



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 19, 2015

No. 47

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TIPTON).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 19, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable SCOTT R. TIPTON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Eternal God, thank You for giving us another day.

Send Your Spirit upon the Members of this people's House to encourage them in their official tasks. Especially during this season of budget deliberations, give them wisdom and an accurate understanding of the needs of the citizens of this country, most particularly those with narrow margins in their life options.

Remind us all of the dignity of work, and teach us to use our talents and abilities in ways that are honorable and just and are of benefit to those we serve.

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

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on

agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania 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.

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 17, 2015.

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

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: I hereby resign as the representative of the 18th Congressional District of Illinois, effective March 31, 2015.

Respectfully,

AARON SCHOCK,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 17, 2015.

Hon. BRUCE V. RAUNER,
*Governor, State of Illinois,
State House, Springfield, IL.*

DEAR GOVERNOR RAUNER: I hereby resign as the representative of the 18th Congressional District of Illinois, effective March 31, 2015.

Respectfully,

AARON SCHOCK,
Member of Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 5 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

THE CLEAN AIR, STRONG ECONOMIES ACT

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, EPA has proposed a new lower standard for ozone—smog—before America has finished her work on the current standard. We have made important gains in air quality, but this latest draft is so low that most of America will be out of compliance.

Under current law, EPA can't even consider whether we have the technology to achieve the new low standard. EPA says that half the work to meet this new rule will come from technology that doesn't yet exist. This rule will mean lost jobs and lost opportunities.

This week, the gentleman from Ohio, BOB LATTA, and I reintroduced H.R. 1388, the Clean Air, Strong Economies Act. Our bill requires EPA to protect health and consider whether a rule can be met.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to help us balance clean air with a strong economy by supporting H.R. 1388.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H1773

HAPPY 105TH BIRTHDAY TO
BERTEL VAN EEK

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, 105 years ago, in a small town in Germany, Bertel Van Eek was born.

Her 105 years on this Earth have been a testament to the greatness of the United States. She has seen so much. Living in Holland during World War II, she saw the capability and bravery of our military and its members.

She personally lived our Nation's immigrant story, coming to America after the war with \$20 and the clothes on her back and eventually becoming an American citizen.

As someone whose spouse died 34 years ago, she has been able to live with dignity because of two of the greatest public policies in the history of this country, Medicare and Social Security.

She has seen the power of the American education system, watching her daughter and son-in-law become teachers and seeing three grandsons, who love her very much, also pursue educational opportunities so they could follow their dreams. Mr. Speaker, she even saw her youngest grandson get the honor of serving his community in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, let me close by saying to Bertel Van Eek, my grandma, happy 105th birthday, Oma. We love you very much.

THE MEDICAL EVALUATION PARITY FOR SERVICEMEMBERS ACT

(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, today, along with the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman TIM RYAN, I am introducing the Medical Evaluation Parity for Servicemembers Act.

This legislation, which has strong bipartisan support and the support of a large number of military and mental health advocacy groups, will help the military identify behavioral health issues and improve suicide prevention by instituting a mental health assessment for all incoming military recruits.

A recent Army study confirmed the need to address mental health issues in a timely manner, finding that "nearly one in five Army soldiers enter the service with a psychiatric disorder, and nearly half of all soldiers who tried suicide first attempted it before enlisting."

Our military makes sure that every servicemember is physically fit for duty, and this legislation will ensure that they are also mentally fit. Furthermore, it will ensure that we have a better baseline against which to measure any potential mental harm that may have occurred during their duty.

These brave men and women put their lives on the line every day in the service of our Nation, and it is our duty to offer everything in our power to guarantee they return home safely, both physically and mentally.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, bipartisan legislation.

TWO ISSUES OF JUSTICE

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I speak on two issues of justice. One deals with my alma mater, the University of Virginia. And I would like to thank the young man, the student who experienced an unfortunate incident that caused him to have 10 stitches and to bleed on the streets of Charlottesville by the hands of those who were enforcing the law. I want to join him by saying that we all should be treated with human dignity, and I thank the Governor of the State of Virginia for a full investigation. We have to find a way to balance law and order with the dignity of the treatment of African Americans and all people.

I will also say that the hostage-taking of the Attorney General nominee by those who will not push for her confirmation on the floor of the Senate, of the other body, is not the handling of the Constitution and the advice and consent that is necessary in the process of government.

She is qualified. She is ready to serve. The Nation needs a chief law enforcement officer. We must come together and find that balance that the Constitution protects, and that is the right of all people to access and freedom of speech. But we must also respect law and order. We have to find a way to walk that pathway together.

ELECTRICITY FOR RURAL HAITI

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

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize three of my constituents from Owenton, Kentucky: Matthew Everett Greenlee, Mark Allen Greene, and Robert Wayne VonBokern. These three outstanding power linemen from Owen Electric Cooperative recently volunteered for a project in Haiti that, when completed, will provide safe, affordable, and reliable power to 1,600 consumers.

The goal of the project is to build a distribution system that will connect three towns in Haiti and establish its first electric cooperative, the Cooperative Electrique de l'Arrondissement des Coteaux.

My constituents upgraded and installed new lines and service drops in the town of Roche-a-Bateaux. They also trained locally hired linemen in proper construction methods, pole

climbing techniques, and proper handline use, and important safety practices.

Electricity is essential to the quality of life for those in Haiti's rural communities. It assists in the provision of clean water, health care, education, and general economic opportunity. Therefore, I salute my constituents for contributing their time and efforts in Haiti on this critical project.

GOP BUDGET MAKES IT HARDER FOR FAMILIES TO GET AHEAD

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

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose this irresponsible and dishonest budget recently proposed by the House Budget Committee Republicans. Under this budget's grossly misguided priorities, people at the top continue to get richer while hardworking American families fall further behind.

Last fall, at election time, congressional Republicans said they understood the pressures that American families were feeling, and they promised to help hardworking Americans. But this Republican budget would squeeze hardworking Americans even harder in countless ways, making it harder to pay for college, making it harder to pay for their health care, making it harder to ensure a secure retirement.

This budget would eliminate health care coverage for tens of millions of Americans, cut nondefense government programs, from transportation to research to education, and make more than \$1 trillion in unspecified cuts in Federal entitlement programs.

This House Republican budget would make life a lot harder for hardworking American families like the ones I represent in western Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this is a budget that needs not to pass.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET

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

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity to speak about values, the values that we have as Americans, the values that we hold dear. The fact that someone can work their entire life and finally make it to retirement and be able to live out their golden years with dignity is something that this budget denies.

The idea that an American child could be born in this great country and have an opportunity to go to a college or university and become whatever they want to be—maybe an astronaut, maybe an engineer, maybe even a politician—but without an education, every single one of those dreams is tougher and harder than ever before.

The budget that has been proposed by the Republicans in this House denies

dreams, denies food, denies health care to seniors; and many more disasters are in this budget. This budget denies an opportunity for children to get an education.

If you were born with a silver spoon in your mouth, this budget is for you—extending tax loopholes into perpetuity but denying and condemning children away from education, seniors away from food and health care.

This budget doesn't deserve one vote. This budget deserves to be reworked, to carry the values that we hold dear in this country.

□ 0915

PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 114TH CONGRESS, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 8, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 152 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 152

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 132) providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution, as amended, to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration; and (2) one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 8) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce; and (2) one motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman

from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 152 provides for a closed rule providing for consideration of S.J. Res. 8, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board, and a closed rule for consideration of H. Res. 132, providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the 114th Congress.

Across the Capitol, the United States Senate took positive action on March 4 when it passed a resolution, S.J. Res. 8, invoking the Congressional Review Act to overturn the National Labor Relations Board's recent ambush election rule. On that same day, my colleagues and I at the Committee on Education and the Workforce Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions held a hearing on legislation I strongly supported and cosponsored, H.J. Res. 29, which is identical legislation to that which will come before the House today.

The National Labor Relations Board's ambush election rule is just the latest of its outrageous actions taken in defiance of longstanding precedent, jeopardizing employee free choice and privacy and employer free speech. This rule would give workers as few as 11 days to consider a consequential decision before voting for or against joining a union, prevent employers from having adequate time to prepare for union elections, and postpone critical questions over the election, such as voter eligibility, until after the election.

While providing little consideration of the longstanding rights of employees and employers, the rule further violates their privacy by ensuring that workers' personal information such as email addresses, work schedules, phone numbers, and home addresses are provided to union leaders.

There is a myriad of consequences to this harmful regulation, including constraining the rights of workers to make informed decisions, severely hampering employers' rights to speak to their employees during union organizing campaigns, and weakening privacy rights of workers.

These consequences will seriously impact the relationship of workers and employers and upend a carefully crafted process for organizing elections. These precedents have arisen over decades of practice within existing rules and should not be upended by hyperpartisan bureaucrats to the ben-

efit of national unions at the expense of hardworking Americans.

H. Res. 152 also provides for consideration of H. Res. 132, the committee funding resolution for the 114th Congress. Since taking the majority, House Republicans have been careful stewards of taxpayer dollars, streamlining House operations and saving funds wherever possible. In fact, this Congress, the House remains below the amount authorized in 2008.

This bipartisan resolution will allow our committees to continue their vital work on behalf of this institution, including legislative reforms and oversight with additional investigations and field hearings.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying resolutions, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 8, the resolution to overturn the National Labor Relations Board's election rule.

The other bill I support, H. Res. 132, which provides for the expenses of the committees of the House. The House Committee on Administration's bipartisan work should be commended because, as we all know, committees that we individual Members of the House are members of play a very important role in the work we do every day.

Now, I think it is unfortunate that this bipartisan bill has been packaged with a partisan bill to repeal important, commonsense reforms that were done at the National Labor Relations Board, and they have been wrapped up with a controversial bill.

The NLRB's function, as you know, is both to investigate and prosecute unfair labor practices and to provide a legal framework for employees and employers where employees may be seeking to organize in their workplaces for better wages and working conditions. Both of those functions are required of them by the National Labor Relations Act, which has been in place since 1935.

The work that the NLRB is doing is important. It is precisely what is required by the National Labor Relations Act. Holding a vote on this resolution will get in the way of the NLRB's pursuing its mandate successfully. Instead of focusing on important issues like shrinking the wage gap and growing the middle class, instead, the Republicans are spinning their wheels to score points by going after the National Labor Relations Board and commonsense reforms to make it function more effectively.

The President has already released a statement vowing to veto this resolution, so it is another example of spinning our wheels. It is obvious that neither the Senate nor the House will have enough votes to override this

veto, so I ask simply: Why are we wasting our time on this misguided legislation when there are plenty of challenges that our country faces, whether it is balancing the budget, growing the middle class, or dealing with use of force abroad? Instead, we are discussing legislation which won't become law. While we are 3 months into this Congress, I can't even count the amount of hours we have spent on the floor discussing legislation that, as everybody knows, won't become law because we have a President in the White House who said he will veto it.

Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation uses the Congressional Review Act, which is a rare legislative tool that allows the majority to rush through legislation with little debate. In the Senate, normal rules of debate and cloture are not even required, but it does require the President's signature.

Now, keep in mind, the Congressional Review Act is used to undo rules that have been promulgated by the executive branch through the Executive Office. So why would a President sign something that undoes his own rules? He simply wouldn't have made those rules in the first place if he didn't want them done.

So here we are, without two-thirds of this body, going through these motions on something that we know isn't going to become law. The Congressional Review Act has only been used once to overturn a rule in the entire history of the United States and is there for emergencies. This bill is far from an emergency. Instead, it is packaged with a closed rule—an extreme and unnecessary procedural action—rather than allowing for amendment and discussion of ideas from both sides of the aisle.

This resolution would overturn the new and improved election rules at the NLRB which are simply modernizing an antiquated system. The current rules were done before email existed, as an example. And we talk about how important privacy is; we are only talking about email addresses that the employer has. So if employers can use them to lobby their employees one way or the other in a vote, the organizing campaign should also be able to use those same email addresses. If neither side has access to them, that is fine; but if one side has access to them in an election, the other side needs to have access under similar terms.

We in this body have a responsibility to protect workers' rights and to provide employers with predictability and an expeditious processing of organizing requests in the workplace. Under the current archaic rules prior to this change, it was far too easy for bad actors to endlessly delay workplace elections.

In our committee that Dr. Foxx and I serve on, we got to hear the testimony of a nurse from California who had engaged in an effort in her workplace to organize the nurses that had been delayed time and time again,

more than a year before a vote was finally held. Oftentimes, if a year or 2 or 3 go by, there might be different employees, people come and go, the groups of employees change, and often some of these involved in the organizing are subsequently fired. Employers are able to do this by appealing time and time again on issues that have no bearing on the election simply to delay, delay, delay.

The modest, commonsense reforms of the election rules truly go a long way in balancing the system and making it work more efficiently. They are standardized practices that are already common through many parts of the country to allow workers to make their own decisions without manipulations, threats, or intimidation from either party.

Under current rules, what happens all too often is employers continuously appeal an election with unwarranted litigation so they have time to threaten, coerce, and, far too often, fire workers. By the time the election occurs, workers have moved on, voluntarily or involuntarily, to other jobs or have been threatened so many times they feel they have been forced to vote "no."

There is a proven direct and causal relationship between the length of time it takes to hold an election and illegal employer conduct. In other words, bad actors stall the election process and use the system they have to do whatever it takes to win the election. There are hundreds of examples of unscrupulous actors using the current system in this way.

The nurse that I mentioned earlier decided that she and her coworkers wanted a better workplace environment and began to organize, but the employer delayed the action multiple times so they had time to threaten the workers via text and email. They even held mandatory meetings with employees to threaten and coerce them into voting against organizing. They even did this under the guise of education. In the end, the nurses were too scared to form a union.

Another unfortunate, but telling, example we talked about in committee is a Mercedes-Benz dealership that delayed and stalled an election at every opportunity. The entire process wound up lasting 428 days. With the new rule, the process would have taken 141 days. What I can't understand is how some people think that 428 days is reasonable and that somehow 141 days is an ambush election. I think 428 days for a union election is inexcusable. It is harmful to our families and the economy and harmful to the businesses, the lack of predictability that that brings.

The average resolution for an election is 38 days. And we are not dealing with the average here; we are dealing with the outliers. One in 10 election cases are still unresolved after 100 days. There is no excuse for that. It is unthinkable. It is these 10 percent of employers and organizing efforts that

this election will impact. The other 90 percent work well. The current NLRB processes work well. We don't need to change their methods.

I keep hearing arguments that employees are losing the rights to privacy, but I want to address these points because they are completely false.

The companies have work schedules, email addresses, and phone numbers. They often use these to threaten and coerce employees at all hours of the day and night. Those who are organizing already have access to home addresses, but that is all they have. Without work schedules, they might show up when an employee is sleeping or when they are not home. This new rule provides the same information to employers and organizers. If you ask me, a home address—which they already have—is far more intrusive than an email or phone number, and I think that these reforms will, therefore, further the privacy of workers.

The rules simply modernize the disclosure requirements, because the last time they were updated people didn't have cell phones and emails. All they had were home addresses, which is why the union organizers currently have access to home addresses.

Employers also indicate that they might be surprised by an election. The timeline the employers are referring to of 11 days is essentially impossible in the real world. Moreover, in essentially every case, the employer is fully aware that organizing is occurring long before the petition is filed. Under the new rule, employers will have plenty of time to make their cases, and employees will have plenty of time to make an informed decision.

It is important to note that if the resolution were to actually pass and somehow be signed by the President—which it won't be—it would forever prohibit the NLRB or any agency from enacting a substantially similar rule.

□ 0930

That means the simple modernization efforts that I hope we could all agree upon, such as allowing parties to file election documents electronically, as this rule does, will be forever off the table, forcing both businesses and workers to use an antiquated and costly system.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I oppose the rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

My colleague from Colorado knows very well that the House is doing its work and focusing on the things that are important to hardworking Americans. Just this week, we are holding 81 hearings here in the House in various committees. That is definitely doing our work. We are here on the floor today looking at a very important piece of work and overriding this onerous rule. That is not a waste of time.

Mr. Speaker, the National Labor Relations Board has been attempting for

years to tip the scales toward union organizers, and last December, it was finally able to accomplish one of its major goals with approval of this ambush election rule.

The two Board members who descended from the decision were clear about the rule's primary purpose: enabling initial union representation elections to occur as soon as possible. This rule will shorten the length of time in which such an election is held from the current median of 38 days to as little as 11 days.

The Board's decision was broad and unprecedented, overturning decades of practice in labor laws and skewing elections in favor of unions. One of its most outrageous provisions is postponing decisions about who is eligible to participate in an election to after the election.

One of the most fundamental principles of a fair election is ensuring only those eligible to vote to have the ability to vote, maintaining the value of each voter's individual vote. That basic democratic protection would be shattered by this rule. It may also lead to more union representation elections being set aside and new elections being ordered.

Glenn Taubman characterized the consequences of this ambush election rule very fittingly in testimony before our Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, saying:

It is akin to a mayoral election in which it is unknown, either before or after the election, whether up to 20 percent of the potential voters are inside or outside the city limits.

The rule will also require a new mandatory poster be placed in the workplace within 2 business days of receiving a petition for election, the content of which will be determined by the National Labor Relations Board.

Employers are also provided only 8 days to find experienced representation before facing a hearing and must file an in-depth statement of position within only 7 days of receiving a petition for election.

Companies of any size—and, in particular, small businesses—frequently do not have in-house counsel and are not prepared at the drop of a hat to respond to complex, consequential legal situations.

A provision with a serious impact on employee privacy is the access provided to unions of additional contact information, including every employee's name, address, personal phone number, and personal email address, which must be provided within 2 days of an election order without any option to opt out.

Important review procedures would be set aside by this rule as well, including the opportunity for review of decisions made prior to the election by the Board itself. The Board's requirement for review of postelection disputes would be made discretionary for the first time as well, limiting oversight.

This flawed decision is currently facing litigation from the private sector

as well, with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and other trade associations filing a lawsuit to block its implementation as a violation of the National Labor Relations Act, Administrative Procedure Act, and employers' rights.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Export-Import Bank ensures that American businesses remain competitive in foreign markets, and reauthorizing it would create certainty for business across this country and is fully permissible under WTO rules.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to allow for consideration of legislation which would reauthorize the Export-Import Bank for 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, to discuss our proposal, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK).

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I, indeed, rise to oppose the request for a previous question in order that we might get on with the task of deliberating on reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

Just to remind people, the Export-Import Bank provides loans or loan guarantees to the foreign purchasers of American-made goods and services—American-made goods and services.

This venerated institution has been around for 80-some years, it has been enthusiastically supported by every single President since; Democratic and Republican, liberal and conservative, all have supported reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

This federally chartered Bank disappears in 103 days if we do not act. If the House continues to refuse to place it before the committee of jurisdiction for a hearing, refuses to place it before the committee of jurisdiction for a markup, refuses to consider it on this floor, the Bank will disappear in 103 days.

The problem is that is not when the damage is done. The damage is already beginning because of the cloud of uncertainty that hangs over the Export-Import Bank. Air Tractor, a company in Texas, which manufactures airplanes for use in firefighting and agriculture, lost a multimillion dollar order to Africa because they were told: We don't know if the Bank will be around.

Last year, FirmGreen, a California-based firm that was founded by a wounded Vietnam veteran, lost a multimillion dollar deal overseas because they were told there is too much uncertainty, there is too big a cloud of uncertainty hanging over the Export-Import Bank.

Ladies and gentlemen in the House, I don't know what to say, I don't know what to say to Terry and Stacie Cochran, the owners of a business in eastern Washington that have grown their

business from one-third based on exports to two-thirds based on exports as a consequence of their relationship with the Export-Import Bank. I don't know what I would say to Terry and Stacie if this cloud of uncertainty continues to hang and the Bank goes away.

I don't know what to say to STAC, a business located in my district in Sumner, Washington, an idea in a gentleman's head—also, by the way, a veteran—who formed a business to sell adhesives into the marketplace that now employs 8 or 10 people with a significant export business. Why? Because of the Export-Import Bank.

I don't know what to say to Manhasset, of all places in Yakima, Washington, one of the world's leading music stand manufacturers. Indeed, 90 percent of the transactions, approximately, of the Export-Import Bank are for small businesses.

The damage is being done now in the absence of action and the failure of this House to take up this issue. The real damage is long term, and it is significant, and it is material.

I talked the other day on the floor about the fact that commercial airlines is basically a manufacturing duopoly. We all know that. One is based in France. It is Airbus.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. HECK of Washington. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Airplane manufacturing currently is a duopoly, a French-based business and an American-based business, which I want to remind people is the heart and soul of engineering manufacturing in this country, it is the heart and soul of it.

It is not going to remain the case, in any event, because, as we all know—and if we don't, we should—China is right now in the process of developing a wide-body commercial aircraft for entry into the world marketplace. I think it is tentatively named the C919.

China's export credit authority, which I remind the Chamber every other developed nation on the Earth has, is multiple in size of America's export credit authority, the Export-Import Bank. They are literally—not figuratively—they are literally sitting over there, rubbing their hands in glee, waiting for this Chamber to refuse to act because when their airplane comes online in 2 to 8 years, they are going to jump into this market like there is no tomorrow.

The damage to the heart and soul of our manufacturing sector cannot be exaggerated; indeed, to remind you, every advanced economy on the face of the planet has an export credit authority, and if we allow ours to expire, it is tantamount to unilateral disarmament.

An amazing array of groups support this. Everybody from—yes, believe it or not—the Sierra Club, to the Chamber

of Commerce, to the International Association of Machinists, to the National Association of Manufacturers. Everyone supports our bill; yet we dither.

In summary, to repeat, the Export-Import Bank is a job-creating machine, 1.2 million jobs in the last 5 years. The Export-Import Bank is a deficit-reducing machine, \$6.9 billion to reduce our deficit. It doesn't cost us anything. There are no Federal taxpayer dollars involved. It is a superperforming agency. It creates jobs; it reduces our deficit—and significantly—and it goes away in 103 days if this Chamber fails to act.

I oppose the demand for the previous question so that we might get on with the business of strengthening America's economy.

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

The word "venerated" is usually reserved for clerics and not government agencies. Such an attitude borders on worship of government agencies, and I doubt very seriously that the majority of hardworking Americans agree with that attitude.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), my distinguished colleague.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I hope you are feeling better soon, also.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of both the rule and Senate Joint Resolution 8, which would overturn the National Labor Relations Board's ambush elections rule. I was proud to join my friend, Chairman JOHN KLINE, in introducing the House version of this resolution.

We are here today because the Obama administration is trying to fix a problem that does not exist, claiming that expediting elections on whether to form a union is needed because of delays in the process and supposed unfair advantages to employers.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that I grew up in a union household. My father worked for B.F. Goodrich Company. He was a longtime union member after World War II. I have seen many things that the unions have done that have been good. Unions are legal in America. Employees have a right to hear all the information. They can decide whether they want to be in a union or not be in a union.

There is no big hurry. Look, the National Labor Relations Board—and this is March Madness, so I will use a basketball metaphor. I played basketball, and other people do; you expect the referees to just be a fair arbiter of the game. When you go in someone else's home court, you expect to get a fair call.

□ 0945

That is all we expect the NLRB to do, and that is not what is happening now. Here are the facts.

In reality, under the current procedures, 94 percent of elections are held

within 56 days. The median is 38 days from a petition's being filed. Furthermore, unions won 60 percent of those elections, so they win more than half—or two-thirds, I should say. Given the importance and consequences of the decisionmaking being made by workers, this is an entirely reasonable period of time.

Under the NLRB's radical new policy, union elections could be held, Mr. Speaker, in as little as 11 days after a petition is filed. As an employer myself of not a large business, I don't know if I could find a labor attorney in 11 days to go through this very complicated legal issue. This is not nearly enough time for employers to present their side to employees or for those employees to make an informed decision. Unfortunately, for workers, the NLRB rule doesn't stop here.

Of grave concern to me is the threat posed to workers' privacy. Currently, employers are required to turn over a list of employees and their home addresses to union organizers within 7 days after an election is ordered. So you have a week. The ambush election rule, instead, would open the door for greater harassment and intimidation by requiring employers to turn over each employee's name, address, phone number, email address—all within 2 days of an election order.

It is for this reason that I introduced the Employee Privacy Protection Act in the last Congress. This bill would have required only the names of the employees and one piece of contact information of the employee's choosing. The employee gets to decide how he is contacted and to have that be provided to union organizers. I think that is very reasonable. This will allow communications to happen but on the workers' terms.

Choosing whether to be represented by a union is a big decision with ramifications in the workplace and at home. Instead of ensuring a fair process for unions, employers, and workers, this NLRB is trying to rig the game in favor of union bosses, and that is not fair to workers or to employees.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the resolution.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Thank you, Mr. POLIS.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question because I believe that it is imperative that we have an opportunity to present a piece of legislation that will have a tremendous impact on our economy.

I believe that H.R. 1031, Promoting U.S. Jobs through Exports Act, is an important piece of legislation, and I am in complete agreement with my colleagues who have indicated that this piece of legislation has not received a fair hearing. It has not received a markup in the Financial Services Committee, and it has not been afforded an opportunity to come to the floor.

One of the ways that we can eliminate things here in Congress is by not acting on them at all. It appears that this piece of legislation is destined not to be acted upon; thereby, the elimination of the Export-Import Bank will take place. This is unfortunate.

I believe that, when there are things that you would like to say that are being said better by others, it is better to let them say them. I would like to just quote a few things from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce with reference to the Ex-Im Bank.

The Chamber indicates: "Failure to reauthorize Ex-Im would put at risk more than 150,000 American jobs at 3,000 companies." That is significant.

The Chamber goes on to talk about the spinoffs—the other jobs—that will be impacted by virtue of the 150,000 jobs that will be put at risk: "Tens of thousands of smaller companies that supply goods and services to large exporters also benefit from Ex-Im's activities," meaning that these companies too will suffer, and these are additional workers who will suffer.

The Chamber indicates: "Other countries are providing approximately 18 times more export credit assistance to their exporters than Ex-Im did to U.S. exporters last year."

It goes on to read: "If Congress fails to reauthorize Ex-Im, the United States would become the only major trading nation without such a bank, putting American exporters at a unique disadvantage in tough global markets."

Now, that is the United States Chamber of Commerce. I think this is a source that many of my colleagues on the other side would rely upon.

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

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am also here to say that the State of Texas, which is the largest State that deals in exports—the top exporting State, accounting for approximately 18 percent of the national exports—would be hurt. In Texas, we have approximately 1,630 exporters that utilize the Export-Import Bank. In my district, 46 small businesses are using the Export-Import Bank, and 14 of these are minority-owned while five are owned by women. The bank is making a difference.

In Texas, we have a saying: "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." It ain't broke. We are trying to fix it, and we are doing it by eliminating an entity that is making a difference for our economy.

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

The history of this regulation is as sordid as most of the NLRB's actions have been over the past few years.

The Board initially attempted to promulgate this regulation in 2011 without a legitimate quorum and saw its decision struck down by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

That court decision was upheld by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

After rescinding its initial attempt at imposing an ambush election rule, the Board, now back to its full strength after threats by Senate Democrats to exercise the nuclear option to spark filibuster reform, reintroduced the ambush election rule in February of last year. Today, we face the consequences of that effort.

Those efforts are not the only objectionable actions of the National Labor Relations Board in recent years. Last year, I sent a letter, with several of my colleagues, opposing the NLRB general counsel's efforts to deem franchisers joint employers with their franchisees. That determination could have profound consequences for the over 8 million Americans who go to work at our country's over 750,000 franchise businesses.

The NLRB also purported to be able to instruct private businesses as to where they could invest, telling The Boeing Company in 2011 that it could not operate a factory in South Carolina it had already built. Our Federal Government has far too much power, but, thankfully, it does not yet have the power to tell businesses where they can and can't expand. The Board was forced to withdraw its complaint in that instance.

The NLRB regulation that we will address today on the floor is just another in a long line of objectionable actions that the Board has taken since President Obama's appointees have taken office. There is no reason to believe that their approach to the law will change, but our step today to invoke the Congressional Review Act is merely another sign of our willingness to exercise oversight tirelessly into the Board's actions. We will continue to be vigilant on behalf of workers and their employers.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK).

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, Mr. GREEN's repeated reference to the United States Chamber of Commerce's point of view prompted me to believe that entering their actual words, that of the Chamber's, into the RECORD would be a constructive addition to this debate. So I read from their letter:

"Failure to reauthorize Ex-Im would put at risk more than 150,000 American jobs at 3,000 companies that depend on the Bank to be able to compete in global markets. Ex-Im is especially important to small- and medium-size businesses, which account for more than 85 percent of Ex-Im's transactions. Tens of thousands of smaller companies that supply goods and services to large exporters also benefit from Ex-Im's activities.

"Other countries are providing approximately 18 times more export cred-

it assistance to their exporters than Ex-Im did to U.S. exporters last year."

Further, the "reauthorization of Ex-Im would benefit taxpayers by reducing the deficit by hundreds of millions of dollars. Far from being a subsidy, Ex-Im has generated \$2.7 billion for taxpayers in the last six years, mostly through fees collected from foreign customers. Eliminating Ex-Im would increase the U.S. budget deficit."

I am going to repeat that. "Eliminating Ex-Im would increase the U.S. budget deficit."

"Ex-Im's overall active default rate hovers below one-quarter of one percent, a default rate lower than commercial banks.

"The U.S. Chamber, the world's largest business federation representing the interests of more than three million businesses of all sizes, sectors, and regions, as well as state and local chambers and industry associations, and dedicated to promoting, protecting, and defending America's free enterprise system, urges the House to pass long-term Ex-Im reauthorization as expeditiously as possible."

Those are verbatim words from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's position on the long-term reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. Why? Because they know that the failure to do so 103 days from now will materially damage the U.S. economy and will reduce the numbers of jobs. I urge you to support the long-term reauthorization of the Ex-Im.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close if my colleague from Colorado is also prepared.

Mr. POLIS. If somebody else shows up, I might yield to him; but with that understanding, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about the Export-Import Bank and what they do and why it is so important.

First of all, there are a lot of forms of subsidization that are not permitted under trade rules or the WTO. However, there are certain safe harbors for things that are allowed, and all of our major trading partners have something like an Export-Import Bank.

What it does is it helps to effectively finance our exports. When we have somebody who wants to buy products from an American company in another country, rather than have that company, itself, have to collect that overseas debt, effectively, that debt is transferred to this pseudopublic entity, the Export-Import Bank, and that, effectively, becomes the collection agent overseas for that debt. It, effectively, allows our exporters to get their payments up front to outsource any risk of no payment occurring. In fact, the U.S. Export Agency is in a better position to collect those debts because people will see them abroad as an entity of the U.S. Government. It works out well, as it is profitable; it is supported by the business community; and it is fully permissible under trade rules.

If we fail to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, we are, effectively, stabbing ourselves in the foot. We are hurting our own export economy. Do we think for 1 minute that other countries are going to stop engaging in similar allowable trade practices that benefit their own manufacturing industries? No, of course not. People across the world are going to scratch their heads just as they do when our own Congress shuts down our government, just as they do when Members of our own Congress undermine our own President diplomatically. They ask: What are the Americans doing? They are doing this to themselves. They are hurting their own exports, and they are hurting their own manufacturing.

That is exactly why I hope that we do defeat the previous question and come forward with a clean Export-Import Bank reauthorization, which I am confident would overwhelmingly pass here on the floor of the House.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, what this discussion really comes down to with regard to the NLRB is whether or not bad actors should continue to get away with abusing an antiquated system for their own advantage.

I truly believe—and I hope my colleagues do, too—that employers and employees should have a level playing field with an updated and expeditious processing mechanism. Employers should not be able to endlessly delay and appeal elections and abuse a process that was put in place just as much for them as it was for employees.

Organizing has a long and important history in America. Unions and collective bargaining have made sure we have a weekend to spend with our families, a 40-hour workweek, and made sure women are paid fair wages.

□ 1000

Organizing has made sure workers are safe from all types and forms of workplace dangers. Countless studies show that the proportion of workers in labor organizations tracks very closely with income for middle class Americans.

Critics of this rule don't want a level playing field for labor organizations to fight for the middle class. They want a process that is open to delay and manipulation. Rather than letting workers choose for themselves whether or not they want to join a union, bad actors would prefer to delay or prevent the choice from ever being made at all. This new rule reduces the opportunity for bad actors to play games with the process and applies new technological updates to the process as well.

The Republicans, time and time again, seem to want to waste time on

grandstanding instead of legislating. This is a perfect example of another bill that won't become law. The Republicans want to tilt the economy toward the wealthy, toward big business, toward CEOs.

We were sent here to do the people's work. The new rule for the NLRB is entirely consistent with the legislative intent of the creation of that agency, and it is for the advantage of people who live in our towns and cities. It improves the economy, raises up the middle class, helps give everybody a fair shot at the American Dream.

When we talk about the pathway to the American Dream, the pathway to success in our country, the organized labor movement has and continues to make enormous contributions toward making sure that Americans are earning livable wages, that they can support their families and live the American Dream. It is not only the weekends and 40-hour workweeks that they have given us. The organized labor movement continues to fight for the middle class and to fight to grow the middle class and to address some of the increasing trend of income disparities that are threatening our country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question, and then we will bring forward the Export-Import Bank clean reauthorization that does create jobs for middle class Americans and in manufacturing. Some of those plants will be union and some won't be. That is the choice of the workers. The NLRB bill facilitates that choice. It doesn't presuppose that every workplace will want to organize nor that no workplaces will want to organize. It simply has a fair set of rules in place—fair to businesses, fair to employees, fair to labor, fair to everybody—that allows a decision to be made regarding organizing in the workplace.

What is even more important about the effort Mr. HECK talked about is it will allow workers and business owners to participate in a bigger pie. That is what we all want. By reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank, we are creating jobs in our country and the export sector; and that means that the owners of the companies will do well; it means the employees of the companies will do well; it means the management will do well; it means the line workers will do well.

So let's participate in a growing pie by passing a clean reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank rather than trying to divide the pie to take more away from working families and the middle class and give more to big businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The proud traditions of this House and its committees are continued by

the committee funding resolution this rule will provide for consideration of. Our record of careful stewardship of taxpayer dollars continues with the House authorized funds for the 114th Congress below those in 2008. The funding resolution was favorably reported out of committee by unanimous voice vote. The chair and ranking member of each committee worked together to develop their individual budget priorities, and each committee also reaffirmed its commitment to uphold the equitable two-thirds/one-third allocation between the majority and minority sides.

Our record of careful stewardship of taxpayer dollars continues, with the House authorized funds for the 114th Congress below those in 2008.

Returning to the ambush elections rule, which was, sadly, not crafted in the same bipartisan fashion as our committee funding resolution, Mr. Speaker, we must remember that providing for free and fair elections is one of the most fundamental principles of our democracy.

The National Labor Relations Board's ambush elections rule is an affront to that principle. Without a chance to opt out, it provides the personal contact information of every employee to organizers who may have had no previous interactions with those employees. The rule could lead to union representation elections being held within only 11 days without any certainty over who should be participating in the election or adequate time to consult with legal counsel.

It is not as if existing rules favor one party over another. If anything, they favor unions. Currently, 95 percent of elections occur within 2 months, and unions win more than 60 percent of them. The National Labor Relations Board should be focused on maintaining fair union representation elections backed by longstanding precedent, not upending a longstanding, carefully tailored process for elections that provided fundamental protections to all stakeholders: workers, unions, and employers.

This Congressional Review Act joint resolution is an important step in Congress exercising its oversight role to ensure that independent agencies and the executive branch do not step on vital protections for hardworking Americans.

I strongly commend this rule and the underlying resolutions to my colleagues for their support.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 152 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1031) to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes. General de-

bate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1031.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

Ms. FOXX. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 181, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 126]

YEAS—233

Abraham	Culberson	Herrera Beutler
Aderholt	Curbelo (FL)	Hice, Jody B.
Allen	Davis, Rodney	Hill
Amash	Denham	Holding
Amodei	Dent	Hudson
Babin	DeSantis	Huelskamp
Barletta	DesJarlais	Huizenga (MI)
Barr	Diaz-Balart	Hultgren
Barton	Dold	Hunter
Benishek	Duffy	Hurd (TX)
Bilirakis	Duncan (SC)	Hurt (VA)
Bishop (MI)	Duncan (TN)	Issa
Bishop (UT)	Ellmers (NC)	Jenkins (KS)
Black	Emmer (MN)	Jenkins (WV)
Blackburn	Farenthold	Johnson (OH)
Blum	Fincher	Johnson, Sam
Bost	Fitzpatrick	Jolly
Boustany	Fleischmann	Jones
Brady (TX)	Fleming	Joyce
Brat	Flores	Katko
Bridenstine	Forbes	Kelly (PA)
Brooks (AL)	Fortenberry	King (IA)
Brooks (IN)	Fox	King (NY)
Buchanan	Franks (AZ)	Kinzinger (IL)
Buck	Frelinghuysen	Kline
Bueshon	Garrett	Knight
Burgess	Gibbs	LaMalfa
Byrne	Gibson	Lamborn
Calvert	Gohmert	Lance
Carter (GA)	Goodlatte	Latta
Carter (TX)	Govdy	LoBiondo
Chabot	Granger	Long
Chaffetz	Graves (GA)	Loudermilk
Clawson (FL)	Graves (LA)	Love
Coffman	Griffith	Lucas
Cole	Grothman	Luetkemeyer
Collins (GA)	Guinta	Lummis
Collins (NY)	Guthrie	MacArthur
Comstock	Hanna	Marchant
Conaway	Hardy	Marino
Cook	Harper	Massie
Costello (PA)	Harris	McCarthy
Cramer	Hartzler	McCaul
Crawford	Heck (NV)	McClintock
Crenshaw	Hensarling	McHenry

McKinley	Ratcliffe
McMorris	Reed
Rodgers	Reichert
McSally	Renacci
Meadows	Ribble
Meehan	Rice (SC)
Messer	Rigell
Mica	Roby
Miller (FL)	Roe (TN)
Miller (MI)	Rogers (AL)
Moolenaar	Rohrabacher
Mooney (WV)	Rokita
Mullin	Rooney (FL)
Mulvaney	Ros-Lehtinen
Murphy (PA)	Ross
Neugebauer	Rothfus
Newhouse	Rouzer
Noem	Royce
Nugent	Russell
Nunes	Ryan (WI)
Olson	Salmon
Palazzo	Sanford
Palmer	Scalise
Paulsen	Schweikert
Pearce	Sensenbrenner
Perry	Sessions
Pittenger	Shimkus
Pitts	Shuster
Poe (TX)	Simpson
Poliquin	Smith (MO)
Pompeo	Smith (NE)
Posey	Smith (NJ)
Price, Tom	Smith (TX)

NAYS—181

Adams	Frankel (FL)
Aguilar	Fudge
Ashford	Gabbard
Bass	Gallego
Beatty	Graham
Becerra	Green, Al
Bera	Green, Gene
Beyer	Grijalva
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez
Blumenauer	Hahn
Bonamici	Hastings
Boyle, Brendan	Heck (WA)
F.	Higgins
Brady (PA)	Himes
Brown (FL)	Honda
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer
Bustos	Huffman
Butterfield	Israel
Capps	Jefferson Lee
Capuano	Jeffries
Cárdenas	Johnson, E. B.
Carney	Kaptur
Carson (IN)	Keating
Cartwright	Kelly (IL)
Castor (FL)	Kennedy
Castro (TX)	Kildee
Chu, Judy	Kilmer
Cicilline	Kind
Clark (MA)	Kirkpatrick
Clarke (NY)	Kuster
Clay	Langevin
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)
Clyburn	Larson (CT)
Cohen	Lawrence
Connolly	Lee
Conyers	Levin
Cooper	Lewis
Costa	Lieu, Ted
Courtney	Lipinski
Crowley	Loeb sack
Cuellar	Lofgren
Cummings	Lowenthal
Davis (CA)	Lowe y
Davis, Danny	Lujan Grisham
DeFazio	(NM)
DeGette	Luján, Ben Ray
Delaney	(NM)
DeLauro	Lynch
DelBene	Maloney,
DeSaulnier	Carolyn
Deutch	Maloney, Sean
Dingell	Matsui
Doggett	McCollum
Doyle, Michael	McDermott
F.	McGovern
Duckworth	McNerney
Edwards	Meeks
Engel	Meng
Eshoo	Moore
Esty	Moulton
Farr	Murphy (FL)
Fattah	Nadler
Foster	Napolitano

Stefanik	Stewart
Stivers	Stutzman
Thompson (PA)	Thompson (PA)
Thornberry	Tiberi
Tipton	Trott
Turner	Turner
Upton	Upton
Valadao	Valadao
Wagner	Wagner
Walberg	Walberg
Walden	Walden
Walker	Walker
Walorski	Walorski
Walters, Mimi	Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)	Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)	Webster (FL)
Wenstrup	Wenstrup
Westerman	Westerman
Westmoreland	Westmoreland
Whitfield	Whitfield
Wilson (SC)	Wilson (SC)
Wittman	Wittman
Womack	Womack
Woodall	Woodall
Yoder	Yoder
Yoho	Yoho
Young (IA)	Young (IA)
Zeldin	Zeldin
Zinke	Zinke

NOT VOTING—18

Ellison	Johnson (GA)	Schock
Garamendi	Jordan	Scott, Austin
Gosar	Labrador	Smith (WA)
Graves (MO)	Payne	Williams
Grayson	Rogers (KY)	Young (AK)
Hinojosa	Roskam	Young (IN)

□ 1033

Mr. CARNEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Messrs. RUSH and BUTTERFIELD changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. MICA, BURGESS, and Mrs. HARTZLER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 181, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 127]

AYES—233

Abraham	Duncan (TN)	King (IA)
Aderholt	Ellmers (NC)	King (NY)
Allen	Emmer (MN)	Kinzinger (IL)
Amash	Farenthold	Kline
Amodei	Fincher	Knight
Babin	Fitzpatrick	LaMalfa
Barletta	Fleischmann	Lamborn
Barr	Fleming	Lance
Barton	Flores	Latta
Benishek	Forbes	LoBiondo
Bilirakis	Fortenberry	Long
Bishop (MI)	Fox	Loudermilk
Bishop (UT)	Franks (AZ)	Love
Black	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Blackburn	Garrett	Luetkemeyer
Blum	Gibbs	Lummis
Bost	Gibson	MacArthur
Boustany	Gohmert	Marchant
Brady (TX)	Goodlatte	Marino
Brat	Govdy	Massie
Bridenstine	Granger	McCarthy
Brooks (AL)	Brooks (GA)	McCaul
Brooks (IN)	Graves (LA)	McClintock
Buchanan	Griffith	McHenry
Buck	Grothman	McKinley
Bueshon	Guinta	McMorris
Burgess	Guthrie	Rodgers
Byrne	Hanna	McNerney
Calvert	Hardy	McSally
Carter (GA)	Harper	Meadows
Carter (TX)	Harris	Meehan
Chabot	Hartzler	Messer
Chaffetz	Heck (NV)	Mica
Clawson (FL)	Hensarling	Miller (FL)
Coffman	Herrera Beutler	Miller (MI)
Cole	Hice, Jody B.	Moolenaar
Collins (GA)	Hill	Mooney (WV)
Collins (NY)	Holding	Mullin
Comstock	Conaway	Mulvaney
Conaway	Cook	Huelskamp
Cook	Costello (PA)	Huizenga (MI)
Cramer	Cramer	Hultgren
Crawford	Crawford	Hunter
Crenshaw	Crenshaw	Hurd (TX)
Culberson	Culberson	Hurt (VA)
Curbelo (FL)	Curbelo (FL)	Issa
Davis, Rodney	Davis, Rodney	Jenkins (KS)
Denham	Denham	Jenkins (WV)
Dent	Dent	Johnson (OH)
DeSantis	DeSantis	Johnson, Sam
DesJarlais	DesJarlais	Jolly
Diaz-Balart	Diaz-Balart	Jones
Dold	Dold	Joyce
Duffy	Duffy	Katko
Duncan (SC)	Duncan (SC)	Kelly (PA)

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
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell

Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner

Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—181

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah

NOT VOTING—18

Bucshon
Garamendi
Gosar
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Hinojosa

Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Graham
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler

Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Pelosi
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

□ 1040

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 127 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Stated against:

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 127 I was unavoidably detained and missed voting of rollcall No. 127. Had I been present, when the vote was called, I would have voted "no."

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 19, 2015, the House voted on H. Res. 152, to provide consideration of H. Res. 132. I accidentally voted "aye" on rollcall vote No. 127; I do not support H. Res. 152 or H. Res. 132; I intended to vote "no" on rollcall vote No. 127. I would like the record to accurately reflect my stance on this issue.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 152, I call up the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 8) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Pursuant to House Resolution 152, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S.J. RES. 8

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 National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures (published at 79 Fed. Reg. 74308 (December 15, 2014)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

□ 1045

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S.J. Res. 8.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in strong support of S.J. Res. 8.

In just a few short weeks, a regulatory scheme that many Americans never heard of will become a reality in almost every private workplace across the country.

Today, workers and employers rely on a fair process for union elections. Under the current process, employers have time to raise concerns and, more importantly, time to speak with their employees about union representation.

Under the current system, workers have an opportunity to gather the information they need to make the best decision for their families. But unless Congress acts, Mr. Speaker, that will all change.

Under the guise of streamlining union elections, the National Labor Relations Board is imposing draconian changes that will undermine the rights workers, employers, and unions have long enjoyed.

The Board's rule arbitrarily limits the amount of time employers have to legally prepare for the election, and it denies workers a reasonable opportunity to make informed decisions about joining a union.

The rule also delays answers to important questions—including voter eligibility—until after the election, which means the integrity of the election results will be compromised before a single ballot is cast.

To add insult to injury, the Board's rule will also force employers to provide union organizers with their employees' personal information, including email addresses, phone numbers, work schedules, and home addresses. Instead of advancing a plan to help stop union intimidation and coercion, the Board is actually making it easier for labor bosses to harass employees and their families.

Are there times when delays occur under the current system? Of course. But delay is the exception, not the rule. In fact, right now, the median time between the filing of an election petition and the election is 38 days. Yet under the Board's new rule, a union election could take place in as little as 11 days. Eleven days.

This is a radical rewrite of labor policies that have served our Nation's best interests for decades. Unfortunately, this is what we have come to expect from the National Labor Relations Board.

Let's not forget, this is the same Federal agency that tried dictating where a private employer had to run its business. This is the same agency restricting workers' rights to secret ballot elections. This is the same agency ignoring the law by asserting its jurisdiction over religious institutions. This is the same agency tying employers in union red tape and empowering labor leaders to gerrymander our Nation's workplaces. This is a Federal agency that is simply out of control, and it is our responsibility to do something about it.

This resolution, which I am proud to sponsor along with Senator LAMAR

ALEXANDER of Tennessee, invokes Congress' authority under the Congressional Review Act to block the NLRB's ambush election rule and anything substantially like it.

If the Board or my Democrat colleagues want to pursue responsible reforms to improve the union election process, then I stand ready to work together on that effort.

But if you believe employers should be free to speak to their employees during a union organizing campaign, then support this resolution. If you believe workers should be free to make an informed decision about whether to join a union, then support this resolution. If you believe we should protect—rather than threaten—employee privacy, then support this resolution. Finally, if you believe workers, employers, and union leaders deserve a fair election process, then reject the Board's ambush election rule by supporting this resolution.

I encourage my colleagues to stand with America's workers and job creators by voting "yes" on S.J. Res. 8.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to S.J. Res. 8.

The Congressional Review Act resolution of disapproval that we are considering today would undo the NLRB's election rule. The National Labor Relations Board election rule was promulgated to make the election process more efficient and fair.

The current process to hold an election on whether to form a union is badly broken. After workers have filed a petition to hold an election, bad actors can use frivolous litigation to stall an election for months, even years. Election delays can provide opportunities for unscrupulous employers to engage in threats, coercion, and intimidation of workers. These delays can be exploited to violate workers' rights, including firing pro-union workers or threatening to close the plant if the workers choose to vote a certain way.

We all know that the sanctions against violations are insufficient to deter the unscrupulous activities, including firing pro-union employees.

Researchers from the Center for Labor Research and Education at Berkeley found that the longer the delay before the union election, the more likely the employer was to engage in illegal conduct that violates its employees' rights. The NLRB election rule would help prevent the illegal intimidation and coercion of workers.

Mr. Speaker, this regulation provides targeted solutions to discrete, specifically identifiable problems. The rule brings into the 21st century the updating of rules involving the transmission of documents and communications, allowing you to use email and electronic communication rather than paper. It will enable the Board to better fulfill its responsibility to protect employees'

rights by fairly, accurately, and quickly resolving issues of representation.

In many cases, the rule just simplifies and standardizes practices that have been common in regions all over the country already, or reflects existing practices used in civil actions. The rule does not change substantive law involving elections. It just makes sure that you can have a timely election.

These modest updates provide workers and employees with reasonable time to consider unionization while preventing unreasonable delay by bad actors.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this resolution isn't going to go very far. The administration has already issued a Statement of Administration Policy that I would like to quote from. It says that:

"The Board's modest reforms will help simplify and streamline private sector union elections, thereby reducing delays before workers can have a free and fair vote on whether or not to form or join a union."

It goes on to say that:

"Giving workers greater voice can help ensure that the link is restored between hard work and opportunity and that the benefits of the current economic recovery are more broadly shared.

"The National Labor Relations Board's representation case procedures rule helps to level the playing field for workers so they can more freely choose to make their voice heard. In doing so, it will help us build an economy that gives greater economic opportunities and security for middle-class families and those working to join the middle class."

It concludes, Mr. Speaker, that:

"If the President were presented with S.J. Res. 8, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the Resolution."

Mr. Speaker, instead of wasting time on this resolution, we should be addressing job creation, stagnating wages, economic inequality, and working to improve opportunities for Americans, rather than considering this resolution.

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

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, somehow I am not surprised that the Obama administration supports the administration's National Labor Relations Board's actions.

At this time, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections.

Mr. WALBERG. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I hate to say it this way, but the fact of the matter is that the NLRB is creating a solution to a problem that does not exist by wholly changing the union election process through their new ambush election rule. This rule, if left unchecked, restricts the right of employers to speak to their employees during their orga-

nizing campaign. It cripples—it cripples—the rights of workers to make an informed decision. It denies all stakeholders access to a fair process. And isn't that what we are about?

This change is meant to weaken employers and employees who simply want a fair and just process that gives ample time for a deliberative review, discussion, and decisionmaking. Furthermore, the ambush election rule completely disregards the promise of neutrality that NLRB is mandated to uphold.

The NLRB should serve as an impartial arbiter of labor disputes, and I urge my colleagues to join the Senate in passing S.J. Res. 8, which will stop these harmful and unjust actions committed by the NLRB and preserve fair election policies which have been in place for decades.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I rise in very strong opposition to this resolution, and I urge every one of my Members to oppose this resolution.

We considered a Paycheck Fairness Act, a card check bill which said that if the unions got the signatures of a certain percentage, that they could move ahead and be organized, subject to an election.

There was a hue and cry about, that was undemocratic, that there ought to be a requirement for an election. A number of people came into my office, and I said, Well, I think we can accommodate that. We will make sure there is a requirement that—as every one of us can do—you can get the names of the voters, you can get their addresses, you can even get their history of voting, and you can perhaps call them on the phone. We can all do that in elections.

But the fact of the matter is—and everybody on this House floor knows it—procedurally, so many employers who do not believe that they are going to prevail take the steps of delaying and delaying and delaying. They want elections tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, what the NLRB is trying to do with this rule is to make sure that there is an election, that it is fair, and that it will be held in a timely fashion.

I hope this House defeats this resolution.

This resolution would prevent the National Labor Relations Board from implementing the rule it promulgated in December to modernize worker representation elections.

But there is a fear of elections, and the fear of elections is that the majority of employees will say, yes, I want to have a better voice.

This is a case, once again, of the Republican majority seeking to roll back

the hard-earned rights of workers to organize and bargain collectively for better wages and benefits. And that is not an assertion. That is demonstrably proved in State after State after State over the last few years in which Republicans have taken control, and their first item of the agenda has been to undermine workers' rights.

When workers organize for higher wages and benefits—like health insurance, retirement savings, and affordable child care—it opens the doors of opportunity for workers and their families to secure a place in our middle class. We know our middle class is shrinking. We know the middle class is having a very tough time.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

According to a 2013 report by the Center for American Progress, the decline of union membership between the 1960s and today correlates to a decline of the middle class.

When we have strong unions and workers' rights protections, the middle class does better. And workers who are not unionized benefit from the ripple effect of rising wages.

Let's defeat this bill.

I think the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), the chairman of this committee, has said that he would sit down with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) to come up with a bipartisan bill—which this is not—which will do what all of us say we think is fair, to have elections, to have elections where both sides—and of course the employer always has access to the voter in this case—and do something for the American worker and for business which will put us on a steady path to growing the middle class and making sure that workers are treated as they ought to be, with the dignity and respect and the ability to support their families that they need.

□ 1100

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I always find it to be of interest listening to this debate. Do you know what is most ironic about this bill? It is about elections. Everybody in this body has an election. But do you know what is different? Everyone in this body knows when their next election is going to be held and knows how much time they have to campaign, so much so that we have rules on this floor when we cut off communication months in advance so you can campaign.

I listened with interest to the minority whip speak on this floor his support for something different from what this bill does. I wonder, if he cared so much

about what the NLRB is doing, would he apply those exact same rules to his own election? Would he care to not know when it is going to be and then when it gets called he has 11 days to campaign? I think his speech would be different. So why are we asking the rules for us to be different from every other worker across this country?

The root of representation is to work for the interests of those you represent. Everyone in the House knows that. And unions, as representative bodies, should exist for the benefit of the workers. But I don't think anyone disagrees that it is the workers, not the unions, who know what is best for themselves. Workers are the best judges of whether they want to support union political activity or even if they want to join a union at all. Joining a union is a big choice. To make an informed decision, workers need time to decide what is best for them and their families, and they shouldn't be pressured or rushed.

So if unions really care about workers, and if they are confident that the benefits of their union outweigh the costs, they will give the workers as much time as they need. That is the irony of the recent decision by the National Labor Relations Board, to allow unions to call rush elections, to ambush employees and employers. Ambush elections don't help workers; instead, they bully workers to accept unionization as fast as possible. That is not pro-worker; that is pro-union—and there is a big difference.

What makes the situation worse is that ambush elections will soon be forced on workers not by an act of Congress, but by unelected bureaucrats in the NLRB. That is an affront to the separation of powers that this country was based upon.

So here in Congress, Mr. Speaker, we are taking action. As our Senate colleagues have already voted to do, we are going to use the Congressional Review Act to send a resolution straight to the President's desk that blocks this antiworker and antibusiness rule.

Now, I know the President has already threatened to veto this resolution, but I actually hope he will change his mind, because what does the President want to fight for? Does he want to fight for the workers? Does he want to fight for small businesses and jobs?

Ambush elections don't help workers. They don't help employers. They only help unions. And no public official, not any Member of this House, and especially not the President, should ever support rules that allow special interests to strong-arm the hardworking American people.

Mr. Speaker, nobody in this House should support a rule about an election they wouldn't put upon themselves, and I don't know one Member of this House that would sit back and say somebody can call an election and you only have 11 days to campaign. I would like to hear somebody vote for that on this floor and ask to be held to the

same standards they are trying to hold every other worker to in this Nation.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, where to begin? In hearing the majority leader's remarks and in talking about fair elections, how is it fair if only one side has access to the phone numbers and email addresses and not the other side? Can any of us imagine running in our campaigns where only we or only our opponent can call or write emails to the voters? That doesn't make any sense.

Talking about 11 days, again, that is fictitious. This rule is about the 1 in 10 cases that take over 100 days. Mr. Speaker, we heard testimony in committee about organizing that lingered on hundreds and hundreds of days. And as our ranking member pointed out, the longer it takes, there is a direct and causal relationship to illegal behavior.

The election rules that the NLRB has implemented will help expedite this process to be sure it is done in accordance with the law. It modernizes our antiquated system to level the playing field for workers. These rules set up a fair system so that bad actors that needlessly delay and abuse the electoral system for the sole purpose of having time to coerce employees through mandatory meetings, threats, and even firings won't be rewarded for their bad behavior. This coercion is not just some far-fetched idea. One in 10 cases take over 100 days.

Now, why would delaying a union election be a bad thing for union workers? Because during that delay, these workers are forced into rooms, receive threats, are bombarded with texts and emails from the employer—again, from one side in the election—but the other side in the election, absent these rules, doesn't even have access to text or phone.

Mr. Speaker, we should be focused on creating new jobs, not destroying them, and growing the middle class, not shrinking it. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), a member of the committee.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Thank you, Chairman KLINE, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman's leadership on this important issue, and I am grateful to be a cosponsor of this legislation.

As a member of the House Education and the Workforce Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, I am concerned with the National Labor Relations Board's latest rule, which is referred to as the ambush election rule, and I stand in strong support of S.J. Res. 8.

The ambush election rule is a tool to force union elections, not to protect

workers. Revisions of the list requirements under the rule will compel employers to provide very personal information about their employees, such as names, address, telephone numbers, and email addresses. This will violate the privacy of workers while reducing the informed decision period. To add insult to injury, the rule does not limit or dictate what unions can do with this sensitive information.

I am pleased that South Carolina is a right-to-work State. Union membership is not a requirement of employment in our State. It is based on freedom of choice. I am grateful we have fought as a State to give our employees and job creators the flexibility to choose what is best for them.

South Carolina has successfully opposed the rogue NLRB when the NLRB tried to block 1,000 jobs at the Boeing facility in Charleston. With the leadership of Governor Nikki Haley, Attorney General Alan Wilson, and Senators LINDSEY GRAHAM and TIM SCOTT, we stopped the NLRB, and now over 7,000 jobs have been created.

S.J. Res. 8 will express our strong disapproval of the National Labor Relations Board rule and ensure a fair elections process.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Thank you, Ranking Member SCOTT.

Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Review Act is yet another attack on employees' rights to organize and to limit the National Labor Relations Board. The NLRB should have the ability to safeguard those rights and protect our Nation's workers from unfair labor practices.

It is outrageous that the rights of employees are attacked, particularly at a time when we have a jobs deficit, a shrinking middle class, and are still struggling to recover from the Great Recession.

The NLRB has made modest attempts to modernize its election procedures and reduce unnecessary litigation and delay in the election process. These are commonsense fixes that should not be controversial.

The CRA would freeze in place the Board's current flawed election procedure. The Board would be prohibited from adopting rules to utilize new technology or modernize its procedures. The NLRB is an expert agency and should be trusted to determine the appropriate use of electronic voting or rules to safeguard ballot secrecy.

Furthermore, I am not aware of any other government agency that has to seek Congress' permission before modernizing its rules for voting that takes place under its jurisdiction.

Dismantling the NLRB would only serve to weaken, undermine, and jeopardize the economic security of the middle class. It is bad for business, bad for families, and bad for our economy.

In fact, the National Labor Relations Board is the last line of defense for workers.

We shouldn't be attacking our Nation's employees; we should be supporting them, investing in them, and protecting them. Let's come together to create jobs, protect the middle class, and make the investments we need to grow our economy.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL), a new member of the committee and someone who has been actively engaged in the major debates since he has walked into this body.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, labor relations are vital to the smooth operation of business and commerce. In the culture of our Republic, Americans are raised to expect to have their say in everything from schoolroom elections to choosing the President of the United States. It is in our DNA to have a choice. To inform that choice, we expect free speech so we can ask questions, gain information, and make wise decisions. This is why the recently finalized rule by the National Labor Relations Board is so egregious. It is against that American spirit.

Under this rule, longstanding policies that allow employers and employees to guide how they relate through unions has been deeply damaged. Companies could have as little as 11 days, or employees in relating to the companies, as little as 11 days to make a choice that could drastically affect their career and the health of the business that they rely on to put bread on the table.

Employers would only have a 7-day period to obtain counsel, set parameters, and are even restricted in contacting and discussing issues with their employees. They are prohibited from making any changes after that 7-day period based on new information that they may acquire.

Further, the privacy and safety of workers is placed in jeopardy by a swift ambush election process imposed by these rules that could put their employment in jeopardy.

This resolution stops this. It restores policies that have guided labor relations for decades. It upholds the right for American workers to gain information to make choices without draconian, strong-arm pressure tactics that harm the worker and stifle American free enterprise.

This body was founded, Mr. Speaker, on the spirit of promoting the general welfare and ensuring domestic tranquility for our Nation. Passage of S.J. Res. 8 aids this by stopping and blocking the strong-arm tactics of the National Labor Relations Board, and the American people are counting on us to do that job.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 8, an unnecessary partisan attack on hardworking Americans that will interfere with the rights of workers to an expeditious election on union representation.

America's middle class workers should be free to decide if they want an election. Unfortunately, the current process can be mired in litigation, and in some cases, workers waiting for an election have faced interference or intimidation from outside groups. The NLRB's rule safeguards the ability of workers to choose whether to be represented by a union without confronting unnecessary delays.

It makes little sense why Congress would want to get in the way of middle class Americans—factory line workers, health care workers, and utility workers—who ask for an election on union representation. It is also unreasonable to assume that employers, many of which have sophisticated legal teams, are going to be caught flat-footed. There is no ambush here.

Mr. Speaker, the NLRB had a lengthy rulemaking proceeding with thousands of comments. It is unfair and, in fact, draconian to now use the Congressional Review Act to try to undermine the rights of workers by getting rid of this rule. The resolution is an ill-advised attempt to silence the voice of American workers, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

□ 1115

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), another new member of the committee and someone who has also been engaged since the day he walked in.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am always interested when we are talking about workers and I hear that people want to talk about what is best for workers.

I will tell you that I am a new Member of Congress, and I have had the privilege the past 30 years of my life to give people the privilege to have a good job. That is one of the greatest privileges of my life.

We all want to do what is best for those folks who are sacrificing for us. We appreciate them; we appreciate their efforts. That is why I rise to support Senate Joint Resolution 8, to demonstrate the disapproval of Congress of the National Labor Relations Board's "ambush election" rule to protect our workers.

A few weeks ago, the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, of which I am a member, held a hearing on this very issue. We learned that this NLRB is not only unprecedented, it undermines the rights of both workers and employees and creates for challenges for businesses when our economy can least afford it.

The expert testimony was from those who have been engaged in labor relations for quite a long time with tremendous experience. Their testimony

provided comments about just how troubling such a threat to the privacy of workers and their families as employers would be required to disclose the names, addresses, phone numbers, and emails of employees to the NLRB, then to the union.

This rule is misguided, and NLRB has no business in rushing to advance its own agenda. We need to protect fairness in the work place. That is why I call on my colleagues to support Senate Joint Resolution 8.

I am proud to say that I am from the State of Georgia, a right-to-work State.

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

Mr. KLINE. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ALLEN. In the State of Georgia, we have created almost 300,000 jobs since 2006. I am proud to say we have got the finest workers in America, and I want those workers to have the freedom to make their decisions and not the NLRB.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, BOBBY SCOTT, for yielding me time.

I am a small business owner, and I am a union member, and I have a union business. The disapproval of the NLRB rule under the Congressional Review Act is an extreme move that would roll back hardworking Americans' rights to a fair and timely election on union representation.

Let us look at what this rule does, two things: One, it modernizes communications; and, two, it protects workers from dishonest employers.

When this law was written, emails and iPhones didn't exist, so it simply adds them to the list of what is available to contact people about joining a union.

Second, it creates a fair, modern workplace election process that elections can be done in a timely manner. The current process has long been vulnerable to manipulation, delay, and drawn out legal maneuvering by some unscrupulous employers.

The reality of today's workplace is employers still hold all the cards. The few bad actor employers can delay a union vote by intimidating or threatening employees. They already have the phone numbers, the emails, and the home addresses. Let's face it: What is more intimidating, getting an email or saying you know where someone lives?

The bottom line is this isn't about the NLRB rule; this is about a process that we see across the country attacking hardworking Americans. Whether it is through so-called right-to-work laws or preventing the NLRB from updating the union election process, this is more evidence that the majority party is out to hurt the very hardworking Americans who want the ability to form a union.

This has a substantial impact on their lives. Workers covered by a collective bargaining agreement are paid more on average than those not covered and are more likely to have health care, retirement, and paid leave benefits than nonunion workers.

I would strongly urge us to vote against this political maneuvering message.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from my neighboring State of Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), another new member of the committee. We have got an almost embarrassment of riches of hardworking new Members.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be here to speak one more time on Senate Joint Resolution 8.

I will make two points again. One of the things we see here is we have new rules which continue a trend, and that is you are fundamentally changing the way things have been for 70 years. In the past, unions have done a good job of organizing.

We have added union representation to things, but one of the things that businesses want and that America wants is consistency. One more time, after having no big problems for 70 years, we are turning things fundamentally around. Now, why is that bad?

The gentlewoman from Oregon just said this is no big deal because businesses all have lawyers on staff or whatever.

Two comments on that: First of all, businesses don't all have lawyers on staff; and, secondly, I think it shows a fundamental misunderstanding of how business works and why it is so difficult to go into business today and why it particularly targets small businesses when you come up with new regulations.

This would be a problem even for a big company that did have a lawyer on staff and say it is no big deal; but, of course, who is less likely to have a lawyer on staff? A small business who doesn't have full-time HR representatives and that sort of thing. This is targeting those small businesses.

Again and again and again in this country, one thing that bothers me is the degree to which people don't have sympathy for small businesses. When you change things, they are the ones who have to go out, hire an outside lawyer, get up to speed on things, pay the big legal bills, and pay the price.

That is one reason why, in certain industries, you do see, over time, big businesses continuing to grow because little businesses can't keep up with all the little rules.

I will remind people one more time that this invades employee privacy. It is something they are not asking for. There is no reason for outside groups to be able to get somebody's home address or that sort of thing.

In any event, I will ask the other people present in the room to go back home and ask, particularly their small employers, when they have to run to a

lawyer—first of all, to ask their small employers whether or not they have a lawyer on staff because I think the vast majority of businesses in this country don't have a lawyer on staff; and, secondly, whether they do or don't have a lawyer on staff, if they have to go run to a lawyer, whether they think it's no big deal, because I think it is an awfully big deal.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

I would like to point out that I think the people who promote this piece of legislation and the people who oppose it basically take their positions for the same reason, and that is that labor unions improve wages, make better working conditions, promote job security, and give strength in numbers.

We oppose and support this bill for the same reason. Some people want to see workers get more pay—we have seen stagnant wages—and some people think that when workers make more money, it just hurts corporate profitability—which, by the way, is up and has been increasing.

The point is simply this: The NLRB does its job and modernizes union elections and proposes a rule. The Republican majority comes in and says, We don't like that because that might lead to more union elections, and it may lead to more unionized workers, and we like it how it is, we like flat and declining wages, we want the employers to have all of the power, we want the workers to be alone and on their own and without the strength that the numbers that a union provides. It is just as simple as that.

Americans watching this debate today have yet another opportunity to see who is on their side and who is not. American workers get more money and get paid better when they are in unions.

Collective bargaining strengthens family budgets because it means that workers can say, Do you know what, that is unsafe; do you know what, you are making plenty of money, so should we; do you know what, we need to get some job security in a union contract around here—and that is exactly why we see the opposition to this NLRB rule.

So it is disappointing. I think President Obama was right when he said the number one problem facing the United States today is income inequality. That is the concentration of riches at the top and the stagnation for wages for everybody else.

If that is the problem, then we need to do something about it. That means modernizing the right to collectively bargain.

I will say modernizing union elections is the thing that will help us achieve that equality.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member.

It is incredible. We are in this great Hall of democracy. The world looks to this very building, for what it seeks is to give people a voice, what our country was founded on. What we are having a vote on today is to clamp down and shut the mouths of those who are seeking to have a voice.

Very recently, there was a poll conducted that said, if given the opportunity, 73 percent of American workers want to have a voice and would vote for a union, but what we are hearing today is shutting down the voice and creating predictability. This is about democracy; this is about what we in America believe in: giving everybody an equal opportunity for a voice.

What the NLRB—and I have dealt with them for over 30 years. We have won some; we have lost some. They have been independent. Sometimes, I haven't been happy with their decisions, but I have always felt they have been fair.

What we are talking about is bringing them into the 21st century, making a voting date that is agreeable to what real people think. You shouldn't have to wait 6 months, 9 months, go through the appeal process.

Let's have a vote because, remember, the employer has had access—unfettered access—to all these employees, and all we are saying is let's make sure that workers have a voice. If they say "no," no harm, no foul, and go home. This is about creating an equal playing field, which certainly isn't there.

That is why I am urging my colleagues to vote against this anti-American, antidemocracy, antiworker resolution.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE).

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SCOTT.

One of the things that made the 20th century known as the American century was that the United States had the largest middle class in the history of the world—the idea that if you worked hard and played by the rules, you would get a fair wage and good benefits and that your children would be even able to do a little bit better than you have been able to do.

It wasn't always that way, though, in the United States. We can thank to a great extent some of the great advances that we had in the 20th century, as far as workers' rights, to that of organized labor. Without labor unions, we would not have the strength of the middle class today.

It is no accident that in the post-World War II period, when you saw average incomes rise in the fifties, in the

sixties, in the seventies, you saw average incomes rise for workers, sure enough, you saw the percentage of the American workforce unionized also increase.

□ 1130

It is also no accident that, as the percentage of the American unionized workforce declined, so, too, did the average wages to the point at which we are today, where we have had a 20-year period in which middle class wages are stagnant, in which the working class has actually fallen behind, and in which—no surprise—we actually have the lowest percentage of the workforce unionized today in over 70 years.

Mr. Speaker, let's stand up for the middle class. Let's stand up for our workers. Let us reject this antilabor, anti-union, antiworker measure, and let's start fighting and working for those who are working for America.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Is the chairman prepared to close?

Mr. KLINE. I am.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The rule that is subject to this resolution creates no substantive change in the law. It just requires that an election be timely. We have heard this 11-day myth. Let me just go through a little about that myth and how you get to the 11 days.

First of all, the regional office would have to issue a notice of a hearing on the same day that the union would have filed the election petition. The hearing would have to be held as soon as possible and last only one day, and the regional director would have to issue an opinion on the same day.

Right now, it currently takes a median of 20 days for the regional director to issue a decision on the hearing, and there is no reason to believe that it would be any shorter under this rule.

The union would have to waive all of its rights to get information in terms of contact lists and things like that, and the region would have to schedule the election on the very first day possible. The chance that all of that is going to happen to get you down to 11 days is just very improbable.

The administration has already indicated that its senior advisers would recommend a veto of this legislation, so it is not going anywhere.

I look forward to working with the chair of the committee to do what we can to create jobs and to increase wages and to create safe workplaces. I would hope that the chair and I will get together on that rather than waste time on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the Statement of Administration Policy.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
S.J. RES. 8—CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD REPRESENTATION CASE PROCEDURES RULE
(Sen. Alexander, R-TN and 51 cosponsors,
Mar. 3, 2015)

The Administration strongly opposes Senate passage of S.J. Res. 8, which would over-

turn the National Labor Relations Board's recently issued "representation case procedures" rule. The Board's modest reforms will help simplify and streamline private sector union elections, thereby reducing delays before workers can have a free and fair vote on whether or not to form or join a union. The rule allows for electronic filing and transmission of documents, ensures that all parties receive timely information necessary to participate in the election process, reduces delays caused by frivolous litigation, unifies procedures across the country, requires additional contact information be included in voter lists, and consolidates appeals to the Board into a single process.

Instead of seeking to undermine a streamlined democratic process for American workers to vote on whether or not they want to be represented, the Congress should join the President in strengthening protections for American workers and giving them more of a voice in the workplace and the economy. Growing and sustaining the middle class requires strong and vital labor unions, which helped to build this Nation's middle class and have been critical to raising workers' wages and putting in place worker protections that we enjoy today. Giving workers greater voice can help ensure that the link is restored between hard work and opportunity and that the benefits of the current economic recovery are more broadly shared.

The National Labor Relations Board's representation case procedures rule helps to level the playing field for workers so they can more freely choose to make their voice heard. In doing so, it will help us build an economy that gives greater economic opportunities and security for middle-class families and those working to join the middle class.

If the President were presented with S.J. Res. 8, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto the Resolution.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

It is always interesting—isn't it, Mr. Speaker?—to listen to the debate and to the claims that are made and to the claims that are refuted. I found it a little bit interesting in listening to some of the comments on the other side of the aisle that, apparently, this Congressional Review Act S.J. Res. 8 action and all of those who support it are anti-union, antilabor, antiworker, and—I was a little shocked to hear—even anti-American.

I am not called "anti-American" very often, Mr. Speaker, and I do resent it a little bit, but that is the way this debate kind of goes. Let's get a couple of things, I think, straight. I know that everybody can have his opinion and not the facts, but there are some things that, I think, are pretty clear.

According to the National Labor Relations Board, itself, more than 94 percent of elections occur in less than 56 days, which is less than 2 months, Mr. Speaker, and the median time is only 38 days. Unions, Mr. Speaker, win over 60 percent of those elections, so there is a voice for union organizers, for workers, and for employers, because there is time. There is not a rush.

Now, we just heard some discussion about whether 11 days is probable—we all agree, I think, it is possible—or

maybe it would be 12 or 13 or something like that, but it is not in question that you only have 7 days under this rule. This is the rule, by the way. This is the rule that we are talking about. The law that is affected is many times thicker than this.

My colleague from Wisconsin talked about whether or not you have a labor lawyer on staff. Certainly, if you are a small- or middle-sized company, you don't. You can't afford that. So you have 7 days to go out and find a lawyer who can help you comply with this rule and with the law, the much thicker law. You have 7 days to get your position down in writing, and then you are stuck with it. Then you could have the election 4 days later. That is not an opportunity for informed discussion, debate for either the workers or for the employers.

This is called an "ambush" election because it is, indeed, an ambush. We heard one of the speakers talk about: Would you rather have somebody have your email address or your home address? Under this rule, you get it all. Mr. Speaker, clearly, there are many instances of intimidation during these exercises, and often that intimidation comes from union organizers, not from your fellow workers usually but from outside union organizers, who are trying to push this onto the workforce.

So I am very pleased to be supporting S.J. Res. 8, which is to provide congressional disapproval. I am not surprised, as I mentioned earlier, that the Obama administration supports the Obama National Labor Relations Board's position here, but it doesn't mean it is right, and it doesn't mean we shouldn't be standing up for the voices that we have heard about—for employers and employees—so that they can make informed decisions.

The NLRB's rule, Mr. Speaker, stifles the right of employers to speak to their employees during an organizing campaign. It also cripples the right of workers to have the information they need to make a very important decision about whether or not to join a union or even that union. That is a big decision, and it shouldn't be jammed into 11 days or 2 weeks. You need the time to be informed in order to make such a decision.

A "yes" vote on the resolution will help rein in this activist National Labor Relations Board, and it will ensure workers, employers, and unions can participate in a fair union election process. I urge my colleagues to support S.J. Res. 8.

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

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 152, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

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 yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. 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, this 15-minute vote on passage of the joint resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 186, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 128]

YEAS—232

Abraham	Gohmert	Murphy (PA)
Aderholt	Goodlatte	Neugebauer
Allen	Gowdy	Newhouse
Amash	Graves (GA)	Noem
Amodei	Graves (LA)	Nugent
Babin	Griffith	Nunes
Barletta	Grothman	Olson
Barr	Guinta	Palazzo
Barton	Guthrie	Palmer
Benishek	Hanna	Paulsen
Bilirakis	Hardy	Pearce
Bishop (MI)	Harper	Perry
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Pittenger
Black	Hartzler	Pitts
Blackburn	Heck (NV)	Poe (TX)
Blum	Hensarling	Poliquin
Bost	Herrera Beutler	Pompeo
Boustany	Hice, Jody B.	Posey
Brady (TX)	Hill	Price, Tom
Brat	Holding	Ratcliffe
Bridenstine	Hudson	Reed
Brooks (AL)	Huelskamp	Reichert
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Renacci
Buchanan	Hultgren	Ribble
Buck	Hunter	Rice (SC)
Bucshon	Hurd (TX)	Rigell
Burgess	Hurt (VA)	Roby
Byrne	Issa	Roe (TN)
Calvert	Jenkins (KS)	Rogers (AL)
Carter (GA)	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (KY)
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Chaffetz	Jolly	Rooney (FL)
Clawson (FL)	Jones	Ros-Lehtinen
Coffman	Joyce	Ross
Cole	Katko	Rothfus
Collins (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Rouzer
Collins (NY)	King (IA)	Royce
Comstock	Kinzinger (IL)	Russell
Conaway	Kline	Ryan (WI)
Cook	Knight	Salmon
Costello (PA)	LaMalfa	Sanford
Cramer	Lamborn	Scalise
Crawford	Lance	Schweikert
Crenshaw	Latta	Sensenbrenner
Culberson	Long	Sessions
Curbelo (FL)	Loudermilk	Shimkus
Davis, Rodney	Love	Shuster
Denham	Lucas	Simpson
Dent	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)
DeSantis	Lummis	Smith (NE)
DesJarlais	MacArthur	Smith (TX)
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Stefanik
Dold	Marino	Stewart
Duffy	Massie	Stivers
Duncan (SC)	McCarthy	Stutzman
Duncan (TN)	McCaul	Thompson (PA)
Ellmers (NC)	McClintock	Thornberry
Emmer (MN)	McHenry	Tiberi
Farenthold	McKinley	Tipton
Fincher	McMorris	Trott
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Turner
Fleischmann	McSally	Upton
Fleming	Meadows	Valadao
Flores	Meehan	Wagner
Forbes	Messer	Walberg
Fortenberry	Mica	Walden
Foxx	Miller (FL)	Walker
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Walorski
Frelinghuysen	Moolenaar	Walters, Mimi
Garrett	Mooney (WV)	Weber (TX)
Gibbs	Mullin	Webster (FL)
Gibson	Mulvaney	Wenstrup

Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)

Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho

Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—186

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

NOT VOTING—14

□ 1208

Mr. CLYBURN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. STUTZMAN 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.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on

agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 159, answered "present" 1, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

AYES—233

Abraham	Esty	Meng
Aderholt	Farr	Messer
Allen	Fattah	Mica
Amodel	Fleischmann	Miller (MI)
Ashford	Foster	Moolenaar
Babin	Frankel (FL)	Mooney (WV)
Barletta	Franks (AZ)	Mullin
Barr	Frelinghuysen	Nadler
Beatty	Gabbard	Napolitano
Becerra	Gallego	Neugebauer
Beyer	Goodlatte	Newhouse
Bilirakis	Graham	Noem
Bishop (GA)	Granger	Nugent
Bishop (UT)	Graves (LA)	Nunes
Black	Green, Al	Olson
Blackburn	Grothman	Pelosi
Blum	Guinta	Pingree
Blumenauer	Guthrie	Pitts
Bonamici	Gutiérrez	Pocan
Boustany	Hahn	Polis
Brady (TX)	Hardy	Pompeo
Brat	Harper	Posey
Bridenstine	Heck (WA)	Price (NC)
Brooks (AL)	Hensarling	Rangel
Brown (FL)	Hill	Reichert
Buchanan	Himes	Rice (SC)
Bustos	Huelskamp	Richmond
Butterfield	Huffman	Rigell
Byrne	Hultgren	Roby
Calvert	Hunter	Roe (TN)
Capps	Hurt (VA)	Rogers (KY)
Carney	Issa	Rohrabacher
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Rokita
Carter (TX)	Jolly	Rooney (FL)
Cartwright	Kaptur	Ross
Castro (TX)	Katko	Rothenfus
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Royce
Chu, Judy	Kennedy	Ruiz
Cicilline	Kildee	Ruppersberger
Clay	King (IA)	Russell
Cleaver	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Cole	Kline	Salmon
Collins (NY)	Knight	Sanford
Comstock	Kuster	Scalise
Conyers	LaMalfa	Schiff
Cook	Lamborn	Schweikert
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Latta	Sensenbrenner
Cramer	Lawrence	Serrano
Crenshaw	Lieu, Ted	Sessions
Crowley	Lipinski	Sherman
Cuellar	Lofgren	Shimkus
Culberson	Long	Simpson
Curbelo (FL)	Loudermilk	Smith (NE)
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Smith (NJ)
Davis, Danny	Lucas	Smith (TX)
Delaney	Luetkemeyer	Speier
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham	Stefanik
DelBene	(NM)	Stewart
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Stutzman
DesJarlais	(NM)	Takai
Deutch	Marino	Takano
Diaz-Balart	Massie	Thornberry
Dingell	McCarthy	Titus
Doyle, Michael	McCaul	Tonko
F.	McClintock	Trott
Duncan (SC)	McCollum	Tsongas
Duncan (TN)	McHenry	Upton
Edwards	McMorris	Van Hollen
Ellison	Rodgers	Wagner
Emmer (MN)	McNerney	Walden
Engel	Meadows	Walker
Eshoo	Meeks	Walorski

Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup

Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yarmuth

Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin
Zinke

There was no objection.

NOES—159

Adams
Aguiar
Amash
Bass
Benishek
Bera
Bishop (MI)
Bost
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Carter (GA)
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cummings
DeFazio
DeGette
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Dold
Duckworth
Duffy
Ellmers (NC)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxy
Fudge
Garrett
Gibson
Gowdy
Green, Gene
Griffith
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Hurd (TX)
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Lance
Langevin
Levin
Lewis
LoBiondo
Loebback
Love
Lowe
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McSally
Meehan
Miller (FL)
Moore
Moulton
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Nolan
Norcross

Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rogers (AL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Sewell (AL)
Shuster
Sinema
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tiberi
Tipton
Torres
Turner
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 2015, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING IN JOINT MEETING HIS EXCELLENCE MOHAMMAD ASHRAF GHANI, PRESIDENT OF THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF AFGHANISTAN

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, March 25, 2015, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting His Excellency Mohammad Ashraf Ghani, the President of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 2015

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Tuesday, March 24, 2015, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Wednesday, March 25, 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 114TH CONGRESS

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 152, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 132) providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 152, the amendment printed in House Report 114-45 is adopted, and the resolution, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the resolution, as amended, is as follows:

H. RES. 132

Resolved,

SECTION 1. COMMITTEE EXPENSES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, there shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives, in accordance with this primary expense resolution, not more than the amount specified in subsection (b) for the expenses (including the expenses of all staff salaries) of each committee named in such subsection.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture,

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

NOT VOTING—39

Barton
Capuano
Cárdenas
Crawford
Davis, Rodney
Doggett
Fincher
Garamendi
Gibbs
Gosar
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Grijalva
Hanna
Harris
Hinojosa
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Labrador
Larsen (WA)
Lee
Lummis
Marchant
O'Rourke
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Perry
Quigley
Roskam
Schock
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sires
Smith (WA)
Walberg
Wilson (FL)
Young (IN)

□ 1215

So the Journal was approved.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 976

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 976.

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

\$10,173,096; Committee on Armed Services, \$14,208,340; Committee on the Budget, \$10,380,424; Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$14,044,580; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$19,531,442; Committee on Ethics, \$6,201,326; Committee on Financial Services, \$15,086,852; Committee on Foreign Affairs, \$14,923,986; Committee on Homeland Security, \$14,407,846; Committee on House Administration, \$9,293,130; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$9,197,310; Committee on the Judiciary, \$14,395,572; Committee on Natural Resources, \$13,422,774; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, \$18,059,682; Committee on Rules, \$5,846,964; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$10,671,164; Committee on Small Business, \$6,045,228; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$16,728,260; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$6,958,062; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$17,515,290.

SEC. 2. FIRST SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2015, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2016.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$5,086,548; Committee on Armed Services, \$7,104,170; Committee on the Budget, \$5,190,212; Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$7,022,290; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$9,765,721; Committee on Ethics, \$3,100,663; Committee on Financial Services, \$7,543,426; Committee on Foreign Affairs, \$7,461,993; Committee on Homeland Security, \$7,203,923; Committee on House Administration, \$4,646,565; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$4,598,655; Committee on the Judiciary, \$7,197,786; Committee on Natural Resources, \$6,711,387; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, \$9,029,841; Committee on Rules, \$2,960,982; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$5,335,582; Committee on Small Business, \$3,022,614; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$8,364,130; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$3,479,031; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$8,757,645.

SEC. 3. SECOND SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2016, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2017.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$5,086,548; Committee on Armed Services, \$7,104,170; Committee on the Budget, \$5,190,212; Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$7,022,290; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$9,765,721; Committee on Ethics, \$3,100,663; Committee on Financial Services, \$7,543,426; Committee on Foreign Affairs, \$7,461,993; Committee on Homeland Security, \$7,203,923; Committee on House Administration, \$4,646,565; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$4,598,655; Committee on the Judiciary, \$7,197,786; Committee on Natural Resources, \$6,711,387; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, \$9,029,841; Committee on Rules, \$2,885,982; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$5,335,582; Committee on Small Business, \$3,022,614; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$8,364,130; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$3,479,031; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$8,757,645.

(c) REVIEW OF USE OF FUNDS IN FIRST SESSION.—

(1) REVIEW.—None of the amounts provided for in section 1 for a committee named in subsection (b) may be available for expenses of the committee after March 15, 2016, unless the chair or ranking minority member of the committee appears and presents testimony at a hearing of the Committee on House Administration held prior to such date to review the committee's use of the amounts provided for in section 1 during the first session of the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress and to determine whether the amount specified in subsection (b) with respect to the committee should be updated on the basis of the review.

(2) WAIVER.—The Committee on House Administration may waive the application of paragraph (1) to any or all of the committees named in subsection (b).

SEC. 4. VOUCHERS.

Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 5. REGULATIONS.

Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 6. RESERVE FUND FOR UNANTICIPATED EXPENSES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established a reserve fund for unanticipated expenses of committees for the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress.

(b) AMOUNT.—The reserve fund under this section shall have a balance of \$1,000,000, of which—

(1) \$500,000 shall be available for unanticipated expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2015, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2016; and

(2) \$500,000 shall be available for unanticipated expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2016, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2017.

(c) ALLOCATION TO COMMITTEES.—Amounts in the reserve fund under this section shall be paid to a committee pursuant to an allocation approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 7. ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY.

The Committee on House Administration shall have authority to make adjustments in amounts under section 1, if necessary to comply with an order of the President issued under section 251A or 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or to conform to any change in appropriations for the purposes of such section 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 132.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 132, which is a resolution setting the funding levels for each House committee.

Every Congress, it is the responsibility of the Committee on House Administration to establish funding levels for committees in the House so that they may budget appropriately and prepare their oversight and operational responsibilities for the rest of Congress with a full knowledge of the resources available.

The Committee on House Administration started the consideration process out of this committee funding resolution by holding hearings to receive input from the chair and ranking members of each of our House committees. These were very productive, very informative hearings, and I am certain that my partner in this effort, the ranking member of our committee, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, certainly will share that belief. Each chair and ranking member worked together in the development of their committee's budget requests and in their advocacy for those requests before our committee. It was a true example of bipartisanship.

This funding resolution that is a product of the information developed by our hearings is also a bipartisan product, which was favorably reported out of our committee by unanimous voice vote. I am very pleased that each committee reaffirmed their commitment to uphold the equitable two-thirds/one-third allocation between the majority and the minority sides.

The Committee on House Administration has taken really great care, Mr. Speaker, in examining the funding levels authorized for each committee in this resolution so that the priorities of the House and the priorities of the American people are put front and center.

I think it is important to note that, over the past few Congresses, the House has not only asked for fiscal responsibility across the Federal Government, but has led by example in showing fiscal responsibility by making reductions in our own budgets, both in individual Member office budgets as well as the committee budgets.

Since the 110th Congress, for example, Mr. Speaker, the House has had actually a 15 percent reduction in our committee budgets. At the same time, our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol did not actually reduce the funding for their committees other than what was mandated by "sequestration." In fact, the other body actually increased their committee spending while the House was reducing spending, until making some modest reductions in the committee budgets recently at the start of the 114th. I just point that out. We were leading by example here.

Additionally, the Executive Office actually had a 30 percent increase in

their spending since 2008, and, given that it is the role of the Congress to conduct effective and needed oversight over the entire executive and judicial branches, I think it is very vital that we make certain that our committees have the resources they need to meet this important duty.

So that brings us here today, Mr. Speaker, to the consideration of House Resolution 152.

After hearing from each chair and each ranking member, the committee was able, really, to better ascertain the needs of each committee and to ensure that they did have adequate and proper funding. Many committees, including the Committee on House Administration, received no increase in funding in this resolution from what we were allocated in the 113th Congress. Many committees received flat funding. Because of the increased oversight or legislative priorities, other committees required a very modest or targeted increase in their resources.

The overall proposed increase in authorized funding for the committees is 1.63 percent for 2015 and 1.57 percent for 2016. Again, though, there are about half of the committees that received no increase in funding, got level funding.

The committee funding resolution also takes into account that there might be unforeseen circumstances that will pop up during the course of this Congress that might require some additional resources. For instance, in the case of the Judiciary Committee, it was testified by the chair and the ranking member that there is a possibility of a judicial impeachment proceeding. They may have to conduct that; they may not. So to prepare for that kind of unanticipated need, the Committee on House Administration has actually allocated \$500,000 for each session in the 114th into a reserve fund which could be allocated for something like that or, if there is another committee that demonstrates a real need for it, an emerging priority that perhaps they couldn't see at this point in time.

I just think that that is a very fiscally prudent way to budget, not just giving money on the "if come," but if we really do see that we need it, of course then we can protect that money; if we don't need to spend it, it won't be spent.

Before authorizing any increase in funding, the Committee on House Administration really dove into why the increase was needed, such as a specific new priority, emerging challenges that some of our committees will face this Congress. Some of the committees requested additional funds for urgent equipment needs.

Part of our responsibilities, of course, are to ensure smooth operations of this institution, because a breakdown of equipment that we rely on every day to assist with the daily function of the House may lead to proceedings being severely delayed or halted, and we thought that was an unacceptable possibility. So, as an exam-

ple, some of the equipment that, as I say, that some of the committees are looking for, we wanted to make sure we had resources there.

Another example is the need for additional specialized staff members to assist in the oversight functions that the committee is charged with. For instance, the Armed Services Committee, a good example, had great needs for additional staff to help with conducting vigorous oversight in the pursuit of major overdue reforms at the Pentagon which could save the Nation, literally, tens of billions of dollars. We thought that was a fiscally prudent use of additional resources.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee has immense new challenges in conducting their oversight needed to get to the bottom of the scandalous treatment of our veterans at the VA hospitals across the Nation. Again, we thought that that was an appropriate expenditure as we ensure that those who have served the cause of freedom get the care and the benefits that they have earned. Again, not only do we believe that it is a prudent use of additional resources, but an imperative duty.

Other committees have expressed a desire for more field hearings across the country, and our committee was very supportive of this because we really believe that getting out of Washington, if you will, and conducting these field hearings, talking to the American people, really allowing Members and committees to gather firsthand knowledge of how the Federal programs are functioning and their impact on our Nation, was a very important thing.

So I would say this. I think it is important to note that, while there is a very small overall increase in authorized committee spending, this funding resolution does not require any new spending, does not require any new spending within the House's overall budget. This funding resolution only redirects already appropriated resources to new priorities.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, we are proposing modest, targeted increases to meet the House committees' oversight and operational needs, and I would hope that each Member of the House will concur with the priorities that we have set forth in this funding resolution to allow each of our committees to continue with their important work.

Producing this resolution, I think, was important work for our committee, and I certainly want to thank all of our members, both Republican and Democrat, particularly the distinguished ranking member, Mr. BRADY from Pennsylvania, for his cooperation, their participation in the process, and the ideas that everybody brought to the table that helped produce this resolution that we bring to the full House today, which I will note as well, Mr. Speaker, was passed out of our committee unanimously.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 132.

After several days of testimony by committee chairs and ranking members and careful review by the Committee on House Administration, we determined what we believe to be appropriate committee funding levels for the 114th Congress.

I want to thank Chairman MILLER and her staff for their diligence throughout this process. We have worked closely and cooperatively. While we would have liked to have done more, I believe that these levels will allow committees to perform their oversight responsibilities. It is my hope that we continue to explore ways to ensure congressional committees are equipped with the proper amount of resources needed to operate fully, while still maximizing the value of their committee funding.

I urge a "yes" vote on this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would add that, for the 114th Congress—and I think this is a very important point, actually—the House remained below the amount authorized back in 2008. We are below the amount authorized in 2008. So the House has been making significant strides to take a very hard look at the way that we utilize our individual budgets, both in our Member offices as well as in our committees, and we are absolutely committed to being fiscally responsible stewards of the taxpayer dollar.

This funding resolution highlights those priorities to remain guardians of the taxpayer dollar, and as such, each committee must operate responsibly, using their budget to set priorities to carry out their important work.

Even after the adoption of the resolution, the Committee on House Administration will continue to work with each committee to assist them in finding solutions which deliver savings and allow every committee to stretch the valuable resources allocated so that they can continue to carry out their important duties.

At the Committee on House administration, we understand, Mr. Speaker, that it is our responsibility to ensure that the House operates in a fiscally responsible manner, an effective and efficient manner, and that is a responsibility that we take very, very seriously. I believe strongly that we have found the appropriate balance in funding this resolution that will keep in place fiscal responsibility and, at the same time, ensure that the important work of the House is carried out.

Mr. Speaker, I would mention to the ranking member that I don't think I have any other speakers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1230

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER). It is no secret that she won't be returning in the next Congress, but this will be the last time that I will be with her managing the committees' funding.

I know she is here 21 months more, but I want her to know that every chance I get, with this microphone, I will thank her.

She is, without question, one of the classiest ladies I know in this House. She is fair. I enjoy going to the committee meetings. We smile and we shake hands before the meeting, and we smile and we shake hands after the meeting. She is a pleasure to work with. I wish her well. And again, for the next 21 months, any chance I get, I just hope that I do have the opportunity to keep on thanking her.

I only hope that this House will take note of the way our committee works. We work together. We compromise together. And because of that, things get done.

So, again, I wish her well, and I will have more opportunity to wish her well.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, let me just sincerely, sincerely thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY), my ranking member.

If I am going to miss anything in this House, it is the great friendships that I have made with many people, both Republicans and Democrats. Certainly he has been right at the top of the list. He has been nothing but professional in our committee deliberations, in the way that we handle all of these different challenges that come before our committee.

I do think it is a very good thing that he points out that our committee does operate in a very bipartisan way. We are all about making sure that this institution is able to do what the American people expect from us, and we both share that passion. So I look forward to working with him for another year and a half here.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member to support the passage of this resolution so that each committee can plan appropriately with the full knowledge of their available resources.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 152, the previous question is ordered on the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A TRIBUTE TO RUTH ELLEN DAILEY HELM

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

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Ruth Ellen Dailey Helm, who passed away at the age of 98 recently in Tucson.

Ruth was a pilot during World War II, one of the first female pilots to serve in our military and a trailblazer.

Unlike many of the male pilots who served at the time, Ruth was qualified to fly multiple aircraft as a member of the Women Airforce Service Pilots, or WASPs; and she ferried bomber, transport, and pursuit aircraft all over the country during World War II.

She was inducted into the Arizona Aviation Hall of Fame in 1999 and awarded the Congressional Gold Medal with her WASP colleagues in 2010.

In addition to serving our country, Ruth and the WASPs were pioneers who inspired an entire generation of women to pursue their dreams of serving as pilots in our military, and that includes me.

When I was going through the challenges of becoming a fighter pilot in the first wave, there were no mentors in front of us to see us through. But when I needed encouragement or when I wanted to quit, Ruth and her fellow WASPs, starting 20 years ago, would be there for me, to inspire me and to encourage me and to give me what I needed to fight for another day.

They were more than role models who broke down gender barriers to serve in our military. They were my personal wingmen—or wingwomen, and I will be forever grateful to Ruth and all the WASP women for paving the way for me, for serving as my friends and my mentors, and for proving that women could be exceptional pilots too.

SAN DIEGO REGIONAL CLIMATE COLLABORATIVE

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the San Diego Regional Climate Collaborative, which recently won the United States Environmental Protection Agency's Climate Leadership Award for Innovative Partnerships. This award recognizes organizations across the country working on cutting-edge climate initiatives that address greenhouse gas reduction goals, adaptation, and resilience.

As a member-based network that supports public agencies in the San Diego region, the Climate Collaborative works to advance comprehensive solutions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and prepare our region for climate impacts.

In San Diego, climate change is not a partisan issue. While there is debate in Congress about the science of climate

change, there is not debate amongst scientists.

As I see every day, San Diegans aren't waiting for Washington to act to address climate change. The collaborative has built partnerships with business, academia, nonprofits, and philanthropic entities to share expertise, leverage resources, and advance actions that benefit San Diego's communities, economy, and natural resources.

The San Diego Regional Climate Collaborative serves as a model for other regions as we seek to address the harmful effects of climate change as a nation and as a planet. I congratulate them.

GENDER EQUALITY AT ABBOTT LABORATORIES

(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 honor the 10th District's very own Abbott Laboratories in North Chicago and their commitment to gender equality.

The National Association for Female Executives recently released their list of the top 50 companies for executive women. For the sixth consecutive year, Abbott Laboratories placed in the top 10. The association recognized Abbott for their commitment to promoting and empowering women.

I am extremely proud of Abbott's commitment and accomplishments. But it is also a sign, Mr. Speaker, of how much progress we still have to make as a country. We must continue to ensure that our young women have all the same opportunities available to them as young men. We must be sure that women are not at a disadvantage simply due to their gender. It is our duty not just as Members of this House but also as human beings to ensure that women and men are equals in the workplace, and increasing the number of female executives is crucial to that goal.

Mr. Speaker, companies like Abbott have made tremendous strides, but there is still work to be done. I applaud their example and urge others to follow.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE WEEK

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise during National Agriculture Week, with yesterday being National Agriculture Day, to recognize the contributions of farmers, ranchers, and producers to our economy and well-being.

Agriculture supports one in four Nebraska jobs and contributes more than \$23 billion to our State's economy. I am very proud to represent Nebraska's Third District, now the number one agriculture district in the Nation.

Our global economy presents great opportunity. Ninety-five percent of the world's consumers live outside the United States, and they all need to eat. As a result, we are seeing growing demand for Nebraska's agriculture products. Our State's beef exports reached a record high, \$1 billion in sales, in 2014.

The efficiency and forward thinking of our ag producers is making it possible to meet demand with fewer inputs and less waste.

As founder and cochairman of the Modern Agriculture Caucus, I am committed to promoting scientifically based innovation and policies.

On this National Agriculture Day and Agriculture Week, please join me in thanking the many producers working tirelessly to support our economy and help feed the world.

BOSMA ENTERPRISES AND ABILITYONE

(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, I rise today to pay tribute to an exemplary partnership between the AbilityOne Program, an extraordinary initiative that helps people with disabilities, and Indiana's own Bosma Enterprises.

For the past 25 years of Bosma's 100 years in business, their partnership with AbilityOne has helped disabled Hoosiers achieve a greater level of independence and enabled many to gain employment in good-paying jobs.

Nearly 60 percent of all employees there are blind or suffer some degree of visual impairment. One such man is Don Green. Don is totally blind and found it very difficult to reenter the job market. About to give up after almost 200 job rejections, Don applied to Bosma, which, because of its contracts through AbilityOne, was able to hire him as a material handler. Just 6 years later, Mr. Speaker, Don is a production supervisor, managing 40 people.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize the work that Bosma Enterprises is doing in partnership with the AbilityOne Program. They open doors of opportunity and help make the State of Indiana, my beloved State, a better place to live each and every day.

THE AMERICAN PATENT SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from New York (Mr. KATKO).

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND SEXUAL ABUSE

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about important issues that face our society, domestic violence and sexual abuse.

As a former Federal prosecutor for the last two decades, I witnessed how violence affects people of all ages, races, religions, and socioeconomic conditions. Domestic violence does not discriminate.

Our country has a moral obligation to stand up against those who exploit their power to commit violence against men, women, and children.

In an effort to raise awareness and to put an end to domestic violence and sexual abuse, my district will be kicking off the White Ribbon Campaign. The White Ribbon Campaign is one of the largest efforts in the world of people working together to prevent and end domestic violence and sexual assault against women, men, and children. The White Ribbon Campaign will begin this Friday, March 20, and run through March 29.

Vera House of Syracuse, New York, is spearheading the local effort in my district. Vera House is a comprehensive domestic and sexual violence service agency that provides shelter, advocacy, and counseling services for women, children, and men. They also provide education and prevention programs and community coordination.

Vera House will be providing white ribbons, such as the one on my lapel here, and white wrist bands, such as the white one on my wrist here today, in an effort to build awareness and put a stop to domestic violence and sexual abuse.

From March 20 to March 29, thousands of my constituents in central New York will be wearing a white ribbon or a white wristband to raise awareness about domestic violence and sexual abuse.

I encourage my House colleagues to join me and New York's 24th Congressional District in wearing a white ribbon to put a spotlight on this very important issue. Wearing the white ribbon demonstrates a personal pledge to never commit, condone, or remain silent about violence against men, women, or children.

I hope my country can join me today to support survivors of abuse while providing alternatives to this destructive cycle.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I hope everyone paid attention to that wonderful idea that has just been given to us.

These Special Orders play a role here in that we permit ourselves the opportunity to hear from people for a little bit more than 1 minute to talk about issues that are significant and who would like to bring them to the attention of the American people and, of course, to their colleagues here in Congress.

Today I intend to bring the attention of the American people and my colleagues to a threat to the well-being of the American people, a major threat that has gone unrecognized and could well change our way of life and change the way of life for our children and destroy one of the basic rights that were

written into our Constitution in order to protect the prosperity and security of our country.

I am talking about the changes that are being proposed in our fundamental technology law, in our patent system. And I know that sounds very boring to most people. But the fact is, without a strong patent system, the American people would be at the mercy of both competitors, in terms of their labor overseas, but also in terms of the vicious and totalitarian elements in other countries that might want to do us harm.

□ 1245

It is our ability to produce the technology that America needs in order to make our people competitive and to produce the wealth that is necessary for a decent standard of living that has made America the great country that it is. We are a great country not because we have very powerful and wealthy interests here in the United States, which we do. We are a great country because ordinary people are permitted to live decent lives and because our country has not been challenged throughout its history over and over again and had to waste all of our resources and all of our wealth on vast amounts of armaments and drafting all of our people into the military and having a militarized society in order to have us safe from a foreign threat. No. What we have done is we have been able to produce wealth dramatically in our country and had our workers' being competitive with labor from around the world because we have been technologically superior.

Mr. Speaker, there is a threat to that technology superiority, an incredible threat that is being foisted off on the Congress and the American people. I am here to alert my fellow Members of Congress to this threat.

One needs only to see how important the technology element of our society has been right here in the United States Congress. There is a statue here in the Capitol to Philo Farnsworth. Now, who the heck knows who Philo Farnsworth was? Well, not many. But there is a statue to him here because he represents a very significant part of the American story.

Philo Farnsworth was a farmer in Utah, a man who was educated in engineering, but a man who had very little resources. He set out in between farming to try to find and discover a technological secret that had perplexed some of the most powerful and financial interests in our country.

RCA, at that time under a man named David Sarnoff, was America's premier technology company, a company that had vast resources and was deeply involved in trying to find out how to invent a picture tube, how we would have a tube that showed images rather than just radio waves that had voice on them. This was a huge challenge and a historic challenge. RCA pumped millions of dollars of research into this.

The one who discovered this secret was Philo Farnsworth, an independent inventor, a man who was a farmer in Utah. He discovered the secret and then wrote to RCA very naively believing that this big corporation would honor his discovery and permit him to have the benefit—or at least a benefit—from this discovery.

Yes, then RCA sent Philo Farnsworth a representative from their laboratories. When he described what he had found, the scientist from RCA went away saying, “We will be in touch,” and never got in touch. The next thing that Philo knew was that there was an announcement that RCA had made a major breakthrough in discovery—only it was exactly the discovery that Philo Farnsworth had made and had transmitted the information to RCA.

This became one of the great jury and great legal battles of the early 20th century. Philo Farnsworth, an individual person, was up against the most powerful American corporation of the day, RCA, and had one of the strongest and toughest leaders of that corporation, David Sarnoff, who vowed not to give him a penny and not to recognize him because it was RCA that actually came up with this.

Philo Farnsworth was able to mobilize support behind his claim. He was able to have people invest in his lawsuits, and slowly but surely they made their way through our court system all the way to the Supreme Court of the United States. God bless the United States of America. A single man, a poor, individual farmer who had come up with an important technology secret had his rights respected by our Supreme Court over the power and influence of America’s most powerful corporation of the day, RCA.

Philo Farnsworth was recognized as the inventor, the inventor of the picture tube which has transformed our country and transformed the world. All the picture tubes you see, and now the screens that we see on our computers, can be traced back to the discovery of this one individual, Philo Farnsworth, and the tragedy that his life was because, over the years, he lived a very poor life. He was constantly in struggle. He had very little resources. By the time he won the Supreme Court case, it was late in his life, and he did not benefit, as he should have greatly, from that.

We have a statue to this wonderful American, a man who stands for what America stands for, using technology to benefit the people, not just to enrich huge corporate interests. Indeed, Philo Farnsworth has a statue here in the Capitol. But you will never see a statue to David Sarnoff of RCA. That shows you where the heart and soul of America is.

The fact that we had a Supreme Court that decided for the little guy rather than the huge, powerful corporation showed what kind of country we have. That is what makes America great. That is what has created the new

technologies that have uplifted our people and made sure that our people were competitive and, thus, had high standards of living and that we were secure from foreign threats because we were technologically superior to those foreign threats.

This is what has made America great, and today it is in jeopardy. The technological edge of our country will be robbed from us by multinational corporations who are powerful and are shifting issues through the Congress that will greatly diminish the patent protection of the American people. Had these same changes in the law that these multinational corporations would now foist upon us been the law in the days of Philo Farnsworth, we would have no picture tube. We would never have had a Philo Farnsworth. We would never have had the recognition of the creative genius of the American people. Instead, we would have had the powerful, rich, multinational corporations running roughshod over America’s creative genius.

No. We have that threat today, and I would ask people to pay close attention to what is happening here on the floor of House in the next few months. What has happened is we have to understand that patent protection of the American people is something that was written into our Constitution. It is part of the heart and soul of our country.

Benjamin Franklin is well-known as the man who discovered electricity, but he was also one of the great Founders of our Declaration of Independence and, yes, one of the people who authored our Constitution—Benjamin Franklin, the great technology hero, the hero of liberty and just for all.

If you go to Monticello and visit Thomas Jefferson’s home, it is filled with inventions, small inventions. Thomas Jefferson knew that we were not going to rely on Big Government, we couldn’t rely on big corporate interests and rich people, but we would rely on the genius of the American people through technology. Freedom and technology are the two things that would uplift ordinary Americans. Those things are now at stake. They are now in danger.

We, in fact, are now facing basic changes to the concept of intellectual property rights, and especially the rights of our inventors, and it is being foisted upon this body in what I would say is a very deceitful manner by powerful interest groups from the outside. But remember, with the protection that we have had, America has had the inventions. We have uplifted the standard of living of the ordinary American.

We built the reaper, which permitted us to harvest huge crops of food so that Americans were well-fed, and we became the breadbasket of the world; the cotton gin which made sure that people had clothing. There was a Black American who invented the machine that permitted the mass production of shoes. The mass production of shoes was permitted because a Black Amer-

ican whose other rights were not protected, his rights to own the intellectual property, the inventions, the patent rights to his invention, were respected. Because of that, all Americans ended up with being able to have more than just one pair of shoes. Before this man invented his invention of how to mass produce shoes, ordinary people had one pair of shoes and that was it. That was it. When they wore out, your feet wore out.

We had things like the electric light that we know that Thomas Edison was so involved with; telephones, Alexander Graham Bell. All the major inventions that we have were invented by American genius, not of very powerful corporations, but of the American genius of the American people.

What we have always had, however, is a situation where big guys did try to steal the creativity of the little guy, but in our country, they couldn’t get away with it. In our country, the Philo Farnsworths knew that they would be protected if they created something that uplifted their fellow man. So Americans and American genius was put to work as never before in any country’s history to make sure ordinary people, and especially our working people in our factories and our companies, could be competitive with those factories and companies and the workers overseas.

Our people don’t work harder than the people overseas. That is not what made us a great country. The fact is people work really hard all over the world, especially in Third World countries where people live in utter poverty. They work really hard. But it is the technology that is put into play, the technology put into play with that hard work and the profit motive for investing in that technology and creating that technology, that is what has made the difference in an American people that are well-fed, American people with great opportunities, American people who can be proud that they have a decent standard of living and are able to make decisions for themselves and their families, not just live in the abject poverty that existed for so long in so much of the world.

No, it wasn’t just our hard work. It wasn’t just our natural resources. It was a Constitution that wrote into it the rights of every individual citizen. And paramount to those rights, even before the Bill of Rights in our Constitution, is a provision that guarantees that our inventors and our writers will be given the right to own, to control their invention or their book for a given period of time and profit from it.

Traditionally, our inventors have had ownership rights to what they have invented for 17 years of protection. During that 17 years, they would own it, and when they applied for a patent, once that patent was issued, they would have 17 years to control what they had invented. Also, until that patent was issued, it has always been, in the United States, kept totally secret

what that invention is until the inventor has been actually granted the rights to own that invention.

Well, these things have led directly to a genius, a surge of genius in our borders that reflected the fact that our people had freedom and technology available to them. So these are things that we have taken for granted because this is what America is all about.

But today, powerful multinational corporations, especially in the electronics industry, are trying to destroy America's patent system. My colleagues should now understand this, and the American people should understand this and be talking to their Member of Congress and their Senators, because if they succeed in undermining our patent system and destroying the rights of the little guy to own what he has created and give the big guys the power to steal from the little guys, we will see a difference in our country. Within a generation, we will no longer have these advantages that I just spoke about. What we have today is an effort by the big guys to change the rules so they can get away with stealing from the little guys.

Now, obviously, people aren't going to come out and just say: "Please let's vote for a bill that is going to break down the patent system so that big, multinational corporations can steal from American inventors." Of course they are not going to say that. So what do they say? Well, let me put it this way. 25 years ago when I first noticed—this fight has been going on the entire time that I have been in Congress.

I noticed that what had happened was that some big corporations were trying to put into the GATT implementation—GATT is a trade treaty. They were trying to put into that trade treaty's implementation language a bill that had to go through Congress, changes in our patent system that weren't even required by the treaty. I will get into what they were doing if you really want to see how heinous and sinister this is.

What were those changes 25 years ago that these big corporations wanted to make? Number one was saying that, yes, when you apply for your patent, 20 years after you apply for it, you really have no patent rights after that at all, even if it takes 15 years to get your patent.

□ 1300

The American system was the clock starts ticking when you get your patent, 17 years of protection. These big guys were trying to give our American inventors maybe no protection. After 20 years, they had nothing.

But everybody would know about it because the second provision they were trying to foist off on us was that after 18 months, if a patent had been applied for, after 18 months, even if the patent had not been granted, they were going to publish the patent application, so that every thief in the world would have heard all of the secrets of every American inventor.

They called it the Patent Application Publication Act, they were so blatant about it. After we fingered it and drew America's attention to it, they changed the name, of course.

Then it became an issue of not trying to disclose patents or patent applications, not trying to limit the amount of ownership that our patent people had; it became, instead, a battle against the "submarine patentors." That is what they called it.

That was the bogeyman that was created that day in order to get people here to vote in a way that would destroy the patent rights of the American people, the patent rights that I just outlined.

Both of those were going to be eliminated. You are going to have, instead of no disclosure, you will have full disclosure of your patent application, even before you are granted the patent, and you are not guaranteed any specific time, but your patent was going to run out after 20 years, even if you had never had any time to protect it. That is what they were trying to do, and we managed to stop them.

We put a coalition together, a bipartisan coalition. MARCY KAPTUR of Ohio and myself have been active on this issue for the last 25 years, trying to thwart these huge corporate interests who are trying to neuter the rights of the little guy, of the small inventor, of the independent operator.

How did we stop them that very first time? Well, we added an amendment on that said these changes that are being foisted on us today—or being voted on today—only apply to companies that have over 100 employees.

All of a sudden, those people who were advocating this saying, Oh, this will be good for everybody, especially the small inventor, all of a sudden, they had to withdraw the bill.

Well, if it was so good for the little guy, why would they withdraw the bill? Well, they withdrew the bill because the bill was aimed at helping huge corporate interests to step on the little guy in the United States.

We defeated that, but we have been fighting, fighting, fighting for 20 years; and this year, it looks like we have lost the leverage that we had to defeat these powerful special interests.

That is why it is important for the American people and people involved in technology development to pay attention to proposals that are being made here in the House and in the Senate concerning intellectual property rights, especially concerning the patent rights that our people have enjoyed, as I say, since the founding of our country.

Today, we have a bill that is being presented. Again, it can't be presented on how do we destroy the patent rights of the average American. They have to find something that sounds so sinister that they can set up a straw man. They will say, Look at him, we are going to beat him up. That is what this bill is about.

Just like I said, submarine patents were the reason why they had to eliminate the right of the small inventor to a guaranteed term or to have confidentiality in its patent application like before. That was a submarine patent.

Well, now, they are not saying that. They have had to come up with a better term that is even more frightening and sickening than submarine patent. The cynical nature of this type of debate on an issue was demonstrated by the fact that a corporate leader, who was on the other side of this issue than I am, has now changed his position and come to me with a description of how the words "patent troll" came about because, now, we hear that we have got to change the law, not for submarine patents, but now because patent trolls are preying on the American people, they are draining us of funds and enriching themselves, these patent trolls.

Well, where did that word come from? This gentleman that I am talking about was in a meeting with the heads of some very powerful corporations. They sat around in a circle to decide what term they should use.

He said to me: Well, I recommended "patent pirate." Well, that wasn't sinister enough, so they came up with patent troll.

By the time everyone heard that: Yes, that is the one.

Well, why is it the one? Because it sounds so sinister that it is going to be able to blind people as to who the real victim is. Now, we are out to get the patent troll, but it is the little guy, it is the small inventor, it is the independent inventors that are going to be damaged severely by an attack on a patent troll.

Now, what is a patent troll, by what they are trying to tell us? Patent troll—we keep hearing the argument that there are people in our society that are using, basically, patents that are not really good patents.

They are patents that really are not legitimate patents, and they are using these to create litigation that will enrich the lawyers—the patent trolls—because the patent trolls just reach out with some illegitimate patent claim, and then they have to get paid off or they have to go to jail.

Well, how much of this is there? There is some of that, but let us note this: There are frivolous lawsuits throughout our entire system; there are frivolous lawsuits in almost every endeavor in the American economy, but there are also legitimate lawsuits. There are people who are really damaged and deserve to have the right to sue somebody.

The law that we are facing now, that is being proposed here in Congress for a patent law, is the equivalent of eliminating the right of people to sue someone who has done damage to them in order to prevent a frivolous lawsuit from happening.

Do we really want to neuter the rights of people? Because some people abuse the system, you are going to

take the 90 percent of the cases where it is not being abused or 95 percent of the cases where it is a legitimate suit and eliminate that right in order to handle the frivolous suits? That is what is happening.

Although we are being told that all of the suits are frivolous and that the inventors are being portrayed as money-grubbers, these guys trying to take advantage of these big corporations—yeah, right. The little guy is trying to take advantage of the big guy, and that is why we have got to pass a law that dramatically restricts the rights of the little guy to deal with an infringement by a big corporation.

What this bill is, H.R. 9, and it is waiting to be brought to the floor. It could be brought to the floor in the next week, month, 2 months; we don't know yet. This bill dramatically undercuts the rights of legitimate patentholders to enforce their patents.

The patent troll element comes in with this. Today, if you are a small inventor and a large corporate interest has been infringing on your invention, if you own it for 17 years—after that, by the way, everybody can use it for free—but during that 17 years, you have a right to be compensated for the fact that you are the one who discovered this.

You invested your time and your effort and your scarce resources in order to come up with this new discovery, yes; and they have a right then to try to bring, if a large corporation is using it without paying them royalties, they have a right to bring suit.

But many of them don't have those resources. They don't have any money. They are, indeed, independent small inventors up against corporations that are worth billions of dollars and, I might say, multinational corporations.

These aren't just an American David Sarnoff. A lot of these corporations we are talking about are multinational corporations, and they have nothing to do with the American interests. They have everything to do with the interest of making money for their stockholders and their company, which is multinational, which is global in scope and not an American company necessarily.

We are going to undercut American inventors' rights to try to enforce their patent from being stolen by multinational corporations. That is what this bill does.

This is, to me, in my 25 or 26 years here in Congress, the best example of crony capitalism that I have ever seen. What is crony capitalism? That is when we pass laws and we set up regulations that are aimed at—what—helping the big guy in relationship to the little guy.

Crony capitalism is when the little guys pay and end up having their rights trampled upon, but the big guys are protected by different laws and clauses that we put into law here in Washington in the House and in the Senate.

Well, the bogeyman this time, as I say, is the patent troll. The patent troll is what? The patent troll is someone—although I wouldn't call him a patent troll. I would say there is a person who is willing to join with a small inventor—or independent inventor—to see that his patent is enforced.

We are not talking about phony patents; we are talking about legitimate patents. We are not talking about frivolous claims; we are talking about legitimate claims to patent claims of an inventor, but the inventor does not have the strength to enforce that against a big corporation that has an unlimited budget.

This bill would make it dramatically more difficult for anyone to enlist someone who is not the inventor to help them press their case against the infringement, the stuff that they had.

By the way, if this law, H.R. 9, was passed and would have been law at the time of Philo Farnsworth, Philo Farnsworth would have been beaten up, kicked around, stepped upon, and he would not have had any benefit from his invention of the picture tube.

Do we want a country in which the big guys are able to do that to the small inventors? How long are we going to be on top of things? How long will the standard of living of our people stay high and our businesses competitive and our country safe and secure because of technological advances? How long will that last if we are stepping on the little guy and we fundamentally change the nature of technology law in our country? That is what is happening.

This bill passed last year in the House, and it was stopped in the Senate. Let me note that one of the amendments that I personally had to propose that demonstrate how bad this bill is—although I managed to win the one amendment that we were able to win—was they wanted to take away the rights of an inventor to sue the Patent Office if, indeed, the Patent Office was not legally acting in terms of his patent application.

In other words, if a government agency was doing something illegally, using illegal criteria—maybe because someone else was influencing the decision from the outside, maybe there was just some sort of personality problem, maybe it was corruption from within—but if an independent inventor sees that he is being treated and is being dealt with in a way that is not consistent with the law, the small inventor has always had a right, just like any other American, to sue and take his case to court.

This is how blatant H.R. 9 is. That bill contained a provision that said the small inventor can't take his case to court. They are going to neuter the small inventor of his right to take it to court; and he has to, instead, go to an ombudsman at the Patent Office—oh, my, an ombudsman, how nice.

Eliminating the right of an American citizen and inventor in order to—

what—in order to send him to a government bureaucrat and the agency that he thinks has done him wrong, rather than having a day in court.

□ 1315

That exemplifies everything that is in H.R. 9, and it is so cynical because what we have got is, again, the American people saying, "Look at this straw man." It is called "straw man argumentation." Let's build up a straw man—the trolls—and everybody will think that we are aiming at the trolls when, in fact, the real targets are the little guys—the American independent inventors—the little guys who can't afford without some help from the outside to enforce their patents.

There is nothing wrong with someone investing in an inventor who says, "Look, I have got my whole life's savings in this. I have invented this, but this big corporation refuses to give me any royalties from my patent." There is nothing wrong with trying to help that inventor enforce his rights—there is nothing wrong at all—but the straw man is that person who is actually investing in this. Now, he didn't invent it, and he is going to profit by it. Thus, he is a troll. No. That person is fulfilling an important role in not permitting outside people to invest in inventions and with inventors.

By doing that, what we have done is diminish the value of every American patent. That understanding defeated this bill in the Senate last year because our American universities understood that, if that went in, the value of all of these patents that the American universities have been developing would dramatically go down. It diminishes the value of all patents when you eliminate that right of the people to invest in patent enforcement. That makes sense.

So there was an upheaval at almost every American major university and in many other industries that deal directly with long-term research and development, like the pharmaceutical industry, for example. They knew that we could not allow this to happen. That was stopped in the Senate the last time around. People realized that this type of crony capitalist attempt was to the detriment of the American people.

We have some of the most powerful multinational corporations still at play, trying to push this through this session of Congress. People have to know that H.R. 9 is crony capitalism personified. They need to talk to their Congressmen, and my colleagues need to talk to each other about this bill and not just accept what is being handed to them as something that has made its way through the committee process.

This bill destroys the rights of discovery for the little guy. This suit basically doesn't do anything to go up against frivolous lawsuits, but it deems all of the legitimate cases and puts them in the same category as frivolous

lawsuits. H.R. 9 causes fees, and fees on defending infringement would be levied not on the guys who have committed the crime. We are actually leveling fees on the people who are trying to enforce their rights. We are asking people to pay more money in order to enforce their rights.

It destroys, for example, the treble damage awards. Now, what does that mean? If you are a little guy, to get a lawyer to help you, that lawyer has to know he is going to make a profit when getting involved in a suit against a big corporation. Today, they have what they call triple damages. If the corporation knows that it is infringing on the little guy, there are triple damages. They are trying to get rid of those triple damages and say, "No, only actual damages."

What does that mean? The little guy can never afford to hire a lawyer. The lawyers won't get involved. You can see these big corporations, they certainly have all of the legal help they need. Basically, that provision alone neuters the leverage that a small inventor has to get some legal help in his battle to defend his or her own property rights.

This bill, by the way, fails to identify—and it even sometimes protects—lawyers who are operating on bad faith with frivolous lawsuits, as compared to trying to help—let's deter frivolous lawsuits, but let's not do it by eliminating the rights of people who have legitimate claims against big corporations.

There is another bill now emerging. In the House, it is H.R. 9. It is a disaster. We need to make sure people know that the American people have been tipped off and that we are not going to let this happen by the major, huge corporations like Google, which is one of the main groups behind this trying to rip off these little guys. We are not going to allow that to happen, and they are not going to rip us off either.

This has been recognized in the Senate. Like I said, it was stopped the last time, so there is a bill in the Senate, S. 632. Senator COONS has put this bill in. This bill reasserts the condition of willful infringement. Basically, it reinforces the idea that, if a company is willfully infringing, this is something that someone needs to be paid for and compensated for because someone intentionally stepped on his rights. It gives the PTO the discretion to award damages in these cases when you see that a big company has willfully said, We will ignore the fact that we know this group invented it. Ignore that. Just go ahead, and if they try to sue us, we will step on them, or we will get the rules of the game changed in Congress so that they don't have a chance to sue us.

S. 632, the Coons bill in the Senate, specifically allows higher education and smaller entities to be identified as legitimate owners. Thus, we are protecting the actual little guys and their educational institutions. What we also

have in the Senate bill is something that identifies bad faith in these demand letters. There are frivolous lawsuits. It actually gives strength and power to thwart these frivolous lawsuits without damaging the rights of the small inventor and the traditional rights of the American people.

We are up against a major fight, but here we have a good piece of legislation in the Senate, in the Coons bill, S. 632, and in a crony capitalism bill, H.R. 9, here in the House. The American people have to at times get involved or things will go haywire in our country. We don't have the rights and privileges that every American enjoys simply because they are in the Constitution. Over the years, the American people have stepped up when they have seen that their rights were being trampled upon.

The big guys were always around, trying to steal from the little guys, but as we saw in the case of Philo Farnsworth, we have a commitment to America's little guys. As for the men and women who maybe are not rich but who have a creative genius that will uplift all of us, we have made a commitment to them. H.R. 9 breaks that commitment and destroys their ability to actually benefit from their own creative genius.

I would ask my colleagues to spend time reading H.R. 9 and consider the straw man argument—the trolls. Get beyond the slogan, and see what effect it will have, and ask small inventors— independent inventors—and educators what impact the changes in H.R. 9 will have. Once the legislators here in the House do, and once they understand the damage that this will do to the American people and how the little guy is going to be stepped upon, they will vote against it, but they have to have their attention drawn to this.

People are busy here in Washington. The biggest problem is getting the attention of our colleagues to pay attention to a bill like H.R. 9. That is part of what the citizenry has to do if our process is going to work. They need to be talking to their Congressmen. They need to be talking to their Senators. Whether you are an educator and you deal with patents of your educational institution or whether you are an independent inventor and have an idea that will make Americans more productive and more competitive or make our country safer, you are the treasure house of this country, and they are trying to destroy that treasure right now.

I call on my colleagues to join me in opposition to H.R. 9 and to work with the Senate to try to have the Senate bill intertwined and to come to a compromise so we can have a positive bill here in the House and so we can move forward in a positive way to make sure that Americans remain prosperous, that Americans remain secure, and that Americans remain free. That is what our Constitution was all about. That is what Thomas Jefferson was all about, and that is what Benjamin

Franklin was all about. That is what we are supposed to be all about.

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

IN MEMORY OF FIREFIGHTER DANIEL CORRIGAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of local Santa Barbara, California, firefighter Daniel Corrigan.

Dan was born and raised in Hayward, California, where he played football and attended Moreau Catholic High School. Dan earned his degree in mechanical engineering from Cal Poly Pomona, and he began his firefighting career with the Fresno Fire Department in 2007. In 2013, Dan joined the Santa Barbara City Fire Department, where he made a tremendous impact not only on his colleagues but on the entire community.

Throughout his career, Dan was recognized by his colleagues for his hard work ethic, his considerable intelligence, and enjoyable sense of humor.

That is why we were all so deeply saddened by the unexpected news when Dan passed away 2 weeks ago. He was just 35. His loss came much too early for a beloved hero who devoted so much of himself to serve his community.

Dan is survived by his pregnant fiancée, Sarah; by his son, Jack; by his sisters Debbie and Rosanne; and by his parents, John and Anne.

Our thoughts and prayers are with them all at this sad time.

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

WOMEN'S AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS HISTORY MONTH

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

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, every year during the month of March, we celebrate the contributions to events in history and modern society by women. We call it Women's History Month, but in my district, in the U.S. Virgin Islands, the month of March is also commemorated as Virgin Islands History Month.

So, in keeping with both customs, I would like to take the time to recognize a few Virgin Islanders who have broken the glass ceiling for women in the upper echelons of law in the territory and, indeed, in the United States, and who inspired generations of young women to do the same:

The Honorable Eileen Ramona Peterson, who became the first female judge in the U.S. Virgin Islands in 1971; the Honorable J'ada Finch-Sheen, who later became the first female sworn in

as attorney general of the Virgin Islands; and the Honorable Wilma Lewis, who, among a long list of noteworthy accomplishments, was the first African American woman to serve as inspector general to the U.S. Department of the Interior and, later, as the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia. Judge Lewis currently serves as the chief judge of the District Court of the Virgin Islands.

Our fight for law and justice and equality comes from our history, and that fight has often been led by women, women such as Queen Mary Thomas, who, along with three other women, led a revolt in the streets of St. Croix to protest unfair labor wages and deplorable working conditions in 1878.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize these women because their work and their contributions have allowed many Virgin Islands women to ascend through the glass ceiling. Their contributions made it possible for a young girl from the Virgin Islands—myself—to become a New York assistant district attorney, to be at the Justice Department and to later serve as the fifth-elected Delegate to Congress from the U.S. Virgin Islands.

To that end, Mr. Speaker, it troubles me to see the political gamesmanship that is delaying the confirmation of Loretta Lynch as the next Attorney General of the United States. By all accounts, she is highly qualified and regarded, and would make a great Attorney General. I am urging my colleagues in the Senate Chamber to bring Ms. Lynch's confirmation to a vote. Place your objections on the record.

□ 1330

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

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, the story out in a number of media, like this from Breitbart, "First Details of Iran Deal: Allows 6,000 Centrifuges, Rolls Back the U.N. Arms Embargo." That story talks about in order to entice Iran to cut back to 6,000 or 6,500 centrifuges, elements of the U.N. arms embargo against Iran could be rolled back.

I think it is important to recall, it hasn't been that long ago that a principal cornerstone of the discussions between the Obama administration and the—I have to be careful the words I use here on the House floor—America-killing Iran administration was going to require them to dismantle their efforts toward nuclear production, and now they are floating a draft that is going to allow them to have thousands of centrifuges.

Now, I have been advised by people at the IAEA in Vienna that, actually, if they just have 3,000 centrifuges, with all of the uranium that has been en-

riched to 5 percent, they only need 3,000 to take it up to 90 percent. Once you are at 5 percent, it seems like it would be a long way to get to 90, but actually it is just a matter of weeks.

You could do it easily in a facility that would be easy to hide, because you could take those 3,000 in a facility 30 meters by 70 meters and you could enrich from 5 to 90 percent at weapons grade uranium, have the nukes that at least at one time Ayatollah Khamenei has indicated—I understand still believes—that they can hasten the return of the 12th imam, the Mahdi, to rule over this world caliphate, and they can do so because they believe the prophecy is that he will arise—the 12th imam, as the Mahdi, the head of the caliphate, this world caliphate, he will arise out of chaos, and they believe that could be nuclear chaos.

So, in effect, if this administration agrees to allow even 1,500 centrifuges to continue to spin in Iran, he is hastening the demise of millions of people, ultimately. A new Holocaust. Now, it is one thing when leaders in the United States could say, "Gee, we didn't know that millions of Jews were being killed by Hitler; gee, we just didn't know," but there came a point where it became very clear, and Hitler and his subordinates really tried to hide what they were doing.

Iran has made no bones about what they want to do. They want to wipe Israel off the map. First of all, they are never going to eliminate all of the Jews in the world; it will not happen. As God is my witness, that will not happen. What will happen, as anybody, including this administration, if they are intent on going there, to allow Iran to continue to move toward nuclear weapons under this so-called nuclear agreement, they move there, it will cause judgment to come down on our country for allowing something so horrific to become possible when we had the means to stop it.

This is no time for anyone who is a civilized individual, who believes in the rights of men, the rights of women, the rights of children, to be cutting a deal with these cutthroats in Iran. Nobody seems to want to talk about it, but Iran has drug this thing out for over a year.

Perhaps Valerie Jarrett was working a deal even longer than that. There were reports that she was negotiating with them early on, trying to see if something could be done. Whether that is true or not, clearly what Iran has done is drug out the talks, continued to increase the number of centrifuges it has spinning, continued to move toward the ability to have a tremendous amount of 5 percent enrichment so that it very quickly can move to 90 percent and develop the nukes.

They would likely develop a number of them at the same time, not just do one. They would do a number and then spread them out so that, once they move into nuclear mode, they have several. You try to take them out at that

point; you are going to find one or more of them in cities that you care about. So we should never allow that to even become possible.

When I see this deal, I see all these articles about it, then I see this article "Obama Planning Drastic Shake-Up in Policy Toward Israel." So because the people of Israel, in their election, made clear, "We would prefer not to be wiped out by Iran, and we can tell that the deal that the Obama administration is cutting is bad for Israel and puts us at extreme risk," they gave more seats than were expected to the Likud Party, Netanyahu's party.

What is the response of the Obama administration after they threw everything they possibly could, threw temper tantrums about Prime Minister Netanyahu speaking from right here just to tell us his perspective on the Iranian deal because his country is most at risk? Those that refused to understand—it isn't just Israel at risk—may pay at the cost of thousands or millions of lives. These people have no respect for the lives of people who are not radical Islamists, as they are.

So you might think: Oh, gee, maybe the Obama administration learned a lesson; let's don't try to interfere in the election process in a foreign country. It does make you wonder, you know, there were all those rumors about since the Obama money was never audited in his original campaign in 2008 and there were massive numbers of \$50 contributions with credit cards, where did those come from? Were any of those foreign?

We have seen allegations about money coming in to Hillary Clinton's campaign from foreigners. We know in Bill Clinton's campaign they got caught redhanded with money from monks that was given to Vice President Al Gore, but, you know, foreigners are not supposed to be able to influence our elections. It appears that potentially they have.

If that were true—don't know for certain because there wasn't an audit done, but maybe that would help explain why this administration is so quick to get involved in the election process in Israel to try to destroy Netanyahu, who was more concerned with the preservation of the nation of Israel than he was in getting another Nobel Peace Prize for this administration.

But this, dated today, by Melanie Batley says:

The White House on Wednesday suggested it could reverse its decades-old policy of using its veto in the United Nations Security Council to protect Israel. It could refuse to veto resolutions related to the Palestinians or introduce a measure of its own, The Wall Street Journal reported.

The U.S. could also lend its support to a two-state solution based on Israel's 1967 borders, a senior White House official told The New York Times: "We're currently evaluating our approach," State Department spokeswoman Jen Psaki said, according to the Journal. "We're not going to prejudge what we would do if there was a U.N. action."

She should have said “if there were,” but she said “if there was.”

The article also says:

The Obama administration in the past has shielded Israel at the Security Council, using a veto to strike down a resolution condemning Israeli settlement activity in Palestinian territory.

Now, Obama officials may decide to allow Israel to be exposed to more international pressure in an attempt to force them back into negotiating.

This is what I would call a deal to hasten the attempted demise of Israel.

It is interesting, though, “We’re currently evaluating our approach,” the State Department said, because we were told by a Muslim Brothers publication in December of 2012 that—yes, I believe it was 2012. It was before the fall of Muslim Brother Morsi as President of Egypt, but it was a Muslim Brothers-approved publication in Egypt that bragged about the six top advisers in the Obama administration who they bragged were Muslim Brothers.

Now, some in the media don’t want to do anything but vilify me for pointing out what the Muslim Brothers have pointed out, but for a number of years I tried to advise the Homeland Security Department that you have elevated a man to the top advisory council, given him a secret security clearance, allowed him to access documents, which I was told by people, I believe, including the director of DPS in Texas, that we know that this man downloaded two documents. We know he downloaded them with his personal computer at his home, and then the report from Patrick Poole, the reporter, that he had direct indication from a national media outlet that Mr. Elibiary had shopped those documents to this national media outlet, who happened to refuse.

I asked Secretary Napolitano about it. She said she knew nothing about it. That was interesting, because her chief told the director of Texas Department of Public Safety the night before, who advised me the night before, that she had been totally briefed on what Elibiary had done. When I brought it up the next day, either she lied in front of our committee or her close staff member lied to the Department of Public Safety director in Texas the night before.

But we do know this. Later when I again asked her about it and if it had been investigated, she said that DHS had looked into it and there was nothing to it. Yet, when there was a FOIA request for the documents pertaining to the investigation, there were no documents that supported that there ever was an investigation. So either, again, the Department of Homeland Security Secretary lied, committed a crime, or DHS lied and there were documents about that investigation.

In any event, last September, the Homeland Security Department, after years of being warned about this person they kept elevating, after one of the ISIS videos hit television and

showed the Islamic State cutting off the head of an American, this top adviser to our Homeland Security Department tweeted out, basically, the caliphate’s inevitable; people just need to get used to the idea. That was the basis of it. So at Homeland Security, they allowed him to go ahead and not be renewed as a top adviser to Homeland Security.

We also know that Imam Magid, who had been head of the Islamic Society of North America, which Islamic Society of North America was aimed as a co-conspirator in the largest prosecution for supporting terrorism in the history of the United States in going after the Holy Land Foundation in Dallas, Texas, Federal Court. The Islamic Society of North America was named as a co-conspirator, as was the Council of American Islamic Relations, CAIR.

□ 1345

Although, we saw a story last year where they were thinking about changing their name to—I forget what the words were—but instead of CAIR, it would be WTF. I guess they thought better of having WTF be their symbolic letters representing who they are.

In any event, CAIR, ISNA, they were named coconspirators in the Holy Land Foundation trial. When an effort was made to remove their names from being listed as coconspirators, the judge in the Federal court there in Dallas reviewed the evidence and said, No, there is evidence that supports having their names as coconspirators.

They appealed to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals for the United States and all those judges looked at it and said, No, there is plenty of evidence here to support that these groups are coconspirators with the Holy Land Foundation—whose principals were convicted of supporting terrorism and sent to prison.

This administration gets sworn in within 2 months of the conviction, and instead of being careful about these groups that U.S. Federal courts had said we had plenty of evidence to show that they support terrorism, this administration neglected—refused—to consider that because they thought they knew better.

They brought the leaders of CAIR and ISNA into the realm of their close advisers; so is it any mystery that when Prime Minister Netanyahu was coming to Washington in May of 2011, the President sought advice—got advice—from the leader of this named co-conspirator supporting terrorism, Imam Magid?

When the President gave this speech in the State Department itself, Imam Magid was there. This administration had obviously given him credentials to allow him not only in the White House, but in the inner sanctum of the State Department.

When I read, “We are currently evaluating our approach,” from the State Department, I can’t help but wonder: Have you got Imam Magid in there—

which this Egyptian Muslim Brother-approved article said was a Muslim Brother, a top adviser—have you got him in there helping advise you on how to go after Netanyahu and how to put Israel more at risk than you already have?

“We are evaluating our approach” scares me—should scare others—when you know the kind of people that are giving this administration advice.

This article says:

The Obama administration in the past has shielded Israel at the Security Council, using a veto to strike down a resolution condemning Israeli settlement activity in Palestinian territory. Now, Obama officials may decide to allow Israel to be exposed to more international pressure in an attempt to force them back into negotiating a peace deal.

Well, Israel has eyes wide open as Iran continues to spin centrifuges and enrich uranium. They understand that their very existence is at risk; yet we have people here in Washington—this administration—that apparently are hearing from people saying, Oh, no, it’s no problem. Israel is the real problem here.

Never mind the people that are advising this administration are more upset with Israel wanting to continue to exist than they are with Iran for wanting to wipe out Israel and the United States.

This should scare people in the United States because, as Prime Minister Netanyahu pointed out—though he didn’t have to—he cares about the United States. He was educated here. He would like to see us continue to exist and be friends with Israel.

He pointed out, Look, they are developing intercontinental ballistic missiles. Those are not to hit us in Israel, he says, they are coming after us, but they really don’t even need intercontinental ballistic missiles.

They can put them on a cargo ship and bring them right into our ports, bring them right up the Potomac River, into the Houston Ship Channel, into New Orleans. In between New Orleans and Houston, they can wipe out 70 percent of our refined gasoline, so we could be in a world of hurt in a real hurry.

The President’s job is to help provide for the common defense, and it seems that his initiative is more to be opposed to anything Israel knows in its collective heart will keep them protected.

Unfortunately, that is not all the news. We look here and find this article from Newsmax:

Islamic State jihadists may have committed genocide in trying to wipe out the Yazidi minority in Iraq, the U.N. said Thursday in a report laying out a litany of atrocities. The Islamic State “may have committed all three of the most serious international crimes—namely, war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide,” the United Nations human rights office said in a statement.

The agency published a horrifying report detailing killings, torture, rape, sexual slavery, and the use of child soldiers by the extremists. All of these crimes, it said, were

violations of international human rights and humanitarian law, and some may amount to “crimes against humanity” and “war crimes.”

Further down, it says:

In numerous Yazidi villages, men and boys over the age of 14 were rounded up and shot, while the women and girls were abducted as the “spoils of war.” The report, which was ordered by the U.N. Human Rights Council last September, following a request from the Iraqi Government, pointed out that some villages “were entirely emptied of their Yazidi population.”

Many Yazidi women and girls were sold into sexual slavery or handed over to Islamic State members as “gifts,” the report said, adding that witnesses had described hearing girls as young as 6 screaming for help as they were raped in a house used by Islamic State fighters.

A pregnant 19-year-old had told the investigators she had been repeatedly raped by a Islamic State “doctor” over a period of 2½ months and that he deliberately sat on her stomach, saying, “This baby should die because it is an infidel. I can make a Muslim baby.”

We had the report in the last few weeks from a Catholic source in Nigeria where they have begged the United States for any help that it will give to try to stop Boko Haram and their efforts to wipe out Christians in Nigeria.

This source indicated that they had heard from the United States—from the Obama administration—that the Obama administration will only help them against Boko Haram if Nigeria will change its laws to allow same-sex marriage.

Well, apparently, once this administration got through ObamaCare, it promised the Catholic leaders, Christian leaders: Hey, we will never, ever refuse to allow you to practice your religious beliefs.

Well, that turned out to be a lie because, of course, they went after Catholic nuns, they went after the Catholic Church—well, at least those who actually practice what they hear preached in the Catholic Church—and any other Christian who believes that abortion is religiously wrong.

I guess after the administration broke its promise and went after and used the full force of the government to prevent people from practicing their religious beliefs and being able to conform their conduct to their religious beliefs, it was a no-brainer that they would then try to impose their religious beliefs—or lack thereof—upon countries like Nigeria or others in Africa or around the world.

There will be a price for the United States as a country to pay when we know about Jews being wiped out, when we know about Christians being wiped out, and God has blessed us with the ability to protect ourselves and to stop such genocide; not only do we do nothing to stop it, we demand that they abandon their Christian beliefs before we will offer any help.

There will be a price to pay for the United States of America for being so callous as Christians and Jews around the world are suffering in numbers like never before.

I applaud my friend BRAD SHERMAN. This article from Pam Key today quotes Sherman as saying:

I fear that you have misled this committee in telling us that once Iran has the rights of a nonnuclear state subject to additional protocol, that you’ll be able to stop sneak-out, because you’ve said first that, well, they can’t develop a nuclear weapon because that would be illegal. That’s a preposterous argument. Obviously, they’re willing to break the law.

My friend Mr. SHERMAN and I disagree on so much, but I know him to be an honorable man, and he understands Iran doesn’t care about breaking deals. Any deal with Iran is like a deal with Hitler. The Soviet Union thought they could cut a deal with Hitler. The thing that their leaders were most mad about was that Hitler reached the agreement before they did because they had intentions, apparently, of breaching it.

We are somewhere between Neville Chamberlain and Stalin in trying to reach a deal with a modern-day Hitler, except Hitler didn’t have some crazy religious idea that he should wipe out everybody in the world that didn’t have the exact same religious beliefs that he did.

Look, we are on the side of right. President al-Sisi in Egypt is on the side of right. Saudi Arabia, the UAE, all over the Middle East, they are becoming afraid because this administration is on the verge of cutting a deal that will allow Iran to continue moving forward to not just one nuke, but many nukes, and a breakout could be a matter of weeks.

I know people are talking about it could be years, but when you hear from people that know that you could have a facility 30 meters by 70 meters and that you could sneak that 5 percent into a secret facility without people knowing and you could enrich it to 90 and have nuclear weapons, we ought to take notice.

We have been blessed with much, and to whom much is given, of them much is required. The world deserves better with what we have been blessed with in the way of power, and they deserve to have us stand up against Iran. It is time for us to bomb Iran’s nuclear facilities.

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

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 23, 2015

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, March 23, 2015, when it shall convene at noon for morning hour-debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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. YOUNG of Indiana (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for March 18 and today on account of a family medical emergency.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o’clock and 59 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 23, 2015, at noon for morning-hour debate.

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. LEWIS (for himself, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. ASHFORD, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPAS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O’ROURKE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Mr.

POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VISCOLOSKY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Ms. DeLAURO):

H.R. 12. A bill to modernize voter registration, promote access to voting for individuals with disabilities, protect the ability of individuals to exercise the right to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Science, Space, and Technology, Veterans' Affairs, Oversight and Government Reform, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 1457. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide for direct payment of statutory sound recording performance royalties to record producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 1458. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide bundled payments for post-acute care services under parts A and B of Medicare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. LEE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 1459. A bill to secure the Federal voting rights of persons when released from incarceration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of

Georgia, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. CAPPAS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 1460. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study with respect to stormwater runoff from oil and gas operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself, Mr. AMASH, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. JORDAN):

H.R. 1461. A bill to repeal certain provisions of titles 23 and 49, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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 Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 1462. A bill to combat the rise of pre-natal opioid abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 1463. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide for a one-year employment restriction for ex-employees of the Securities and Exchange Commission seeking to work for companies against which the Commission brought enforcement actions that were participated on by such ex-employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 1464. A bill to impose a tax on certain trading transactions to invest in our families and communities, improve our infrastructure and our environment, strengthen our financial security, expand opportunity and reduce market volatility; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 1465. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide an individual with a mental health screening before the individual enlists in the Armed Forces or is commissioned as an officer in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 1466. A bill to repeal the USA PATRIOT Act and the FISA Amendments Act of 2008, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), Financial Services, Foreign Affairs, Energy and Commerce, Education and the Workforce, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provi-

sions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HILL, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. WESTERMAN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 1467. A bill to amend section 31306 of title 49, United States Code, to recognize hair as an alternative specimen for pre-employment and random controlled substances testing of commercial motor vehicle drivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. FATTAH, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California):

H.R. 1468. A bill to galvanize United States Government programs in support of brain health for global victims of autism, hydrocephalus and Alzheimer's and other forms of dementia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 1469. A bill to improve, coordinate, and enhance rehabilitation research at the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. UPTON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. BOUTSTANY):

H.R. 1470. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and improve Medicare payments for physicians and other professionals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and 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. BARLETTA (for himself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 1471. A bill to reauthorize the programs and activities of the Federal Emergency Management Agency; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 1472. A bill to establish a modernized national Integrated Public Alert and Warning System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 1473. A bill to establish a modernized national Integrated Public Alert and Warning System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 1474. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the reissuance of Social Security account numbers to children in cases in which the confidentiality of the number has been compromised; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 1475. A bill to authorize a Wall of Remembrance as part of the Korean War Veterans Memorial and to allow certain private

contributions to fund that Wall of Remembrance; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BABIN (for himself and Mr. MCCLINTOCK):

H.R. 1476. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System from providing bailouts or other financial assistance to a pension plan of a State or political subdivision thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. YODER, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 1477. A bill to provide for Federal agencies to develop public access policies relating to research conducted by employees of that agency or from funds administered by that agency; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 1478. A bill to provide for notice to, and input by, State insurance commissioners when requiring an insurance company to serve as a source of financial strength or when the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation places a lien against an insurance company's assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 1479. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to apply budget neutrality on a State-specific basis in the calculation of the Medicare hospital wage index floor for non-rural areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLD (for himself and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 1480. A bill to ensure access to certain information for financial services industry regulators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 1481. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to strengthen the small business industrial base, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 1482. A bill to repeal the exemption for hydraulic fracturing in the Safe Drinking Water Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 1483. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, to repeal wage requirements applicable to laborers and mechanics employed on Federal-aid highway and public transportation construction projects; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 1484. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal lands to the State of Nevada in fulfillment of the Nevada Statehood Enabling Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 1485. A bill to improve the control and management of invasive species that threaten and harm Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources,

and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. HULTGREN):

H.R. 1486. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to bring the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection into the regular appropriations process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE (for himself, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. JORDAN):

H.R. 1487. A bill to free the private sector to harness domestic energy resources to create jobs and generate economic growth by removing statutory and administrative barriers; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, Agriculture, the Judiciary, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York (for himself, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. LATTA, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. JONES, and Mr. ABRAHAM):

H.R. 1488. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to include firearms in the types of property allowable under the alternative provision for exempting property from the estate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H.R. 1489. A bill to seek the establishment of and contributions to an International Fund for Israeli-Palestinian Peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 1490. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to have an independent advocate for campus sexual assault prevention and response; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DELANEY (for himself, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HIMES, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 1491. A bill to reform the housing finance system of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. EDWARDS (for herself, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORRIS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 1492. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and improve the credit for dependent care expenses and to provide a credit for education of employees of child care centers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 1493. A bill to protect and preserve international cultural property at risk due to political instability, armed conflict, or natural or other disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Armed Services, and 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. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 1494. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit rollovers from retirement plans to health savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 1495. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for limitations on expenditures in elections for the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HIGGINS (for himself and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 1496. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the access to child care for certain veterans receiving health care at a facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUELSKAMP:

H.R. 1497. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require reporting by the Secretary of the Treasury of reduction measures being used to avoid defaulting on Government obligations in the event that the debt limit is reached, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. COOK, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. GUINTA, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 1498. A bill to direct the President to designate an existing Federal officer to coordinate efforts to secure the release of United States citizens who are hostages of hostile groups or state sponsors of terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 1499. A bill to provide for the publication by the Secretary of Health and Human Services of physical activity recommendations for Americans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KLINE (for himself, Mr. LATTA, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 1500. A bill to ensure that certain TRICARE program beneficiaries may enroll in TRICARE Prime regardless of the location of their residence; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. KEATING, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 1501. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide that the United States Postal Service may not close, consolidate, or sell any historic postal facility without prior congressional approval, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DEFALVO, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LEE, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1502. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend for 5 years payment parity with Medicare for primary

care services furnished under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. TAKAL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. HAHN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 1503. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the Secretary of Labor, to establish a program to provide for workforce training and education, at community colleges, in sustainable energy; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. WOMACK, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. JONES, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. BARR, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. SALMON):

H.R. 1504. A bill to prohibit regulations establishing certain limits for the school lunch program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NUGENT (for himself, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 1505. A bill to make the National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Pass available at a discount to certain veterans; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 1506. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to promulgate rules in an open proceeding with respect to updating its competitive bidding rules; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself and Mr. CASTRO of Texas):

H.R. 1507. A bill to incentivize State support for postsecondary education and to promote increased access and affordability for higher education for students, including Dreamer students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. POSEY (for himself and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 1508. A bill to promote the development of a United States commercial space resource exploration and utilization industry and to increase the exploration and utilization of resources in outer space; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1509. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act to require the reinstatement of the draft whenever an authorization on the use of military force or declaration of war is in effect and to provide for the registration of women with the Selective Service System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1510. A bill to require that overseas contingency operations be paid for; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROKITA (for himself and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 1511. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for qualified elementary and secondary education tuition; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROUZER (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. WALKER):

H.R. 1512. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to designate at least one city in the United States each year as an "American World War II City", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 1513. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 to provide whistleblower protection for union employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1514. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to provide protections for active duty military consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. FARR, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1515. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to require testing of underground sources of drinking water in connection with hydraulic fracturing operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 1516. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage and payment for complex rehabilitation technology items under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 1517. A bill to provide greater clarity in the regulation of electronic nicotine delivery systems, including electronic cigarettes, cigars, cigarillos, pipes, and hookahs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 1518. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for a limitation on the time for the use of contributions or donations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 1519. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish an award program recognizing excellence exhibited by public school system employees providing services to students in prekindergarten through higher education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 1520. A bill to amend titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a Social Security Surplus Protection Account in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund to hold the Social Security surplus and a Medicare Surplus Protection Account in the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund to hold the Medicare surplus, to provide for suspension of investment of amounts held in such Accounts until enactment of legislation providing for investment of the Trust Funds in investment vehicles other than obligations of the United States, and to establish a Social Security and Medicare Part A Investment Commission to make recommendations for alternative forms of investment of the Social Security and Medicare surpluses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZINKE:

H.R. 1521. A bill to rename the Captain William Wylie Galt Great Falls Armed Forces Readiness Center in honor of Captain John E. Moran, a recipient of the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ZINKE (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 1522. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and improve the Indian coal production tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. SALMON, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. JONES, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE):

H. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution effectuating the Compact for a Balanced Budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself and Mr. ENGEL):

H. Res. 160. A resolution welcoming the Seventh Summit of the Americas, to be held in Panama City, Panama, April 10, 2015, and April 11, 2015; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. HANNA, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. CLARKE of

New York, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. POLIS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. CONYERS):

H. Res. 161. A resolution expressing support for designation of September 18 as “National Innovation in Education Day”; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

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. LEWIS:

H.R. 12.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 1457.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 8: “The Congress shall have Power [. . .] To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries. . . .”

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 1458.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 1459.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

1) Article I, Section 4, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution. This provision permits Congress to make or alter the regulations pertaining to Federal elections;

2) Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. This provision grants Congress the authority to enact appropriate laws protecting the civil rights of all Americans; and

3) The Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution. This provision prohibits excessive bail, excessive fines and cruel and unusual punishment.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 1460.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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. MASSIE:

H.R. 1461.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3, Clause 7, and Clause 18.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1462.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 1463.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 8 Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 1464.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7, Clause 1 and Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1465.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution which gives Congress the power “to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.”

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 1466.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution of the United States. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the authority to establish post offices and post roads, as enumerated in Article I, Section, 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 1467.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 1468.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 1469.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 1470.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 1471.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress) and Article I, Section 10, Clause 3 (relating to interstate compacts).

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 1472.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 1473.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper

for carrying out the powers vested in Congress) and clause 17 (relating to authority over the district as the seat of government), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 1474.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, related to providing for the general welfare. Additionally, it is enacted under the authority provided in Article I, Section 8 related to Congress’ ability to “[carry] into Execution the foregoing powers.”

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1475.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States, as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BABIN:

H.R. 1476.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, clause 7, which states that, “No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by the law.”

By Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1477.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with Indian tribes.

and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Power vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1478.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 1479.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. DOLD:

H.R. 1480.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 1481.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the ability to enact legislation necessary and proper to effectuate its purposes in taxing and spending.

By Ms. DeGETTE:

H.R. 1482.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 1483.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Because the legislation would change the formula for government contracts on federal-aid highway and public construction transportation projects, it is authorized under clause 1 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution which states' [t]he Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.'

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 1484.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 1485.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 1486.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.R. 1487.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 gives Congress the power to "make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper" to execute the enumerated power of regulating "Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes." The titles of the American Energy Renaissance Act deal with existing laws affecting the production and transportation of energy among the states and Indian tribes and the export of energy to

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 1488.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 1489.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 1490.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 1491.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. EDWARDS:

H.R. 1492.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section I.

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1493.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 1494.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 1495.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4, Clause 1

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 1496.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. HUELSKAMP:

H.R. 1497.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 gives Congress the power to borrow money on the credit of the United States.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 1498.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII, Clause XVIII: 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 and the Government of the United States or in any Department or officer thereof.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1499.

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. KLING:

H.R. 1500.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation ensures that the Secretary of Defense provides retired military veteran beneficiaries who live beyond 100 miles of a Military Treatment Facility, an opportunity to retain access to TRICARE Prime. Specific authority is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, and 16), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 1501.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 1502.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and

interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 1503.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 1504.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, 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. NUGENT:

H.R. 1505.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 1, 12, 13, 14, and 16), which grants Congress the power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; raise and support Armies; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 1506.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 1507.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1508.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1509.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Congress is given the power under the Constitution "To raise and support Armies," "To provide and maintain a Navy," and "To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces." Art.I, §8, cls. 12- 14. See also: ROSTKER V. GOLDBERG, 453 U. S. 57 (1981)

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1510.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article XVI of the Constitution—Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes....

By Mr. ROKITA:

H.R. 1511.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States;

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 1512.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

"This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, of the US Constitution

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 1513.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California:

H.R. 1514.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One of the United States Constitution, section 8, clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof,

Or

Article One of the United States Constitution, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have Power—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 1515.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1516.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 1517.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 1518.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 1519.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 1520.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1—The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. ZINKE:

H.R. 1521.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. ZINKE:

H.R. 1522.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 27: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 154: Mr. DELANEY and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 170: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 173: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 188: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 232: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 244: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 271: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 283: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 303: Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 317: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 353: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 358: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SCHRAEDER, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 366: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 383: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 415: Mr. SCHIFF and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 420: Mr. OLSON and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 430: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 448: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 456: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 465: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 484: Mr. NORCROSS and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 509: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 531: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 546: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 571: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 577: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 581: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 592: Mr. ZINKE and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 599: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 601: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 605: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 606: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 625: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 628: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 649: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 650: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 685: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 696: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 706: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 711: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 721: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 727: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 742: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 745: Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 751: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 766: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 775: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LOBONDO, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 784: Mr. KILMER and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 814: Mr. ROSS and Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 815: Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 835: Mr. COHEN, Mr. CRAMER, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 843: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 845: Mr. WELCH and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 855: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 868: Mr. BABIN, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 869: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 879: Mr. POSEY, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BARR, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. REED.

H.R. 880: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.

H.R. 893: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KLINE, Ms. EDWARDS, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 913: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 918: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 919: Mr. COHEN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 923: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 928: Mr. MICA.

H.R. 938: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 955: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 969: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BERA, Mr. TIPTON, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 973: Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 985: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 989: Mr. TONKO, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. TAKAI.

H.R. 1022: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 1062: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. SCHRAEDER.

H.R. 1078: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1088: Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SCHRAEDER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. YARMUTH, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1096: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1103: Ms. BASS, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1105: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. JOLLY, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 1112: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1117: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1132: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1142: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 1147: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 1148: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 1149: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 1170: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1192: Mr. GOWDY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1195: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BARR, and Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 1197: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. KIND, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 1210: Mr. POLIQUIN and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 1218: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 1220: Mr. LANCE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1247: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. GRIMALVA.

H.R. 1258: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. SIREs, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 1267: Mr. BOST.
 H.R. 1269: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 1274: Ms. NORTON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SIREs, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. WALZ, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. MOORE.
 H.R. 1282: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 1294: Mr. VEASEY.
 H.R. 1299: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BARTON, and Mr. WESTERMAN.
 H.R. 1300: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
 H.R. 1301: Mrs. WALORSKI.
 H.R. 1312: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
 H.R. 1320: Mr. BURGESS.
 H.R. 1342: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
 H.R. 1349: Mr. LAMBORN.
 H.R. 1354: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 1358: Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 1365: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. ALLEN.
 H.R. 1369: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1384: Mr. PETERSON and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1389: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. HILL, and Mrs. WAGNER.
 H.R. 1404: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 1411: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 1413: Mr. ZINKE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. CRAWFORD.
 H.R. 1425: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 1433: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
 H.R. 1434: Mr. GRAYSON, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. VARGAS.
 H. J. Res. 22: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. WALBERG.
 H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. JONES.
 H. Con. Res. 23: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Ms. MENG, Mr. POCAN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. Cárdenas, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. FARR, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mrs. TORRES.
 H. Res. 11: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 12: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
 H. Res. 28: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. KEATING, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
 H. Res. 54: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FARR, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CRAMER, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H. Res. 139: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
 H. Res. 151: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H. Res. 154: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. CONYERS.
 H. Res. 157: Mr. Cárdenas, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. SCHAROWSKY.

DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 976: Mr. BOUSTANY.