard. If you need more information, please call my office at (202) 785–8683 and ask to speak with a member of our government relations team.

Sincerely,

GENE KARPINSKI,
President.

HEALING OUR WATERS-
GREAT LAKES COALITION,
January 11, 2016.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the Healing Our Waters-Great Lakes Coalition, I ask you to vote against S.J. Res. 22.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and Army Corps have spent years talking to the public, including state and local governments, about providing clarity to which water bodies will be covered by federal law. After being asked to propose a rule by stakeholders from all sides, the EPA and Army Corps did so after receiving nearly one million comments regarding what they proposed. Many of these comments suggested substantive changes on how to define what a water of the United States is. The EPA and Army Corps incorporated many of the suggestions in the rule finalized last year.

S.J. Res. 22 stops these clean water protections from going into force. More radically, it prohibits the EPA and Army Corps from proposing anything that would be substantially the same as what has already been developed after years of deliberation.

For years the Clean Water Act protected all wetlands and tributaries in and around the Great Lakes. However, Supreme Court decisions in 2001 (SWANCC) and 2006 (Rapanos) left many of these wetlands, small streams, and lakes at increased risk of being polluted and destroyed. This lack of protection in particular left intermittent and headwater streams vulnerable to pollution and adjacent wetlands open to be filled and destroyed. Half of the streams in Great Lakes states do not flow all year, putting them, and adjacent wetlands, at risk of increased pollution and destruction. Over 117 million Americans get their drinking water from surface waters, including nearly 37 million people in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York. More importantly, 83 percent of the population in Great Lakes states are dependent on public drinking water systems that rely in intermittent, ephemeral, and headwater streams.

Protecting and restoring wetlands and streams is critical to the restoration and protection of the Great Lakes. According to a review of more than a thousand publications from peer-reviewed scientific literature conducted by an EPA Science Advisory Board, streams, tributaries (e.g., headwater, intermittent, ephemeral), and wetlands are connected to downstream waters. The science overwhelmingly concludes that upstream waters in tributaries (intermittent, ephemeral, etc.) exert strong influence on the physical, biological, and chemical integrity of downstream waters. Common sense also tells us this is true. Pollution in a tributary is carried downriver into bigger and bigger waterways. Upstream waters also feed water to Great Lakes rivers and streams.

We need clean water protections now for our Great Lakes. Wetlands and tributaries provide vital habitat to wildlife, waterfowl, and fish; reduce flooding; provide clean water for hunting, fishing, swimming, and paddling; and serve as the source of drinking water for millions of Americans. Healthy waters around the Great Lakes also fuel tourism and other industries that sustain jobs because of clean Great Lakes water. The

Clean Water Rule is an important part of our Great Lakes restoration efforts.

Please vote against S.J. Res. 22. For more information about our Coalition's position, please contact Chad Lord.

Sincerely,

TODD AMBS,
Coalition Director.

STATEMENT OPPOSING SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 22 TO ROLL-BACK THE CLEAN WATER RULE, JANUARY 12, 2016.

Allagash Brewing Company (Maine), Andersonville Brewing Company (Illinois), Arbor Brewing Company (Michigan), Arcadia Brewing Company (Michigan), Bear Republic Brewing Company (California), Brewery Vivant (Michigan), Brooklyn Brewery (New York), Central Waters Brewing Company (Wisconsin), Corridor Brewery & Provisions (Illinois), DryHop Brewers (Illinois), Engrained Brewing Company (Illinois), Founders Brewing Company (Michigan), Great Lakes Brewing Company (Ohio), Greenstar Brewery (Illinois), Half Acre Beer Company (Illinois), Harmony Brewing Company (Michigan), Hops & Grain Brewing Company (Texas), Horse and Dragon Brewing Company (Colorado), KelSo Beer Company (New York), Lagunitas Brewing Company (California and Illinois), Lakefront Brewery (Wisconsin), Maine Beer Company (Maine), New Belgium Brewing Company (Colorado and North Carolina), Oak Park Brewing Company (Illinois), Odell Brewing Company (Colorado), Old Bust Head Brewery (Virginia), Portsmouth Brewery (New Hampshire), Revolution Brewing (Illinois), Right Brain Brewery (Michigan), Rising Tide Brewing Company (Maine), Sierra Nevada Brewing Company (California and North Carolina), Short's Brewing Company (Michigan), Smuttynose Brewing Company (New Hampshire), Temperance Beer Company (Illinois), Two Brothers Artisan Brewing (Illinois), Wild Onion Brewery (Illinois).

Our breweries cannot operate without a reliable, clean water supply. We strongly support the Clean Water Act, one of our nation's bedrock environmental laws, as well as the Clean Water Rule, which provides important clarity regarding which waterbodies are covered by the Act.

That is why we urge you to oppose Senate Joint Resolution 22, that would prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers from doing ''a new rule that is substantially the same'' as the Clean Water Rule. That could be read to prohibit EPA and the Army Corps from issuing any rule that establishes protections for waters that the Clean Water Rule protects, like lakes, streams, and wetlands.

Our breweries—and the communities in which we operate—need a strong Clean Water Act, as well as the clarity provided by the Clean Water Rule.

For more information, please see www.nrdc.org/brewers or call Karen Hobbs, Senior Policy Analyst, Natural Resources Defense Council.

JANUARY 12, 2016.

REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned organizations, and our millions of members and supporters, oppose the Dirty Water Resolution (S.J. Res. 22). The ''Resolution of Disapproval'' under the Congressional Review Act attacks the Clean Water Rule, the Obama administration's landmark initiative to restore safeguards against pollution and destruction for lakes, streams, wetlands and other water bodies.

The Clean Water Rule restores important safeguards that once existed for a variety of water bodies. Those safeguards were eroded after a pair of Supreme Court decisions and by policies the Bush administration adopted, which left many water bodies inadequately protected or lacking the pollution control requirements of the Clean Water Act. The rule restores prior protections for many critical wetlands, which curb flooding, filter pollution, and provide habitat for a wide variety of wildlife, including endangered species and wildfowl and fish prized by hunters and anglers.

The Dirty Water Resolution is an extreme action that seeks to kill the Clean Water Rule using the Congressional Review Act, which goes far beyond stopping a disapproved administrative action. The Congressional Review Act says that an agency may not adopt ''a new rule that is substantially the same'' as the disapproved rule, and the breadth of that requirement is very unclear.

In the context of the Clean Water Rule, it could be read to prohibit EPA and the Army Corps from issuing any rule that establishes protections for waters that the Clean Water Rule covers, like lakes, streams, and wetlands. The Dirty Water Resolution radically undermines the agencies' ability to clarify the jurisdiction of the Clean Water Act—despite urging from industry associations, conservation groups, members of Congress, state and local leaders, and Supreme Court justices for such a clarification.

By pursuing this anti-clean water resolution, pro-polluter members of the House of Representatives are seeking to kill a commonsense and modest rule containing scientifically-sound and legally-valid protections for the nation's waters, including critical drinking water supplies.

Restored clean water protections enjoy broad support. In polling for the American Sustainable Business Council, eighty percent of small business owners—including 91% of Democrats, 73% of Independents and 78% of Republicans—said they supported the then-proposed Clean Water Rule. A strong majority, 71%, also said that clean water protections are necessary to ensure economic growth; only six percent said they were bad for growth. Similarly, a bipartisan research team polled hunters and anglers nationwide and discovered that 83% surveyed thought that the Environmental Protection Agency should apply the rules and standards of the Clean Water Act to smaller, headwater streams and wetlands. Support for this policy was strong across the political spectrum, with 77% of Republicans, 79% of Independents and 97% of Democrats in favor.

We ask that you oppose the Dirty Water Resolution (S.J. Res. 22) because it will undermine protections for our drinking water supplies, flood buffers, and fish and wildlife habitat. This attack on clean water is not only a waste of the House's time but also an excessive and dangerous act that jeopardizes clean water for generations to come.

Sincerely,

Alliance for the Great Lakes, American Rivers, American Whitewater, Amigos Bravos, Arkansas Public Policy Panel, BlueGreen Alliance, Central Minnesota Chapter of Audubon, Clean Water Action, Conservation Minnesota, Earthjustice, Endangered Habitats League, Environment America.

Environment California, Environment Colorado, Environment Connecticut, Environment Florida, Environment Georgia, Environment Illinois, Environment Iowa, Environment Maine, Environment Maryland, Environment Massachusetts, Environment Michigan, Environment Minnesota, Environment Montana.

Environment New Hampshire, Environment New Jersey, Environment New Mexico, Environment New York, Environment North Carolina, Environment Oregon, Environment Texas, Environment Virginia, Environment Washington, Freshwater Future, Friends of the Cloquet Valley State Park, Friends of the Mississippi River.

Great Lakes Committee—the Izaak Walton League, GreenLatinos, Greenpeace, Gulf Restoration Network, Hoosier Environmental Council, Iowa Environmental Council, Kentucky Waterways Alliance, League of Conservation Voters, Michigan Wildlife Conservancy, Midwest Environmental Advocates, Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy, Minnesota Conservation Federation, Minnesota Environmental Partnership, Missouri Coalition for the Environment.

Natural Resources Defense Council, Nature Abounds, Ohio Wetlands Association, PennEnvironment, Prairie Rivers Network, Religious Coalition for the Great Lakes, River Network, Save the Dunes, Shaker Lakes Garden Club, Sierra Club, Southern Environmental Law Center, Surfrider Foundation, Tennessee Clean Water Network, Wisconsin Environment, Wisconsin Wildlife Federation.

JANUARY 11, 2016.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader, House of Representatives, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND LEADER PELOSI: The undersigned public health organizations urge you to oppose a piece of harmful legislation: S.J. Res. 22, a Congressional Review Act resolution to block the Clean Water Rule proposed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. This resolution is a sweeping attack on the Clean Water Act that could not only impair the Clean Water Rule, but also our ability to protect clean water in the future. The public health community recognizes that clean water and healthy populations are inextricably linked and that polluted water can expose Americans to harmful contaminants in numerous ways. The public depends on water not only for basic survival, but for recreation, bathing, cleaning and cooking. The EPA and Army Corps should be allowed to implement a rule that will improve water quality and protect the health of America's families and children.

The Clean Water Act was designed to keep pollution, including carcinogens, nutrient runoff, sewage and oil, out of the nation's water. The EPA and Army Corp's rule seeks to clarify the protection of streams and wetlands under the Clean Water Act, including streams that provide some portion of water to drinking water systems that serve nearly 117 million people. The rule, which is based on peer reviewed science, clarifies which waters are protected and which are not, allowing EPA and the Army Corps to best protect water quality and public health. Unfortunately, this bill would block their efforts and prevent them from implementing the law and ensuring the protection of water quality for millions of Americans.

Clean water is one of our greatest necessities and a cornerstone of public health. EPA and the Army Corps should be allowed to better protect public health from water pollution through this important science-based rule.

Sincerely,

American Public Health Association, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Trust for America's Health.

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

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure really for three reasons. One, I come from the Lowcountry of South Carolina. The First Congressional District is called the Lowcountry. It is called so for a reason, which is our land lies low.

I think of the farm I grew up on. My father got it about the time I was born. The reality of this measure, if these rules promulgated by the administration simply move forward, as has been referenced by several different speakers, that which he thought he got, he would have gotten a lot less of.

I think that, fundamentally, this is about private property rights. It is about what Philip Howard talked about years ago in his book ''The Death of Common Sense.'' I don't think it makes common sense to classify as navigable waters of the U.S. so many of these dry streambeds or dry areas in any part of this country.

I also think that this is fundamentally about the rule of law. We have a real tension in this country, particularly during the time of this administration, on: Do we stick with this 200-year tradition we have had in place or do we move toward rule by edict?

I think it would be a huge mistake to go down the other avenue. But, fundamentally, that is what this debate is about. It is about how do we decide things? There will always be disagreement. But how do we decide things?

Finally, I think this is about taking something that wasn't partisan. I go back to the Clean Water Act, in its origination, was a bipartisan bill, but making it partisan by, again, executive overreach.

So my colleague from Oregon, who is a dear friend and I think a strong advocate, mentioned the fact that he has strongly advocated for craft brewers back home. It would take me many beers to buy into the notion of moving forward without change.

I think this is about upholding a 200-year tradition in this country on rule of law. I think it is about protecting farmers, whether they be in Johns Island, South Carolina, or the outskirts of Texas, or, for that matter, it is about those of us who love the environment, but sticking with this tradition of deciding these things in this Chamber.

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

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S.J. Res. 22, a resolution to disapprove the waters of the U.S. rule, a rule that amounts to a massive overreach by the Obama administration's EPA.

This rule and the process in which the EPA developed it ignored stakeholders, ignored States, and, as reports have shown, even ignored concerns from the Army Corps of Engineers, the Federal agency that was supposed to be co-developing the rule.

□ 1015

Through hearings, letters, and public forums, we repeatedly asked the administration to simply start over with a process that works with stakeholders to achieve the goals of the Clean Water Act, rather than act like a schoolyard bully. We all want clean water, and we can and should work together to achieve it.

Unfortunately, all of these requests fell on deaf ears, and the administration, in what has become an all-too-common pattern, moved forward to ram this bill through with little regard to the comments or the concerns of Americans.

The final rule ignores the spirit and the intent of the law in that EPA has claimed Federal jurisdiction over essentially any body of water, such as a farm pond, or even a ditch that is dry most of the year.

America's farmers and ranchers deserve a government that will review and consider their thoughts, not a government that refuses to engage stakeholders and hands down orders from on high.

The process of developing the rule was flawed from the get-go, and the final product was right on par with an administration that wants to impose its authoritarian will on every inch of this great land.

That is why the House voted overwhelmingly in favor of H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act of 2015. That is why I stand before you today to ask my colleagues to support S.J. Res. 22. Americans deserve better.

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

Again, we want to expedite this, but just really, I mean, we should deal with reality on the floor.

Rule text 230.3(S)(2)(iv)(B): ''The following are not 'waters of the United States' . . . ''—to go to this—''artificial, constructed lakes and ponds created in dry land such as farm and stock watering ponds . . . ''

There had been language in the original rule which said that they would have to be used exclusively for farm purposes. This rule said they can be used for farm purposes or any other beneficial purposes. So ponds are not regulated.

How many times do we have to say it?

There are questions and interpretations and problems and, again, Congress should act. Congress should have hearings and write legislation to reauthorize the Clean Water Act for the first time in 28 years. Otherwise, we are going to be waiting 2 years for the courts to make a decision and, in the interim, we are stuck with the Bush rule.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding me time, and I support S.J. Res. 22, which rejects the Environmental Protection Agency's waters of the United States rule.

This rule is just another one of EPA's many attempts to expand its jurisdiction and increase its power to regulate American waterways, even if that means invading Americans' own backyards.

The Science, Space, and Technology Committee's oversight hearings revealed that the EPA made arbitrary decisions in writing this rule and justified it with phony science. And the Government Accountability Office found that the EPA's use of social media to promote the rule actually violated the law.

The Obama administration will do anything and say anything to impose its liberal agenda on the American people. I urge my colleagues to support S.J. Res. 22 and disapprove the waters of the United States rule.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. GIBBS. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Well, I think this is the fifth time we have debated this issue on the floor, clearly, subject to widely disparate interpretation in terms of where we are and how we best move forward.

I am not going to regurgitate the arguments. They have all been made. Not everybody has said it, but they have all been made.

But, again, I think that the best way forward—I mean, first off, this resolution is going to be vetoed. It will go back to the Senate first because it is a Senate bill, and the Senate showed clearly that they are far, far short of a veto override. So that will be the end of it, unless we want to take it up for the sixth time in the House and pretend that somehow, by overriding a veto in the House, if that could happen, that we are going to compel the Senate to re-re-reconsider its failure to override the veto.

Hopefully we won't go through that charade. We don't have very many legislative days this year. I think that time would be better spent, perhaps, on initiating hearings and looking toward, in the next Congress, Congress exerting its constitutional authority to revisit the Clean Water Act, which hasn't been revisited in 27 years.

We have learned a lot about waters of the United States in the last 27 years, what needs to be protected and what can be exempted. We have certainly learned a lot since the Bush era when a rule was written that indiscriminately covers ditches, and other features of farms and roadwork. That was a mistake.

So we could, I believe, probably, like we did with the WRRDA bill in the last Congress, or the surface transportation

bill in this Congress, have a pretty vigorous debate, but come up with a decent way forward, because nobody disagrees over the need for clean water in this country. It is a precious, precious commodity.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, we have had a lot of good discussion and debate today, and it is clear that we need to have clarity and certainty for all the stakeholders, while we protect the environment at the same time.

We tried to do that with H.R. 1732, which passed with bipartisan support here, and, obviously, it wasn't taken up in the Senate. So we are here with this Congressional Review Act.

I would like to talk about, if this rule goes through, what happens. Really, what happens is it greatly expands the power of the bureaucracy, and it gives them a lot of open, free discretion to make decisions on a case-by-case basis.

But it is going to do something else. It is going to require farmers, States, local governments, developers, homeowners to get permits from the Federal Government to do pretty much anything, because they are under Federal jurisdiction.

It also opens them up to citizens' lawsuits, frivolous lawsuits, but they will defend themselves because when the Clean Water Act was passed, it was passed with tough penalties to go after the polluters that we had back in the sixties and the seventies, and we have addressed a lot of that. So it is going to add costs, unnecessary costs.

And I would argue, and nobody has mentioned this, but I would argue that this rule can make us go backwards in the improvements we have made in this country on water quality and protecting the environment. The reason we can go backwards is because most people want to do the right thing. Most people want to protect the water. Farmers, I am a farmer, I want to protect it because I am one of the first ones to drink it. So we want to protect that.

But when you add up so much red tape and bureaucracy and costs, they are not necessarily going to do what they might have done otherwise. They will just do what they have to do to get by. They won't put in buffer strips. They won't do grass waterways. They won't do things to protect the environment because they have got to get a permit to do everything. And they will just say: No, this is just ridiculous, the bureaucrats are going to come out here and hassle me. And they are just not going to do it.

So that is what this rule does. It actually has the potential to hurt the environment, and we need to protect the environment.

So we need to rescind this rule, revoke this rule, go back to the table, the drawing board, and instruct our agencies to come up with a commonsense rule, go through the process correctly, don't break the law when they do it, and talk to the States.

You know, it is incredible. As soon as they filed the new rule in the Federal Register, 20-some States immediately, almost 30 States immediately, within 24 hours, filed a lawsuit. That ought to be a red flag that there is a problem.

So I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. Let's go back to the drawing board and start over.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to S.J. Res. 22, a bill providing for Congressional disapproval of the rule submitted by the Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency relating to a "Clean Water Rule: Definition of Waters of the United States."

Today, the House is debating S.J. Res. 22, a resolution under the Congressional Review Act (CRA) to disapprove the Administration's Clean Water Act Rule issued in June 2015.

The CRA is a blunt instrument and the resolution would not only strike the rule in its entirety—throwing out decades of work and reigniting confusion and uncertainty among industry and conservation communities—it would block future administrations from ever resolving the confusion surrounding the Clean Water Act's definition of "waters of the United States."

This joint resolution is an extraordinary and radical action to overturn a fundamental, once-in-a-generation final rule that is critical to the effective implementation of the 1972 Clean Water Act, and that was adopted following an exhaustive public rulemaking process.

This joint resolution would overturn this rule that finally resolves longstanding confusion and debate, promotes clarity and efficiency for regulatory programs promoting river health, and preserves longstanding protections for farmers, ranchers, and forester.

America's hunters and anglers cannot afford to have Congress undermine effective Clean Water Act safeguards, leaving communities and valuable fish and wildlife habitat at risk indefinitely.

Along the Texas Gulf Coast where Houston is located we have worked long and hard to protect essential habitats for fish, crabs and bird estuaries.

This joint resolution dismisses out of hand the voices of the millions of Americans, including businesses that depend on clean water, who support the new rule and are eager to reap its benefits.

The President has communicated that this bill will be vetoed if passed in its current form.

The "Resolution of Disapproval" under the Congressional Review Act attacks the Clean Water Rule, the Obama Administration's landmark initiative to restore safeguards against pollution and destruction for lakes, streams, wetlands and other water bodies.

The Clean Water Rule restores important safeguards that once existed for a variety of water bodies that are the breeding grounds for fish.

The rule restores prior protections for many critical wetlands, which curb flooding, filter pollution, and provide habitat for a wide variety of wildlife, including endangered species and wildfowl and fish prized by hunters and anglers.

We must reject this attempt to inject Congress into a regulatory process that is best managed by the agency experts who are well versed in the process and the objectives.

Although this issue of the children of Flint haven been poisoned by lead contamination of drinking water it is relevant to the broader debate on clean water and what we must remain focused upon.

The Clean Water Act (CWA) is the primary federal law in the United States governing water pollution.

It is credited for restoring clean water levels in the United States that were contaminated by chemicals and pollutants being dumped into fresh water sources.

The law maintains the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation's waters by preventing point and nonpoint pollution sources, providing assistance to publicly owned treatment works for the improvement of wastewater treatment, and maintaining the integrity of wetlands.

It is one of the United States' first and most influential modern environmental laws.

The disapproval resolution would undo years of work by this and previous Administrations to clarify which waterways are covered by the Clean Water Act, reducing costly confusion and permitting delays and restoring protections for streams and wetlands across the country.

The confusion surrounding which waterways are covered by the Clean Water Act protections originates from two Supreme Court decisions (2001 and 2006) which called into question whether the Act protects isolated, intrastate, non-navigable waters and waters and tributaries in the upper portions of a watershed.

Subsequent interpretive guidance by the Bush Administration has led to an inconsistent, patchwork system frustrating the regulated community and general public concerned with health and safety of our waterways.

In April 2014, in response to requests from regulated industry and the conservation communities, the Obama Administration published a proposed rule, replacing the Bush Administration-era guidance documents, to reduce regulatory uncertainty and establish a dear process for asserting Clean Water Act jurisdiction over waters. The EPA held more than 400 public meetings and listened to a significant amount of public comment on the proposed rule. The final rule was issued on June 29, 2015.

In October 2015, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit stayed the Clean Water Act Rule nationwide. Accordingly, the rule is tied up in Federal and state courts and, therefore, is not in effect.

House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Ranking Member PETER DEFAZIO opposes this damaging disapproval resolution and is urging Members to vote NO.

The White House has threatened to veto this disapproval resolution if it reaches the President's desk: The Administration strongly opposes S.J. Res. 22, which would nullify a specified Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Department of the Army (Army) final rule clarifying the jurisdictional boundaries of the Clean Water Act (CWA). The agencies' rulemaking, grounded in science and the law, is essential to ensure clean water for future generations, and is responsive to calls for rulemaking from the Congress, industry, and community stakeholders as well as decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

If enacted, S.J. Res. 22 would nullify years of work and deny businesses and communities the regulatory certainty needed to invest

in projects that rely on clean water. S.J. Res. 22 is not an act of good governance. If the President were presented with S.J. Res. 22, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

There is broad opposition to this disapproval resolution from the conservation, consumer, science, and recreational sports communities including: Clean Water Action, Earthjustice, Greenpeace, League of Conservation Voters, Natural Resources Defense Council, Sierra Club, Southern Environmental Law Center, Consortium of Aquatic Science Societies, American Fly Fishing Trade Association, International Federation of Fly Fishers, Backcountry Hunters & Anglers, The Izaak Walton League, National Wildlife Federation, Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, and Trout Unlimited.

I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 583, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. GIBBS. 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.

IRAN TERROR FINANCE TRANSPARENCY ACT

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 583, I call up the bill (H.R. 3662) to enhance congressional oversight over the administration of sanctions against certain Iranian terrorism financiers, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 583, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3662

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 ''Iran Terror Finance Transparency Act''.

SEC. 2. CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT FOR REMOVAL OF FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS, INCLUDING IRANIAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS, FROM THE LIST OF SPECIALLY DESIGNATED NATIONALS AND BLOCKED PERSONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—On or after July 19, 2015, the President may not remove a foreign financial institution, including an Iranian financial institution, described in subsection (b) from the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Asset Control of the Department of the Treasury unless and until the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a certification described in subsection (c) with respect to the foreign financial institution.

(b) COVERED INSTITUTIONS.—A foreign financial institution, including an Iranian financial institution, described in this subsection is a foreign financial institution listed in Attachment 3 or Attachment 4 to Annex II of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

(c) CERTIFICATION.—The President may remove a foreign financial institution, including an Iranian financial institution, described in subsection (b) from the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Asset Control of the Department of the Treasury if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a certification that the foreign financial institution—

(1) has not knowingly, directly or indirectly, facilitated a significant transaction or transactions or provided significant financial services for or on behalf of—

(A) Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps or any of its agents or affiliates whose property or interests in property are blocked pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.);

(B) a foreign terrorist organization for or on behalf of a person whose property or interests in property have been blocked pursuant to Executive Order 13224 (66 Fed. Reg. 49079; relating to blocking property and prohibiting transactions with persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism); and

(C) a person whose property or interests in property are blocked pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act in connection with Iran's proliferation of weapons of mass destruction or delivery systems for weapons of mass destruction, or to further Iran's development of ballistic missiles and destabilizing types and amounts of conventional weapons; and

(2) no longer knowingly engages in illicit or deceptive financial transactions or other activities.

(d) FORM.—A certification described in subsection (c) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ''foreign financial institution'' has the meaning given such term in section 1010.605 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations.

(2) FOREIGN TERRORIST ORGANIZATION.—The term ''foreign terrorist organization'' means any organization designated by the Secretary of State as a foreign terrorist organization in accordance with section 219(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189(a)).

(3) IRANIAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ''Iranian financial institution'' has the meaning given the term in section 104A(d)(3) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513b(d)(3)).

SEC. 3. CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT FOR REMOVAL OF CERTAIN FOREIGN PERSONS FROM THE LIST OF SPECIALLY DESIGNATED NATIONALS AND BLOCKED PERSONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—On or after July 19, 2015, the President may not remove a foreign person described in subsection (b) from the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Asset Control of the Department of the Treasury until the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a certification described in subsection (c) with respect to the foreign person.

(b) COVERED PERSONS AND ENTITIES.—A foreign person described in this subsection is a foreign person listed in Attachment 3 or Attachment 4 to Annex II of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

(c) CERTIFICATION.—The President may remove a foreign person described in subsection (b) from the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Asset Control of the Department of the Treasury if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a certification that the foreign person—

(1) has not knowingly assisted in, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or financial or other services to or in support of terrorism or a terrorist organization; and

(2) has not knowingly engaged in significant activities or transactions that have materially contributed to the Government of Iran's proliferation of weapons of mass destruction or their means of delivery (including missiles capable of delivering such weapons), including any efforts to manufacture, acquire, possess, develop, transport, transfer, or use such item.

(d) FORM.—A certification described in subsection (c) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term ''foreign person''—

(A) means—

(i) an individual who is not a United States person;

(ii) a corporation, partnership, or other nongovernmental entity which is not a United States person; or

(iii) any representative, agent or instrumentality of, or an individual working on behalf of a foreign government; but

(B) does not include a foreign financial institution, including an Iranian financial institution, described in section 2(b).

(2) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ''United States person'' means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or of any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

SEC. 4. CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT FOR REMOVAL OF DESIGNATION OF IRAN AS A JURISDICTION OF PRIMARY MONEY LAUNDERING CONCERN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President may not remove the designation of Iran as a jurisdiction of primary money laundering concern pursuant to section 5318A of title 31, United States Code, unless the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a certification described in subsection (b) with respect to Iran.

(b) CERTIFICATION.—The President may remove the designation of Iran as a jurisdiction of primary money laundering concern if the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a certification that the Government of Iran is no longer engaged in support for terrorism, pursuit of weapons of mass destruction, and any illicit and deceptive financial activities.

(c) FORM.—The certification described in subsection (b) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

SEC. 5. APPLICABILITY OF CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF CERTAIN AGENCY RULEMAKING RELATING TO IRAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any rule to amend or otherwise alter a covered regulatory provision as defined in subsection (c) that is published on or after the date of the enactment of this Act shall be deemed to be a rule or major rule (as the case may be) for purposes of chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, and shall be subject to all applicable requirements of chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the head of the applicable department or agency of the Federal Government shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the operation of the licensing system under each covered regulatory provision as defined in subsection (c) for the preceding 2-year period, including—

(1) the number and types of licenses applied for;

(2) the number and types of licenses approved;

(3) a summary of each license approved;

(4) a summary of transactions conducted pursuant to a general license;

(5) the average amount of time elapsed from the date of filing of a license application until the date of its approval;

(6) the extent to which the licensing procedures were effectively implemented; and

(7) a description of comments received from interested parties about the extent to which the licensing procedures were effective, after the applicable department or agency holds a public 30-day comment period.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''covered regulatory provision'' means any provision of part 535, 560, 561, or 1060 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as such part was in effect on June 1, 2015.

SEC. 6. PROHIBITIONS AND CONDITIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN ACCOUNTS HELD BY FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

Section 104(c)(2)(A)(ii) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513(c)(2)(A)(ii)) is amended by adding at the end before the semicolon the following: '', including Hezbollah, Hamas, the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, and any affiliates or successors thereof''.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' has the meaning given the term in section 14(2) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

(2) JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION.—The term ''Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action'' means the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna July 14, 2015, by Iran and by the People's Republic of China, France, Germany, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States, with the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, and all implementing materials and agreements related to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, and transmitted by the President to Congress on July 19, 2015, pursuant to section 135(a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–17; 129 Stat. 201).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to submit any extraneous materials on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

I want to recognize Congressman RUSSELL for his work on this legislation, the Iran Terror Finance Transparency Act. I think we should all reflect on the reason for this resolution, one of the reasons, and that is that, since the Obama administration sealed the nuclear deal with Iran, Iran has been on a bit of a tear. It has accelerated its missile program at the request of President Rouhani. It has taken an additional American hostage. It has stepped up the slaughter in Syria.

Days after that agreement was finalized, you had Iranian rockets firing 1,500 yards off the U.S. aircraft carrier *Truman*. And just yesterday, Iran detained 10 U.S. sailors, which was not appreciated, especially coming on the aftermath of firing those rockets near the *Truman*.

Now, we are all relieved to learn this morning that the sailors have been released. Yet, in what could be a matter of days, Iran will cash in with $100 billion-plus in sanctions relief of money which is now in escrow. And I am sure it has occurred to many of us that if Iran behaves this way now, in a few days, when it gets its hands on this bankroll, especially given the fact that that money is going to the IRGC, not to the Iranian people, what other actions are we going to see from the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps?

We had a story this weekend, front page, in the weekend edition of The Wall Street Journal, and the headline of that story is ''Nuclear Deal Fuels Iran's Hard-Liners.'' Iran's hard-liners will be the biggest winner out of this.

The Revolutionary Guards, the same radical forces that held these 10 U.S. sailors, that force and their proxies control many of the industries that will benefit from the influx of hard currency and new investment. Whether it is energy or construction, they control it. This ICBM program, they control it.

□ 1030

Just as many of us warned prior to this deal about the appetite for enforcement, once this deal gets underway, there is no pushback from the administration on this. Since the nuclear deal, Iran has tested two ballistic missiles. Now, that is in violation of the U.N. Security Council resolution. This administration's response was to announce and then abandon new sanctions within a very short timeframe, apparently to not offend the Supreme Leader, to not risk its flawed nuclear deal.

When it comes to Iran, we need a policy of more backbone, not more backing down, because it was not supposed to be this way with this deal. In announcing the nuclear deal, President Obama claimed that American sanctions on Iran for its support of terrorism, its human rights abuses, and its ballistic missile program will continue to be fully enforced. Those were the President's words, and just after that, with Secretary Kerry's argument testifying before the Foreign Affairs Committee.

This legislation is a first step in holding the administration to these commitments. Under the bill, before the President can lift sanctions on a particular person or bank or company to implement the nuclear deal, he must certify that their removal is related to Iran's nuclear program alone. That is who we were told would be getting the sanctions relief—not those tied to terrorism, not those tied to Iran's ballistic missile or other illicit weapons programs that were under sanction from the U.N. resolutions.

When the Treasury Department sanctioned Bank Melli in 2007, it noted that the institution had provided banking services to the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps and the Quds Force. The Quds Force is in charge of assassinations outside of Iran. As we all know, the Revolutionary Guards have committed acts of terrorism and committed those missile tests that we just recently saw. Why, then, is this bank set to receive sanctions relief in the coming days?

Bank Sepah, one of Iran's largest banks, will be another big winner of sanctions relief in the coming days. When that bank was designated, and that was January of 2007, then-Treasury Under Secretary Stuart Levey noted with this argument: ''Bank Sepah is the financial linchpin of Iran's missile procurement network.''

What we have to think about here is there is one reason—one reason—why a state develops ICBMs. It is to deliver a nuclear payload. It is to deliver a weapon. So, he says it is the financial linchpin and ''has actively assisted Iran's pursuit of missiles capable of carrying weapons of mass destruction.''

Indeed, Iran's ballistic missile program is advancing under President Rouhani. He just called for the program to be accelerated. That is what we have in the face of this agreement. We should not be letting this bank off the ropes, opening it for business from Europe to Asia.

To be clear, those Iranian banks and individuals not supporting terrorism and not supporting ICBMs can be delisted—that was what was originally represented to this Congress—but not those threatening our national security, and not those making threats to

us while the Ayatollah is saying ''death to America,'' ''death to Israel.''

That is what this legislation does, and it is the policy that the administration explained to this House.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, January 8, 2016.

Hon. ED ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROYCE: I am writing concerning H.R. 757, the North Korea Sanctions Enforcement Act of 2015, and H.R. 3662, the Iran Terror Finance Transparency Act, both of which were referred to the Committee on Financial Services in addition to your Committee.

As a result of your having consulted with the Committee on Financial Services concerning provisions of the bills that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree to discharge our Committee from further consideration of the bills so that they may proceed expeditiously to the House Floor. The Committee on Financial Services takes this action with our mutual understanding that, by foregoing consideration of H.R. 757 and H.R. 3662 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for any such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 757 and H.R. 3662 and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in your Committee's report to accompany the legislation and in the Congressional Record during floor consideration thereof.

Sincerely,

JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, January 8, 2016.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,
Chairman, House Committee on Financial Services, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Foreign Affairs on H.R. 3662, the Iran Terror Finance Transparency Act, and for agreeing to be discharged from further consideration of that bill.

I agree that your forgoing further action on this measure does not in any way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this legislation.

I will seek to place our letters on H.R. 3662 into the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with your Committee as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

Mr. ENGEL . I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this measure.

First, I do want to thank my good friend, Chairman ED ROYCE. It is not very often we find ourselves on different sides of foreign affairs issues, which is a credit to the way he runs our committee; but in this case, in my view, this bill isn't the right fit or the right approach.

We should go back to the drawing board, rather than ramming through a partisan measure that will never become law. We should go through our normal process of drafting legislation in a bipartisan way with input from both sides, rather than advancing something that was put together without a single Democrat having any input whatsoever. As a result, this bill does not have a single Democratic cosponsor.

If we are going to pass legislation like this, it only works if we do it in a bipartisan way—as Americans—not as Democrats or Republicans. We should come back here with a bipartisan bill that can actually move forward, just as we have done again and again and again on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

The question here is not whether Iran is a good player. Iran is a bad player. In fact, it is a terrible player. It is important that we do act on the challenge of Iran. Like Chairman ROYCE, I oppose the Iran deal, but our side lost the debate. The deal is in place. Now we need to make sure that Iran is living up to its commitments under that deal, that every word of the deal is enforced, that we crack down on Iran's other bad behavior, and that we take steps to shore up the security of Israel and our other allies in the region. That is the kind of bill I want to support, and we can do it together.

This bill doesn't address any of the issues. Instead, this bill would establish an impossible standard for the President. The bill says that, in order to remove a person or a company from the nuclear sanctions list, the President would have to certify that the person or company never, at any point, engaged in sanctionable behavior, including support for Iran's weapons of mass destruction programs. Well, if they had never engaged in sanctionable behavior, why would they be on the sanctions list in the first place? It just doesn't make sense, Mr. Speaker.

Now, this could be a drafting flaw or it could be just about embarrassing the President, but it would make it impossible for the United States to meet its obligations under the JCPOA. That worries me because, rather than holding Iran's feet to the fire and strengthening oversight, we seem to be going down the same path we have taken with the Affordable Care Act. Sixty-two times we voted to repeal it. A couple of months ago, we had a vote which essentially repeals the JCPOA, and now we are doing it a second time. Will we do it 60 more times? It is a waste of all of our time. Let's put our heads together and come up with a bipartisan bill that really works.

Now, 62 times to vote to repeal the Affordable Care Act; my opinion is, those were symbolic votes because we knew the President would never repeal his own bill. Today, this is a symbolic vote because we know the President is never going to sink his own agreement. My constituents don't want symbolic votes, Mr. Speaker. They want results. Symbolic votes won't help us crack down on Iran's support for terrorism or their other dangerous behavior.

Again, I am confident that we can work in a bipartisan way to craft legislation. We have done it again and again and again on the Foreign Affairs Committee. Just look at the Iran sanctions bill that Chairman ROYCE and I wrote in 2013. It passed unanimously out of the Foreign Affairs Committee—unanimously. And we have people who believe in their politics from the right to the left and everywhere in between, but it was unanimous because we did it in a bipartisan way and it made sense. It came to the floor, and it passed by a vote of 400–8. That is the kind of thing we should be doing now on this very serious issue.

So if we are serious about this issue, that is the approach we need to take. I am confident that in the days ahead, I will be working with Chairman ROYCE and all of our Members to bring forward good, bipartisan legislation, but this bill is the wrong way to go.

I don't impugn anybody's motives. I know people worked hard on this. But this is just simply, in my opinion, the wrong way to go. So, Mr. Speaker, I will vote against it, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL), the author of this legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, 19 August 2015, and I quote the President of the United States:

> I made sure that the United States reserved its right to maintain and enforce existing sanctions and even to deploy new sanctions to address those continuing concerns, which we fully intend to do when circumstances warrant.
>
> It is imperative that we take steps to deal with Iran's destabilizing activities and support for terrorism. This involves continued enforcement of international and United States law, including sanctions related to Iran's nonnuclear activities.

I am quoting the President:

> We will maintain powerful sanctions targeting Iran's support for groups such as Hezbollah, its destabilizing role in Yemen, its backing of the Assad regime, its missile program, and its human rights abuses at home.

This was in direct response, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman who is saying that he is not for upholding these things today. We had many in a bipartisan fashion who voted against this agreement. The President has stated clearly that, under the terms of the

Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010, he would not interfere with the terrorist list, that he would not interfere with the human rights list.

But the simple fact is—and I have read every single word of the joint agreement—there are hundreds of people in Annex II on that sanctions list. Among them are more than 50 that are on the terrorist list and the human rights list as violators. The President said that they will not be lifted off, and yet there they are. That is what this bill does.

It is interesting that last week—and I quote a letter by our esteemed colleagues on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker—and here is the letter that they sent to the President of the United States reinforcing why this bill is such a good idea:

> Iran's destabilizing behavior in the region and continued support for terrorism represent an unacceptable threat to our closest allies as well as our own national security. As the international community prepares for implementation of the joint agreement, Iran must understand that violating international laws, treaties, and agreements will have serious consequences. We call on the administration—this is their words, Mr. Speaker—to immediately announce new, U.S. sanctions against individuals and entities involved in Iran's ballistic missile program to ensure Iran is held accountable for its actions.

I continue to quote this letter:

> Inaction from the United States would send the misguided message that, in the wake of the joint agreement, the international community has lost the willingness to hold the Iranian regime accountable for its support for terrorism and other offensive actions throughout the region—including Syria, Yemen, Lebanon, and the Gaza Strip. This behavior—including ballistic missile tests, as the chairman spoke about—poses a direct threat to American national security interests and those of our allies.

Mr. Speaker, this was signed by Representative LOWEY; our esteemed colleague that is at the podium now on the other side of the aisle, Mr. ENGEL; the leader of the Democratic National Committee for Congress, DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ; and our esteemed colleagues Mr. SIRES, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. NADLER.

Do you know what? We agree with them. We agree totally with them that these sanctions should be upheld, that the law is the law, and that the 2010 Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act is still the law. That is what this bill does.

There have been claims that it was not done in a bipartisan fashion, and I find this somewhat puzzling because I personally talked to Mr. ENGEL about this bill. I went item by item through it and what its content was. I reached out to the Democratic leadership in August. I have been working this bill since July. So, yes, we can do it in a bipartisan fashion.

I regret, because I am a freshman and only have fought on three continents and have a foreign affairs and national security background, that I am not on the Foreign Affairs Committee. But that doesn't denote, Mr. Speaker, a lack of understanding of the way the world works and what the threat is in the United States of America when we have made a law that says that, if you are a terrorist or a human rights violator, we are not going to allow you to have sanctions relief under the JCPOA. The President said that that is what he is going to do. Democrats and Republicans have said that is what they will uphold. That is what this bill does, and yet we see, puzzlingly, opposition to these very things.

Here is what the bill is: Annex II of the joint agreement lifts sanctions for hundreds of individuals for nuclear proliferation or human rights violation or terrorist violation. More than 50 of these individuals and entities have been identified on the joint agreement for sanctions relief. This simply requires that, before those are delisted, the President certify why. It doesn't say they can never come off. Read section 4. It is pretty clear. It says that the President must certify justification on why that is the case.

What this bill is not: a knee-jerk reaction, a partisan ploy that is quickly crafted due to recent events. We have been working for months on this.

The bill was crafted without major efforts—not true, as I have proven this morning. This is upholding the law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we have the discussion. I know my colleagues feel deeply about this. I know that they also would like to see this continued. Let's pass this bill.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), my friend and colleague. He is a very valued member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa.

□ 1045

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the ranking member, Mr. ENGEL, for his leadership today.

I deeply appreciate the bipartisan way that he and Chairman ROYCE have run our committee when it comes to the goal that we all share of preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. I am also grateful for the commitment that my friend Mr. RUSSELL has made to this same issue and to his service to our country.

This legislation, unfortunately, doesn't advance this goal that we share, nor does it prevent Iran's other provocative, illegal, and destabilizing regional activities.

I opposed the nuclear deal. I have been clear about my concerns with the deal itself and with what Iran might try to do with billions of dollars in sanctions relief. I have also been clear about my frustration that the ballistic missile tests undertaken by Iran in violation of U.S. and international law have not yet resulted in sanctions either by the United Nations Security Council or by the administration.

Given the dangerous behavior that we have seen out of Iran in the past months and weeks with respect to its illicit ballistic missile program and its continued funding of Hezbollah in Syria, we should be working together to put forward legislation that strengthens the enforcement of the JCPOA and prevents Iran from continuing its sponsorship of terror, its illegal missile development, and its gross human rights violations. This bill, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, doesn't do any of those things.

Some of my colleagues claim the bill will prevent entities from getting sanctions relief under the deal that have ties to terrorism or WMD proliferation. I expressed directly to the administration that they need to ensure that any entity that is subject to sanctions relief under the nuclear deal be carefully investigated and resanctioned if they are found to be engaging in support for terrorism or human rights abuses, but this bill doesn't do that.

Instead, it requires certification that the 400 entities named in the JCPOA have never engaged in activities related to terrorism or the development of weapons of mass destruction. This standard will result in the administration devoting significant time and resources to a certification that can never be met, while also preventing—importantly preventing—implementation of the JCPOA. Instead of devoting the necessary resources to sanctioning individuals and entities that support terrorism and violate human rights—dangerous activities that were never part of the nuclear deal—it devotes enormous resources to a process that won't accomplish that. Iran must pay the price for its continued bad behavior.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today adds several of Iran's terrorist proxies to the banking provisions of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act, one of our most important sanctions laws. Of course we want to stop banks from facilitating transactions to these terrorist organizations; but, unfortunately, some of our European friends attempt to distinguish between the military and political wings of terrorist groups. They shouldn't. There is no distinction. I have spoken out against this policy.

Nevertheless, because of this discrepancy, by naming these specific terrorist groups in CISADA, this bill has the potential to cut off European banks from the U.S. financial system. Now is the time, Mr. Speaker, for us to be working with our allies to craft the toughest international sanctions to crack down on Iran's dangerous activities.

Mr. Speaker, whether you supported this deal or not, as Mr. ENGEL said, it is going forward.

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

Mr. ENGEL. I yield the gentleman from Florida an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DEUTCH. I thank my friend.

We should be looking for bipartisan ways to ensure that it is enforced with vigor and with the most stringent verification and compliance. If a violation occurs or if Iran continues to engage in illegal activities that were never a part of this nuclear deal, we must ensure that we have the tools to enact punishing new sanctions, hopefully, with the support of our international partners, but certainly with the full, bipartisan support of the United States Congress.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak about Iran on the floor of the U.S. House without making clear that every one of us—435 Members of the House of Representatives—stand united in our commitment to bringing home from Iran Jason Rezaian, Amir Hekmati, Saeed Abedini, Siamak Namazi, and, my constituent, Bob Levinson. They sit in Iran, but we look forward to welcoming them home.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time and for his work on this legislation.

I do want to comment that the ranking member, Mr. ENGEL, I value his wisdom on the issue of Iran, and especially in defense of Israel. We happen to disagree on this specific legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the nuclear agreement that the administration made with Iran was still a bad deal for America. As a former judge down in Texas, I know that when the bad guys do bad things, you don't reward bad conduct.

At a time when the administration needs to be strong and firm, it seems to be showing wobbly knees on this deal. Now we are left with a deal where the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism is only a few small steps away from a nuclear bomb. The administration's continued leniency with Iran is conceding even more than what is required in the deal. The administration is making this bad deal even worse.

The President promised the American people that this bad deal still allows nonnuclear-related sanctions on Iran. Good for the President. Great promise.

Iran, not to the shock of any of us, has violated some of the rules that they are to abide by. They violated two U.N. resolutions restricting ballistic missile tests last month.

The Treasury Department told Congress it would levy new sanctions on Iran, primarily financial sanctions. That would support the President's promise to America. But at the last minute, the State Department got involved and said, whoa, no sanctions, not so fast—and no sanctions. More shaky knees, Mr. Speaker.

Why does the administration waffle on calling Iran out for violations? America's national security interests seem to take a backseat to confronting Iran politically.

I support H.R. 3662. This is an important bill to ensure the President can't lift sanctions on those institutions and individuals who are involved in terrorism. Remember, Mr. Speaker, Iran is still the number one world state sponsor of terrorism, and they are continuing their mischief throughout the world. We don't need to make it easier for Iran's terrorist proxies to get even more money than the $150 billion that they are getting in the deal.

With this bill, the President must prove to Congress that a person or entity has not given financial or materiel support to a terrorist organization before removing them from the sanctions list. Sounds logical to me, Mr. Speaker.

Sanctions unrelated to the nuclear deal must remain in place. The national security of the United States is at stake.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), my friend and colleague, and a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague.

I rise in strong opposition to this deeply misguided legislation.

Reports from international experts, nuclear watchdogs, and representatives of our international coalition make clear that Iran is on its way to fully dismantling its nuclear weapons program. Breakout times at this moment have already been tripled and quadrupled.

We need to understand, just because the JCPOA does not deal with all of Iran's abuses doesn't mean that we shouldn't solve the nuclear issue. We have already had that debate. Iran is still a state sponsor of terrorism, and the proposed expansion of its ballistic missile program is particularly troubling. These issues must be addressed.

But a nuclear-armed Iran would only make these abuses more dangerous, and it would be wildly foolish to suggest that we must forego our only real opportunity to keep a nuclear weapon out of the regime's hands just because these ancillary issues remain. This bill would do exactly that. It would scuttle the JCPOA, the result of years of international negotiation and diplomacy in cooperation with our international partners. Absent the nuclear agreement, Iran could resume its nuclear program without international oversight, could go back to that 3-month breakout time, and, by the way, continue the state sponsorship of terrorism, continue its human rights abuses, and continue its ballistic missile expansion.

In short, this bill would snatch the feet from the jaws of victory as the dismantling of Iran's nuclear program proceeds. It would be reckless in the extreme, and I strongly urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and the cosponsor of this bill.

Mr. ROSKAM. Thank you, Chairman ROYCE, for your leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Mr. RUSSELL's initiative.

Last night, Mr. Speaker, there was a murmur throughout the room here when the President was giving the State of the Union message. I am paraphrasing, but when he made the assertion that essentially the United States is perceived well around the world and, in fact, better than ever before, there was an audible sense of outcry. People were really concerned about that assertion. Then the President went on to make his point.

I think it is an admonition for us all to recognize, as Judge POE said a couple of moments ago, there is a wobbliness in this administration. In other words, how many provocations are the Iranians able to move forward and the administration is inert? How many provocations can the Iranians push and the administration remains with no action?

I will tell you something. This is just off the news. Reuters is reporting that the Major General Hassan Firouzabadi, the head of the Iranian Armed Forces, says that the naval incident that is being reconciled today, that this should be a lesson to whom? To troublemakers in Congress—troublemakers in Congress—who oppose Iranian aggression.

I think Mr. RUSSELL's approach here is very commonsense. It says those who have been complicit in sponsoring terror in the past ought not be getting the benefit of the sanctions regime being raised; they don't get the benefit of participating in that. This has to be certified clearly, according to Mr. RUSSELL's language, and it makes all the sense in the world.

The notion that somehow the administration is incapable of doing this I don't find persuasive. I think we need an administration that can make these certifications, that does make these certifications, and if they can't, then these terror financiers ought not be getting the benefit of sanctions relief.

I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), a very valued member of our committee and ranking member on the Asia and the Pacific Subcommittee.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I voted for every sanctions bill on Iran that has come to this floor—I helped draft many of them—and I am ready to help draft, work on, and vote for sanctions bills on Iran because Iran continues its behavior in the area of missiles, and terrorism, and keeps seizing American hostages. I am ready to work on and support legislation to impose sanctions on Iran even if it is opposed by the administration. After all, almost every sanctions bill passed by this Congress was opposed either by the George W.

Bush administration or this administration.

We need a good process to draft good legislation that will do what President Obama told us we would do, and that is use sanctions to deal with Iran's nonnuclear wrongdoing. But we need a good process that will get us good legislation. Unfortunately, this is a bill that is the product of a bad process, a flawed process, and the bill itself is flawed.

Let's look at the process.

Almost 100 cosponsors, but all of them from one party. No Democrat on the Foreign Affairs Committee was invited to help draft the legislation or even invited to cosponsor it. Now this bill comes to the floor under a closed rule, a rule that prevents us from offering amendments that will deal with the flaws in the bill. There are at least two such flaws.

The first is that the bill deprives the President of the authority to delist 489 entities. It locks those entities onto the SDN list, but it leaves out 269 other entities, creating two classes of entities: one which must stay on the list under almost any circumstance I can think of, the other which the President can remove. And there is no particular reason for the 269 entities to be treated differently than the 489. All of them have been involved in supporting Iran's proliferation and terrorist efforts.

□ 1100

Second, this bill creates too high a standard for the President to be able to remove an entity. He has to certify that it has never at any time in history engaged in even the most trivial transaction with a whole list of terrorist entities. We need a better drafting of that portion of the bill that deals with delisting entities, perhaps entities that have changed their behavior for well over a decade.

I look forward to a bipartisan process and to, hopefully, an open rule. We see that reflected in the fact that I have introduced legislation, as just an example, that would impose additional sanctions on Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps and that is sponsored by the chairman of our committee and by the immediate past chairman of our committee.

I know our committee can work in a bipartisan way to create better legislation than that which is before us, and we need additional sanctions on Iran drafted carefully because Iran has engaged in a missile test in violation of U.N. Security Council resolutions, because Iran's support for terrorism and Assad is responsible for the deaths of tens and tens of thousands—hundreds of thousands—of people in Syria and Yemen and because Iran used to hold four, but now holds five, American hostages. Fortunately, it does not hold our U.S. Navy sailors, but it holds five American civilians.

It is consistent with American policy and with this administration's policy. They negotiated a nuclear deal. They kept it only on the nuclear issue not because America has conceded and has accepted and has given Iran carte blanche to engage in terrorism and hostage-taking, but because the President's policy was that we would deal with these issues separately. It is time for us to deal with these issues separately through well-drafted, bipartisan legislation.

I am confident that, in the weeks to come, the administration will use its existing power to sanction additional entities as a result of Iran's illegal missile test, and I am confident that our committee will craft bipartisan legislation that will do what we know we need to do to deal with Iran's wrongdoing outside the nuclear area.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. TROTT. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3662.

When President Obama announced the nuclear agreement, he promised that sanctions against Iran's support of terrorism, human rights abuses, and its ballistic missile program would continue to be enforced. All this bill does is require the President to keep his word.

If the bill passes, the President won't be able to give Hezbollah, Hamas, and other terrorist groups billions of dollars. They will not be able to use billions of dollars to continue testing long-range missiles in violation of U.N. resolutions.

Who can disagree with this goal? The President probably disagrees.

Some suggest that, if the bill reaches his desk, he will veto it. All we in Congress can do is to try and remind the President about his promises surrounding this deal.

This might also be a good time to remind the President about Iran's behavior over the past 2 months. They convicted and imprisoned one of our journalists. They detained another American. They released five al Qaeda prisoners. They have not released the four Americans they have been holding for years. They have tested their ballistic missiles. They fired a missile that came close to one of our naval vessels. And in the last 24 hours, they held 10 American sailors.

It may well be true that neither Iran's behavior nor this bill will cause the President to realize he made a mistake in trusting Iran. I will rely on historians for that.

It is unfortunate that this debate and this bill are necessary to remind the President that we expect him to keep his promise, his promise to withhold billions of dollars in sanctions relief that Iran will otherwise use to spread terror and will use to develop ballistic missiles that are aimed at our shores.

Ranking Member ENGEL may be correct in that our actions today are symbolic, but we troublemakers in Congress have no choice. Whenever possible, we must try to remind the President that he cannot do a good deal with a bad guy.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3662.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE). The gentleman from New York has 14½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce's Subcommittee on the Environment and the Economy.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. I appreciate the chairman's leadership. The gentleman knows how hard I work in supporting freedom and of my opposition to totalitarian regimes.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, we passed H.R. 757, the North Korea Sanctions Enforcement Act. Unfortunately, I missed that vote—that happens here sometimes—and the gentleman knows how I fully support it.

Again today we address a problem with a rogue regime: Iran. I voted against the flawed Iranian deal. Iran still holds a marine veteran, a contractor, an American pastor, and a Washington Post reporter. They have tested two ballistic missiles. Sanctions should not be waived by the U.S. That is why I support this bill.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART), a member of the Committee on Appropriations and of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in my work on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I have spent an awful lot of my time on these types of issues. I think there is much we can say about this bill, but at the end of the day, it comes down to two fundamental questions. They are really quite simple.

The first is: Do you believe that the President will hold Iran accountable?

In an interview yesterday, I challenged the other person to show me the President's foreign policy success because I believe in this administration there has been 7 years of foreign policy failure, from China, to Russia, to Afghanistan, to Syria. The list is long. We have to ask: Do we trust the President to implement policies that keep the world more or less safe?

The second question is just as simple: Do we trust Iran?

I asked Secretary Kerry to show me a single example of Iran working with us or with our allies in any positive fashion. They are, as has been said

here, the world's greatest sponsor of terrorism.

Recently they broke U.N. agreements not to test ballistic missiles. They have held our soldiers. From Hezbollah, to Hamas, to Syria, they foster terror and darkness everywhere they go. Do we trust Iran? Very simply, the answer is no, which is why this bill is so important.

It helps us to hold Iran accountable. It helps us to hold their proxies accountable. It removes the incentives for them to continue to expand their power and their policies and their goals, which are counter to U.S. and Western goals throughout the world.

That is why I support this bill. I urge my colleagues to as well.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman from New York for his kindness. I acknowledge the chairman of this committee for his courtesies in debating this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I think it is important for all of us to acknowledge the safe return of our United States sailors and to recognize that the United States was persistent and determined and, as well, made no apology and that the Iran Government moved quickly to return them.

Let it be very clear that our sailors did nothing wrong. Obviously, when other sailors are in trouble, let me thank those who remain, as our heroes do. They leave no person, in essence, behind. So I am very grateful, and I know their families are grateful that they are safe.

That, Mr. Speaker, is a distinctive point from where we are today. Everyone knows that Iran is a bad actor. Some of us on this floor voted for the Iran non-nuclear agreement while others did not. But I believe that we do ourselves harm when we continue to renegotiate or to re-vote, as we have continued to do 62 times with regard to ObamaCare.

This legislation would restrict the President's ability to lift sanctions on Iranian entities, thereby preventing the U.S. from carrying out its commitment under the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed in Vienna, Austria, on July 14, 2015.

Specifically, the bill would require the President to certify that the delisted entity has not knowingly facilitated a significant financial transaction or has provided significant financial services to the IRGC or to terrorist affiliates.

This, of course, would be a very difficult and hindering aspect of the President's responsibilities in his role as the Commander in Chief. It would specifically prevent the delisting of 400 banks, companies, and individuals that are engaged in Iran's nuclear program, particularly the Central Bank.

Section 2 would require the President to certify to Congress that any entity from the Office of Foreign Assets Control sanctions list has not ever knowingly facilitated a significant financial transaction.

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

Mr. ENGEL. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this legislation impedes, prohibits, and stops the President and the next President, as our representative of the face of America internationally and who has the responsibility, from enforcing this agreement. It was done primarily to stop Iran's nuclear efforts.

I, too, as one who has supported this legislation, believes that sanctions should be increased and that we should respond to Iran's ballistic missile episode, but there are ways to do that by strengthening the sanctions, not by tying the hands of the Commander in Chief—the President of the United States—and not by renegotiating this on the floor of the House to the extent that we have, in essence, giving the President no latitude with which to negotiate.

I ask my colleagues to oppose this legislation because it is not legislation that enhances our place. It takes away from the President's authority, and it makes it very difficult to interact with Iran. Let me be very clear: Iran has its troubles, and it is a bad actor, but I will tell you there are better ways to handle this situation.

I ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3662, the Iran Terror Finance Transparency Act.

We are here again wasting valuable time on measures we know have no real chance of survival beyond these debates.

I strongly oppose this futile measure to block all efforts to enforce the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA).

H.R. 3662, would prevent the U.S. from implementing the JCPOA by tying the Administration's ability to fulfill U.S. commitments under this long negotiated deal to unrelated, non-nuclear issues.

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 3662, the Iran Terror Finance Transparency Act, which would prevent the United States from implementing the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) by tying the Administration's ability to fulfill U.S. commitments under the deal to unrelated, non-nuclear issues.

This bill includes provisions that connect the United States' JCPOA commitment to provide sanctions relief by delisting certain Iran-related individuals and entities, including banks, to non-nuclear issues outside of the scope of the JCPOA.

Certain provisions would effectively preclude delisting of individuals or entities on Implementation Day of the JCPOA—the day on which the International Atomic Energy Agency verifies that Iran has completed key nuclear-related steps that significantly dismantle and constrain its nuclear program—based on activity that may have taken place and ended long before Implementation Day and involving persons or activity that will no longer be sanctioned post-Implementation Day.

By preventing the United States from fulfilling its JCPOA commitments, H.R. 3662 could result in the collapse of a comprehensive diplomatic arrangement that peacefully and verifiably prevents Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon.

Such a collapse would remove the unprecedented constraints on Iran's nuclear program that we achieved in the JCPOA, lead to the unraveling of the international sanctions regime against Iran, and deal a devastating blow to America's credibility as a leader of international diplomacy.

This would have ripple effects, jeopardizing the hard work of sustaining a unified coalition to combat Iran's destabilizing activities in the region, calling into question the effectiveness of our sanctions regime and our ability to lead the world on nuclear non-proliferation.

The Administration has consistently made clear that the purpose of the nuclear negotiations, and ultimately the JCPOA—was to address one issue only: the international community's concerns over Iran's nuclear program and to verifiably prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon.

The JCPOA is the critical mechanism through which the United States was able to garner international support for our sanctions and achieve a diplomatic resolution.

As we address our concerns with Iran's nuclear program through implementation of the JCPOA, the Administration remains clear-eyed and shares the deep concerns of the Congress and the American people about Iran's support for terrorism.

Powerful sanctions targeting Iran's support for terrorism, its ballistic missile activities, its human rights abuses, and its destabilizing activities in the region remain in effect.

Anyone worldwide who transacts with or supports individuals or entities sanctioned in connection with Iran's support for terrorism or development of WMD and their means of delivery, including missiles—or who does the same with any Iranian individual or entity who remains on Treasury's Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons List, puts themselves at risk of being sanctioned.

Up until this point, Iran has been meeting all commitments under the JCPOA—any impediments to the United States ability to uphold its commitments jeopardizes the security of our nation.

The President has made it clear that he will veto any legislation that prevents the successful implementation of the JCPOA.

According to the Statement on Administrative Policy, if presented with H.R. 3662, the President will VETO this bill.

Let's just take a quick look back at some of the President's foreign policy achievements:

The capture and neutralization of Osama Bin Laden which brought an end to a nearly decade long manhunt.

The withdrawal of U.S. forces from Iraq which helped to bring an end to a costly war, helping our country save billions of dollars in U.S. taxpayer funds.

The current Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, which has been instrumental in deterring and stemming Iran's nuclear ambitions and enabling security in the global society.

The repealing of Don't Ask, Don't Tell, an aspersion on the personal private matters of those who have dedicated their lives to protecting our nation.

Signing into law the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), an important treaty

that showcases how the U.S leads by example by signing a treaty that requires both the United States and Russia to reduce their nuclear warhead arsenals to 1,550 each, a 30 percent reduction from the 2002 Treaty of Moscow and a 74 percent reduction from the 1991 START treaty.

Neutralization of al Qaeda propagandist and foreign fighter recruiter Anwar Al Awlaki, one of the main leaders in the Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP).

Indeed, under President Obama's leadership, our country's military aid to Israel has increased remarkably with the eye towards deepening and expanding U.S./Israeli relations—an important aspect of our nation's foreign policy and geopolitical efforts to promote peace in the region.

Not to mention historical deals on the environment vis a vis Cop 21, organizing over 200 nations on strategies to protect the environment and proposed trade deals that will organize and facilitate the United States stamp on the Asian economy.

This president's foreign policy achievements in promoting the security of our nation are irrefutable.

Any serious legislation addressing Iran should be done as it has been done up until now, in a bipartisan way.

H.R. 3662 is an entirely partisan bill that excluded the participation of all Democratic Members in drafting this measure or supporting it.

This bill is fundamentally flawed and I urge all Members to vote against it.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE), who is the cosponsor of this legislation.

Mr. LANCE. I thank Chairman ROYCE and Mr. RUSSELL for their tremendous leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3662, the Iran Terror Finance Transparency Act.

The detention and interrogation of 10 American sailors near the Strait of Hormuz is the latest in a significant list of Iranian acts of aggression against American interests since President Obama signed the Iran nuclear agreement in October. Thank God our sailors have been released. They never should have been detained.

In recent weeks, we have witnessed two reported long-range ballistic missile launches, the revelation by Iran of a new underground missile depot, the firing of rockets near U.S. Navy ships in the Strait of Hormuz, and the Tehran government continuing to hold American hostages. These provocations and the lack of response from the White House have merely emboldened Iran to increase its aggression. Iran believes it can act against American interests with impunity.

I urge my colleagues to support the underlying legislation and to stop the lifting of sanctions on Iran that would provide billions of dollars in economic relief.

Let's send a clear message that Iran's aggression against the United States and its allies will not go unchallenged by Congress. History will judge our actions on this issue as history will judge the President and the administration on their actions on this issue. Let history be the judge. Let's support H.R. 3662.

□ 1115

Mr. ENGEL. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL), author of this legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this bill.

There have been a lot of accusations about what is in this bill and the content. The fact of the matter is, what is being quoted is simply not in the bill.

It says that it would deprive the President of the authority to make decisions. That is simply not the case. Page 2, line 20; page 5, line 17; page 7, line 7: ''The President may lift''—spelled out—if he meets the certification criteria. What is that criteria? That they are no longer conducting activity and they have justification for that relief.

Where this language ''never at any time'' is being quoted, Mr. Speaker, by my esteemed and caring colleagues on this issue—I know how they feel about this issue personally, and I commend them for it because we are on common ground here—but they are quoting something that is simply not in the bill. When they say ''never at any time,'' that is simply not there.

The President may lift the sanctions. What we are calling for is a certification as to why. If he comes in and makes the case—look, this bank has corrected its behavior, general Soleimani has had some epiphany and he is no longer a terrorist—then, fine, we can have that certification, and the President does that.

Talking about several of them and that there was no bipartisan effort, every single speaker that has said that there was not a bipartisan effort I have personally been in contact with—personally—talking on this particular issue. So that is simply not the case. I am kind of hurt by that because I reached out to all of them, and I didn't deny any of them a chance for amendment, for dialogue, or discussion. I do think that we have much common ground to go on here.

I think it is also important that it says that it doesn't advance goals. It is upholding the law. The law, which is the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions and Divestment Act of 2010, says that if there are people on terror and human rights list, that they shouldn't come off without certification. We agree. That is why we are saying we have to have the similar certification for those that overlap on the joint agreement. That is why we have identified them.

The hundreds of others that were mentioned by the opponents of this measure, Mr. Speaker, they weren't on those lists. That is why they are not there. They weren't targeted for this. Only those that are on the terror and human rights or nuclear proliferation with missiles list, if they are there, then that is why they have been targeted.

This isn't apparently about the merit of the measure or how we feel about the national security of the United States. It has now become an issue about process. Well, I guess that experience doesn't matter. It is about process. We need to do what is right for the country, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Let me first clear up, I think, what is a misperception. There are roughly 700 Iranian entities on our sanctions list. Of those, only 200 are removed from sanctions and those are those who were involved in the nuclear program. It is not true that the JCPOA removed sanctions on entities that are engaged in terrorism or proliferation or human rights violations. This is black and white in the JCPOA.

Entity by entity, we know exactly who will be removed. None of them are involved in terrorism or other malign behavior. We know who will be removed. There is a list in the annex. I have it right here, every company that will be removed, and none of them are removed for terrorism or other malign behavior. So I want to make that very, very clear.

Let me say that I think everyone on both sides has good intentions, and I think that we don't disagree about Iran. The question here is not whether Iran is a bad player or a good player. I don't trust the Iranians. I voted against the deal, and I don't believe anything the government says. That is not the question here.

The question is, how do you combat it in a unified way? We are not interested in embarrassing the President, certainly not on this side of the aisle. We are not interested in playing gotcha with the President either. We want to have a bill that has input from both sides so we can accomplish what both of us say we want to accomplish, and that is to hold Iran's feet to the fire.

I want to make sure that the JCPOA—again, which I did not support, but again it is the law—that Iran is complying with everything it is supposed to be doing. And that is where our efforts should be, to make sure that they do that, and then to also make sure that our allies like Israel have the kind of help that they need to maintain their qualitative military edge and to have another memorandum of understanding with the United States that supports Israel. This is what we should be concentrating on, not embarrassing the President or playing gotcha. That doesn't do anything.

Mr. RUSSELL, the gentleman from Oklahoma, did come up to me and ask me if I would cosponsor the bill, but that was after it was already drafted, having no input into the bill. So that is not really a way of being collaborative, if you really want to be collaborative.

I appreciate what the gentleman from Oklahoma says. I don't doubt his sincerity, and he obviously worked very hard on this bill, but many of us have difficulties with it.

We don't have difficulties with the end goal, with what we want to accomplish. We have difficulties by the way this is done. This seems, again, more to us like embarrassing the President, calling him names, than really putting our heads together in a collaborative way and really doing something that will hold Iran's feet to the fire.

So I believe in the old adage that politics should stop at the water's edge when we are talking about foreign affairs. That is why I love the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Our Nation's security and our interests abroad are too important to let partisan politics get in the way. Ninety-nine times out of 100, the Foreign Affairs Committee operates in that spirit, and this bill is an exception to that. I think the lack of input from both sides of the aisle, the lack of time the Foreign Affairs Committee didn't spend working on it, is reflected in the final product. I am not pointing a finger at anybody. Again, I think Mr. RUSSELL is sincere about this. I think we want the same thing.

This bill is deeply flawed. It would force the President to meet an impossible standard on an issue where Congress had already spoken. That is no way to advance our interests abroad. That is no way to hold Iran accountable.

So let's vote down this bill, go back to the drawing board, and come back with bipartisan legislation that would actually help us achieve our aims. I urge a ''no'' vote.

Again, the question here is not whether Iran can be trusted. They cannot. Iran is a bad player. Three people on this side of the aisle who spoke against this bill voted against the JCPOA. So it is not a matter of just trying to rubberstamp what the administration wants or anything like that. No, we don't think that this bill goes in the right direction. We don't want to embarrass the President. We want to work with the President to make sure that Iran's feet are held to the fire.

Again, we had the vote on the Iran deal. I voted no, my friends on that side of the aisle voted no, but we lost. So let's not repeat what we have done with the Affordable Care Act, 62 times again and again and again playing gotcha with the President.

Let's do something that really works. Let's put our heads together to make it work. We can take parts of this bill and put it together into a bipartisan bill. I am not opposed to that. But we have got to do it together. Politics need to stop at the water's edge.

So let's now work together to ensure that Iran is complying with the JCPOA. That would be a positive step forward. Let's hold their feet to the fire. Let's make sure they do what they are supposed to do, because I don't trust them anymore than anybody on that side of the aisle.

So I urge a ''no'' vote. Let's go back to the drawing board. Let's do what the Foreign Affairs Committee is known for doing for the past 3 years under the leadership of Chairman ROYCE and myself. We believe that we are the most bipartisan committee in the Congress. We believe that is the way foreign policy should be created, and I know we can do better. Again, I don't impugn anyone's motives. Let's all put our heads together and let's come up with a bill that we can pass and be proud of.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I appreciate all the Members who have engaged in this debate. As Ranking Member ENGEL noted, this is not usually the place we find ourselves. What we have seen from Iran over the last few months is that the Iranian threat isn't going away. So we will have to keep working together to address the Iranian threat, and I look forward to that continuing collaboration.

As the Iran nuclear agreement gets set for implementation, some 500 specific individuals and companies and several banks are set to get relief for their ties to the nuclear program. This bill simply asks the President to ensure that those receiving this reprieve are not involved in Iran's support for terrorism, nor are they involved in the missile development program that Iran continues to push for intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Soon, maybe in a matter of days, Iran will get access to over $100 billion in frozen oil assets, and this is not going to go to the Iranians on the street. This is not going to go to small business in Iran, to those that despise their government. It is going to go to the regime. It is going to go to the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps.

The reason it would work that way is because that is the entity that nationalized these businesses years ago, after 1979. They are the ones that right now control approximately a quarter of the entire economy, including the major businesses, such as, for example, energy or construction.

If we look at what the U.S. Department of Treasury says about this, they labeled the IRGC as the ''most powerful economic actor'' in the country. So this entity has deep reach into those critical sectors of the economic infrastructure, as the Treasury Department tells us. The IRGC's largest business is its construction arm, which controls 800 affiliated companies and billions of dollars in assets.

These activities, in turn—and here is the problem, here is the nexus of the problem—fund Iran's ballistic missile program. What we had hoped for was, of course, to temper the appetite of the regime to move forward with that ICBM program. Instead what we see is a huge step-up several weeks ago as the President of Iran announced this huge step-up.

Now we see these ICBMs that are being launched and tested. We also see the military activities, the regional aggression, the call for the overthrow of the governments in Yemen, which they actually carried out in Bahrain, and in Saudi Arabia. This is a huge problem because the IRGC are doing this.

Now, during our hearings, Members expressed concerns that there would be no pushback from the administration when it comes to Iran's aggressive behavior. This has, unfortunately, proven correct.

The response to two ballistic missile tests? The administration proposed a few modest sanctions. We were all notified about that. What happened? As soon as Iran pushed back, what happened? The administration pulled them back.

The Iranian President, Hassan Rouhani, ordered his Defense Ministry to accelerate its missile program just weeks after the Obama administration joined with his diplomatic partners to sweep Iran's past illicit nuclear weapons activities under the rug. Again, countries pursue ICBMs for one reason: to deliver a nuclear warhead.

I ask for an ''aye'' vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today, I will vote against H.R. 3662—the most recent attempt to undermine the Iran nuclear agreement. This legislation would explicitly prevent the United States from implementing its obligations under the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA).

We are all concerned about the prospects of a nuclear-armed Iran, given its history and nebulous relationship with the United States. This is why I have consistently supported a diplomatic solution with other world powers, as sanctions do not work when applied by the U.S. alone. The JCPOA is our best path forward to enforce a non-nuclear future for Iran, particularly as we have countries, including China and Russia, join with us.

We're going to need to be diligent. Iran does have a number of internal conflicts and bad actors. The clerics and some members of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard are destructive components within a country whose people have long suffered from the effects of sanctions. There is no indication that destroying this agreement would put us in a better position to prevent Iran from revitalizing its nuclear program. If the agreement falls apart, we can always sanction later. In the meantime, we ought to continue to give diplomacy a chance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 583, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and a result was announced. The vote was subsequently vacated by order of the House, and pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and by order of the House, further proceedings on the question of passage of the bill were postponed to January 26, 2016.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 44 on January 13, 2016, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 44 on January 13, 2016, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 44 on January 13, 2016, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 44, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 44 on January 13, 2016, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 44 on January 13, 2016, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 44. We are at war. My top priority is to keep our families safe. We must hold Iran accountable for financing terrorism. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 44 on January 13, 2016, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 44 on January 13, 2016, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 44 on January 13, 2016, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 44 on January 13, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 44 on January 13th, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 44, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 44, I was unavoidably detained and missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, on January 13, 2016, I regret that I was otherwise detained and unable to cast a vote on rollcall vote No. 44, on passage of H.R. 3662, the Iran Terror Finance Transparency Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 44 on January 13, 2016, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 44, I was unavoidably detained in a constituent meeting. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 44, I was meeting with constituents and was detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 44, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 44, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 44 on January 13, 2016, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 44 on January 13, 2016, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 44, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 44, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 44, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye".

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and was not present for one rollcall vote on Wednesday, January 13, 2016. Had I been present, I would have voted in this manner: Rollcall Vote Number 44—H.R. 3662—"no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote number 44 on January 13, 2016, I was unavoidably detained due to traffic delay. Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 22) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency relating to the definition of "waters of the United States" under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 253, nays 166, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 45]

YEAS—253

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
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
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
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 (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
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)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
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
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—166

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
McCollum
McDermott
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Ashford
Bishop (GA)
Conyers
Dingell
Kennedy
Knight
Lieu, Ted
Matsui
McGovern
Neal
Palazzo
Richmond
Smith (WA)
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1155

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

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 45, on S.J. Res. 22, I missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 13th, I had to return to the district to attend to urgent constituent business related to the Aliso Canyon gas leak. Had I been present for the day's vote series, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall No. 44, the passage of S.J. Res. 22, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency relating to the definition of "waters of the United States" under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; and "yea" on rollcall No. 45, the passage of H.R. 3662 or the Iran Terror Finance Transparency Act.

□ 1200

ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 3442, DEBT MANAGEMENT AND FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 2015

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, today the Rules Committee issued an announcement outlining the amendment process for H.R. 3442, the Debt Management and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2015. An amendment deadline has been set for Thursday, January 21, 2016, at 12:00 p.m. That is also known as noon.

Amendments should be drafted to the text of the bill as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, which is posted on the Rules Committee Web site. Please feel free to contact me or a member of the Rules Committee if we may be of assistance to any Member in their preparations.

VACATING VOTE ON H.R. 3662, IRAN TERROR FINANCE TRANSPARENCY ACT

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which the bill (H.R. 3662) to enhance congressional oversight over the administration of sanctions against certain terrorism financiers, and for other purposes, was passed and the motion to reconsider was laid on the table be vacated and that further proceedings on the question of passage of H.R. 3662 may be postponed through the legislative day of January 26, 2016, as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object—I want to thank the majority leader. I personally, as a former majority leader, appreciate the policy enunciated by the Speaker in turn to accommodate Members' schedules so that we vote on time. But this was an extraordinarily important vote. Large numbers of Members of both sides missed it, and I very much appreciate the majority leader's action and the Speaker's agreement to it to accommodate our Members so that, on this important bill, they will be able to vote on the 26th.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of objection is withdrawn.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings whereby the motion to reconsider was laid on the table and by which the House passed H.R. 3662 are vacated, and further proceedings on the questions of passage of H.R. 3662 are postponed pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the order of the House of today.

ADJOURNMENT FROM WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 13, 2016, TO FRIDAY, JANUARY 15, 2016

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 1 p.m. on Friday, January 15, 2016.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DONOVAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

CONGRATULATING ZIPPY DUVALL, FARM BUREAU FEDERATION'S NEW PRESIDENT

(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, today I join my colleagues in the Georgia delegation, Representative AUSTIN SCOTT and Representative BUDDY CARTER, to recognize Zippy Duvall, the American Farm Bureau Federation's new president.

As a third-generation dairy farmer, who better than Zippy would know what our farmers and agriculture sector need to succeed?

Zippy and his wife, Bonnie, maintain a 300-head beef cow herd, produce quality hay, and have developed a very successful poultry production company, growing out over 75,000 broilers per year.

Zippy formerly served as president of the Georgia Farm Bureau, and will replace president Bob Stall, the national president, who is retiring after 16 years.

Zippy has a passion for agriculture like no other. It is in his blood.

Agriculture is Georgia's number one industry, and we are proud that a great Georgian has filled this national and important role.

As members of the House Committee on Agriculture, we look forward to working with Zippy, and wish him all the best as he begins this new journey in his life.

Congratulations to Zippy and Bonnie Duvall. I know the American Farm Bureau Federation will be served well with Zippy as president.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF THE WOMEN AIRFORCE SERVICE PILOTS

(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 recognize the female pilots who served during World War II, known as the Women Airforce Service Pilots, or the WASPs.

These brave and hardworking female pilots signed up, of their own volition, were trained in over 12,000 aircraft, and stepped up to the plate to fill the shortfall of male pilots.

Despite the fact that the WASPs were merely considered civilians, they served their country, delivering planes overseas in dangerous conditions and helping to train the male pilots for combat.

Thirty-eight of these WASPs died while serving their country, and their patriotic sense of duty is truly inspirational.

Unfortunately, these courageous women have been unjustly denied the honor of burial at the Arlington National Cemetery. Why? Because they were civilians.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 4336, I strongly urge the Secretary of the Army to change its policy and allow these female pilots to be honored at Arlington National Cemetery. It is the moral imperative of our country to honor them.

CONGRATULATING NASA FLIGHT DIRECTOR MARY LAWRENCE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mary Lawrence, a native of Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District, who was named late last year as one of the five new flight directors to manage the operations of the International Space Station from NASA's Mission Control Center in Houston.

Mary grew up in Wattsburg, Erie County, earned a bachelor's degree in mechanical engineering from the Pennsylvania State University's Behrend campus in 2001. Following graduation, she worked for the U.S. Space Alliance, a NASA contractor, before joining NASA in 2007.

As a flight director, Mary will lead teams of flight controllers, research and engineering experts, along with support personnel, in ensuring the crew of the International Space Station have the tools that they need to conduct their important scientific research.

Mr. Speaker, Mary is hoping to be certified as a flight director in a few months, and will then be one of only 27 active flight directors for NASA.

Again, I congratulate Mary, her husband, Andrew, and their entire family on this commendable accomplishment. I wish her the best of luck as her career with NASA continues.

NORTH KOREA SANCTIONS ENFORCEMENT ACT

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

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of North Korea's alleged hydrogen bomb test last week, the House of Representatives yesterday passed the North Korea Sanctions Enforcement Act and sent a strong signal that the United States will not tolerate such hostile behavior.

Yesterday's legislation strengthens and expands our existing sanctions against North Korea, increases our investigations into nefarious activities that support North Korea's weapons programs and human rights abuses, and holds bad actors accountable when they engage with North Korea to launder money, traffic narcotics, or carry out cybersecurity attacks.

I am glad that the final bill includes a measure I proposed stressing the strategic importance of U.S. trilateral cooperation and military intelligence-sharing with Japan and South Korea. The United States will uphold its commitment to Japan and South Korea, protect their security in the face of the North Korean threat, and work to preserve stability in the Asia-Pacific region.

□ 1215

THE WORLD IS NOT SAFE TODAY

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in his State of the Union message, President Obama claimed that America's standing as a world power is greater than when he first took office.

Let's see, Mr. Speaker. Iran just took 10 of our sailors hostage for 24 hours. Iran props up a dictator in Syria who has killed millions of his own citizens. Iran is the world's number one sponsor of terrorism. Iran is currently developing ICBMs and eventually will have nuclear weapons.

Russia invaded Ukraine, a country hungry for freedom. The Ukrainians looked to the United States for leadership, and the United States watched and basically did nothing. The Russians are still in Ukraine.

North Korea has nuclear weapons and ICBMs that can now reach the United States. ISIS and other terrorist groups control more territory and have more money than ever before in history. Last year was one of the deadliest years of terrorist violence on record.

The fact is the world is not safer today. It is not a more stable place than it was 8 years ago. The world is full of dangerous, rogue nations seeking to do harm. Our friends don't trust us, and our enemies scoff at us.

The administration's foreign policy is based on wobbly knees, not strength.

And that is just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING COMBINED INSURANCE COMPANY OF AMERICA IN GLENVIEW, ILLINOIS

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Combined Insurance Company of America in Glenview, Illinois, for receiving an estimable award. GI Jobs magazine announced its Top 100 Military Friendly Employers for 2016, and for the second consecutive year, Combined Insurance was number one.

This is a prestigious honor, as Combined was ranked above 5,000 other organizations in the United States that were considered, and it marks the fifth straight year that they made the Top 100 organizations.

Since 2010, Combined Insurance has hired over 2,500 veterans or those with a military background. Their president, Brad Bennett, has committed to hiring an additional 2,800 more by the end of 2017.

Brad and his leadership team know that servicemembers at any rank offer employers skills such as discipline, independent work ethic, and commitment. They actively recruit from all levels of the military, offering opportunities for former officers and those from the enlisted ranks as well.

In addition to providing meaningful employment to our veterans, Combined also gives back to several veteran charities in both time and resources.

I hope more organizations will emulate Combined Insurance in their unwavering efforts to support our Nation's veterans.

RIGHT TO LIFE

(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, the Declaration of Independence records for posterity the fact that we have been given by our Creator certain unalienable rights. Among these, of course, are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

These rights extend to all persons, even those who are physically with us, but yet unborn. Indeed, life inside a mother versus outside of her is ultimately a matter of geography.

The rights of the unborn must be protected, and I believe we can never speak too strongly for those who cannot speak for themselves. Protecting life must be our top priority.

This debate is more than a simple disagreement about making choices. It is a debate about fundamental, God-given rights, the first of which, of course, is the right to life.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this House, the people's House, has no higher duty than to protect human life, no matter how big or how small it is or where it may be located.

As we approach the 43rd anniversary of Roe v. Wade, I pray for all the families in our Nation who have chosen life and for all the life that we have lost.

IRAN TERROR FINANCE TRANSPARENCY ACT

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

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, it seems we can't go more than a few days without the regime in Tehran once again making the headlines.

From violating U.N. Security Council resolutions to firing rockets dangerously close to one of our aircraft carriers, to detaining our sailors, Iran shows no interest in actually wanting to be part of the international community

What is worse, Mr. Speaker, is that this administration seems all too willing to look the other way, with new sanctions being announced all for the sake of preserving a flawed nuclear agreement.

Later this month the House will consider again the Iran Terror Finance Transparency Act, legislation that, in light of Iran's recent actions, is absolutely necessary.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time for strong American leadership, leadership that stands up to rogue regimes bent on the destruction of America and our allies.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO DR. J.S. STONE OF HOUSTON, TEXAS

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness in my heart that I rise to acknowledge the death of a great leader in our community, Dr. J.S. Stone, a graduate of Talladega College and a graduate of Meharry Medical School, who leaves his beloved wife, Gertrude, a dear friend, and three children.

This was a great leader and a great medical professional, committed to service in our community, serving on many, many boards and sharing his great brilliance with all of us.

He had a residency at Texas MD Anderson and hospitals in Philadelphia and became one of the first African Americans to participate in the Harris County Medical Society and to practice in hospitals that, for the first time, saw an African American doctor, such as St. Joseph, a community hospital that has remained historic in our community.

Again, I want to pay tribute to him for his service in the United States military as captain.

This is the kind of African American leader and a kind of American leader that stood tall, being born in 1930 in the face of segregation, but he never let the ills of the world overcome him. He became a servant of the people—not elected—but he became a servant in medicine and serving them.

I honor him today and express my deepest sympathy to his family, his wife, his children, and to the entire community in Houston, for we have lost a fallen hero. He is a hero.

I say well done, good and faithful servant. May you rest in peace, Dr. J.S. Stone.

PROTECTING FAMILIES FROM CARBON MONOXIDE POISONING

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, every year carbon monoxide kills over 400 people and sends an additional 20,000 people to the emergency room. Carbon monoxide is a colorless, odorless gas, and poisoning from it most often occurs in households with a malfunctioning heat source.

Because of its nature, it can be extremely difficult to detect a carbon monoxide leak. Carbon monoxide detectors, however, are extremely effective in alerting families to a leak and have already saved lives.

I am introducing bipartisan legislation with Congresswoman ANN KUSTER to allow States to apply for grants to purchase and install carbon monoxide detectors in schools, in low-income homes, and, also, senior residences at no cost to the taxpayer.

The grants will also help and train local and State fire officials on the dangers of carbon monoxide and the best methods of prevention because, Mr. Speaker, it is important to educate the public on the risks of carbon monoxide poisoning and what people should do to protect themselves. This is one more way to do so.

OUR SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration has just issued a series of executive actions attempting to limit our Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms.

As the new chairman of the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee, I have been entrusted with the responsibility handed down to us by our Founding Fathers of the power of the purse.

The Department of Justice and the Department of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives have already been put on notice that, if they attempt to interfere with our Second Amendment rights, I have the authority, as chairman, to block their ability to move money within the agency, to block their ability, for example, when they submit a spending plan. That is a very powerful tool of persuasion, not always guaranteed.

The Founding Fathers entrusted the power of the purse to the Congress as a way to give a check and balance to an out-of-control executive.

I don't need a bill. I don't need an amendment. And I don't need any new authority. The Congress has it.

I will execute that authority entrusted to me to protect our Second Amendment rights and to make sure that Americans always have the right to keep and bear arms in defense of our freedom.

If the Obama administration wants access to our hard-earned tax dollars, they are going to have to assure me and the American people that they will not interfere with our constitutional rights.

HONORING KOREAN AMERICAN DAY

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

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, on January 13, 1903, 102 Korean immigrants first arrived in the United States. Today we celebrate Korean American Day and the contributions of our Korean American community. Earlier this week, we had a celebration right here on Capitol Hill, with many of my colleagues joining our local and national community.

When I previously served as the State delegate and now, as a Member of Congress, I have been privileged to work with our Korean American community in northern Virginia and throughout the 10th District through organizations such as the Korean American Association of the Washington Metropolitan Area; the Korean Medical Society; the Korean Women's Chamber of Commerce, which has worked with us tirelessly on battling the human trafficking issue. These are a few of the many organizations that serve in our area.

I have also been privileged to visit with the Korean faith community and attended many cultural festivals, such as the annual KORUS Festival, which I

was honored to chair just last year, and Korean Independence Day, which we celebrate annually in August with our local community—and I know we celebrate it throughout our country—so that we can all unite in our passion for freedom and for the ''One Korea'' cause, something we are all united on.

Near my home in the 10th District is Meadowlark Botanical Gardens, which is home to the Korean Bell Garden, a gift to the community and to our park system from the Korean American Cultural Committee, which serves our whole community as a beautiful symbol of goodwill towards all.

I am proud to be a member of the Korea Caucus, and I appreciate that goodwill and the goodwill that is found throughout our Korean American community. I join with them today in celebrating this anniversary.

STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, having been the location for the State of the Union Address last night, we agree that we care deeply about this country, but there were some things that were said here from this lectern right here, where national and international leaders speak when they are invited to speak here in the House, that I felt needed some deliberation.

It is noteworthy. My late mother, English teacher that she was—if I had given this speech, the first thing she would have harassed me about was that you start the first five paragraphs—and this is the content: I have come, I know, I also, I hope, I will keep, I don't, I want, I want.

My mother would have made big red circles around there and said: Eliminate the first person. It tells people that you care more about yourself. Get rid of that. Quit having so much first person.

Of course, she would have done the same thing toward the end of the speech when we have: I hold, I know, I intend, I can't, I am asking, I see, I will be, I can, I travel, I see, I see, I know, I see, I see, I see, I see, I see, I see, I know, I believe, I stand.

No doubt my late mother would have taken a red pen and said: Son, if you want to give a great speech, quit talking about the first person ''I'' all the time. You have got to eliminate it if you want to give a great speech.

So, Mr. Speaker, since we care deeply about each other in this country, those who are in elected positions, I thought maybe, since the door is not always open to me at the White House—I know that going back to the ObamaCare days when the President said: If you have got better ideas, my door is always open.

I know my office kept trying to get me into that open door. I am sure the President was telling the truth. I am sure his door was open. But there were so many Secret Service agents and staff members between me and that open door, I was not allowed to come present my better ideas on health care.

□ 1230

I still have them. Hopefully, we will get a chance to work those in. Some of the things, PAUL RYAN and I have been on the same page for years; some of them are a little different. TOM PRICE has had some great proposals, MIKE BURGESS. We have a lot of doctors here that have had some great ideas on how to fix it. From that experience, I know that the door is not always open, so this is the format in which I have to point these things out.

When the President said, ''second, how do we make technology work for us and not against us,'' what immediately comes to mind is what many Republicans have been concerned about and some of my Democrat friends have been very concerned about. Don't seem quite as concerned under a Democratic President as they were under President Bush, but, nonetheless, still concerned that the President asked, perhaps rhetorically, how do we make technology work for us.

Mr. Speaker, I would humbly submit that the President has got technology working for the administration pretty well. You have got NSA that has been amazing in their ability to use algorithms and sort through emails. You have got the Federal Government, as we found after the Snowden revelations, after we had been told by both Bush and Obama administration officials that we are not checking people's phone calls, we are not getting that information.

It turned out that, in the FISA court, both administrations had been seeking and getting blanket orders not consistent with the Constitution, which requires specificity. You have to specifically name what it is being searched for and specifically the reason you have for searching it. There is no specificity. They just said: We want every list of everybody's phone call in your phone company. The judge said: Oh, sure, that is specific enough—every single phone call without any reason, just need the information. So you have got emails, you have got phone calls.

Then, of course, under ObamaCare, the Federal Government is going to get to have everybody's medical records. It sounds like crony capitalism involved in having a deal with a private entity to gather everybody's medical records. So you will have the Federal Government and a private company gathering everybody's medical records.

Then we have the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau that, under the guise of trying to protect people from unscrupulous banks, you have the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau say: We want every debit and credit card record of everybody. That way we can watch for unscrupulous banking practices and banks.

Well, that is not the way the Constitution requires things be done. As a judge, if you wanted somebody's bank records, you had to come to a judge like me in a felony case and you had to have probable cause established under oath that there is probable cause to believe a crime was committed, this person committed it, and only then would I sign an order allowing them to get someone's bank records. Not under the CFPB. Under the guise of helping people, they are gathering people's bank records, whether they want them to have them or not. That needs to stop.

The President said: ''We have done all this while cutting our deficits by almost three-quarters.'' The trouble is I remember back in 2006 when Democrats were rightfully and righteously pointing out that with a Republican President, President George W. Bush, and Republicans in control of the House and Senate, they felt it was outrageous that we were going to have a $160 billion deficit, that we would bring in $160 billion less than we would spend.

They were right. We should have had a balanced budget then. We were trying to get there. We were pushing for cuts trying to get there. But they convinced the American public Republicans can't be trusted; they have got you a $160 billion deficit. You put us in charge, and we will cut that to get a balanced budget.

Then we got a Democratic President, a Democratic House, and a Democratic Senate, and what happened? The budget that they gave us created about a $1.6 trillion deficit. So much for the $160 billion that we were lambasted for allowing. They 10-times that right up to $1.6 trillion or so.

People need to understand, when the President says we have cut the deficit by almost three-quarters, when you still haven't gotten back to that $160 billion deficit that we were lambasted for back in 2006, you still have not done an adequate job. We wish that the President and Democrats in the Senate would work better with us so that we can get back more to the kind of budget the Democrats promised Americans back in the fall of 2006.

Then the President said: ''More and more wealth and income is concentrated at the very top.'' I want to applaud the President, Mr. Speaker, for stating the truth. Under his watch, more and more wealth and income has been concentrated at the top. The President has actually admitted on the record a couple years or so ago that it is true that for the first time in American history—it has never happened before under any other President—the first time in American history, under President Obama's watch, 95 percent of all income in America has been reported went to the top 1 percent of income earners in America. Ninety-five percent of the country's income went to the top 1 percent. It never happened before, not under a Republican, not under a Democrat, not under anybody. That has never happened before.

In fact, we feel the middle class shrinking, and it is not in a good way where they are moving up to the rich. They are moving down to the poor, and the poor are getting poorer. It is not because a free market system doesn't work. It is because the government, under this President, blew past the 73- or 74,000-page-per-year record that President Bush finally reached and now is pushing toward 80,000 new pages of regulations every year that business has to live under.

The only chance you have is to be a big investment bank that got us into trouble, that nearly brought down the country, because the regulations of this administration and the push that this administration has had against community banks that did not get us in trouble is about to bring them under. We are losing them constantly, and the big banks are getting bigger and more powerful instead of getting lower to a point where they would not bring down the country as they nearly did previously.

The President says: ''The bipartisan reform of No Child Left Behind was an important start.'' My understanding was he was promising that he would get rid of that. I thought when he got elected, okay, look for the silver lining. He is going to get rid of No Child Left Behind. Hallelujah, that is a good thing. Let's get the control back to the States and the people as the 10th Amendment requires, because education is not an enumerated power. It is reserved to the States and people.

Before the Federal Government got involved, I know in Texas—I have seen the stats—it was nearly 75 percent of all education employees were teachers in Texas. Makes sense. Then that year President Carter started the Department of Education. Now everybody has got to have a massive number of bureaucrats at the State level and at the local level.

You have got to have people at the local school district providing all the data that is being demanded at the State capitol because it is being demanded here in Washington. So we are now about 50 percent of our employees in Texas—about—are teachers. Why 70 to 75 percent down to 50? Because we have a Federal Department of Education. The emphasis is on being bureaucrats, not on education, and we need to get back to that. I sure wish that had been a promise the President had kept.

There are numerous promises and statements made. I am just highlighting some here, Mr. Speaker. But when the President says, ''Nearly 18 million people have gained coverage so far,'' I am not sure where that number is coming from. It may come from the same source that the President used to say: ''Surveys show our standing around the world is higher than when I was elected to this office.''

In both cases, I haven't been able to find any basis whatsoever for either of those statements and would welcome hard, factual evidence, not something they create and make up—it is easy to make things up—but an actual survey. Because I have seen surveys that show that, even though this President was raised as a child in a Muslim country back in Indonesia—he thought that that would get him more respect in Muslim countries—the surveys I have seen show he has less respect in Muslim countries than President Bush did, and that was bad enough. But at least the countries had more respect for President George W. Bush. They knew he was serious and meant business.

Unfortunately, Muslim countries actually believe that they could take—say, just hypothetically, Mr. Speaker—they could take 10 of the U.S. Navy sailors, just take them into custody, and this administration would do nothing, nothing to retaliate or respond. As President Reagan made clear and history showed, you get peace through strength. If you don't get peace through strength, then the only way you get peace is total subjugation to a tyrant.

The President said: ''America is about giving everybody willing to work a chance, a hand up.'' Yet this is the very President that, with executive orders, changed—this administration at least—and violated the existing welfare reform laws because it was a requirement. If you could work, you had to work.

I was thrilled to see a graph that a professor at Harvard had at a seminar up there at Harvard back in 2005. He showed that for 30 years of the welfare system, '65 or '66 to '95 or '96, that single moms' income, when adjusted for inflation, was just flat-lined. Single moms' income was flat-lined. No increase over 30 years and spending trillions of dollars, they were no better off.

Yet, after the welfare reform, after the Republican revolution under Speaker Newt Gingrich, welfare reform required working, if people could. They had a graph that showed that, for the first time since we started having welfare, from '96 through 2005 or through 2004, single moms' income had a sharp increase over that period and was still headed up.

I am not sure if it was still headed up when this President took that requirement away, which no doubt put them back on a flat line again, making them worse off. I am sure it is not intentional that he would make single moms worse off; but when you have the data to show what happens, it is very unfortunate he put single moms back on a path to low income that never increases after adjusted for inflation.

The President said: ''I think there are outdated regulations that need to be changed and there is red tape that needs to be cut. But, after years now of record corporate profits''—that is a problem.

Outdated regulations—I am asking rhetorically, Mr. Speaker. Is that the reason that he has set records with nearly 80,000 pages of new regulations where you have got the founders of some of the biggest businesses in the country saying: With all these regulations pouring out of Washington every year, I could never found the company that I have today. I could never get started today because of these massive, bloated regulations?

□ 1245

Here again, he takes a shot at big banks or Big Oil.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, if you look back at the President's proposal on his American Jobs Act—my American Jobs Act that I filed before his was a lot better, it would have stimulated the economy better—he said he was going to punish Big Oil.

But if you look at the deductions he was eliminating, they were basically deductions that only the smaller, independent oil producers could take, which kept them in business, and that Exxon—the big companies—didn't even take the deductions. They were not eligible to take those that the President was going to eliminate.

Therefore, it was going to put out of business the independent oil and gas producers, which would be a boon to the Big Oil that the President said he didn't like.

He has talked about and railed against the big banks and the fat cats on Wall Street, but it is as if there is a wink and a nod there: I am going to call you names, but I am going to let you make more money than you have ever made in your lives while the rest of those in the country make less money than they have ever made—because, under this President's policies and regulations, that is what happened.

He says that immigrants aren't the reason that wages haven't gone up enough. I hope that we will have a chance to show him the accurate data that show, yes, that is the biggest reason that wages haven't gone up. For all of the jobs that have been created, it looks like the number indicates it is the same number of immigrants that have taken jobs during that time.

The President said that he plans to lift up the many businesses. Mr. Speaker, that is the problem. This President thinks he is the one who lifts businesses or puts them down. It is true that he can destroy businesses, as he has done, but the fact that anyone thinks the government is the one that lifts businesses is at the heart of the problem with this administration, one of many.

The President says that, over the past 7 years, we have nurtured that spirit. He is talking about discoveries in DNA. Yet, with the 70,000 to 80,000 pages of new regulations every year, there is not much spirit there to nurture.

He said that we have protected an open Internet, but he failed to mention that the government took over the Internet. The FCC had said that they were not going to take it over. Then he gave a speech, saying that we were

going to take it over. The next thing you know, they have taken it over.

He says that he is putting JOE in charge of mission control. He is talking about curing cancer. I love the idea that we are going to cure cancer. That would be fantastic. A lot of loved ones I have lost have died of cancer.

Then I heard he was going to put JOE in charge. Then I remembered, Mr. Speaker, wasn't it he that was going to stamp out all waste, fraud, and abuse in the Federal Government, so he was going to put JOE in charge, and we knew it could happen? It seems like he says he is going to put JOE in charge when he may not really be serious about doing anything or having any results. So we will see.

In any event, there are a lot of problems that he failed to address and the fact that he was being mocked by Iran as he was speaking about the higher respect that other countries have. Go back to President Reagan. The radical Islamists had so much more respect for President Reagan. They didn't like him, but they had respect and fear.

Proverbs said: ''Fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom.'' There is a component of fear within respect. They had no fear of Carter, but they had so much fear and respect for Reagan that they released our hostages the day he was sworn in. I am hoping and praying that we get a leader elected who takes office a year from now who has that kind of respect.

He says that, when it comes to every important international issue, people of the world do not look to Beijing or to Moscow to lead—they call us.

I wish the President got more briefings or was able to attend more or got better information if he is not getting this, but we have had a real problem under his Presidency. People have been shocked, including some here in this body—I was not really shocked—when Egypt and some of our Muslim ally nations have done airstrikes.

The big news was they didn't consult Washington, and people in the administration were upset: Why didn't they check with us? I have met with those people. They said: We can't tell this administration, because they will leak it to our enemies. We can't trust them.

For heaven's sake, this administration has declassified information on nuclear weapons, trying to embarrass and harass Israel. They have taken steps to try to prevent Israel from defending themselves.

Is it any wonder that Egyptian President el-Sisi—whom I have tremendous respect for—and other leaders, including Iran and other leaders in the Middle East, when they have got a problem, they don't talk to Washington except for the largest supporter of terrorism, Iran?

Iran knows they can push President Obama around and his administration, John Kerry. They can push them around, and they do. They can take our sailors and not have any consequences. But when they have got a real problem, they go to Moscow, because they know Putin is a man who means business. I don't think he can be trusted. I think he is one of those with whom anything should be verified and that he should be carefully watched.

Some people in this administration think Putin is an anathema and a mystery. They can't figure him out. He is one of the most transparent leaders in the world today. Those of us who know Russian history know you can read him like a book. You can anticipate what he is going to do. He is very transparent.

The President says that, as we focus on destroying ISIL, we don't have a plan. We don't have strategic orders for our military to take out ISIL, but, somehow, he is focused on them. In having been all over north Iraq myself and in having met with Iraqi leaders, especially Kurdish leaders—because they are the military leaders we can trust—I know what they say.

In having just heard another report in September again, we have U.S. military planes flying. They see trucks that are loaded with weapons and supplies for ISIL. We know they are going to ISIL as those are about the only people using some of these roads, with the big trucks.

One of our A–10 pilots said his rules of engagement allowed him to neither crater the road and stop the supplies to ISIL and stop the weapons going to ISIL, nor did he have the authority to take out one of the trucks unless one of the trucks fired at him, and only then could they fire at that truck only. ISIL knows that, so they don't fire at A–10s or at any of our helicopters or aircraft. That is why most of the planes that go out with ordnance come back with most of their ordnance. It is because of this President's rules of engagement.

How else can you explain that, after 7¼ years under Commander in Chief and President George W. Bush, we lost right around 500 precious American military lives in Afghanistan; and then, basically, when we were told the war was over, for 7 years now under Commander in Chief Obama, we have lost three to four times that many people and the peace?

When I talk to people privately—you won't get this in a public meeting but in private meetings with our military—they indicate that it is our rules of engagement: We have to be worried that, if we defend ourselves and live, we will go to Leavenworth for 20 years; so a lot of us would rather die as somewhat of a hero than go home and go to Leavenworth for defending ourselves.

So we have lost three to four times as many under President Obama—in 3 months less time when the war was supposedly over—than we lost during the actual war in Afghanistan. The President says that our foreign policy must be focused on the threat from ISIL and al Qaeda. I agree it must be, but, unfortunately, it isn't at this time.

I will just finish with this, Mr. Speaker. He points out that we also can't try to take over and rebuild every country that falls into crisis. That is not leadership. That is a recipe for a quagmire, spilling American blood and treasure. Ultimately, it weakens us. It is the lesson of Vietnam and of Iraq that we should have learned by now.

Mr. Speaker, SAM JOHNSON—after 7 years in the Hanoi Hilton as a prisoner of war in North Vietnam—was beaten and tortured. If you remember the scenario, Nixon had promised in 1972 to get us out of Vietnam. He calls for the Paris peace negotiations. They start. North Vietnam makes this show about storming out. So Nixon ordered the carpet bombing of Hanoi and North Vietnam for 2 weeks. After 2 weeks of bombing, North Vietnam rushed back to the negotiating table and said: Let's get this done. And there was a peace deal.

As SAM JOHNSON and others were being taken to the bus to be taken to the military plane to leave North Vietnam, he said one of the meanest officers or higher officials there at the prison was laughing and said: You stupid Americans, if you had just bombed us for 1 more week, we would have had to surrender unconditionally.

Mr. Speaker, the lesson of Vietnam is this: If you are going to send American military men and women into harm's way, give them everything they need to win. Let them win, and then bring them home.

That is the lesson of Vietnam that this administration and many others have not learned. That is why, instead of 500 military heroes losing their lives in 7 years in Afghanistan, we have had three to four times that many lose their lives under President Obama. It is because this lesson of Vietnam has not been learned. Give our military what they need to win, and give them rules of engagement and orders to win, and then bring them home.

I hope and pray somebody gets that message in this administration so that we have no more needless loss of life in foreign countries by the heroic, patriotic men and women of our military.

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

□ 1300

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 107

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Wednesday, January 13, 2016, through Tuesday, January 19, 2016, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned

until 2 p.m. on Monday, January 25, 2016, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. (a) The Speaker or his designee, after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the House to reassemble at such place and time as he may designate if, in his opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

(b) After reassembling pursuant to subsection (a), when the House adjourns on a motion offered pursuant to this subsection by its Majority Leader or his designee, the House shall again stand adjourned pursuant to the first section of this concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT FROM WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 13, 2016, TO FRIDAY, JANUARY 15, 2016

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today on a motion offered pursuant to this order, it adjourn to meet at 1 p.m. on Friday, January 15, 2016, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in House Concurrent Resolution 107, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KNIGHT (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of urgent constituent business in the district related to the Aliso Canyon gas leak.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of today, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, January 15, 2016, at 1 p.m., unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 107, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4030. A letter from the Co-Chairs, National Commission on Hunger, transmitting the Commission's report entitled ''Freedom from Hunger: An Achievable Goal for the United States of America'' for 2015, pursuant to Public Law 113-76, div. A, title VII, Sec. 743(a)(3); (128 Stat. 40); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4031. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's notice of final directive — Ski Area Water Clause (RIN: 0596-AD14) received January 11, 2016, 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 Agriculture.

4032. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting draft of proposed legislation entitled the ''Military Justice Act of 2016''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4033. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule — Amendments to the Capital Plan and Stress Test Rules [Regulations Y and YY; Docket No.: R-1517] (RIN: 7100-AE33) received December 30, 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 Financial Services.

4034. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule — Regulatory Capital Rules: Regulatory Capital, Final Rule Demonstrating Application of Common Equity Tier 1 Capital Eligibility Criteria and Excluding Certain Holding Companies from Regulation Q [Docket No.: R-1506] (RIN: 7100-AE27) received January 8, 2016, 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 Financial Services.

4035. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's Report to Congress on Preservation and Promotion of Minority Depository Institutions for 2014, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1463 note; Public Law 101-73, Sec. 367 (as amended by Public Law 111-203, Sec. 367(4)(B)); (124 Stat. 1556); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4036. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Report to Congress on the Social and Economic Conditions of Native Americans: Fiscal Years 2009 — 2012, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2992-1; Public Law 88-452, Sec. 811A (as added by Public Law 102-375, Sec. 822(12)); (106 Stat. 1299); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4037. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Report to Congress on the Prevention and Reduction of Underage Drinking for December 2015, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 290bb-25b(c)(1)(F); Public Law 109-422, Sec. 2; (120 Stat. 2892); ; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4038. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's 2014 Report to Congress on the Comprehensive Community Mental Health Services for Children with Serious Emotional Disturbances, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 290ff(c)(2); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title V, Sec. 565 (as amended by Public Law 106-310, Sec. 3105(c)) (114 Stat. 1175); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4039. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report entitled, ''Report on the Multiagency Collaboration on Unconventional Oil and Gas Research'', for December 2015, in response to the Explanatory Statement on H.R. 83, Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act of 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4040. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Ceiling Fan Light Kits [Docket No.: EERE-2012-BT-STD-0045] (RIN: 1904-AC87) received January 12, 2016, 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 Energy and Commerce.

4041. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Biennial Report to Congress entitled, ''2013 Scientific and Clinical Status of Organ Transplantation'', pursuant to Sec. 376 of the Public Health Service Act, as codified at 42 U.S.C. Sec. 274d; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4042. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Indirect Food Additives: Paper and Paperboard Components [Docket No.: FDA-2015-F-0714] received January 11, 2016, 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 Energy and Commerce.

4043. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Report to Congress on the Poison Help Campaign for Fiscal Year 2014, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 300d-72; ; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4044. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report entitled, ''Assessment of Demand Response and Advanced Metering'', for December 2015, pursuant to Sec. 1252 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4045. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Cote d'Ivoire that was declared in Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4046. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Certification Related to Condition 7(C)(i) of Senate Executive Resolution 75 (1997) Concerning Advice and Consent to the Ratification of the Chemical Weapons Convention; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4047. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Interagency Working Group on U.S. Government-Sponsored International Exchanges and Training FY 2015 Annual Report, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2460(f) and (g); Public Law 87-256, Sec. 112(f) and (g); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4048. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, ''Fiscal Year 2014 Annual Report on Advisory Neighborhood Commissions''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4049. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, ''Advisory Neighborhood Commission Security Fund Annual Financial Report for Fiscal Year 2015''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4050. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the

Board's report, ''Training and Development for the Senior Executive Service: A Necessary Investment'', pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1204(a)(3); Public Law 95-454, Sec. 202(a) (as amended by Public Law 101-12, Sec. 3(a)(7)); (103 Stat. 17); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4051. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's Semiannual Report to Congress for April 1, 2015, through September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); Public Law 95-452, Sec. 5(b); (92 Stat. 1103); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4052. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final specifications — Pacific Island Pelagic Fisheries; 2015 U.S. Territorial Longline Bigeye Tuna Catch Limits for Guam [Docket No.: 150615523-5973-03] (RIN: 0648-XD998) received January 12, 2016, 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 Natural Resources.

4053. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial and Recreational Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions #37 Through #39 [Docket No.: 150316270-5270-01] (RIN: 0648-XE259) received January 12, 2016, 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 Natural Resources.

4054. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Coastal Fisheries Cooperative Management Act Provisions; American Lobster Fishery [Docket No.: 150610515-5999-02] (RIN: 0648-BF16) received January 12, 2016, 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 Natural Resources.

4055. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Commerce in Firearms and Ammunition — Reporting Theft or Loss of Firearms in Transit (2007R-9P) [Docket No.: ATF 40F; AG Order No.: 3607-2016] (RIN: 1140-AA41) received January 12, 2016, 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 the Judiciary.

4056. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting a letter stating that the Administration is in the process of drafting a proposed regulation, for publication, providing names of Social Security beneficiaries to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4057. A letter from the Senior Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazmat Safety Law Division, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Requirements for the Safe Transportation of Bulk Explosives (RRR) [Docket No.: PHMSA-2011-0345-(HM-233D)] (RIN: 2137-AE86) received December 30, 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.

4058. A letter from the Deputy CFO, National Environmental Satellite, Data and Information Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Schedule of Fees for Access to NOAA Environmental Data, Information, and Related Products and Services; Correction [Docket No.: 150202106-5999-03] (RIN: 0648-BE86) received January 11, 2016, 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 Science, Space, and Technology.

4059. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Fiscal Year 2013 Annual Report to Congress on the Child Support Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 652(a)(10); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title IV, Sec. 452 (as amended by Public Law 93-647, Sec. 101(a)); (88 Stat. 2352); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4060. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Report to Congress on the Treatment of Certain Complex Diagnostic Laboratory Tests Demonstration final report, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395l note; Public Law 111-148, Sec. 3113(d); (124 Stat. 422); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 4376. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to require certain disclosures be included on employee pay stubs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. PALMER, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. KNIGHT, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. ISSA, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. YOHO, Mr. HARDY, Mr. COLE, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. LONG, Mr. BRAT, and Mr. ROUZER):

H.R. 4377. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to tax business income on a cash flow basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 4378. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants for treatment of heroin, opioids, cocaine, methamphetamine, 3,4-methylenedioxymethamphetamine (ecstasy), and phencyclidine (PCP) abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 4379. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds to further restrict conduct in relation to firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AMASH (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. MASSIE):

H.R. 4380. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to remove limitations on the ability of certain dual citizens from participating in the Visa Waiver Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 4381. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow members of the Ready Reserve of a reserve component of the Armed Forces to make elective deferrals on the basis of their service to the Ready Reserve and on the basis of their other employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 4382. A bill to amend the Federal Food Donation Act of 2008 to require certain Federal contractors to submit a report on food waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California (for herself and Ms. MCSALLY):

H.R. 4383. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to enhance Department of Homeland Security coordination on how to identify and record information regarding individuals suspected or convicted of human trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GUINTA (for himself and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 4384. A bill to amend the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to preclude certain senior employees of the Veterans Health Administration from receiving bonuses when any employee of such Administration has not met certain wait-time goals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 4385. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act to improve higher education programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 4386. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to make certain improvements in the Federal Pell Grant Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 4387. A bill to establish the Tule Lake National Historic Site in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LOEBSACK (for himself, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KENNEDY, and Ms. MATSUI):

H.R. 4388. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize a primary and behavioral health care integration grant program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL (for himself and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 4389. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to ensure fair returns for Federal onshore oil and gas resources; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM (for herself, Mr. COLE, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 4390. A bill to amend and reform the Johnson-O'Malley Act to award contracts to certain tribal organizations, Indian corporations, school districts, States, and consortia of tribal organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 4391. A bill to amend the Illegal Immigration and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to complete the required 700-mile southwest border fencing by December 31, 2016, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. ROSS (for himself and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia):

H.R. 4392. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require that the Office of Personnel Management submit an annual report to Congress relating to the use of official time by Federal employees; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

H.J. Res. 81. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOHMERT:

H. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. FORBES (for himself, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution affirming the importance of religious freedom as a fundamental human right that is essential to a free society and is protected for all Americans by the text of the Constitution, and recognizing the 230th anniversary of the enactment of the Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HURT of Virginia (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. RICE of South Carolina):

H. Res. 585. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding an Interstate 73 corridor transportation compact; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KNIGHT (for himself, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. CONYERS):

H. Res. 586. A resolution expressing support for designation of the fourth week in May as ''DIPG Awareness Week'' to raise awareness and encourage the research into cures for diffuse intrinsic pontine glioma (DIPG) and pediatric cancers in general; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SWALWELL of California (for himself, Mr. PEARCE, and Mrs. LUMMIS):

H. Res. 587. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to permit absent Members to participate in committee hearings using video conferencing and related technologies and to establish a remote voting system under which absent Members may cast votes in the House on motions to suspend the rules; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. RIGELL):

H. Res. 588. A resolution condemning and censuring President Barack Obama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. MOORE):

H. Res. 589. A resolution establishing the Select Committee on Excessive Use of Police Force; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

169. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, relative to House Enrolled Concurrent Resolution No. 58, 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 Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 4376.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 4377.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 4378.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .

Article I, Section 8; Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 4379.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8. To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. AMASH:

H.R. 4380.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the implied power to repeal laws that exceed its constitutional authority as well as laws within its constitutional authority.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 4381.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Secton 8, Clause 1

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 4382.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 4383.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

''The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 18), which grants Congress the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers.''

By Mr. GUINTA:

H.R. 4384.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 4385.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Aritcle I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 4386.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Clauses 1 and 18 of Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LAMALFA:

H.R. 4387.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constition of the United States.

By Mr. LOEBSACK:

H.R. 4388.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL:

H.R. 4389.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution:

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution:

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution:

The Congress shall have Power * * * To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 4390.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the power ''To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers.''

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 4391.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Sec. 8, Clause 1

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 4392.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the

foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.J. Res. 81.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution, which grants Congress the authority, whenever two thirds of both chambers deem it necessary, to propose amendments to the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 583: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 771: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 775: Mr. YODER.
H.R. 790: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 814: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 997: Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 1057: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 1076: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 1130: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1197: Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 1283: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1301: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 1397: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRAT, and Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 1460: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 1475: Mr. FLEMING.
H.R. 1610: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1769: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia and Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 1779: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 2058: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 2096: Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 2226: Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 2255: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 2278: Mr. ZELDIN and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 2300: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 2302: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 2367: Mr. FARR and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 2378: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 2460: Ms. PLASKETT.
H.R. 2470: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2536: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 2633: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2646: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 2663: Mr. PETERS, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GALLEGO, and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 2694: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 2802: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 2805: Mr. DOLD.
H.R. 2817: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 2894: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 2901: Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 2956: Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 3036: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3065: Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 3119: Mr. JONES, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3222: Mr. BRAT and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 3223: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 3229: Mr. RIBBLE and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 3299: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 3323: Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 3513: Ms. TITUS and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3546: Mr. TROTT, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 3684: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 3713: Mr. TAKAI.
H.R. 3719: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. CARNEY.
H.R. 3765: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 3808: Mrs. BLACK.
H.R. 3846: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 3953: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. JOLLY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 4063: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 4073: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 4084: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 4087: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. ROUZER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 4094: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.
H.R. 4137: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 4179: Mr. SARBANES.
H.R. 4185: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H.R. 4197: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 4218: Mr. BRIDENSTINE and Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 4226: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 4229: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. DENT, and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 4247: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 4262: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.R. 4263: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 4266: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. LEE, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 4278: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 4285: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 4291: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 4333: Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. MENG, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 4336: Mr. RENACCI, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 4342: Mr. PETERS, Ms. MENG, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 4364: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. DENT, and Mr. COLE.
H. Con. Res. 80: Mr. COHEN.
H. Con. Res. 105: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. MULLIN.
H. Res. 110: Mr. MARCHANT.
H. Res. 289: Ms. LEE.
H. Res. 290: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H. Res. 343: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H. Res. 400: Mr. JEFFRIES.
H. Res. 416: Mr. JOLLY.
H. Res. 501: Ms. ESHOO.
H. Res. 551: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. WESTERMAN.
H. Res. 569: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. VARGAS, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H. Res. 571: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.