United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 12, 2015 No. 72

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 12, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVE WOMACK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

GROWING U.S. NATIONAL DEBT

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, last week, while we were in recess, I traveled through my district and had the opportunity to appear on local television and to speak at civic clubs. Every time I mentioned that we have an $18 trillion debt, eastern North Carolinians were astounded and could not believe it.

To put the debt into perspective, on January 20, 2009, the total Federal debt stood at $10.6 trillion. As of last Friday, May 8, 2015, it has risen to $18—an increase of $7.5 trillion. Our debt now stands at over $200,000 for every full-time private sector worker. I agree with my constituents that it is time Congress stopped passing legislation that is not paid for.

Republicans have control of both Chambers of Congress now because voters want us to cut the debt and deficit and stop passing legislation that is not paid for.

In an April article for Forbes Magazine, Stan Collender wrote:

> If you haven't noticed that Congress is about to increase the Federal deficit substantially, you haven't been watching carefully . . . or at all. Virtually every policy change that has already or soon will be considered seriously in the House and Senate will make the deficit higher rather than lower.

He further writes:

> Based on what Congress is now considering, the deficit could be $100 billion or more next year than it otherwise would be if you just put Washington on autopilot; that is, if you made no changes to existing tax and spending policies. That would be an almost 21 percent increase.

It is obvious that our current fiscal policies are unsustainable.

Mr. Speaker, I have been speaking for months and even years about the waste of money in Afghanistan. It is sad to me that we have been pouring money down a rat hole known as Afghanistan.

We have spent over $685 billion in Afghanistan in the last 14 years, and President Obama just entered into a bilateral security agreement with Afghanistan late last year that ties us—our Nation—to a failed policy for another 9 years.

What have we gained there, with over 2,000 American troops killed, over 20,000 wounded, and billions of dollars spent? My answer to my own question is: nothing. Absolutely nothing.

A couple of weeks ago, I visited Walter Reed Army Medical Center to meet some of our veterans who had been wounded and are trying to heal. Some have wounds that will never truly heal.

Congress owes it to them—and all of our men and women who serve—and the American taxpayer to have a serious debate about our future in Afghanistan. I think it is high time to leave Afghanistan. Nine more years is absolutely fruitless.

Mr. Speaker, out of fairness to American taxpayers and future generations, we can no longer delay the need to pay down our debt and work toward sound economic policies. And out of fairness to our veterans and the men and women who serve in the military, we need to have a serious debate about spending more money and time in Afghanistan, when it has been proven and is well known by historians to be the graveyard of empires. Is it worth it, Mr. Speaker? I think not.

May God continue to bless our men and women in uniform and may God continue to bless America.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, as I rise on the floor of the House, the Senate is about to begin debate on trade promotion authority, which is Congress ceding all authority to the President to negotiate agreements secretly, bring them before these bodies, and to say take it or leave it, an ''up-or-down'' vote, no amendments—ceding our constitutional authority. I hope the Senate turns him down.

Now, the President went to Oregon last week, to Nike, who originated the idea of chasing cheap labor around the world and outsourcing U.S. production. He gave a speech. I wasn't invited. That was fine with me. He went there to make fun of people like me who have fought these trade agreements for more than 20 years and have been more

Printed on recycled paper.

right than wrong about the impacts of these trade agreements.

He talked about labor, saying: Don't worry. This is going to put enforceable labor provisions on Vietnam, where you can't have a union, where you have child labor, prison labor, and you get paid 60 cents an hour. He says: We are going to fix all that.

Well, I have read that chapter. I can't talk about it. It is classified. But I can say this. It will be as effective in dealing with the abuses—and, Brunei is even worse than Vietnam—in Brunei or Vietnam, in terms of their labor and working conditions, as the recent U.S. Colombia Free Trade Agreement. Guess what? In Colombia, they still kill people who try and form unions, and we have no recourse against them. So it is not going to fix that problem.

He says: Well, I was in law school when NAFTA passed, and these people are just living in the past. Well, unfortunately, you are bringing the past to the future.

This agreement has been vetted by 500 corporations in real time. They can put it on a big screen in their boardroom, bring in all their lawyers and staff, and say: Let's change these words. Let's make it look like the labor stuff is enforceable, but then we put this here, and it isn't.

I can read it, too. I can go to the basement of this building and I can read it in secret, and I can't talk about it.

So this is an agreement that is for labor, for the environment, for consumers, when it is being written in corporate boardrooms and then submitted to the Special Trade Representative who then puts that text into a special agreement we can't see? No, the President is very, very wrong about that.

He says we are wrong because we are making things up about undermining regulation, food safety, worker safety, and even financial regulations. Well, we are not. This has something called investor-state dispute resolution, which means anyone can challenge any U.S. law. Any foreign corporation, Japanese corporation, or Bruneian corporation can challenge a U.S. law in a secret tribunal staffed by lawyers who have no conflict of interest, no legal body underlying their decisions, and who one day represents corporations and the next day sit as judges.

And he is right, they can't make us repeal our laws. He is absolutely right. But they can make us pay to keep them. We had to pay hundreds of millions of dollars to Brazil to keep subsidizing cotton in this country.

Now, I wasn't into subsidizing the cotton, but it really irks me that we were subsidizing it here, and because of the power of the farm lobby, we paid Brazil hundreds of millions of dollars to keep that subsidy.

The Japanese were killing dolphins to catch tuna, and we passed a law to just label dolphin-safe tuna so consumers could decide, too. We had a big campaign with friendly dolphins.

The Mexicans won in the same process. They won a judgment against the United States of America—that it was an unfair trade barrier—and we had to pay the Mexicans to not fish for dolphins. And then they appealed yet to another place and actually made us eliminate dolphin-safe altogether.

Yes, it can undermine our labor laws, it can undermine our environmental laws, and it can undermine our consumer protection laws when they are challenged by a foreign corporation. So the President is yet wrong again. We are not making stuff up.

Currency manipulation, the Japanese wall—every U.S. auto manufacturer knows about this. They manipulate currency. Therefore, their vehicles are $8,000 cheaper than they would be if their currency was fairly traded—$8,000—and we are going to compete on a level playing field?

This agreement gives them full access, with no tariffs, to our pickup truck market, which means the end of pickup truck manufacturing in America. The iconic Fords and Chevys, forget about it. They are gone with an $8,000 advance.

We couldn't put currency manipulation into this and say that is not fair, because the Japanese didn't want it. But they are giving us a big concession. They are going to buy some American rice. Well, isn't that great? We are trading tens of thousands of auto jobs for a few jobs working in the rice fields in California. And that will only last until the Japanese challenge the rice farmers. Because they get subsidized Federal water, they will ultimately be barred from the Japanese market because they will lose in a secret tribunal under this ISDS provision.

Finally, I have just got to wonder what the President is talking about when he says we are speculating and it is made up.

Oh, Mexican trucks. I predicted when we had the agreement with Mexico that they would force us to let Mexican trucks drive freely in America. Guess what? We lost that, and they put tariffs on our goods because they couldn't drive their trucks all around our country.

There is great precedence here. He hasn't fixed a darned thing. He probably hasn't even read the agreement.

WOMEN'S HEALTH WEEK AND NATIONAL NURSES WEEK

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Women's Health Week and National Nurses Week.

Yes, this week is Women's Health Week—a time to raise awareness about manageable steps women can take to improve their health.

Currently, one in five women is in fair or poor health, and almost 40 percent report struggling with mental health issues. Women are less likely than men to be employed full time, meaning they are less likely to be eligible for employer-based health benefits.

Difficulty finding and maintaining employer-based coverage is especially pronounced for older women, who are more likely to develop conditions like breast cancer. But thanks to ObamaCare, women's health took a monumental step forward.

Before ObamaCare, insurance companies could discriminate against women, denying coverage to women—of course, to all people—due to preexisting conditions, such as cancer and even previous pregnancies. Today, being a woman or becoming pregnant is no longer a preexisting condition.

The National Women's Law Center estimates that insurers' practice of gender rating cost women about a billion dollars a year before ObamaCare. ObamaCare ends gender rating. It requires health plans to cover women's preventive services, like contraceptive care and OB/GYN visits, without cost sharing.

Accessible contraceptive coverage is particularly important. Prior to ObamaCare, more than half of all women between the ages of 18 and 34 struggled to afford it.

In addition, every health insurance plan is now required to offer maternity care. Prior to the passage of ObamaCare, the National Women's Law Center found that only 12 percent of private plans included maternity services.

And even without those major improvements, health care accessibility remains a challenge. Almost one out of three women reports not visiting a doctor due to the cost.

Women are still less likely to be insured than men. And even when they have insurance, women face increasingly high deductibles, copayments, and other cost sharing requirements, forcing major sacrifices just in order to make ends meet.

A recent study found that over 40 percent of women have unmet medical needs due to the cost of medical care. This problem is particularly acute in States that have not expanded Medicaid. Currently, 3 million uninsured women live in States that have not expanded Medicaid coverage.

So we have come so far in increasing access to affordable and adequate health care for women, but we still have a long way to go.

This week is also National Nurses Week, and I can't pass up the chance to recognize the important contributions that nurses make—improving women's and men's health care every day. After all, we might not have ObamaCare if it weren't for the support and advocacy for nurses all across the country.

This year's National Nurses Week 2015 theme is: ''Ethical Practice. Quality Care.'' It recognizes the importance of ethics in nursing and acknowledges

the strong commitment, compassion, and care nurses display in the practice of their profession.

Registered Nurses, or RNs, are the largest segment of the health care workforce, with 3.1 million RNs, and that number is growing. RNs meet Americans' health care needs on every level. They provide preventive care, such as screenings and immunizations; they diagnose, treat, and help to manage chronic illnesses; and they help patients make critical health decisions every day. But most importantly, nurses take the time to care for each patient during a difficult time in their or their family's lives.

□ 1215

We have plenty of evidence that hiring more nurses leads directly to improved quality care and patient outcomes.

We have seen study after study showing this connection, including a recent analysis showing that one out of every four unanticipated events that leads to death or injury are related to nurse understaffing; yet we continue to see nurses understaffed at medical facilities.

Nurses around the country have identified understaffing as the single most important barrier they face in providing quality care to their patients. It is also a barrier to quality improvement and efforts to reduce preventable readmissions.

I have introduced legislation called the Safe Nurse Staffing for Patient Safety and Quality Care Act, which would help solve this serious problem by establishing a Federal minimum standard in all hospitals for direct care registered nurse to patient staffing ratios.

This problem is not confined to hospitals. Nursing homes are currently required to only have a direct care nurse on staff 8 hours a day. This simply makes no sense. Patients are in these facilities 24 hours a day and need access to round-the-clock nursing care. That is why I have introduced the Put a Registered Nurse in the Nursing Home Act.

We should be thanking nurses, who are considered the most ethical of our healthcare system, and I applaud them.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WALKER) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

Reverend Andrew Walton, Capitol Hill Presbyterian Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

As the gavel sounds and a new day of business begins, we pause to acknowledge the eternal, creative, redemptive spirit of life that unites all people, transcending political persuasion, personal bias, or cultural creed.

We come seeking the wisdom of the ages that points us away from easy choices of rigid certitude that divide and separate but, rather, guides us toward challenging compromises of flexible possibility that connect and unite.

May we seek a common good where all people know freedom, equality, justice, and mercy; a common good grounded in compassion, gratitude, and generosity. May we remember we are one human family in which the pain of one is the pain of all and the joy of one is the joy of all.

May we find this common good in the conversations, deliberations, and achievements of this day and in the countless opportunities that come our way each and every day.

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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. KILDEE 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.

EASTERN EUROPE PROMOTES PEACE THROUGH STRENGTH

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last week, I was grateful to participate in a congressional delegation with congressional colleagues MADELEINE BORDALLO and REID RIBBLE, coordinated ably by Army Majors Bobby Cox and Jimmy Crook, to visit dynamic Eastern European allies.

In the Czech Republic, it was heartwarming to see the affection for America at Pilsen upon the 70th anniversary of their liberation by the U.S. Army.

M.K. Air Base in Romania is a symbol of growing Romanian-U.S. defense cooperation. The heroic and courageous leaders at Kiev, Ukraine, were unified in facing Putin's aggression where 7,000 civilians have been killed.

Georgia's proven partnership with NATO is confirmed with extraordinary service by their military for freedom and democracy. The Novo Selo training base in Bulgaria is world class, with young Bulgarians and Americans working side by side to promote peace through strength.

In each country, we were welcomed by dedicated U.S. Ambassadors, with talented Embassy personnel, promoting warm relationships with the new emerging democracies for the mutual benefit of all citizens.

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

LET'S PASS THE HIGHWAY AND TRANSIT TRUST FUND BILL

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, once again, House Republican leadership's culture of governing crisis to crisis is endangering hundreds of thousands of American jobs and thousands of critical construction projects across the country.

There are only 7 legislative days left until the highway and transit trust fund expires on May 31, but there is no plan yet to act. According to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, 660,000 good-paying construction jobs are hanging in the balance; 6,000 critical construction projects across the country are also being threatened.

For too long, we have been stuck in these short-term patches that fail to meet the challenges of our Nation's crumbling roads and bridges as other nations, our competitors, advance their infrastructure and pass us by leaps and bounds.

We have got to get to work to fixing America's crumbling roads and bridges. It is the job of the Congress to do this. We need to do our job.

We continue to wait, as Democrats, for a plan that we can work together on to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure. It is up to the Republican leadership to act, and I am calling upon them to do just that.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

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

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of National Police Week, when we remember the sacrifice of our Nation's law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty.

This year's commemoration falls during a time of heightened tension between our officers and the civilians they have sworn to protect, and it serves as a solemn reminder to all of us the importance of communication, duty, and mutual respect.

Today and every day, we honor the lives of our fallen, including Officer Tommy Decker, of Cold Spring, Minnesota, who was killed in the line of duty in 2012 while doing a welfare check.

May they have eternal rest; may their legacy of service to their communities live on, and may those they left behind find comfort and peace.

Blessed are the peacemakers.

THE BAD HABIT OF PATCH FUNDING

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, we are getting a bad habit of patch funding in 6-month increments what traditionally has been a 6-year surface transportation bill. Virtually no major projects are underway in the Nation as a result. Six-month patch funding has produced patch roadwork.

Worse, road and bridge funding, in turn, is delaying billions of dollars in development that can't get started without new roads.

The Washington Post showcased our example featuring overhaul of Union Station, which cannot proceed without a new bridge.

Transportation funding delay is stopping a lot more than transportation infrastructure. Our districts need long-term reauthorization.

COMMUNICATION FROM VETERANS ADVOCATE OF THE OFFICE OF THE 18TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Veterans Advocate of the Office of the 18th Congressional District of Illinois:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for testimony issued by the United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois.

I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL GILMORE,
Veterans Advocate (IL–18).

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 12, 2015 at 9:38 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 651.

That the Senate passed S. 179.

That the Senate passed S. 136.

That the Senate passed S. 994.

That the Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 16.

Appointments:

Board of Directors of Office of Compliance.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

MELANOMA AND SKIN CANCER DETECTION AND PREVENTION MONTH

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, May is Melanoma and Skin Cancer Detection and Prevention Month.

One person dies of melanoma every hour. There will be over 73,000 new cases of invasive melanoma in the United States this year. Early detection is crucial to prevention.

I would like to highlight a very brave constituent of mine, McKenna Fitzpatrick. She is in the fourth grade at Seven Oaks Elementary School and bravely faced skin cancer.

Despite being so young, she detected her skin cancer early, had a biopsy, dealt with her diagnosis, and overcame the challenges. McKenna's experience is a testament to the virtue of early detection.

Take care of yourself when you are outside or any other time you may be exposed to UV light. This is extremely important for residents of Florida and people across the Nation. This summer, enjoy the beach safely and responsibly.

CLIMATE CHANGE IS HAPPENING

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, a new global record was set last week, but this is not a good record. The atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide surpassed 400 parts per million for an entire month. This is the first time we have reached these levels in over 800,000 years. This is a serious and a potent reminder that we have not yet acted on climate change.

The last time CO_2 concentrations were this high, the world was a hotter place. There were forests in the Arctic, and sea levels were meters higher than they are today.

Our planet is telling us that climate change is happening. We owe it to our constituents to put aside partisan differences and to begin to work on solutions to this global problem.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CHIEF FLOYD SIMPSON

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to honor a friend who recently died in a motorcycle accident. On May 3, in my hometown of Corpus Christi, our police chief, Floyd Simpson, died.

Originally from Chicago, Chief Simpson felt drawn to Texas. As a 25-year veteran of the Dallas Police Department before moving to Corpus Christi, Chief Simpson established a reputation as a ''legend in the department,'' and according to his peers, he was an outstanding ''human being, husband, and father.''

He was a great communicator, regularly appearing on the radio and at community events throughout the Coastal Bend. In his interview for the job of chief of police, Corpus Christi City Manager Ron Olson asked him to describe his values. Chief Simpson replied that faith comes first, family second, and everything else comes after that.

In the wake of Chief Simpson's passing, State and local officials are coming together to make State Highway 361 safer. Even in death, he will continue to help keep others safe.

My heart and prayers go out to Tanya, Chief Simpson's wife of 27 years, and his children.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1601

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Iowa) at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

REPORT ON H.R. 2250, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–110) on the bill (H.R. 2250) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

REGULATORY INTEGRITY PROTECTION ACT OF 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1732.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 231 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1732.

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

□ 1602

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1732) to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes, with Mr. YOUNG of Iowa in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act.

The Federal-State partnership Congress created under the Clean Water Act has led to significantly improved water quality over the past four decades. This is because Congress recognized that States should have the primary responsibility of regulating waters within their own boundaries and that not all waters need to be subjected to Federal jurisdiction. These limits on Federal power have also been reaffirmed by the Supreme Court not once, but twice.

However, last year, the EPA and the Corps of Engineers proposed a new rule that discards these limits. This purposefully vague rule will only increase confusion, increase uncertainty, increase lawsuits, and open up just about any water or wet area to Federal regulation.

Don't just take my word for it. At least 32 States, including Pennsylvania, are objecting to the rule as proposed. More than 1 million comments have been filed on this proposed rule, with approximately 70 percent of the substantive comments asking for the rule to be withdrawn or significantly modified.

Mr. Chair, 370 individual counties and the National Association of Counties oppose the rule. The National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and the National Association of Towns and Townships all oppose this rule.

The majority of the regulated community opposes the rule, including the American Farm Bureau, the National Association of Home Builders, the Associated General Contractors of America, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Edison Electric Institute, the National Mining Association, and the American Road and Transportation Builders Association.

This list of those opposed to this rule goes on and on and on. Not only do all these groups oppose the rule, but they all support H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act.

I will insert the list of supporters in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time.

LETTERS OF SUPPORT FOR H.R. 1732

AgriMark, American Farm Bureau Federation, American Public Works Association, American Road and Transportation Builders Association, Associated Builders and Contractors, Associated General Contractors of America, Association of American Railroads, Family Farm Alliance, International Council of Shopping Centers.

National Alliance of Forest Owners, National Association of Counties, National Association of Homebuilders, National Association of Realtors, National Association of Regional Councils, National Association of Wheat Growers, National League of Cities, National Multifamily Housing Council, National Water Resources Association.

Northeast Dairy Farmers Cooperatives, Oregon Dairy Farmers Association, Portland Cement Association, Select Milk Producers Inc, Small Business and Entrepreneurship Council, The American Sugarbeet Growers Association, The United States Conference of Mayors, Virginia Poultry Federation, Waters Advocacy Coalition.

National Association of Manufacturers.

LIST OF SUPPORTERS FOR H.R. 1732

Agricultural Retailers Association, American Exploration & Mining Association, American Farm Bureau Federation, American Forest & Paper Association, American Gas Association, American Iron and Steel Institute, American Petroleum Institute, American Public Power Association, American Road & Transportation Builders Association, American Society of Golf Course Architects.

Associated Builders and Contractors, The Associated General Contractors of America, Association of American Railroads, Association of Oil Pipe Lines, Club Managers Association of America, Corn Refiners Association, CropLife America, Edison Electric Institute, Federal Forest Resources Coalition, The Fertilizer Institute.

Florida Sugar Cane League, Foundation for Environmental and Economic Progress (FEEP), Golf Course Builders Association of America, Golf Course Superintendents Association of America, The Independent Petroleum Association of America (IPAA), Industrial Minerals Association—North America, International Council of Shopping Centers (ICSC), International Liquid Terminals Association (ILTA), Interstate Natural Gas Association of America (INGAA), Irrigation Association.

Leading Builders of America, NAIOP, the Commercial Real Estate Development Association, National Association of Home Builders, National Association Association of Manufacturers, National Association of REALTORS®, National Association of State Department of Agriculture, National Cattlemen's Beef Association, National Club Association, National Corn Growers Association, National Cotton.

National Cotton Council, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Golf Course Owners Association of America, National Industrial Sand Association, National Mining Association, National Multifamily Housing Council, National Oilseed Processors Association, National Pork Producers Council (NPPC), National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, National Stone, Sand and Gravel Association (NSSGA).

Portland Cement Association, Public Lands, Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment (RISE), Southeastern Lumber Manufacturers Association Southern Crop Production Association, Sports Turf Managers Association, Texas Wildlife Association, Treated Wood Council, United Egg Producers, U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. SHUSTER. I next want to read a quote from a constituent of mine, Marty Yahner, a farmer from Cambria County, Pennsylvania.

''This illegal power grab clearly goes far beyond the power granted to the EPA by Congress through the Clean Water Act. Farmers, like me, are very concerned about the proposal giving unprecedented power to government agencies over how farmers can use their land. I'm also worried that the proposed rules will adversely impact the next generation being able to farm.''

That is not a Member of Congress. That is not a government official. That is a real-life farmer, and he has real concerns.

This rule will have serious economic consequences not just for our farmers, but for many others. This rule will threaten jobs and result in costly litigation. It will restrict the rights of landowners and the rights of States and local governments to carry out their economic development plans.

H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act, requires the agencies to withdraw the flawed rule, consult with States and local governments and other stakeholders, and then use that input to develop and repropose a new rule that works.

This bill gives the agencies, their State partners, and stakeholders another chance to work together and develop a rule that does what was intended, provide clarity. This is a chance to find the thoughtful, balanced regulatory approach that is necessary.

We all want to protect our waters. With this bill, we have a chance to do that by restoring integrity to the rulemaking process and restore common sense.

With this bill, we have a chance to tell the administration, the EPA, and the Corps to do it right this time.

I urge all Members to support H.R. 1732, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in opposition to this bill, H.R. 1732, very aptly name the RIP Act, rest

in peace—oh, no, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act. It will rest in peace. It would be inevitably vetoed if the Senate chose to take it up, which I don't believe they will.

We are being asked to vote on things here that no one has seen or read, and that is why we are here today.

Now, the President wants us to vote on trade policy for the United States of America. I have read parts of it. Many Members haven't read any of it, but nobody—probably very few have read all of it. The public hasn't seen any of it.

Here we are again today. We are being asked to vote on killing something that nobody has read. No one in this Chamber knows what is in this rule.

Now, I would not rise to support the rule as initially proposed. It was garbled, poorly presented, and I believe there were many problems that it would have created, and that was especially distressing because it was a rule that was trying to fix something done in the Bush era. We are still dealing with the Bush era.

Because of a 4–1–4 Supreme Court decision, with two different tests for jurisdictional waters and total confusion, the Bush administration decided to write a rule to interpret the Clean Water Act.

When it was unveiled, it was opposed by all the groups that are supporting this bill today. They said: This is ridiculous. It is confusing. It just leaves way too much to interpretation. It can be applied in different ways in different parts of the country. There is no certainty here. It is a mess. Get rid of it.

Well, that didn't happen, and the Obama administration, in response to the requests of all those groups, said: Okay. We will take a cut at it.

Now, as I say, the first version was not very well done, and it raised more questions than it answered, but we now have at least some idea of some of the things this bill is going to do.

It is not going to regulate your birdbaths and ditches and all these other things that are out there on the Internet. In fact, it may solve real problems. We don't know that, but we are going to repeal it before it happens.

Now, here is a problem. This farmer in the South was made to go through the environmental review process and get a permit; yet farming and agricultural practices are supposed to be exempt.

I showed this to the Republicans who were using this in a joint hearing with the Senate. I asked the EPA Administrator and secretary of the Corps: Would this land, knowing it is agricultural land, be jurisdictional—they can't tell us what is in their rule—under your rule?

They said: No, that land would be exempt.

This person who had to go through a lengthy permitting process because of the confusion of the Bush guidance would not, under the proposed rule, have to go through any of that and could just go on farming.

Thank you very much.

Now, we are going to prevent him or her from getting that relief. Now, that is just one of the aspects of this rule that we know a little bit about—or at least we know the Administrator's interpretation of that part of the rule, that it would fix a problem for farmers.

I would suggest that there is a better way to proceed in the House, which would be let them publish the rule. If it solves a bunch of problems, great. If it solves a bunch of problems but still needs some tweaks, great. Let's intervene. Let's give them direction.

If it is something that you and everybody else feels we just can't live with, that it is poorly done—instead of this confusing process we are going through here, which I am about to explain contradicts legislation just passed 2 weeks ago—we can do this: I have already had it drafted for you. You don't need to take the time. It is less than a page. It is called a joint congressional resolution of disapproval.

Any major rule—this is a major rule—Congress has the right, under legislation that is 20 years old now, to reject it within 60 days. If the rule is not well written, once we see it and read it, you could reject it. What is the rush to repeal it before we have read it and we know what is in it?

Well, there is a lot of political stuff going on around here. I would say it is just politics playing to the crowd and the fears of people who haven't seen it or read it yet either, but they are worried about what it might be.

Well, it doesn't go into effect immediately, I will say to them. If it is bad, you can ask the same people that introduced this resolution, pass it forthwith, send it to the Senate, pass it forthwith, and that is the end of it, and we would start over.

Now, there is one other confusing aspect here, and that is that, just 2 weeks ago, the House voted on this language, which says that the bill before us purports to start the process over again, the fourth attempt at writing the rule with a whole lot more public hearings and everything, despite everything that has gone on to this point in time.

Two weeks ago, an amendment to the Energy and Water appropriations said there can be no new rule development, so that is already in the bill. Unless that were taken out of the bill, what we are doing here today can't happen.

You can't develop a new rule when it is precluded in the appropriations process, as passed by many of the people who are going to vote for this today. You have sort of contradicted yourself a little bit.

It makes it a little problematic. Do a new rule, but you can't do a new rule, so forget about it. What does that mean? We are stuck with the Bush guidance, which everybody hates and doesn't work and subjects farmers to unnecessary permitting processes.

I don't call that exactly progress or acting in the best interest of the American people and agriculture and a whole host of other people who might be impacted. I would just suggest that we forgo this little political demonstration today, just wait patiently for another 2 weeks when the trolls at OMB finally release the rule.

It has been down there for months. We need to reform OMB, and I hope some on the other side of the aisle would like to help me there. We need a more transparent rulemaking process in this country.

We should not rush ahead and not allow a rule to be published that might help people; and, if it doesn't help people, then you can kill it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is now my honor to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), the chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate Chairman SHUSTER's leadership on this issue. It is important that we go ahead and kill this proposed rule now because it will go final coming out of OMB, and that is a wreck.

I rise today in support of H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act of 2015. I cannot stress enough the importance of this legislation to stop the Obama administration's Waters of the U.S. proposed rule and its damaging impacts on our country.

This rule, in its current form, is a massive overreach of EPA's authority and will impact nearly every farmer and rancher in America. It gives the EPA the ability to regulate essentially any body of water they want, including farm ponds and even ditches that are dry for most of the year.

□ 1615

Bottom line: under the EPA's proposed rule, nearly every body of water in the United States can be controlled by Federal regulators.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this legislation that forces the EPA and the Corps to stop moving forward with the proposed Waters of the U.S. rule and do as they should have done from the beginning—working with States and local stakeholders to develop a new and proper set of recommendations.

I urge support for H.R. 1732. It is imperative that the administration listen to rural America.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, that gentleman hasn't read the rule, I haven't read the rule, and I don't know how one can assert very specifically what it might or might not do if you haven't read it when we have heard there have been major changes.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), the ranking member of the subcommittee of jurisdiction.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I thank Ranking Member DEFAZIO for the opportunity to rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act, for several reasons. First, frankly speaking, I oppose

the bill because it simply does not work. Just before the recess, the House passed the Energy and Water Appropriations, as was pointed out by Mr. DEFAZIO, that included a rider which I opposed that would prohibit the Army Corps of Engineers from using any appropriated funds to develop or implement a change to the current rules that define the scope of Clean Water Act protections. Yet that is what the sponsors of H.R. 1732 say this bill is meant to do.

The sponsors of this bill claim that it will not kill the ongoing rulemaking but only tells the Corps and EPA to do the rulemaking over again. Yet just 2 weeks ago, as was pointed out, the House voted to prevent the agency from taking any action to change the current rules. So which is it? Does the majority want the agencies to do the rulemaking over? Or do they want to kill any effort to change the current process that has been uniformly criticized by farmers, developers, other industries, and environmental organizations as unworkable, arbitrary, and costly?

Secondly, I am opposed to H.R. 1732 because it is yet another attempt to delay needed clarification to the scope of the Clean Water Act. Remember, the executive branch has been trying to clarify the scope of the Clean Water Act since January 2003. Now that is what, 15 years ago, roughly, since the Bush administration released their Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for public comment. Since that time there have been six—again six—attempts by the executive branch to release their interpretation of the Waters of the United States.

We have waited 12 years for clarity. For 12 long years, Mr. Chairman, our Nation's streams and rivers have been vulnerable to pollution and degradation. For 12 years our government has spent millions of dollars working on bringing clarity to the decisions made by the Supreme Court. Delaying this further would cost our American taxpayers—all of us—many more millions of dollars and a lot of wasted time.

Intervening now and forcing the administration to start over again, particularly when we are on the cusp of clarity, is reckless. For example, stopping the administration's rulemaking to clarify the Clean Water Act could further impact the already dire circumstances Western States are facing with prolonged drought.

Mr. Chairman, 99.2 percent of my State in California drink water from public drinking water systems that rely on intermittent, ephemeral, and headwater streams. These streams are drying up in the West. And, to add insult to injury, our actions today would force the administration to withdraw a rule that protects those streams that provide drinking water for 117 million Americans.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. EMMER of Minnesota). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

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

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation puts the legislative agenda of a well-heeled few ahead of the Nation's—our taxpayers'—drinking water. It aims to protect the rights of speculators and developers over the need to conserve and reuse every precious drop of water that falls in our State. The bill potentially creates new opportunities for individuals to overturn decades of Western water law for their own personal benefit.

Mr. Chairman, many of us have had many concerns with the proposed rule—the original one. But I appreciate that the administration has addressed those concerns and most of the concerns of the States and the stakeholders. The administration has pledged to work with stakeholders on implementation of the rule once it is final, which should happen in the next few months.

So, today, we will hear many platitudes that this bill is not about killing the rule but about simply asking for public comment. Yet such statements ignore the fact that the House just passed a rider, as was pointed out, in the Energy and Water bill to block the bill from taking effect and blocking any change to the existing rulemaking or guidance.

So, Mr. Chairman, today's rhetoric that this is simply an attempt to gather more public comment is simply that—just words. I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 1732.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS), the chairman of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, a gentleman who has put lots and lots of work into this issue over the past several months.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support today for H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act of 2015.

One of the reasons that we are doing this bill today is to provide clarity and certainty for the regulated community. Following the SWANCC and Rapanos Supreme Court decisions, determining the appropriate scope of jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act has been confusing and unclear. Both the regulated community and the Supreme Court have called for a rulemaking that will provide such clarity.

Last April, the EPA and Army Corps of Engineers published a rule in the Federal Register that, according to the agencies, would clarify the scope of Federal jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act. But in reality, this rule goes far beyond merely clarifying the scope of Federal jurisdiction under Clean Water Act programs. It amounts to a vast expansion of Federal jurisdiction.

To the agencies, clarity is simple: everything is in. This is a clear expansion of the EPA's jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act and flies in the face of two Supreme Court decisions, both of which told the agencies there are limits to Federal jurisdiction.

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

The agencies had an opportunity to develop clear and reasonable bright-line rules on which is jurisdictional versus not, but they instead chose to write many of the provisions in the proposed rule vaguely, in order to give Federal regulators substantial discretion to claim Federal jurisdiction over most any water or wet area whenever they want. This is dangerous because this vagueness will leave the regulated community without any clarity and certainty as to their regulatory status and will leave them exposed to citizen lawsuits. In addition, since many of these jurisdictional decisions will be made on a case-by-case basis, this will give the Federal regulators free rein to find jurisdiction.

This rule, in essence, will establish a presumption that all waters are jurisdictional and will shift to property owners and others in the regulated community the burden of proving otherwise. This rule will set a very high bar for the regulated community to overcome.

Mr. Chairman, the administration even explicitly acknowledges in its recently issued Statement of Administration Policy for H.R. 1732 that it does not want the bill to constrain the agencies' regulatory discretion.

The Clean Water Act was originally intended as a cooperative partnership between States and the Federal Government, with States responsible for the elimination, prevention, and oversight of water pollution. This successful partnership has provided monumental improvements in water quality throughout the Nation since its 1972 enactment because not all waters need to be subject to Federal jurisdiction. However, this rule will undermine Federal-State partnership and erode State authority by granting sweeping new Federal jurisdiction to waters never intended for regulation under the Clean Water Act.

In promoting this rule, Mr. Chairman, the agencies are asserting that massive amounts of wetlands and stream miles are not being protected by the States and that this rule is needed to protect them. Yet the agencies continue to claim that no new waters will be covered by the rulemaking, which raises the question of how can the rule protect those supposedly unprotected waters without vastly expanding Federal jurisdiction over them? The agencies are talking

out of both sides of their mouths. In reality, however, States care about and are protective of their waters, and wetlands and stream miles are not being left unprotected.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to proposing a rule that has sweeping ramifications for the country, the agencies played fast and loose with the regulatory process. The sequence and timing of the actions the agencies have taken to develop this rule undermine the credibility of the rule and the process to develop it.

Among other things, State and local governments and the regulated community all have repeatedly expressed concern that the agencies have cut them out of the process and have failed to consult with them, first during the development of the agencies' jurisdiction guidance, and now, in the development of the rule.

Mr. Chairman, if the agencies had taken the time to consult with the State and local governments and actually listen up front to the issues that our counties, cities, and townships are facing, we might not have had a proposed rule which, the agencies have admitted to Congress in multiple hearings, creates confusion and uncertainty.

If the agencies had followed the proper regulatory process, we wouldn't have a proposed rule that cuts corners on the economic analysis, used incomplete data, and only looked at economic impacts of the rule on one of the many regulatory programs under the Clean Water Act. If the agencies had done things right the first time, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee wouldn't have had to respond to the more than 30 States and almost 400 counties who have requested the EPA withdraw or significantly revise the proposed Waters of the United States rule. If the agencies had done things right, substantive comments filed on the rule wouldn't have been nearly 70 percent opposed to the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GIBBS. But the agencies didn't do things right.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act, gives the agencies, their State and local government partners, and other stakeholders another chance to work together to develop a rule that does what was intended—to provide clarity.

This bill requires the agencies to withdraw the proposed rule and enter into a transparent and cooperative process with States, local governments, and other stakeholders to write a new rule. This is what EPA should have done in the first place.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

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

Mr. GIBBS. The Regulatory Integrity Protection Act will ensure that the agencies cannot re-propose the same broken rule they released a year ago but does give the agencies an opportunity to get it right.

Mr. Chairman, I know my colleagues across the aisle all believe the agencies have heard the confusion and are committed to changing the rule to respond to the stakeholders' complaints. Unfortunately, the agencies have not provided Members of Congress or stakeholders with any real assurance that that will happen. All they tell us is to trust them.

In fact, at our joint hearing with the Senate earlier this year, when I asked Administrator McCarthy about whether the public would have a chance to review all of the changes they promised to make before the rule goes final, she said they weren't changing the rule enough to need to put it out for public comment again.

In our committee, Mr. Chairman, we have repeatedly heard from our friends on the other side of the aisle that we need to wait until the rule is finalized before taking action. If the agencies have not made the changes that they promised, or if the changes they have made do not work, we have congressional authority to disapprove of the rule.

While I appreciate my colleagues' interest in using the Congressional Review Act, waiting until the rule is finalized doesn't give us or the agencies a real chance to fix the problems that will be created.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GIBBS. Not only would the President have to sign any disapproval resolution we pass, but there are legal scholars who believe if the Congressional Review Act did pass, the agencies would be barred from ever going back and doing another rulemaking, which would leave us in the position of being stuck in the same regulatory uncertainty we are in today. I don't think I want this or any of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want this.

As I said in the beginning, the reason we are voting on the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act today is to get a rule that provides real clarity, that works for the States, that works for local governments, and that protects our waters.

Nearly $220 billion in annual economic investment is tied to section 404 permits. Even more economic investment is tied to other Clean Water Act programs. I urge support for this bill.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

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

First, again, Mr. Chairman, I would remind the gentleman on the other side that we are not voting on the proposed rule. We are voting on a revised rule, and no Member of Congress nor any member of the potentially regulated community nor any member of any environmental group has seen or has knowledge of that rule.

The gentleman reports that this simply tells them to go back again because they didn't do enough. They had 700 days of public comments, and they accepted 1,429 public comments that went into this.

I would also remind the gentleman that I don't know how he voted on the amendment, but on the Republican Energy and Water bill 2 weeks ago, we precluded developing any new rule, none, zero. So kill the one we haven't seen, and you are stuck with the Bush guidance which everybody agrees is a disaster.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a member of the committee.

□ 1630

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1732. This bill would halt efforts to clarify the scope of the Clean Water Act, a clarification necessary to protect the environment, to protect wetlands, and to protect drinking water for a third of the population.

For over a decade, there has been great uncertainty about the jurisdiction of the Clean Water Act, particularly as it applies to wetlands and streams, as a result of Supreme Court decisions in 2001 and 2006, and of guidance documents issued under the Bush administration.

In an effort to provide regulatory clarity—a goal universally shared by State and local governments, industry, agriculture, and environmental organizations—the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers have conducted a formal rulemaking process.

The resulting clean water rule was proposed over a year ago and represents the culmination of years of study, independent scientific review, and unprecedented public comment and outreach. Just as the rule is at OMB and before it has even been published so people could read it, this bill guts all that work and requires EPA and the Corps, essentially, to start over.

The bill has no justifiable purpose. It kills the new rule before anyone has even had a chance to read it. It requires the agencies to conduct what appears to be two additional public comment periods, bringing the total up to six public comment periods in the last decade.

It requires the agencies to consult with stakeholders again, even though the rule was developed after 400 meetings with stakeholders, with comments filed by over 800,000 members of the public.

My Republican colleagues are always complaining about regulatory uncertainty, the resulting increased costs on businesses, bureaucratic delay, and waste of taxpayer dollars; yet this bill is unnecessary, repetitive, and serves no legitimate purpose other than to delay.

The harm it will cause is extensive. There is perhaps no greater responsibility than to protect the Nation's water supply. This bill would leave our environmental resources unprotected and the drinking water for 117 million Americans at risk. The rule is up in the air, unread, unseen, undecided, and unknown.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

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

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle, all of a sudden, want to see this rule; but, when we passed the ObamaCare bill, nobody seemed to care about what it said in it. Again, this is new for me from my colleagues from the other side.

I think one thing is for certain. When you have so many people, so many States—the State of New York, I believe, is one that asked for significant revision—the counties, all these stakeholders crying out to have this rule significantly changed or do away with it is important to the American people.

This bill does exactly what the gentleman said. It delays this rule from going into place because it is a bad rule and will cause great economic harm to this country.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman SHUSTER and Chairman GIBBS for your leadership on this important issue. I am an original cosponsor of this very important bill.

Everyone in this Chamber, Mr. Chairman, supports clean water. That is why I was such a strong advocate for the EPA to designate a portion of the Mahomet Aquifer in central Illinois as a sole source of drinking water, which was finalized just this past year.

This proposed rule on the Waters of the U.S., this attempt by the EPA to expand its authority under the Clean Water Act to lands that are traditionally dry is an overreach and must be reined in.

I am increasingly concerned of the trust gap between the EPA and the agricultural community. Earlier this year, EPA Administrator McCarthy apologized to ag producers for not bringing them to the table when the Agency put out its interpretive rule on conservation practices, which the EPA and the Corps of Engineers ultimately withdrew.

Unfortunately, this is just more evidence of the haste with which the proposed rule was developed, without appropriately seeking and implementing all necessary stakeholder input.

H.R. 1732 would require both the EPA and the Corps to withdraw the proposed rule, go back to the drawing board, and write a new rule with all stakeholders together. Frankly, this is what they should have done in the first place.

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

First, I would correct the Record—and far be it for me to correct the chairman—but, actually, the attorney general of New York, on behalf of the State of New York, as one of our witnesses, testified in favor of going forward with the rule, so there were others who objected.

Mr. SHUSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. The implementing agencies with their comments rejected the rule from New York. It sounds like New York is confused.

Mr. DEFAZIO. New York may be confused, and everybody is confused because they have not seen what it is that they are objecting to and would, again, suggest that the best course of action would be to actually see it.

The gentleman from Ohio brought up something very weird, saying that, somehow, if we used a simple resolution of disapproval, they couldn't write a new rule.

He is confusing it with the bill you passed last year, which said that the rule is rejected and you can't use anything you use to write that rule to write a new rule. A number of us raised questions about that at the time. You did pass that last year. That is probably what he is thinking of.

This is a simple resolution of disapproval. It would not have any impact on future actions of the Agency.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I think the American public, Mr. Chairman, must be quite confused. This rulemaking that we are talking about is actually about clean water; it is about a rulemaking process that hasn't been completed yet, and it is about a rule that we haven't seen, so it seems sort of odd that we are standing here commenting on it.

I just want to remind the other side that, thanks to the Clean Water Act, billions of pounds of pollution have been kept out of our rivers, and the number of waters that now meet clean water goals nationwide has actually doubled with direct benefits for drinking water, public health, recreation, and wildlife.

This is especially true from my home State of Maryland that is within the six-State Chesapeake Bay Watershed and several of its tributaries, including the Anacostia, the Patuxent, Potomac, and Severn Rivers that flow through the Fourth Congressional District.

The Chesapeake Bay Watershed is fed by 110,000 miles of creeks, rivers, and streams; and 70 percent of Marylanders get our drinking water from sources that rely on headwater or seasonal streams. Nationwide, 117 million people, or over a third of the total population, get our water from these waters.

However, due to the two Supreme Court decisions that have been referenced, there is, in fact, widespread confusion as to what falls under the protection of the Clean Water Act. That is precisely why this administration is working to finalize their joint proposed rule clarifying the limits of Federal jurisdiction under the act.

In fact, on April 6, the Army Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency submitted a revised clean water protection rule to the Office of Management and Budget for final review. From my understanding, the final rule may be published in the Federal Register later this spring. I share the view that we want OMB to just get on with it.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman has complained about the confusion in the litigation. That is precisely why we need to get through a final rulemaking, which has been years in the making. If the gentleman seeks clarity, let the administration just finish its job.

That is what the Supreme Court instructed the Federal Government to do 14 years ago with the 2001 SWANCC decision and, subsequently, the 2006 Rapanos case.

Along with those Supreme Court decisions, the Bush administration, as has been said, followed the exact same process in issuing two guidance documents in 2003 and 2008. In fact, they remain in force today.

It is, in fact, these two Bush-era guidance documents that have compounded the confusion, uncertainty, and increased compliance costs faced by our constituents—opponents and proponents alike—who all just say they want clarity.

You don't actually have to take my word for it. In fact, let me quote from the comments made by the American Farm Bureau Federation, something I don't do quite often:

> With no clear regulatory definitions to guide their determinations, what has emerged is a hodgepodge of ad hoc and inconsistent jurisdictional theories.

Those are the words of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

We all agree that it is confusing. Let the Obama administration finish what the Bush administration started and failed to do, and that is publish a rule that finalizes the rule that gives stakeholders the clarity they have been seeking for 14 years.

Quite oddly, H.R. 1732 would actually halt the current rulemaking and require the agencies to withdraw the proposed rule and restart the rulemaking process. This is after 1 million public comments, a 208-day comment period, and over 400 public meetings.

In appearances before the Senate, House, and joint committees, high-ranking Agency officials have testified that the revised rule will address many of the concerns expressed during the public comment period. They have also stated that the revised rule will provide greater clarity to the current permitting process, reduce regulatory cost, and ensure more exacting protections over U.S. waters.

The bill that we are talking about would actually force the agencies to

meet with the same stakeholders again and talk about the same issues again that they have already discussed several times over the last 14 years since the first Supreme Court decision—what a colossal waste of time and taxpayer money. Actually, the other side should be ashamed if they put a cost to restarting the procedure.

In fact, the rulemaking has been more than a decade, as we have described, in development. We need to let the administration get on with its work. As others have pointed out, just 2 weeks ago, the House passed—and I opposed it; many of our colleagues opposed it—the Energy and Water Appropriations bill

It contained a policy rider that explicitly prohibits the Corps from spending any money to develop the same new clean water rule that this bill wants us to restart. Let me repeat that. The House has already passed a provision that states the Corps can use no money not just this fiscal year, but in future fiscal years, going forward in perpetuity.

Republicans try to make it sound as if all they want is for the EPA and the Corps to develop new rules right away, but it is really clear that what they want to do is stop these agencies from doing their jobs at all—no new rules and no clean water, what a shame.

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

I have great regard for the gentlewoman from Maryland. I know that the Chesapeake Bay is incredibly important to not only Maryland, but the United States. The watershed I live in, much of it drains into the Susquehanna that flows into the Chesapeake, so we are very concerned in Pennsylvania about wanting to have clean water.

We also want to have an agriculture community prospering in Pennsylvania. They spent millions of dollars to try to clean it up.

Again, this notion that we haven't seen the rule is not that clear because we have. It is not clear to what the Democrats are saying. What we are saying is we have seen a proposed rule. We have seen a proposed rule.

Because they are not going to make substantial changes to the proposed rule, that means, if they were making substantial changes, they would have to come back and reopen this up and have a significant comment period, but they are not doing that.

Basically, the proposed rule is going to be very similar to the final rule. That is what scares the heck out of people—the farmers, builders, people across this country, landowners. This bill does force the EPA and the Corps to go back in and talk to the stakeholders because of the million comments. Seventy percent were ignored. They said revise or significantly change this. They ignored 70 percent of those million comments.

I am encouraging all Members to support this.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES), a leader on this issue.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I support wetlands, and I support clean water. I spent much of my career actually working to restore coastal wetlands in Louisiana.

The irony here is that the agencies that are proposing this rule are actually the same agencies that right now are the largest cause of wetlands loss in the United States on the way they manage the Mississippi River system. The hypocrisy here is absolutely unbelievable.

This proposed rule goes outside the bounds of the law, the law which states ''navigable waters.'' Read this definition. It clearly goes beyond the scope of the parameters of the law. It goes outside the scope of jurisprudence.

Taking a pass right now would be a dereliction of duty. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. We know what this rule is. We have had the EPA; we have had the Corps of Engineers before our committee, and it is crystal clear the direction this is going in.

Even the sister agency of the EPA and the Corps of Engineers, the Small Business Administration, has indicated that the cost estimate complying with this regulation goes well beyond the higher cost than that done by the EPA and the Corps of Engineers.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. The home State I represent, Louisiana, the watershed goes from the State of Montana to New York and comes all the way down. You can take this proposed definition, and you can basically apply it to 90 percent of the lands in south Louisiana.

This bill simply requires consultation with stakeholders, consultation with the property owners. This is a tax. This is a taking of private property. Mr. Chairman, I want to state: This is private property; this is people's homes; it is people's farms; it is people's small businesses, and it is impeding their ability to achieve the American Dream.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this bill.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

□ 1645

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Chairman, the EPA has, once again, lost all common sense as it has decided unilaterally to redefine Waters of the U.S.

Under its proposed rule change, Waters of the U.S. would now be defined to include smaller bodies of water and even some dry land. This new definition would extend the EPA's regulatory reach to seemingly any body of water, including that water puddled in your ditch after a rainstorm. You heard me right.

Let me put it another way for an even better understanding. This rule is so broad that it could very well require you to get permission from a Federal bureaucrat before acting on your property. Small-business owners, farmers, Realtors, and homebuilders all agree that this bill is bad for business in southeastern North Carolina.

For those reasons, I am a cosponsor of this bill, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act, which requires the EPA to scrap its current proposal and start anew by engaging stakeholders who are actually affected by this rule.

Mr. Chairman, common sense has had its share of setbacks in this country. Let's not let this rule be another one. I encourage my colleagues to vote for this bill, and I thank the chairman for his fine leadership.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the chairman for his work on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, there is a simple truth that exists at all times and in every place: the bigger the government, the smaller the citizen. That is especially true when it comes to regulations. When the bureaucracy makes more rules, those rules limit the freedom and opportunities of real people—people who are just trying to work hard, make a living, and support themselves and their families.

Frankly, the EPA has crossed the line with this proposed water rule. It has crossed the line constitutionally, and it has crossed a line by hurting people and threatening their livelihoods and private property.

Let me tell you a story about a place back in my district called Sandy Creek. It is named Sandy Creek for a reason; it has been dry for over 30 years. With the drought in California, there is no time soon that water is coming.

Now, long before this proposed rule that would expand the EPA's power even more, the EPA tried to regulate Sandy Creek. That would have added more costs to the people who owned the land. It would have meant more paperwork, Federal permits, compliance, and Federal regulators snooping around.

It took me years to finally get the EPA to stop. Do you know how I got them to stop? I had to have an individual come to Taft, California, get in my car, drive out, and walk in Sandy Creek, throughout the sand, before he believed there was no water to regulate.

Mr. Chairman, can you imagine what the EPA would try and do if they even had more authority to regulate things outside their jurisdiction?

These are the actions of an administration that is unaccountable and that

doesn't care about the freedom and prosperity of its citizens. This is an administration that cares more about regulation than reform, that cares more about power than it does about people.

The House is going to pass a bill to stop this rule, this abuse of power. We are going to stop this regulation for all of the hard-working Americans who are tired of this Agency's power grabs just for the sake of power.

We are going to try to do it for all who wish they could have control over their own lives. The EPA doesn't need any more power, Mr. Chairman, the people do.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 90 seconds to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. I thank the chairman for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in favor of H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act of 2015.

We hear that this is all about clean water. This is about clean water, and we all want clean water. It is an issue that should not be demagogued in this debate. We all want clean water. We have kids, and we have mothers and fathers and grandparents.

This is about a process. It is about a process that needs to be transparent, and it is about where stakeholders are at the table. Who are these stakeholders? They are Americans. They are our farmers, our ranchers, the folks who put food on our tables; they are developers and construction workers who build our homes.

This has amazing implications if we don't get this rule right, Mr. Chairman. Can you imagine the EPA's requiring farmers to have to get a permit to tile during a season? Can you imagine how long that could take? Your season could be too late to plant. What would that do to land value? to commodity prices?

We have to get this right. I rise in support of this bill as it is a commonsense, smart bill. We can do it together. We can get it right. The American people must be heard.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from California has 10½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the chairman for his leadership on this issue as it is so important to our farmers and businesses in Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to address the gross regulatory overreach of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Army Corps of Engineers regarding the proposed Waters of the United States rule.

Under the rule's proposed changes to the Clean Water Act, the Federal Government would have the power to regulate virtually any place water flows in the United States. This is not about clean water.

This includes things like creeks, streams, and groundwater but also manmade waterways like a fish pond, irrigation pipes, and dry ditching to harvest timber. If not stopped, this overreach will have damaging consequences for economic growth and jobs.

In Georgia's 12th District, many farmers and businesses are concerned about their ability to comply with these Federal mandates while maintaining their livelihoods. The Waters of the United States rule will grant the Federal Government power to dictate land use decisions, as well as farming practices, making it even more difficult to maintain a competitive and profitable farm or business.

I am proud to cosponsor H.R. 1732, and I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Chairman, there is something terribly wrong when the Federal Government is attempting to regulate our Nation's puddles, streams, and ditches.

The proposed rule that the Obama administration issued last year would, unfortunately, give the EPA the power to do just that. This rule would redefine the Waters of the United States under the Clean Water Act and significantly increase the Federal Government's jurisdiction over waters never intended for regulation.

The blatant power grab and regulatory overreach would not only dismantle a longstanding partnership between the States and the Federal Government, but it would also threaten American jobs, increase the costs of doing business, and heighten the likelihood of costly lawsuits.

The Regulatory Integrity Protection Act, of which I am proud to be an original cosponsor, would require the Obama administration to withdraw its proposed rule and replace it with one that considers stakeholders' input and maintains the State-Federal partnership to regulate our waters. I urge my colleagues to support this vital bill.

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

You have heard a lot about the EPA, that it is a bad agency doing bad things; but, if it weren't for the EPA, many of our communities would be facing undrinkable water because of the pollution that is left behind, without any followup.

We discussed this during the committee, and one of the issues that was brought out was that some of the EPA's regional offices were being a little heavyhanded. I suggested they may be able to take it up with the administrators, themselves, to figure out how we could really bring that to the forefront. Mr. Chairman, I would like to start off with a few facts, and we have covered them already.

There are broad environmental and conservation organizations that also oppose the bill. For the RECORD, I will submit 59 of them that are in opposition.

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE H.R. 1732, REGULATORY INTEGRITY PROTECTION ACT OF 2015 OUTSIDE GROUP LETTERS OF OPPOSITION MAY 12, 2015

Alliance for the Great Lakes, American Rivers, American Whitewater, Arkansas Wildlife Federation, Audubon Naturalist Society, California River Watch, Citizens Campaign for the Environment, Clean Oceans Competition, Clean Water Action, Coalition to Protect Blacksburg Waterways, Earthjustice, Earthworks, Eastern PA Coalition for Abandoned Mine Reclamation, Endangered Habitats League, Environment America, Environmental Law and Policy Center, Environmental Working Group, Freshwater Future, Friends of Accotink Creek, Friends of Dyke Marsh.

Friends of the Nanticoke River, Friends of the Weskeag, Galveston Bay Foundation, Great Lakes Environmental Law Center, Gulf Restoration Network, Izaak Walton League of America, Jesus People Against Pollution, Lake Erie Region Conservancy, League of Conservation Voters, Little Falls Watershed Alliance, Loudoun Wildlife Conservancy, Maryland Conservation Council, Midshore Riverkeeper Conservancy, Milwaukee Riverkeeper, Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy, Montgomery Countryside Alliance, Natural Resources Defense Council, National Audubon Society, National Wildlife Federation, Nature Abounds.

Neighbors of the Northwest Branch, Anacostia River, Ocean River Institute, Ohio Environmental Council, Ohio Wetlands Association, People to Save the Sheyenne, Piedmont Environmental Council, Potomac Riverkeeper Network, Protecting Our Waters, River Network, Sierra Club, Southern Environmental Law Center, St. Mary's River Watershed Association, Surfrider Foundation, Tip of the Mitt Watershed Council, Trout Unlimited, Virginia Conservation Network, WasteWater Education, Waterkeepers Chesapeake, West Virginia Highlands Conservancy.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. The Army Corps of Engineers—the Corps—and the EPA have testified that their revised clean water protection rule will provide more certainty and clarity to the current clean water permitting process, that it will reduce regulatory confusion and costs, and that it will protect our Nation's waters, our economy, and our American way of life, as was stressed in the committee hearing which we all attended. I believe that it is something that they were very sure they wanted to do.

Fact: on April 6, 2015, the Corps and the EPA submitted this revised clean water protection rule to OMB for final review, bringing it closer to publication later this spring, but my Republican colleagues are attempting to stop

the rulemaking without even seeing the final product. As Mr. MCCARTHY just said, we are going to stop this regulation.

Fact: H.R. 1732 would halt the near final rulemaking needed to clarify Clean Water Act protection for countless streams and wetlands, many of which serve as primary sources of drinking water for one in three Americans. If you want to put it in millions, it would be 117 million people.

Fact: rather than allow the Agency to provide additional regulatory certainty and clarity, it would leave in place 2003 and 2008 Bush guidance documents, which have been uniformly criticized by industry as confusing, costly, and frustrating that provide little environmental benefit.

Fact: it is simply a bureaucratic redo, forcing the agencies to repeat steps in what has been a nearly decade-long rulemaking process of unprecedented public outreach, for no other reason than to prevent this administration from finalizing clean water protection rulemaking.

The last fact: if it is released, it fails to protect our water resources and our economy, and Congress simply has multiple avenues with which to address those concerns.

Mr. Chairman, I submit for the RECORD the facts and the myths. I have five of them.

The proposed rulemaking, the Federal Clean Water Act authority over ditches—it reduces Federal authority over ditches by specifically excluding ditches, including roadside ditches that are constructed in dry lands, et cetera, and it goes on.

Myth number two, it is not based on sound science. Fact, in 2015, the Office of R&D—Research and Development—released its ''Connectivity of Streams and Wetlands to Downstream Waters'' report of more than 1,200 existing peer-reviewed publications which support this.

Myth number four, a power grab by the EPA to exert greater Federal authority—fact, it preserves existing statutory and regulatory exemptions for common farming, ranching, and forestry practices, and it goes on.

Myth number five, the EPA did not adequately consult with States and did not take local concerns into consideration. Fact, again, there were 900,000 public comments, and 19,000 provided substantive comments, and they reached out to other States.

MARCH 19, 2015.

MYTHS VS. FACTS: EPA AND CORPS' CLEAN WATER RULE MYTH # 1—EXPANDED REGULATION OF DITCHES

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Last April, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) proposed a Clean Water rule to clarify the jurisdictional scope of the Clean Water Act. This proposal was intended to simplify and improve the process for determining what waters (and wetlands) are, and are not, protected by the Act, consistent with the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Since that time, a number of questions or misconceptions about this proposal have been raised. This is the first in a series of Dear Colleagues to address these questions or misconceptions.

MYTH #1

The proposed rule expands Federal Clean Water Act authority over ditches.

FACT

The proposed rule reduces federal authority over ditches by specifically excluding ditches (including roadside ditches) that are constructed in dry lands and either (1) contain water less than year-round, or (2) do not flow into another waterbody subject to the Act.

The proposed rule retains existing authority over certain ditches that once were, and continue to function as, natural streams.

Recently, the agencies testified that they are reviewing over one million public comments submitted on the proposed rule and will make revisions to further clarify the regulation (including its application to ditches) in order to make it more effective in implementing the Clean Water Act, consistent with the science and the law.

If you have any questions or would like to learn more about the proposal, please see (http://democrats.transportation.house.gov/legislation/waters-united-states) or call the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

PETER A. DEFAZIO, M.C.,
Ranking Member, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

GRACE F. NAPOLITANO, M.C.,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

MARCH 19, 2015.

MYTHS VS. FACTS: EPA AND CORPS' CLEAN WATER RULE MYTH # 2—THE PROPOSED RULE IS NOT BASED ON THE SCIENCE

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Last April, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) proposed a Clean Water rule to clarify the jurisdictional scope of the Clean Water Act. This proposal was intended to simplify and improve the process for determining what waters (and wetlands) are, and are not, protected by the Act, consistent with the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court. Yet, critics of this proposed rule have questioned the science behind the proposal.

MYTH #2

The proposed rule is not based on sound science.

FACTS

In January 2015, EPA's Office of Research and Development released its ''Connectivity of Streams and Wetlands to Downstream Waters'' report—a review and synthesis of more than 1,200 existing peer-reviewed publications from the scientific literature.

This Connectivity report noted that ''the scientific literature unequivocally demonstrates that streams, individually or cumulatively, exert a strong influence on the integrity of downstream waters. All tributary streams, including perennial, intermittent, and ephemeral streams, are physically, chemically, and biologically connected to downstream rivers via channels and associated alluvial deposits where water and other materials are concentrated, mixed, transformed, and transported.''

The Connectivity report also noted that ''the incremental effects of individual streams and wetlands are cumulative across entire watersheds and therefore must be evaluated in context with other streams and wetlands.''

In October 2014, EPA's Science Advisory Board completed its own scientific review of the Connectivity report, and concluded that the report is ''a thorough and technically accurate review of the literature on the connectivity of streams and wetlands to downstream waters'' and found that the scientific literature provides enough information to support a more definitive statement on the degree of connection between certain, geographically-isolated waters and downstream waters.

If you have any questions or would like to learn more about the proposal, please see (http://democrats.transportation.house.gov/legislation/waters-united-states) or call the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, M.C.,
Ranking Member, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

MARCH 24, 2015

MYTHS VS. FACTS: EPA AND CORPS' CLEAN WATER RULE MYTH # 4—EPA IS SEIZING GREATER POWER OVER AGRICULTURE

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Last April, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) proposed a Clean Water rule to clarify the jurisdictional scope of the Clean Water Act. This proposal was intended to simplify and improve the process for determining what waters (and wetlands) are, and are not, protected by the Act, consistent with two decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court. Since that time, a number of questions or misconceptions about this proposal have been raised.

MYTH #4

The proposed rule is a ''power grab'' by the EPA to exert greater Federal authority over farming, ranching, and forestry operations.

FACTS

The proposed rule provides greater certainty to farmers, ranchers, and forestry operations and would preserve existing statutory and regulatory exemptions for common farming, ranching, and forestry practices, including exemptions for prior converted cropland, irrigation return flows, and normal farming, ranching, and silvicultural activities.

The proposed rule would not affect an existing Clean Water Act exemption for the construction and maintenance of farm or stock ponds constructed on dry lands, and would, for the first time, specifically exclude artificial stock watering and irrigation ponds constructed on dry lands from Clean Water Act jurisdiction.

The proposed rule does not just respect the current exemptions for ditches but it would expand the definition of ditches to make the exemption clearer.

No Clean Water Act permit is required today for the application of pesticides or fertilizer to dry land, and this will not change under the proposed rule.

Puddles on crop fields are not subject to the Clean Water Act today, and this will not change under the proposed rule.

In short, if you can plow, plant, or harvest today without a Clean Water permit, you will not need a permit for these activities under the proposed rule.

If you have any questions or would like to learn more about the proposal, please see http://democrats.transportation.house.gov/legislation/waters-united-states or call the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

Sincerely,

DONNA F. EDWARDS,
Member of Congress.

April 13, 2015

MYTHS VS. FACTS: EPA AND CORPS CLEAN WATER RULE MYTH # 5—EPA AND THE CORPS DID NOT CONSULT THE STATES

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Last April, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) proposed a Clean Water rule to clarify the jurisdictional scope of the Clean Water Act. This proposal was intended to simplify and improve the process for determining what waters (and wetlands) are, and are not, protected by the Act, consistent with the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court. However, questions and misconceptions about this proposal continue to be raised.

MYTH #5

During the rulemaking process, EPA and the Corps did not adequately consult with states and did not take local concerns into consideration when developing this rule.

FACTS

EPA consulted with various stakeholders, particularly with those from the agricultural community, and received over 900,000 public comments. Of these, approximately 19,000 provided substantive comments on the proposed rule.

In total, EPA held over 400 meetings throughout the country on the proposed rulemaking, and the agencies extended the public comment period twice for a total of 207 days, to listen to concerns and draft a better, clearer rule.

EPA developed a special process for engaging the states during the public comment period, engaging with Environmental Council of the States, the Association of Clean Water Administrators, and the Association of State Wetland Managers.

At a March 22, 2015, hearing before the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, the EPA's Deputy Assistant Administrator for the Office of Water characterized EPA's outreach efforts as ''unprecedented.''

Further, when describing EPA's meetings with state representatives, the Deputy Assistant Administrator stated, ''At the last meeting, which was scheduled for two hours, it was a little over an hour, and that meeting ended because, quite frankly, the states (ran) out of things they wanted to talk about.''

Since 2003, the agencies have received an estimated 1,429,000 total public comments during six separate rulemakings, lasting a total 700 days, or approximately 2 years.

''Quite candidly, I will tell you that there is not a lot of new in the way of issues that are being raised. Many of the issues that are being raised are the same ones that have been raised for several years.''—Quote from Ken Kopocis, EPA Deputy Assistant Administrator for the Office of Water (3/18/15 Hearing of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee)

If you have any questions or would like to learn more about the rule, please see (http://democrats.transportation.house.gov/legislation/waters-united-states) or call the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

Sincerely,

ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON,
Member of Congress.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Also, for the RECORD, I submit the Statement of Administration Policy from the Office of the President, which states at the end: ''If the President were presented with H.R. 1732, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.''

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
Washington, DC, April 29, 2015.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 1732—REGULATORY INTEGRITY PROTECTION ACT

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 1732. If the President were presented with H.R. 1732, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill, which would require the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Department of the Army (Army) to withdraw and re-propose specified draft regulations needed to clarify the jurisdictional boundaries of the Clean Water Act (CWA). The agencies' rulemaking, grounded in science, is essential to ensure clean water for future generations, and is responsive to calls for rulemaking from Congress, industry, and community stakeholders as well as decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court. The proposed rule has been through an extensive public engagement process.

Clean water is vital for the success of the Nation's businesses, agriculture, energy development, and the health of our communities. More than one in three Americans get their drinking water from rivers, lakes, and reservoirs that are at risk of pollution from upstream sources. The protection of wetlands is vital for hunting and fishing. When Congress passed the CWA in 1972, to restore the Nation's waters, it recognized that to have healthy communities downstream, we need to protect the smaller streams and wetlands upstream.

Clarifying the scope of the CWA helps to protect clean water, safeguard public health, and strengthen the economy. Supreme Court decisions in 2001 and 2006 focused on specific jurisdictional determinations and rejected the analytical approach that the Army Corps of Engineers was using for those determinations, but did not invalidate the underlying regulation. This has created ongoing questions and uncertainty about how the regulation is applied consistent with the Court's decisions. The proposed rule would address this uncertainty.

If enacted, H.R. 1732 would derail current efforts to clarify the scope of the CWA, hamstring future regulatory efforts, and deny businesses and communities the regulatory certainty needed to invest in projects that rely on clean water. H.R. 1732 also would delay by a number of years any action to clarify the scope of the CWA, because it would: (1) require the agencies to re-propose a rule that has already gone through an extensive public comment process; and (2) create a burdensome advisory process that would complicate the agencies' rulemaking and potentially constrain their discretion. The agencies have already conducted an extensive and lengthy outreach to a broad range of stakeholders who will continue to be engaged in the current process. Duplicative outreach and consultation would impose unnecessary burdens and excessive costs on all parties.

The final rule should be allowed to proceed. EPA and Army have sought the views of and listened carefully to the public throughout the extensive public engagement process for this rule. It would be imprudent to dismiss the years of work that have already occurred and no value would be added. The agencies need to be able to finish their work.

In the end, H.R. 1732, like its predecessors, would sow more confusion and invite more conflict at a time when our communities and businesses need clarity and certainty around clean water regulation. Simply put, this bill is not an act of good government; rather, it would hinder the ongoing rulemaking process and the agencies' ability to respond to the public as well as two Supreme Court rulings.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. There you are, Mr. Chairman.

We still oppose H.R. 1732, but I would really like to ensure that we continue to work with the EPA to get in place something that is really going to help America's farmers and industry.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Forty years ago, the Clean Water Act established a partnership between States and the Federal Government to regulate waters. The limits on Federal power under this partnership have also been reaffirmed by the Supreme Court not once, but twice, and I might add that my colleagues, when they were the majority party, tried twice to do what this rule is going to do, but they couldn't get it out of committee because there was not the support for it.

I am not sure what has changed except for the fact that Republicans are in the majority, but there is still a lot of opposition out there to it.

The administration's proposed rule abandons a successful partnership in favor of a vast expansion of the Federal Government's authority to regulate. This proposed rule was developed without consulting States and local governments or regulated communities, and it will have dire economic consequences.

In fact, as the gentlewoman mentioned, there have been 20,000 substantive comments on this, and 70 percent of them have opposed this rule.

As I made the point earlier, the proposed rule is out there. If they were going to change it, they would have to go back and reopen the comment period, but they are not changing it significantly.

□ 1700

The proposed rule will be very, very similar to what the final rule is. That is why we need to stop it. Two-thirds of the States object to this law rule, two-thirds of the States object to it. Local governments, farmers, builders, job creators, and stakeholders object to this rule. As mentioned, of those 20,000 substantial comments, 70 percent of them rejected this rulemaking. The Regulatory Integrity Protection Act rejects this flawed rule and flawed process that created it.

This bipartisan bill restores the integrity of the rulemaking process and the Federal and State partnership. The agencies simply need to go back and do it right. We cannot protect our waters and provide more regulatory clarity without sacrificing common sense and balance. Mr. Chairman, I encourage all Members to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, the proposed Waters of the U.S. rule is critically flawed and needs to be rewritten. After following the rulemaking process very closely, I have no confidence that that the current rule will give any

clarity for those who will be greatly impacted by this proposed rule. If anything, Mr. Speaker, the only clarity I can find in the proposed rule is that we will see an increase in the number of permits that the Corps of Engineers and EPA will need to issue for landowners to develop their land, and any litigation that may result.

The proposed rule would automatically regulate all tributaries that connect to a downstream water body and all streams and wetlands in floodplains or riparian areas of regulated water bodies unless they are deemed not navigable by the EPA or Army Corps. To me, that sounds like a dream for lawyers and a nightmare for everyone else. We must curb regulatory overreach and protect our economy as well as the rights of landowners.

During the public comment period, more than a million comments were submitted. Earlier this year during an Energy and Water Appropriations hearing the Corps informed us that 58 percent of the comments were in opposition to the rule, then later that month at an Interior Appropriations hearing the EPA informed us that 87% of the comments supported the rule. If the two agencies responsible for developing and implementing the rule cannot even agree on the number of comments submitted supporting the rule, how can they be trusted to implement the rule?

In the FY15 Omnibus we included Congressional direction to the EPA and the Army Corps to withdraw the flawed 'Interpretive Rule' that EPA had issued in conjunction with the proposed Waters of the US rule and the Administration withdrew the 'Interpretive Rule'. It's now time that we enact Congressional direction to withdraw the entire Waters of the US rule as proposed, and start fresh following the comment period.

Therefore, Mr. Chair I support this bill and I encourage all my fellow members to vote for it.

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise today on behalf of Iowans in my district to support H.R. 1732, the Regulatory Integrity Protection Act of 2015, to prohibit the implementation of the rule concerning "Waters of the United States (WOTUS)" by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE).

The rule permitting the expansion of WOTUS grants EPA and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers jurisdiction over traditionally state regulated water under the auspices of the Clean Water Act. This includes water previously unregulated by the federal government, such as dry ditches and intrastate rivers.

These regulations simply defy common sense. Every constituent in my district desires clean water, but the EPA and USACE are transferring authority from state and local officials, who know the needs of stakeholders, to Washington bureaucrats.

In response, I am proud to join the 69 other Members as a cosponsor of this bipartisan bill along with the hundreds of organized stakeholders nationwide, along with thousands of individual farmers, raising serious concerns or issued public statements in opposition to adoption of these proposals. These regulations unnecessarily burden farmers and small business owners and prevent job creation, wage increases, and economic growth. I cannot permit such proposals to go unchallenged.

I thank so many of my colleagues for standing with me in this effort and rest assured, I will continue to fight against government overreach on behalf of Iowa's hard working farming families.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee print 114–13 modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 114–98. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1732

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Regulatory Integrity Protection Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. WITHDRAWAL OF EXISTING PROPOSED RULE.

Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall withdraw the proposed rule described in the notice of proposed rule published in the Federal Register entitled ''Definition of 'Waters of the United States' Under the Clean Water Act'' (79 Fed. Reg. 22188 (April 21, 2014)) and any final rule based on such proposed rule (including RIN 2040–AF30).

SEC. 3. DEVELOPMENT OF NEW PROPOSED RULE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall develop a new proposed rule to define the term ''waters of the United States'' as used in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.).

(b) DEVELOPMENT OF NEW PROPOSED RULE.—In developing the new proposed rule under subsection (a), the Secretary and the Administrator shall—

(1) take into consideration the public comments received on—

(A) the proposed rule referred to in section 2;

(B) the accompanying economic analysis of the proposed rule entitled ''Economic Analysis of Proposed Revised Definition of Waters of the United States'' (dated March 2014); and

(C) the report entitled ''Connectivity of Streams & Wetlands to Downstream Waters: A Review & Synthesis of Scientific Evidence'' (EPA/600/R–14/475F; dated January 2015);

(2) jointly consult with and solicit advice and recommendations from representative State and local officials, stakeholders, and other interested parties on how to define the term ''waters of the United States'' as used in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; and

(3) prepare a regulatory proposal that will, consistent with applicable rulings of the United States Supreme Court, specifically identify those waters covered under, and those waters not covered under, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act—

(A) taking into consideration—

(i) the public comments referred to in paragraph (1); and

(ii) the advice and recommendations made by the State and local officials, stakeholders, and other interested parties consulted under this section; and

(B) incorporating the areas and issues where consensus was reached with the parties.

(c) FEDERALISM CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS.—As part of consulting with and soliciting advice and recommendations from State and local officials under subsection (b), the Secretary and the Administrator shall—

(1) seek to reach consensus with the State and local officials on how to define the term ''waters of the United States'' as used in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act;

(2) provide the State and local officials with notice and an opportunity to participate in the consultation process under subsection (b);

(3) consult with State and local officials that represent a broad cross-section of regional, economic, policy, and geographic perspectives in the United States;

(4) emphasize the importance of collaboration with and among the State and local officials;

(5) allow for meaningful and timely input by the State and local officials;

(6) recognize, preserve, and protect the primary rights and responsibilities of the States to protect water quality under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and to plan and control the development and use of land and water resources in the States;

(7) protect the authorities of State and local governments and rights of private property owners over natural and manmade water features, including the continued recognition of Federal deference to State primacy in the development of water law, the governance of water rights, and the establishment of the legal system by which States mediate disputes over water use;

(8) incorporate the advice and recommendations of the State and local officials regarding matters involving differences in State and local geography, hydrology, climate, legal frameworks, economies, priorities, and needs; and

(9) ensure transparency in the consultation process, including promptly making accessible to the public all communications, records, and other documents of all meetings that are part of the consultation process.

(d) STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS.—As part of consulting with and soliciting recommendations from stakeholders and other interested parties under subsection (b), the Secretary and the Administrator shall—

(1) identify representatives of public and private stakeholders and other interested parties, including small entities (as defined in section 601 of title 5, United States Code), representing a broad cross-section of regional, economic, and geographic perspectives in the United States, which could potentially be affected, directly or indirectly, by the new proposed rule under subsection (a), for the purpose of obtaining advice and recommendations from those representatives about the potential adverse impacts of the new proposed rule and means for reducing such impacts in the new proposed rule; and

(2) ensure transparency in the consultation process, including promptly making accessible to the public all communications, records, and other documents of all meetings that are part of the consultation process.

(e) TIMING OF FEDERALISM AND STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION.—Not later than 3 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Administrator shall initiate consultations with State and local officials, stakeholders, and other interested parties under subsection (b).

(f) REPORT.—The Secretary and the Administrator shall prepare a report that—

(1) identifies and responds to each of the public comments filed on—

(A) the proposed rule referred to in section 2;

(B) the accompanying economic analysis of the proposed rule entitled ''Economic Analysis of Proposed Revised Definition of Waters of the United States'' (dated March 2014); and

(C) the report entitled ''Connectivity of Streams & Wetlands to Downstream Waters: A Review & Synthesis of Scientific Evidence'' (EPA/600/R–14/475F; dated January 2015);

(2) provides a detailed explanation of how the new proposed rule under subsection (a) addresses the public comments referred to in paragraph (1);

(3) describes in detail—

(A) the advice and recommendations obtained from the State and local officials consulted under this section;

(B) the areas and issues where consensus was reached with the State and local officials consulted under this section;

(C) the areas and issues of continuing disagreement that resulted in the failure to reach consensus; and

(D) the reasons for the continuing disagreements;

(4) provides a detailed explanation of how the new proposed rule addresses the advice and recommendations provided by the State and local officials consulted under this section, including the areas and issues where consensus was reached with the State and local officials;

(5) describes in detail—

(A) the advice and recommendations obtained from the stakeholders and other interested parties, including small entities, consulted under this section about the potential adverse impacts of the new proposed rule and means for reducing such impacts in the new proposed rule; and

(B) how the new proposed rule addresses such advice and recommendations;

(6) provides a detailed explanation of how the new proposed rule—

(A) recognizes, preserves, and protects the primary rights and responsibilities of the States to protect water quality and to plan and control the development and use of land and water resources in the States; and

(B) is consistent with the applicable rulings of the United States Supreme Court regarding the scope of waters to be covered under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; and

(7) provides comprehensive regulatory and economic impact analyses, utilizing the latest data and other information, on how definitional changes in the new proposed rule will impact, directly or indirectly—

(A) each program under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for Federal, State, and local government agencies; and

(B) public and private stakeholders and other interested parties, including small entities, regulated under each such program.

(g) PUBLICATION.—

(1) FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICE.—Not later than 3 months after the completion of consultations with and solicitation of recommendations from State and local officials, stakeholders, and other interested parties under subsection (b), the Secretary and the Administrator shall publish for comment in the Federal Register—

(A) the new proposed rule under subsection (a);

(B) a description of the areas and issues where consensus was reached with the State and local officials consulted under this section; and

(C) the report described in subsection (f).

(2) DURATION OF REVIEW.—The Secretary and the Administrator shall provide not fewer than 180 days for the public to review and comment on—

(A) the new proposed rule under subsection (a);

(B) the accompanying economic analysis for the new proposed rule; and

(C) the report described in subsection (f).

(h) PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS.—Subchapter II of chapter 5, and chapter 7, of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Administrative Procedure Act'') shall apply to the development and review of the new proposed rule under subsection (a).

(i) STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''State and local officials'' means elected or professional State and local government officials or their representative regional or national organizations.

SEC. 4. NO ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act, and this Act shall be carried out using amounts otherwise available for such purpose.

The CHAIR. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 114–98. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. EDWARDS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 114–98.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike sections 2 and 3 and insert the following:

SEC. 2. LIMITATION.

The Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency are prohibited from implementing any final rule that is based on the proposed rule described in the notice of proposed rule published in the Federal Register entitled ''Definition of 'Waters of the United States' Under the Clean Water Act'' (79 Fed. Reg. 22188 (April 21, 2014)) if such final rule—

(1) expands the scope of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) beyond those waterbodies covered prior to the decisions of the United States Supreme Court in Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County v. United States Army Corps of Engineers, 531 U.S. 159 (2001), and Rapanos v. United States, 547 U.S. 715 (2006);

(2) is inconsistent with the judicial opinions of Justice Scalia or Justice Kennedy in Rapanos v. United States;

(3) authorizes Federal Water Pollution Control Act jurisdiction over a waterbody based solely on the presence of migratory birds on such waterbody;

(4) increases the regulation of ditches, including roadside ditches, when compared to existing Federal Water Pollution Control Act regulations or guidance;

(5) increases the scope of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to municipal separate sanitary sewer systems, water supply canals, or other water delivery systems;

(6) eliminates historical statutory or regulatory exemptions for agriculture, silviculture, or ranching;

(7) increases the scope of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to groundwater or water reuse or recycling projects;

(8) requires Federal Water Pollution Control Act regulation of erosional features;

(9) requires Federal Water Pollution Control Act permits for land-use activities;

(10) requires Federal Water Pollution Control Act regulation of artificial farm and stock ponds, puddles, water on driveways, birdbaths, or playgrounds;

(11) is inconsistent with the latest peer-reviewed scientific studies;

(12) was promulgated without consulting with State and local governmental entities; or

(13) was promulgated without public notice or comment.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 231, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, despite nearly universal calls for increased clarity and certainty from certain stakeholders, my colleagues have made it a priority to halt the current clean water rulemaking and to force agencies to go back to the drawing board and start the process all over again, before the public will ever even see the final product.

After over a year of public outreach on a scale unprecedented in the history of the Clean Water Act, as well as countless congressional hearings, the agencies have submitted a revised clean water protection rule to the Office of Management and Budget for final interagency review, which is the last step before the revised final rule would be released to the general public later this spring.

This, in fact, is the basis of my amendment. You see, Mr. Chairman, to be fair, several of my constituents have expressed similar concerns with the substance of the proposed rule. In fact, Maryland farmers have visited with me on more than one occasion, and I have heard those concerns, and that is why I have pressed the agency witnesses who appeared before our subcommittees on several critical areas.

Indeed, in testimony to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the heads of both the Army Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency have identified several specific areas where the proposed rulemaking may have lacked specificity and where the agencies have committed to clarifying changes in the final rule to address these areas.

For example, the American Farm Bureau and Maryland farmers expressed concern about the distinction between ephemeral—that is rain-dependent—streams, which are currently subject to the Clean Water Act, and erosional features, which are not. EPA has testified that the agencies expect the final rule to clarify the distinction between ephemeral streams and erosional features to ensure that the final rule does not inadvertently bring erosional features under the scope of the act.

Numerous groups, including the National Association of Counties, have expressed concern about the impact of the proposed rule on ''ditches.'' In response, the agencies testified that the proposed rule not only codified the current exemption for ditches but also ''expanded the definition of ditches that would be exempt under the clean water rule to make it clearer, [including] ditches that basically drain dry along public lands and highways.'' Further, the agencies committed to provide greater certainty in the final rule

on what ditches are and are not protected by the act.

Other groups questioned whether the proposed clean water rule would capture municipal separate sanitary storm water sewer systems, that is, MS4s, or water reuse and recycling projects. The EPA Administrator testified before our committee that ''EPA has not intended to capture features . . . that have already been captured in . . . MS4 permits, [and it] is our intent to continue to encourage and respect those decisions and to encourage water reuse and recycling, which very much is consistent with the Clean Water Act and our overall intent.''

Further, the Administrator testified that the EPA would make it very clear that these exclusions are articulated in the final rule, ''so that people will see in writing what they have been asking us about.''

So my amendment simply addresses these concerns and claims. It says that if any of these claims prove to be true, then the Secretary and the Administrator are prohibited from issuing any final rule that would bring about these occurrences. Instead of using a legislative scalpel, my Republican colleagues have decided to use a meat cleaver. In my amendment, I have tried to address these concerns, and I have heard from my constituents and interested parties.

Under the amendment, the administration cannot expand the scope beyond those water bodies covered prior to the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in the two cases that have been mentioned before, and it cannot be inconsistent with either Justice Scalia's or Justice Kennedy's judicial opinions in Rapanos.

In addition to that, they can't increase the regulation of ditches, they can't eliminate any historical statutory or regulatory exemptions for agriculture, which do not exist under the 2003 and 2008 documents. There are questions about ditches under the 2003 and 2008 guidance, but they are interpreted differently in different parts of the country.

As a fallback and an assurance to the regulated committee, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment so that clear legislative restrictions on the final rulemaking addressing the range of concerns that have been expressed by stakeholders are included. It will ensure that the rule does not go further than the Supreme Court decision and does not exceed historical scope, while reaffirming longstanding and existing exclusions.

Both agencies have made it crystal clear in their testimony before our committee and other committees of the House and the Senate earlier this year in a joint hearing with the Senate that many of these concerns were unfounded or would be addressed in the final rule, and so what the amendment I am offering would do, it would be a backstop in the unlikely event that anyone would think differently about regulating streams, ditches, and farmland.

I would ask for support of my amendment under the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GIBBS. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I must strongly oppose the gentlewoman's amendment because it seeks to gut this legislation. This amendment is misleading. It would allow the EPA to move forward and finalize its flawed rule expansion under Federal jurisdiction of the Clean Water Act regardless of the consequences. If the EPA determines entirely of its own discretion that the rule was consistent with the Supreme Court decisions and other factors listed in the amendment, the rule would be finalized.

This amendment gives the EPA the authority to nullify the Supreme Court decisions which reined in the EPA's expansive claims to Federal jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act and legally reinterpreted those decisions to be as broad and expansive as it would like.

The EPA has already stated that it believes its proposed rule is consistent with the Supreme Court decisions and with other factors listed in this amendment. Therefore, the effect of this amendment is to allow the EPA to finalize its flawed rule that many believe is not consistent with the Supreme Court decisions and the other listed factors.

This amendment will put the EPA solely in charge of America's waters and would undermine the Federal-State partnership that H.R. 1732 seeks to preserve. It would allow the EPA to finalize and implement its flawed rule without consultation with the States.

There has been a lot of debate and discussion today, and I want to just kind of address some of that because it goes to this amendment too, once they gut the bill. There was a lot of talk about the amendment that was included in the Energy and Water Appropriations bill. That was really a backstop to stop them from moving forward on the current proposed rule, and they cannot repropose the same rule, but if this bill is passed into law, they could move forward and do what H.R. 1732 directs them to do.

Administrator McCarthy said they don't need to put anything out because there are no new changes, or major changes; that is why they don't need to put out a supplemental to the proposed rule. That is the problem. That is why we have this bill here today, and that is why I am against the gentlewoman's amendment, because they are not being open or transparent about what changes they made.

I have a letter from the Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget, talking about the administration policy in regard to H.R. 1732, and it talks about that they believe that this bill, passed into law, would constrain the Agency's discretion. That is the problem. We can't have a bunch of bureaucrats running around the country and deciding what are going to be waters of the United States and what are not going to be waters of the United States. We have to be clear about that and give clarity. All that H.R. 1732 says is for the EPA and the Corps to go back to the States and stakeholders and work out a rule to satisfy the Supreme Court decisions and that brings clarity and certainty and allows for economic expansion and protects waters at the same time, but if you open it up to having bureaucrats——

Ms. EDWARDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland.

Ms. EDWARDS. Do you have a cost estimate of what it would cost to go back to the stakeholders for what you have described?

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I reclaim my time.

I know that the CBO put out $5 million or something like that. The problem we have here is that if this proposed rule goes forward, it costs at least $200-some billion to the economy. What this rule does, if it goes forward, under the Clean Water Act, it just makes it where farmers, landowners, homeowners would have to go through the Clean Water Act permit policy, permit provisions. All it does is create more red tape and bureaucracy and cost, and doesn't do anything to protect the water quality.

It is very important to remember that, I believe, if this rule goes forward as proposed, we could actually go backward in water quality because at some point when you layer on costs and red tape to farmers and businesses out there, they are going to throw their hands up in the air, and they are not going to do it, so it is going to stifle economic activity. It will possibly make us go backwards in water quality because if we don't have a growing economy, we don't have the resources to do the environmental stuff we want to do.

So it is very important that we kill this amendment that the gentlewoman offers because it guts the bill and support H.R. 1732 going forward. All it does is say to the EPA: Go back and work with the States, and don't propose the same rule you put out there that you won't tell us what your changes are, but go back and work with the States, do it in an open, transparent, and accountable process, and we can do something that protects water quality and the environment in this country and move this country forward.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

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

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the

amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 114–98.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 4. EFFECT ON STATE PERMIT PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, based on the proposed rule developed under section 3, issues a final rule to define the term ''waters of the United States'' as used in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), the Administrator shall—

(1) not later than 90 days after the date of issuance of the final rule, review each permit program being administered by a State under section 402, 404, or 405 of that Act (33 U.S.C. 1342, 1344, or 1345) to determine whether the permit program complies with the terms of the final rule; and

(2) not later than 10 days after the date of completion of the review, notify the State of—

(A) the Administrator's determination under paragraph (1); and

(B) in any case in which the Administrator determines that a permit program does not comply with the final rule, the actions required to bring the permit program into compliance.

(b) COMPLIANCE PERIOD.—During the 2-year period beginning on the date on which the Administrator provides notice to a State under subsection (a)(2), the Administrator may not withdraw approval of a State permit program referred to in subsection (a)(1) on the basis that the permit program does not comply with the terms of a final rule described in subsection (a).

(c) LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to limit or otherwise affect the authority of the Administrator under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act or any other provision of law—

(1) to withdraw approval of a State permit program referred to in subsection (a)(1), except as specifically prohibited by subsection (b); or

(2) to disapprove a proposed permit under a State permit program referred to in subsection (a).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 231, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chair, as allowed under the Clean Water Act, Michigan, my home State, and many other States have successfully attained permitting responsibility for pollutant discharges into their waters through their State environmental departments, as we do in Michigan. These programs have been long a very successful Federal-State partnership, allowing States, who know their lands and waters better than anyone, to be able to keep local control of their permitting program to ensure protection of their waters in compliance with Federal law in their States. The scope and structure of these programs, of course, are determined by the definition of waters of the U.S.

So when the EPA comes out with a new definition of waters of the U.S., every State's program would go under review to ensure that it is compliant with that new definition. Though Michigan has had its authority to operate its own permitting program from the 1970s, its program has been under review by the EPA for several years. So, in response to the EPA's review of Michigan's program, Michigan passed a bipartisan law in 2013 to improve its State-run program to align with Federal law.

□ 1715

Maintaining these current State permitting programs—it is interesting—is supported in my State and other places both by environmental and agricultural interests, something that we don't often see. So it is really important to maintain these successful programs.

Interestingly enough, since the enactment of its 2013 law, Michigan has not lost any of our precious wetlands.

What my amendment would do is ensure that States that do this will be able to continue to control their State permitting program so that the people who know the States and its waters best can comply with their unique application of the law. Particularly in places like Michigan where we have the Great Lakes, that is important.

So here is what my amendment would do:

First, once a rule under this bill would be finalized, the EPA would have 90 days to determine if a State's program is still compliant under the new rule.

Second, the EPA would have a further 10 days to notify a State in writing if its permitting programs are compliant under that new rule.

And finally, if a State is not compliant, the EPA must allow States 2 years to comply with the new rule before they federalize a State's permitting program.

When a new rule for definition of waters of the U.S. comes out, it will automatically place every State's permitting program under review, running the risk of ending these successful partnerships. I believe, and I think others agree, we have to maintain the flexibility so that States can comply with the new rule before the EPA would remove a State's program.

Depending on the State, of course, statutory changes might be required. So we believe that 2 years would be a sufficient period of time for States like Michigan to work through the legislative process. It took Michigan over a year in 2013 to come to a conclusion of that reform.

In practice, to be fair, the EPA has granted broad discretion when reviewing a State's programs. What this amendment would do is simply codify into law that process so that States have the ability to come into compliance and maintain this important partnership. It is really important to the underlying purpose of the act.

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

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, though I am not opposed.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague from Michigan for offering this thoughtful amendment. We are prepared to support this amendment since we believe it helps protect a State's role in administering the Clean Water Act, especially those States with delegated authorities under sections 402 and 404 of the act. We also believe this amendment strengthens H.R. 1732 and enhances the role of States in carrying out the Clean Water Act. I encourage Members to support the Kildee amendment.

I would also ask the sponsor of this amendment if he would support this underlying bill with the amendment included. The reason I argue he should is because, under the current rule, without the underlying bill being passed, States would have to change the processes under the 402 and 404 permitting, and they currently would have no grace period. With this amendment in the underlying bill and passage of the underlying bill, that would solve that problem. And so his amendment strengthens the bill, but also gives the States the flexibility that he is asking for. I would ask that the sponsor of the amendment support the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments and his support. I do think it is important that whenever we can agree, we do express that agreement. I think this amendment is a good example.

I know we all support the underlying purpose of the act. This particular amendment would ensure that, when there is a rule, States that do operate under delegated authority would be able to continue to protect the waters of the U.S. and the waters within their own States with the best knowledge on the ground. It has been a good experience in the State of Michigan. I think it is good for other States as well. I think that this amendment would help to ensure that.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) having assumed the

chair, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1732) to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

RAFAEL RAMOS AND WENJIAN LIU NATIONAL BLUE ALERT ACT OF 2015

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 665) to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 665

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu National Blue Alert Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) COORDINATOR.—The term ''Coordinator'' means the Blue Alert Coordinator of the Department of Justice designated under section 4(a).

(2) BLUE ALERT.—The term ''Blue Alert'' means information sent through the network relating to—

(A) the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer in the line of duty;

(B) an officer who is missing in connection with the officer's official duties; or

(C) an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer.

(3) BLUE ALERT PLAN.—The term ''Blue Alert plan'' means the plan of a State, unit of local government, or Federal agency participating in the network for the dissemination of information received as a Blue Alert.

(4) LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—The term ''law enforcement officer'' shall have the same meaning as in section 1204 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796b).

(5) NETWORK.—The term ''network'' means the Blue Alert communications network established by the Attorney General under section 3.

(6) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

SEC. 3. BLUE ALERT COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK.

The Attorney General shall establish a national Blue Alert communications network within the Department of Justice to issue Blue Alerts through the initiation, facilitation, and promotion of Blue Alert plans, in coordination with States, units of local government, law enforcement agencies, and other appropriate entities.

SEC. 4. BLUE ALERT COORDINATOR; GUIDELINES.

(a) COORDINATION WITHIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.—The Attorney General shall assign an existing officer of the Department of Justice to act as the national coordinator of the Blue Alert communications network.

(b) DUTIES OF THE COORDINATOR.—The Coordinator shall—

(1) provide assistance to States and units of local government that are using Blue Alert plans;

(2) establish voluntary guidelines for States and units of local government to use in developing Blue Alert plans that will promote compatible and integrated Blue Alert plans throughout the United States, including—

(A) a list of the resources necessary to establish a Blue Alert plan;

(B) criteria for evaluating whether a situation warrants issuing a Blue Alert;

(C) guidelines to protect the privacy, dignity, independence, and autonomy of any law enforcement officer who may be the subject of a Blue Alert and the family of the law enforcement officer;

(D) guidelines that a Blue Alert should only be issued with respect to a law enforcement officer if—

(i) the law enforcement agency involved—

(I) confirms—

(aa) the death or serious injury of the law enforcement officer; or

(bb) the attack on the law enforcement officer and that there is an indication of the death or serious injury of the officer; or

(II) concludes that the law enforcement officer is missing in connection with the officer's official duties;

(ii) there is an indication of serious injury to or death of the law enforcement officer;

(iii) the suspect involved has not been apprehended; and

(iv) there is sufficient descriptive information of the suspect involved and any relevant vehicle and tag numbers;

(E) guidelines that a Blue Alert should only be issued with respect to a threat to cause death or serious injury to a law enforcement officer if—

(i) a law enforcement agency involved confirms that the threat is imminent and credible;

(ii) at the time of receipt of the threat, the suspect is wanted by a law enforcement agency;

(iii) the suspect involved has not been apprehended; and

(iv) there is sufficient descriptive information of the suspect involved and any relevant vehicle and tag numbers;

(F) guidelines—

(i) that information should be provided to the National Crime Information Center database operated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation under section 534 of title 28, United States Code, and any relevant crime information repository of the State involved, relating to—

(I) a law enforcement officer who is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty; or

(II) an imminent and credible threat to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer;

(ii) that a Blue Alert should, to the maximum extent practicable (as determined by the Coordinator in consultation with law enforcement agencies of States and units of local governments), be limited to the geographic areas most likely to facilitate the apprehension of the suspect involved or which the suspect could reasonably reach, which should not be limited to State lines;

(iii) for law enforcement agencies of States or units of local government to develop plans to communicate information to neighboring States to provide for seamless communication of a Blue Alert; and

(iv) providing that a Blue Alert should be suspended when the suspect involved is apprehended or when the law enforcement agency involved determines that the Blue Alert is no longer effective; and

(G) guidelines for—

(i) the issuance of Blue Alerts through the network; and

(ii) the extent of the dissemination of alerts issued through the network;

(3) develop protocols for efforts to apprehend suspects that address activities during the period beginning at the time of the initial notification of a law enforcement agency that a suspect has not been apprehended and ending at the time of apprehension of a suspect or when the law enforcement agency involved determines that the Blue Alert is no longer effective, including protocols regulating—

(A) the use of public safety communications;

(B) command center operations; and

(C) incident review, evaluation, debriefing, and public information procedures;

(4) work with States to ensure appropriate regional coordination of various elements of the network;

(5) establish an advisory group to assist States, units of local government, law enforcement agencies, and other entities involved in the network with initiating, facilitating, and promoting Blue Alert plans, which shall include—

(A) to the maximum extent practicable, representation from the various geographic regions of the United States; and

(B) members who are—

(i) representatives of a law enforcement organization representing rank-and-file officers;

(ii) representatives of other law enforcement agencies and public safety communications;

(iii) broadcasters, first responders, dispatchers, and radio station personnel; and

(iv) representatives of any other individuals or organizations that the Coordinator determines are necessary to the success of the network;

(6) act as the nationwide point of contact for—

(A) the development of the network; and

(B) regional coordination of Blue Alerts through the network; and

(7) determine—

(A) what procedures and practices are in use for notifying law enforcement and the public when—

(i) a law enforcement officer is killed or seriously injured in the line of duty;

(ii) a law enforcement officer is missing in connection with the officer's official duties; and

(iii) an imminent and credible threat to kill or seriously injure a law enforcement officer is received; and

(B) which of the procedures and practices are effective and that do not require the expenditure of additional resources to implement.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION.—The guidelines established under subsection (b)(2), protocols developed under subsection (b)(3), and other programs established under subsection (b), shall not be mandatory.

(2) DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION.—The guidelines established under subsection (b)(2) shall, to the maximum extent practicable (as determined by the Coordinator in consultation with law enforcement agencies of States and units of local government), provide that appropriate information relating to a Blue Alert is disseminated to the appropriate officials of law enforcement agencies, public health agencies, and other agencies.

(3) PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES PROTECTIONS.—The guidelines established under subsection (b) shall—

(A) provide mechanisms that ensure that Blue Alerts comply with all applicable Federal, State, and local privacy laws and regulations; and

(B) include standards that specifically provide for the protection of the civil liberties, including the privacy, of law enforcement officers who are seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or who are threatened with death or serious injury, and the families of the officers.

(d) COOPERATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.—The Coordinator shall cooperate with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Transportation, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, and appropriate offices of the Department of Justice in carrying out activities under this Act.

(e) RESTRICTIONS ON COORDINATOR.—The Coordinator may not—

(1) perform any official travel for the sole purpose of carrying out the duties of the Coordinator;

(2) lobby any officer of a State regarding the funding or implementation of a Blue Alert plan; or

(3) host a conference focused solely on the Blue Alert program that requires the expenditure of Federal funds.

(f) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Coordinator shall submit to Congress a report on the activities of the Coordinator and the effectiveness and status of the Blue Alert plans that are in effect or being developed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on S. 665, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

This week in Washington, D.C., we are celebrating National Police Week. This annual tradition, which draws tens of thousands of law enforcement officers from around the country, is a time to celebrate the critical role that police play in maintaining a free and safe society. It is also a time to mourn our Nation's fallen heroes.

Last year, 127 men and women gave their lives while protecting Americans' public safety, including three officers in my home State of Virginia. The average age of these fallen officers is just 40 years old, which is too young to be taken from their loved ones.

The Blue Alert system, which is currently in place in 20 States, is a cooperative effort among local, State, and Federal authorities, law enforcement agencies, and the general public.

S. 665, the Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu National Blue Alert Act of 2015, seeks to expand on these existing programs by encouraging an enhanced nationwide system for the distribution of time-sensitive information to help identify and locate a violent suspect when a law enforcement officer is injured or killed in the line of duty or when there is an imminent and credible threat against an officer.

Similar to the AMBER Alerts for missing children and Silver Alerts for missing seniors, Blue Alerts broadcast information about suspects, including a description of an offender who is still at large and, if available, a description of the offender's vehicle and license plate information. Like AMBER Alerts, Blue Alerts are intended to hinder the offender's ability to escape and will facilitate their capture.

S. 665 directs the Justice Department to designate an existing employee as the Blue Alert national coordinator, who will establish voluntary guidelines for the program and encourage those States that have not already done so to develop Blue Alert plans.

The House has passed similar versions of this legislation in the past two Congresses, but those bills were not taken up by the Senate.

The version of the Blue Alert bill that we consider today is different for two important reasons:

First, unlike the Blue Alert bills from prior Congresses that passed this body only to wither away in the Senate, S. 665 will be sent directly to the President's desk for signature following House passage. I urge him to sign this legislation without delay.

Second, S. 665 is named after New York City Police Officers Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu, who, in December 2014, were murdered in cold blood by a malevolent killer who traveled from Baltimore to Brooklyn with the stated intention of shooting police officers.

Officer Ramos left behind a wife and 13-year-old son. Officer Liu left behind his wife of just 2 months. This bill, a tribute to their service and sacrifice, will hopefully spare other families from the pain of losing a loved one.

I thank Senator CARDIN, Mr. REICHERT of Washington, and the many bipartisan cosponsors of both the House and Senate bills for their work on this important legislation. I also thank the many outside law enforcement organizations that have tirelessly promoted the Blue Alert program over the past several years.

This bill reaffirms Congress' commitment to ensure the safety of the men and women in our Nation's law enforcement communities and the citizens they serve and protect every day.

I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Let me thank Chairman GOODLATTE and Ranking Member CONYERS of the Judiciary Committee for this timely presentation and the offering of this legislation on the floor this week, which is a time to commemorate and mourn and to uphold the Nation's law enforcement. It is a very important statement that we make today on the floor of the House.

As a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee, a ranking member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, and yes, as a Member of Congress from Houston, which has one of the Nation's most effective police departments, and as a cosponsor of the House companion measure, I rise in strong support of S. 665, the Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu National Blue Alert Act of 2015.

I, too, thank Senator CARDIN, Congressman REICHERT, and my colleague and friend, Congressman PASCRELL. I am also a cosponsor. I thank them for their particular leadership on this bill.

Every day, more than 900,000 officers protect and serve the people of the United States. On average, one law enforcement officer is killed in the line of duty every 58 hours. Each year, there is an average of 58,930 assaults on our law enforcement officers, resulting in 15,404 injuries.

Just yesterday, in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, the community held a memorial for two dedicated public servants fatally shot during a traffic stop on Saturday night.

Married and the father of two, Benjamin Deen, a 34-year-old canine officer, was recognized in 2012 as the Hattiesburg Officer of the Year. Liquori Tate, just 25 years old, fulfilled a childhood dream when he graduated from the police academy and joined the police force less than 1 year ago. Many of us heard the sympathetic and emotional outpouring by his family of his love of being a law enforcement officer.

For the community of Hattiesburg, the senseless deaths of on-duty officers are the first in three decades. Hattiesburg is not alone, however, in these tragic developments. Law enforcement fatalities in the U.S. rose 24 percent in 2014, reversing 2 years of significant decline.

The number of law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty rose from 102 in 2013 to 126 in 2014. Statistics released yesterday by the FBI show that

51 law enforcement officers were feloniously killed in the line of duty in 2014. This is an increase of almost 89 percent when compared to the 27 killed in 2013. Of those 51 felonious deaths, offenders used firearms in 46 of them.

Just 1 day before this tragedy in Mississippi, Officer Brian Moore was laid to rest thousands of miles away in Long Island, New York. After 6 p.m. on a Saturday, Moore and his partner came upon the gunman. After identifying himself as a police officer and asking the gunman about the object in his waistband, the gunman fatally shot Moore in the face.

Moore was 20 years old when he joined the New York Police Department. After over 5 years of service, he earned two Meritorious Police Duty medals and two Excellent Police Duty medals. He died several days after he was shot.

□ 1730

The killing of Officer Moore in New York City comes on the heels of the December killings of New York Police Department Officers Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu, for whom this legislation before us memorializes. These officers were killed on a Saturday afternoon while sitting in their parked patrol car by a man who shared his intent to kill police officers on social media.

This man traveled from Maryland to New York to execute his plan; and, unfortunately, at the same time Maryland authorities were warning the NYPD of this threat, Officers Ramos and Liu were being assassinated.

Benjamin Deen, Liquori Tate, Brian Moore, Rafael Ramos, and Wenjian Liu and other fallen heroes join the more than 20,000 U.S. law enforcement officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice since the first known line-of-duty death in 1791, nearly 1,700 of whom hail from my home State of Texas and 121 from the Houston Police Department.

The brave men and women who risk their lives to keep the peace and keep us safe are too often taken by the violence they are working to prevent. When a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed, rapid dissemination of information about the suspected criminal is critical to ensuring justice for that officer and keeping the public safe.

Here lies the opportunity for this important legislation. The Blue Alert System is modeled after the AMBER Alert and the Silver Alert. Currently, 22 States, including my home State of Texas, have local Blue Alert programs in operation.

The gist of this legislation is to provide for the coordination and the provisions for other States to participate and to help other States participate in a Blue Alert plan. This Blue Alert plan, I hope, will save lives or will, in essence, save and protect law enforcement officers or bring their perpetrator, tragically, of their death, to justice.

This is an important statement this week as we mourn those who have fallen in the service of their country as law enforcement officers. This is an important action, if you will, to tell the families of these officers that we care. I hope my colleagues will join us in supporting this legislation.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), the chief sponsor of the companion House legislation.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding generous time for my comments. I also want to thank you for your strong support for this legislation, and I take a moment also to thank Ms. JACKSON LEE for her strong words of support. Her passion was evident and felt in her words.

This is a very close topic to my heart, very near and dear to me. I think, as most Members in this body know, I spent 33 years in law enforcement before I came to Congress. I have been here 10 years; I tell people I just look like I have been here 40 years, but I have had the blessing of serving in many different ways, first in the Air Force and now in Congress.

Today is just an honor to stand here in support of this legislation because, this week, we have families from all across the country. When I arrived at the airport this afternoon, at 3:30, motorcades were lined up to escort the survivors of the fallen officers, honor guards standing at the gates where people are coming off the airplanes, to escort the families of the fallen officers.

These men and women risk their lives every day across this great Nation to protect our communities, protect our families, protect our children, and we need to help them. This bill does just that because, when they leave home, they don't know if they are coming back. The families don't know if they are coming back home that day or that evening.

My own family has had that experience watching me being wheeled into a hospital room with stab wounds in the side of my neck. They learned about it on TV. That was back in the seventies, so it was a little bit different time back then, but it is still a dangerous job.

We worked hard to work with the New York Police Department, the Sergeants Benevolent Association, and the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association to rename this bill after the two New York police officers, Ramos and Liu, because this is a story where this Blue Alert could have made a difference.

It could have made a difference because the suspect in this case shot his girlfriend in Maryland at 5:45 in the morning, and then at 2:45, 3 in the afternoon, showed up in New York, after posting on social media that he was going to make ''angels out of police officers that day.'' As Ms. JACKSON LEE said, the information came to NYPD too late.

We think Blue Alert can make a difference. We think Blue Alert can save lives. We think Blue Alert can keep our officers safer on the streets.

In Seattle, Washington, there is a community called Lakewood; and it is just a half an hour, 40 minutes, south of Seattle, the city of Lakewood. In 2009, there were four police officers sitting in a coffee shop.

They were having a squad meeting, a sergeant and three police officers—Sergeant Renninger, Officer Owens, Officer Griswold, and Officer Richard—just sitting there, having coffee, talking about what was going to happen that day, what they were going to focus on that day to keep that community safe.

A man walked in and assassinated all four officers. A 2-day manhunt occurred looking for that suspect, for that murderer, for that monster—2 days. If we had had Blue Alert—and during those 2 days, that suspect is on the loose. He is not only a danger to other police officers, he is a danger to the entire community. We need to find these people as soon as possible.

A Blue Alert—because we knew who this guy was, and in the New York case, we knew who this guy was—all we need to do is put the information out there sooner, quicker, faster, immediately so we could capture these people and put them behind bars and keep the community safe.

Also, a number of years ago, in 1982, I lost a friend, my best friend and my partner, and he was shot and killed chasing a murder suspect. I was one of the cops out there for 3 days searching for this guy in the foothills of the Cascade Mountains, about 45 minutes southeast of Seattle. In 1982, of course, we didn't have this technology. I know the feeling of losing a good friend, a good cop, a father of five, dedicated, would do anything for his community.

We have got to do everything we can to show support across this country for our cops on the street, for their families, and this week especially, when you see a police officer walking around the Capitol Grounds, make sure you say thank you. Make sure you say thank you to the family because this is a loss they will never, ever forget; and neither will we.

I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

I also want to make mention of a good friend who has worked with me on law enforcement issues here in this body, who was the mayor of Paterson, New Jersey. I always tell BILL PASCRELL that he would have made a good sheriff. He is a strong supporter of law enforcement, first responders, and firefighters.

He and I co-chair the Law Enforcement Caucus together. He is here in this body today, and I know he is going to be speaking on some of these issues this evening.

He has been a good friend to law enforcement, and I appreciate all the

hard work that he has put into this bill and others to help support our law enforcement officers across this country.

I appreciate the time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman REICHERT for his belief in this bill and for his statement of the preciousness of life of our law enforcement officers and our families who depend upon them.

This bill, of course, in particular, would work with States to ensure the regional coordination of various elements of the network, which speaks directly to the heinous crime committed against the two New York police officers and someone who traveled from Maryland to New York.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a gentleman who lives in the region and who we have had the privilege of working with, from COPS on the Beat to the Blue Alert and many other bills dealing with our first responders, and a cosponsor of this bill.

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

Anyone who listened to the gentleman from Washington State, Congressman REICHERT, if they have any doubt as to the significance, not only of this piece of legislation and the other three pieces of legislation that we will pursue after this, I don't know what it is going to take because he was on the front lines. He doesn't have to conjecture.

I personally thank Chairman GOODLATTE. I personally thank Ranking Member CONYERS and, of course, our brothers in the Senate, Senator CARDIN, Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM.

We had a press conference in April and introduced this legislation. At that press conference was Gina Miller. Gina Miller was the fiancee of a Washington State trooper, Tony Radulescu, who was shot at a traffic stop in Washington State and killed.

He went to high school in New Jersey. He was a vet from the gulf war, as many of our police officers are. I promised Gina I would not take off the wristband she gave me until we pass this legislation. It is fitting in this month, when we honor all law enforcement, it is fitting that we move this through the House of Representatives.

I am honored to stand with Mr. REICHERT as we present this, and I am honored and thank you all for coming on this piece of legislation.

We have heard the numbers about how many police officers were killed in the line of duty in 2013 and 2014. It is a grave reminder that these attacks are too common in our communities.

Last year, we mourned the loss of Jersey City Officer Melvin Santiago, who was killed in the line of duty responding to a gang-related robbery. Officer Santiago's death set off a series of targeted threats against the Jersey police officers from the assailant's fellow gang members.

The grave risk that our law enforcement officers face was tragically confirmed this past Christmas when on-duty New York Police Department Officers Ramos and Liu were murdered while simply sitting in their squad car.

When threats like this occur, the rapid dissemination of critical, time-sensitive information is essential, and the national Blue Alert system would provide that in New Jersey and across our Nation.

Regardless of what aspect you talk of about police work, law enforcement, talk must be followed by action.

□ 1745

So cops, the police officers just don't need a pat on the back from us while we place our grandchildren in the back of the car to see what it is like to sit in a police car. They need our actions here in Washington to help communities throughout America.

So I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for putting this bill before us tonight and the other bills that will follow.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), another distinguished gentleman who has worked on these issues and is now the ranking member of the Constitution and Civil Justice Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member for the time; I want to thank the chairman for scheduling these bills; and particularly I want to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) for bringing them.

My first job out of law school was attorney for the Memphis Police Department, and I served 3½ years working as the attorney for the Memphis Police Department. I know that police are on the front lines of democracy in seeing that we have a society that can function and that we have people's rights protected in a most direct way.

The ranking member talked about the losses of the lives in New York of Officer Davis; the two officers this bill is named for, Officers Ramos and Liu; and then there were the two officers killed in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, each of which is tragic and each of which caused me to grieve and be mournful about the loss of these men's lives in the course of duty.

While we have some issues with law enforcement in certain areas, we need to have law enforcement; and the loss of any life of a law enforcement member in the actions of their duties or because of their position is wrong, and we should have a system in place to apprehend and arrest somebody who, with probable cause, committed that crime.

I also want to thank the chairman of the committee for scheduling a hearing next week on civil rights issues. These issues go together. No one should lose their life wrongfully. We must deal with these issues, and it is commendable.

There are some good things happening in Congress. So many times I go home, and people talk about the acrimony and don't we get along. Well, we get some things done, and we get some things done together, and the Judiciary Committee is doing some of those things.

I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member, who is not here, for that.

I am a proud sponsor of this bill. I hope everybody will vote for it and pass it. It will save some law enforcement people's lives.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and if the gentlewoman from Texas is prepared to yield back, I am prepared to do the same.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I was moved by all of the presentations that have been made here today, statements on the floor, by passionate Members of Congress. It reminded me of my time as a municipal court judge, seeing officers in clothing that would not be recognizable because they were undercover officers, seeking what we call probable cause warrants and trying to save communities.

I think this legislation is extremely important in this week because what it says is that we can all get along, that we can pass legislation that deals with the pain of our law enforcement officers and commits us to the statement that we want them to go home to their families. At the same time, we can use the words ''criminal justice reform'' and not offend by saying it is to help everyone: our law enforcement officers and our civilians.

I am also grateful that next week we will have the opportunity to hear a myriad of issues on this particular point.

But as we come together this week, officers of the law will be coming to Washington, D.C., from all parts of the Nation. This legislation will make the statement that we want to coordinate, we want to establish advisory groups, we want to establish guidelines for States, and we want to provide assistance to have the Blue Alert plans.

As we have saved children through the AMBER Alerts and helped find senior citizens through the Silver Alerts, I want to make sure that we bring more officers home to their families by ensuring that heinous criminals who are out to do them harm are caught before they do more harm.

I also want to say that I look forward to working on legislation that deals with bringing us together and making sure that we address all of the concerns.

So I join today with the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Association of Police Organizations, and the National Sheriffs' Association in supporting this legislation, S. 665. But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, I stand today mourning those who have been lost and joining our officers as they

converge upon the United States Capitol, standing shoulder-to-shoulder. I want to say to them that America cares. We honor you; we mourn you; and we stand in assistance to you.

I would like to introduce into the RECORD a list of officers killed in the line of duty in my own hometown of Houston, Texas, from the Houston Police Department.

HOUSTON POLICE DEPARTMENT OFFICERS KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY

LINE OF DUTY DEATHS: 112

Assault: 1
Automobile accident: 10
Fire: 1
Gunfire: 69
Gunfire (Accidental): 2
Heart attack: 2
Motorcycle accident: 9
Stabbed: 2
Struck by vehicle: 5
Vehicle pursuit: 1
Vehicular assault: 10

BY MONTH

January: 12
February: 7
March: 12
April: 10
May: 7
June: 15
July: 5
August: 14
September: 9
October: 6
November: 6
December: 9

BY GENDER

Male: 109
Female: 3

Police Officer Kevin Scott Will, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, May 29, 2011, Cause: Vehicular assault.

Police Officer Eydelmen Mani, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, May 19, 2010, Cause: Automobile accident.

Police Officer Henry Canales, Houston Police Department, EOW: Tuesday, June 23, 2009, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Timothy Scott Abernethy, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, December 7, 2008, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Gary Allen Gryder, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, June 29, 2008, Cause: Vehicular assault.

Officer Rodney Joseph Johnson, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, September 21, 2006, Cause: Gunfire.

Officer Reuben Becerra DeLeon, Jr., Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, October 26, 2005, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Frank Manuel Cantu, Jr., Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, March 25, 2004, Cause: Vehicular assault.

Police Officer Charles Roy Clark, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, April 3, 2003, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Keith Alan Dees, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, March 7, 2002, Cause: Motorcycle accident.

Police Officer Alberto ''Albert'' Vasquez, Houston Police Department, EOW: Tuesday, May 22, 2001, Cause: Gunfire.

Officer Dennis E. Holmes, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, January 10, 2001, Cause: Heart attack.

Police Officer Jerry Keith Stowe, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, September 20, 2000, Cause: Assault.

Police Officer Troy Alan Blando, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, May 19, 1999, Cause: Gunfire.

Sergeant Kent Dean Kincaid, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, May 23, 1998, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Cuong Huy ''Tony'' Trinh, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, April 6, 1997, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Dawn Suzanne Erickson, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, December 24, 1995, Cause: Struck by vehicle.

Police Officer David Michael Healy, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, November 12, 1994, Cause: Automobile accident.

Police Officer Guy P. Gaddis, Houston Police Department, EOW: Monday, January 31, 1994, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Michael P. Roman, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, January 6, 1994, Cause: Vehicle pursuit.

Sergeant Bruno David Soboleski, Houston Police Department, EOW: Friday, April 12, 1991, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer John Anthony Salvaggio, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, November 25, 1990, Cause: Vehicular assault.

Police Officer James Bruce Irby, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, June 27, 1990, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer James Charles Boswell, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, December 9, 1989, Cause: Gunfire.

Officer Fiorentino M. Garcia, Jr., Houston Police Department, EOW: Friday, November 10, 1989, Cause: Motorcycle accident.

Officer Elston Morris Howard, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, July 20, 1988, Cause: Gunfire.

Officer Andrew Winzer, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, February 18, 1988, Cause: Automobile accident.

Officer Maria Michelle Groves, Houston Police Department, EOW: Friday, April 10, 1987, Cause: Vehicular assault.

Officer William Moss, Houston Airport Police Department, EOW: Monday, September 12, 1983, Cause: Automobile accident.

Police Officer Charles Robert Coates, II, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, February 23, 1983, Cause: Struck by vehicle.

Police Officer Kathleen C. Schaefer, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, August 18, 1982, Cause: Gunfire (Accidental).

Officer James D. Harris, Houston Police Department, EOW: Tuesday, July 13, 1982, Cause: Gunfire.

Detective Daryl W. Shirley, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, April 28, 1982, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Winston J. Rawlins, Houston Police Department, EOW: Monday, March 29, 1982, Cause: Fire.

Police Officer William Edwin DeLeon, Houston Police Department, EOW: Monday, March 29, 1982, Cause: Vehicular assault.

Police Officer Jose A. Zamarron, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, April 18, 1981, Cause: Vehicular assault.

Detective Victor R. Wells, III, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, October 2, 1980, Cause: Gunfire.

Deputy City Marshal Charles H. Baker, Houston City Marshal's Office, EOW: Thursday, August 16, 1979, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Timothy Lowe Hearn, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, June 8, 1978, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer James F. Kilty, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, April 8, 1976, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer George G. Rojas, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, January 28, 1976, Cause: Stabbed.

Police Officer Richard H. Calhoun, Houston Police Department, EOW: Friday, October to, 1975, Cause: Gunfire.

Officer Francis Eddie Wright, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, August 2, 1975, Cause: Struck by vehicle.

Police Officer Johnny Terrell Bamsch, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, January 30, 1975, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Jerry Lawrence Riley, Houston Police Department, EOW: Tuesday, June 18, 1974, Cause: Automobile accident.

Police Officer David Huerta, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, September 19, 1973, Cause: Gunfire.

Patrolman Antonio Guzman Jr., Houston Police Department, EOW: Tuesday, January 9, 1973, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Jerry L. Spruill, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, October 26, 1972, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer David Franklin Noel, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, June 17, 1972, Cause: Stabbed.

Police Officer Claude R. Beck, Houston Police Department, EOW: Friday, December 10, 1971, Cause: Struck by vehicle.

Police Officer Robert Wayne Lee, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, January 31, 1971, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Leon Griggs, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, January 31, 1970, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Kenneth L. Moody, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, November 26, 1969, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Bobby L. James, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, June 26, 1968, Cause: Vehicular assault.

Police Officer Ben Eddie Gerhart, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, June 26, 1968, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Louis R. Kuba, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, May 17, 1967, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Louis L. Sander, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, January 21, 1967, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Floyd T. DeLoach Jr., Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, June 30, 1965, Cause: Gunfire .

Police Officer Herbert N. Planer, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, February 18, 1965, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer James Franklin Willis, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, July 1, 1964, Cause: Automobile accident.

Sergeant Charles R. McDaniel, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, August 4, 1963, Cause: Automobile accident.

Police Officer James T. Walker, Houston Police Department, EOW: Friday, March 8, 1963, Cause: Motorcycle accident.

Police Officer Gonzalo Q. Gonzalez, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, February 28, 1960, Cause: Automobile accident.

Police Officer John W. Suttle, Houston Police Department, EOW: Monday, August 3, 1959, Cause: Struck by vehicle.

Police Officer C.E. Branon, Houston Police Department, EOW: Friday, March 20, 1959, Cause: Vehicular assault.

Police Officer Noel R. Miller, Houston Police Department, EOW: Friday, June 6, 1958, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Robert Schultea, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, August 25, 1956, Cause: Gunfire.

Auxiliary Officer Frank L. Kellogg, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, November 30, 1955, Cause: Gunfire.

Captain Charles R. Gougenheim, Houston Police Department EOW: Saturday, April 30, 1955, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Jack B. Beets, Houston Police Department EOW: Saturday, April 30, 1955 Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Fred Maddox Jr., Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, February 24, 1954, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Smith Anderson ''Buster'' Kent, Houston Police Department, EOW: Tuesday, January 12, 1954, Cause: Motorcycle accident.

Police Officer Howard B. Hammond, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, August 18, 1946, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer George D. Edwards, Houston Police Department, EOW: Friday, June 30, 1939, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer M.E. Palmer, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, March 24, 1938, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer A.P. Martial, Houston Police Department EOW: Monday, November 8, 1937 Cause: Automobile accident.

Police Officer James T. Gambill, Houston Police Department EOW: Tuesday, December 1, 1936 Cause: Heart attack.

Detective Rempsey H. Sullivan, Houston Police Department EOW: Saturday, March 9, 1935 Cause: Gunfire.

Officer Harry T. Mereness, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, October 18, 1933, Cause: Motorcycle accident.

Officer J.D. Landry, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, December 3, 1930, Cause: Motorcycle accident.

Officer Willie Bonner Phares, Houston Police Department, EOW: Tuesday, September 30, 1930, Cause: Gunfire.

Officer Edward D. Fitzgerald, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, September 20, 1930, Cause: Gunfire.

Motorcycle Officer C.F. Thomas, Houston Police Department, EOW: Tuesday, December 17, 1929, Cause: Motorcycle accident.

Detective Ed Jones, Houston Police Department, EOW: Friday, September 13, 1929, Cause. Gunfire.

Detective Oscar Hope, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, June 22, 1929, Cause: Gunfire.

Detective A. Worth Davis, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, June 17, 1928 Cause: Gunfire.

Detective Carl Greene, Houston Police Department, EOW: Wednesday, March 14, 1928, Cause: Gunfire.

Officer R. Q. Wells, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, July 30, 1927, Cause: Automobile accident.

Officer Perry P. Jones, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, January 30, 1927, Cause: Gunfire.

Detective E. C. Chavez, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, September 17, 1925 Cause: Gunfire.

Detective Pete Corrales, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, January 25, 1925, Cause: Gunfire.

Officer J. Clark Etheridge, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, August 23, 1924, Cause: Motorcycle accident.

Police Officer George Benard Crawford, Magnolia Park Police Department, EOW: Saturday, September 17, 1921, Cause: Motorcycle accident.

Police Officer Dave Murdock, Houston Police Department, EOW: Monday, June 27, 1921, Cause: Gunfire.

Officer Jeter Young, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, June 19, 1921, Cause: Vehicular assault.

Detective Johnnie Davidson, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, February 19, 1921, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Ira Raney, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, August 23, 1917, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Ross Patton, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, August 23, 1917, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Horace Moody, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, August 23, 1917, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer E. G. Meinke, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, August 23, 1917, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Rufus E. Daniels, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, August 23, 1917, Cause: Gunfire.

Detective Isaac Parson, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, May 24, 1914, Cause: Gunfire (Accidental).

Detective Joseph Robert Free, Houston Police Department, EOW: Friday, October 18, 1912, Cause: Gunfire.

Officer John M. Cain, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, August 3, 1911, Cause: Gunfire.

Deputy Chief William E. Murphy, Houston Police Department, EOW: Friday, April 1, 1910, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer John C. James, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, December 12, 1901, Cause: Gunfire.

Police Officer Herman Youngst, Houston Police Department, EOW: Thursday, December 12, 1901, Cause: Gunfire.

Officer William F. Weiss Houston Police Department, EOW: Tuesday, July 30, 1901, Cause: Gunfire.

Officer James E. Fenn, Houston Police Department, EOW: Sunday, March 15, 1891, Cause: Gunfire.

Officer Henry Williams, Houston Police Department, EOW: Monday, February 8, 1886, Cause: Gunfire.

Patrolman Richard Snow, Houston Police Department, EOW: Friday, March 17, 1882, Cause: Gunfire.

Officer C. Edward Foley, Houston Police Department, EOW: Saturday, March 10, 1860 Cause: Gunfire.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I will close with a prayer that those who are already lost will know that we pray for their eternal rest, and for those who live, that we pray for their continued service to this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior Member of the House Judiciary Committee; as the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations; as the representative from Houston, which has one of the Nation's most effective police departments; and as a co-sponsor of the House companion measure, I rise in strong support of S. 665, the ''Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu National Blue Alert Act of 2015.''

Every day, more than 900,000 officers protect and serve the people of the United States. On average, one law enforcement officer is killed in the line of duty every 58 hours. And, each year, there is an average of 58,930 assaults on our law enforcement officers, resulting in 15,404 injuries.

Just yesterday, in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, a community held a memorial for two dedicated public servants fatally shot during a traffic stop on Saturday night. Married and the father of two, Benjamin Deen, a 34-year-old K–9 officer, was recognized in 2012 as the Hattiesburg ''Officer of the Year.'' Liquori Tate, just 25 years old, fulfilled a childhood dream when he graduated the police academy and joined the police force less than one year ago. For the community of Hattiesburg, these senseless deaths of on duty officers are the first in three decades.

Hattiesburg is not alone in these tragic developments. Law enforcement fatalities in the U.S. rose 24 percent in 2014, reversing two years of significant decline. The number of law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty rose from 102 in 2013 to 126 in 2014. Preliminary statistics released yesterday by the FBI show that 51 law enforcement officers were feloniously killed in the line of duty in 2014. This is an increase of almost 89 percent when compared to the 27 killed in 2013. And, of those 51 felonious deaths, offenders used firearms in 46.

Just one day before this tragedy in Mississippi, Officer Brian Moore was laid to rest thousands of miles away in Long Island, New York. Around 6 p.m. on a Saturday, Moore and his partner came upon the gunman. After identifying himself as a police officer, and asking the gunman about the object in his waistband, the gunman fatally shot Moore in the face. Moore was just 20 years old when he joined the New York Police Department and, over five years of service, he earned two medals for meritorious police duty and two for excellent police duty.

The killing of Officer Moore in New York City comes on the heels of the December killings of NYPD Officers Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu, for whom the legislation before us memorializes. These officers were killed on a Saturday afternoon, while sitting in their parked patrol car, by a man who had shared his intent to kill police officers on social media. This man traveled from Maryland to New York to execute his plan. Unfortunately, at the same time Maryland authorities were warning the NYPD of this threat, Officers Ramos and Liu were being assassinated.

Benjamin Dean, Liquori Tate, Brian Moore, Rafael Ramos, and Wenjian Liu—these fallen heroes join the more than 20,000 U.S. law enforcement officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice since the first known line-of-duty death in 1791, nearly 1,700 of whom hail from my home state of Texas and 121 from the Houston Police Department.

The brave men and women who risk their lives to keep the peace and keep us safe are too often taken by the violence they are working to prevent. So when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed, rapid dissemination of information about the suspected criminal is critical to ensuring justice for that officer and keeping the public safe.

These officers deserve more than just a response after violence, they deserve an effective, nationwide system that can widely disseminate advance warnings when an imminent and credible threat is made against them.

Having in place such a system could be the difference between life and death. And, for Officers Ramos and Liu, having such a system in place may have given them a fighting chance. The measure before us seeks to meet these safety challenges by putting in place such a system.

The Blue Alert system is modeled after the Amber Alert and the Silver Alert programs, which have been very successful in finding abducted children and missing seniors. Currently 22 states, including my home state of Texas, have local Blue Alert programs in operation. There is no national system, however, to coordinate alerts across multiple state lines.

This legislation addresses this gap by directing the Attorney General to establish a national communications network within the Department of Justice to disseminate information when an officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, or the target of an imminent, credible threat to do the same, and assign a Department of Justice officer to act as the national coordinator of the Blue Alert Network.

The National Blue Alert Coordinator will—

(1) provide assistance to states and local governments using Blue Alert plans;

(2) establish voluntary guidelines for states and local governments for developing these plans; develop protocols for efforts to apprehend suspects;

(3) work with states to ensure regional coordination of various elements of the network; and

(4) establish advisory groups, to assist states, local governments, law enforcement agencies and other entities in initiating, facilitating, and promoting Blue Alerts through the network.

The Coordinator will also determine what procedures and practices to use in notifying law enforcement and the public when a law enforcement officer is killed or seriously injured in the line of duty, or is the target of an imminent, credible threat to do the same, and which procedures and practices are the most cost effective to implement.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to expand this excellent program nationwide. Passage of S. 665 will not prevent the loss of all brave law enforcement officials in the future, but it can help. Even if it saves one life, and enables one officer to return safely home to his or her loved ones, this legislation will have proven its value.

It is particularly timely that we consider this measure during National Police Week.

This week is a special occasion during which we recognize our law enforcement officers and honor those who lost their lives in the line of duty. But it would be careless not to also reflect on the events that are unfolding across the Nation in response to tragic incidents involving the use of lethal force against unarmed citizens.

The measure before us will enhance officer safety, which should always be one of our major concerns, but the issuance of alerts alone is not enough. The safety of law enforcement officers and community members are undeniably intertwined, but recent events have made it clear that the mutual trust and respect necessary for this relationship needs to be strengthened.

If we are to succeed in the vital mission of building trust and mutual respect between law enforcement and the communities they serve, we must work to really see each other. We must also work to understand each other's reality.

Citizens need to see the risks and dangers the men and women of law enforcement experience when they put on their badge. Law enforcement needs to see the same risks and dangers men and women in their communities experience when they walk down the street or drive their cars. We must see that we are not enemies and we must commit to addressing these problems in a productive and nonviolent manner.

In order to fully see each other, we need to gain a clear picture of what is happening in our communities. The lack of comprehensive and reliable data feeds into this distrust and is an obstacle to moving us forward.

As stated by FBI Director Comey, we cannot effectively address concerns about "use of force" policies and officer-involved shootings if we do not have a firm grasp on the demographics and circumstances of such incidents.

That is why I have introduced H.R. 1810, the CADET Act, which would mandate the data collection and analysis necessary to properly educate and train law enforcement. We simply cannot have an informed discussion about sound policy if we do not improve the way we collect and analyze data.

But it does not stop there. If we are to truly succeed in this mission, we in Congress must have a frank conversation about the policies we have enacted that have caused and exacerbated this distrust.

We must recognize the role that our actions have played in constructing a criminal justice system that creates more criminals and victims than justice. And, we must do our part by taking up the task of reforming our criminal justice system so that it is fairer and delivers equal justice to all persons.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bipartisan legislation because it increases safety for us all and it is an important step towards repairing the relationship between law enforcement and the communities that they serve.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join me, the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Association of Police Organizations, and the National Sheriffs Association in supporting S. 665.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this good and important legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Iowa). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 665.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DON'T TAX OUR FALLEN PUBLIC SAFETY HEROES ACT

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 606) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain compensation received by public safety officers and their dependents from gross income.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 606

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Don't Tax Our Fallen Public Safety Heroes Act".

SEC. 2. EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN COMPENSATION RECEIVED BY PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS.

Subsection (a) of section 104 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting "; and", and by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

"(6) amounts received pursuant to—

"(A) section 1201 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796); or

"(B) a program established under the laws of any State which provides monetary compensation for surviving dependents of a public safety officer who has died as the direct and proximate result of a personal injury sustained in the line of duty,

except that subparagraph (B) shall not apply to any amounts that would have been payable if death of the public safety officer had occurred other than as the direct and proximate result of a personal injury sustained in the line of duty.".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include statements and extraneous material on H.R. 606 currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend and colleague from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), who is also a member of the Ways and Means Committee, for introducing the legislation that we are considering today.

Mr. PAULSEN has been a great champion for our Nation's law enforcement, and this bill will provide much-needed relief to the families of fallen public safety officers.

As we celebrate National Police Week, we are reminded of the sacrifices of our many brave men and women who wear the badge.

When law enforcement officers pay the ultimate price and give their lives in the line of duty, we have a responsibility to help take care of the families that they leave behind.

For too long, the law has been silent on whether the benefits surviving spouses and dependents receive through State and Federal Public Safety Officers' Benefits programs are subject to Federal income tax. This bill will remove all ambiguity and codify the IRS' 1977 ruling that PSOB benefits should not be subject to taxation.

When a public safety officer has been catastrophically injured or killed in the line of duty, their families should not also have to deal with paying taxes on the benefits they receive after that loved one has paid the ultimate price while protecting their fellow Americans. The sacrifices of our men and women who wear the badge keep us safe, and now we have the opportunity to help provide for those that they leave behind.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank both Chairman RYAN and Ranking Member LEVIN of the Ways and Means Committee for allowing the bill coming to the floor today, and I thank my good friends Representatives PAULSEN and REICHERT, my co-chair, for presenting this bill with me and for their continued support of our law enforcement.

Our public safety officers make extraordinary sacrifices to protect our communities by putting their lives on the line day in and day out.

Members take an oath after we are elected. The first part of the oath, our

chief priority, is to protect the country from foreign, but it also says domestic, foreign and domestic. That is our priority. That is the main reason why we are in the Congress of the United States. There are a lot of other reasons, but that is our primary oath to the people of this country. And that is why the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) and myself—there isn't a day that goes by that we are not talking about how we could support police officers, not in word but in deed, those folks who put their lives on the line, be they trooper, be they sheriff officer, be they municipal police officer, be they an authority police officer, regardless.

We heard the tragic numbers before in the previous bill.

Officer Rafael Ramos, who died with Officer Liu, was sitting in a squad car. Officer Ramos was a 40-year-old married father who was studying to become a pastor when he was killed. His friends and family remember him as a selfless man of faith. He left behind a wife and two children. Officer Ramos loved playing basketball with his sons in the park, watching the Mets, and playing Spanish gospel music.

It is families like these that we honor in this legislation. The last thing a family mourning their lost loved one who died in the line of service should be faced with is a tax penalty.

We have a responsibility to take care of the families of the officers slain in the line of duty. It is a priority. When everything is a priority, nothing is a priority. We are saying in this legislation this is a priority of ours.

This commonsense legislation ensures that the families of fallen public safety officers are not taxed on the death benefits they receive should a horrible tragedy occur and their family member be taken from them on the job.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this legislation to be passed, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN).

Mr. PAULSEN. I thank the gentleman from Washington, Chairman REICHERT, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 54 years, we have celebrated National Police Week during the third week of May; and once again, thousands of officers and the families of law enforcement are here in Washington this week to remember and honor the sacrifices of our officers who serve and protect our homes, our small businesses, and our families every day. That is because, Mr. Speaker, every day, our Nation's police officers—900,000 officers across this country—wear their uniforms with pride. They go about their jobs without a second thought to the dangers that come with protecting others and in securing our community.

Sadly, though, we are reminded too often of the dangers that these heroes face.

Just 3 days ago, in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, Officers Benjamin Deen and Liquori Tate were shot and killed while making a routine traffic stop. They were just 34 and 24 years old.

□ 1800

Last July in Minnesota, Mendota Heights police officer Scott Patrick tragically lost his life in the line of duty. A 19-year veteran, Officer Patrick is remembered as a loving father of two children and somebody who was friendly, helpful, and was always looking to serve others. This year, he would have celebrated his 48th birthday. Instead of a party, his family spent the day in court for the murder trial of his killer.

It is not only law enforcement that put their lives on the line to protect and serve our community. Just last week, 44-year-old Kevin McRae, a 24-year veteran of the Washington, D.C., fire department, tragically lost his life when a high-rise building where he had been fighting a fire for nearly an hour collapsed. He leaves behind a wife and three young children.

For these public safety officers and these first responders who have lost their lives in the line of duty, we have a responsibility to ensure that their families are taken care of. In fact, that is why the Federal Government and many State governments provide that public safety officer benefit to the dependents of those heroes that are killed in the line of duty.

However, because current law is silent on whether State or Federal survivor benefits are subject to Federal income tax, there is a question of whether the IRS can collect tax on these benefits. And the last thing these families need after losing a loved one is for the IRS to come knocking. That is why I worked with Senator AYOTTE to introduce the Don't Tax Our Fallen Public Safety Heroes Act. It will ensure that families of fallen law enforcement officers and firefighters who die in the line of duty receive the benefits they were promised without a tax grab from the IRS.

While the IRS ruled back in 1977 that Federal PSOB benefits should be treated just like workers compensation and not be subject to taxation, the IRS has refused to make a similar rule for State-based payments and instead has forced families to go through a burdensome private letter ruling.

Clarifying current law will provide relief. It will provide certainty to surviving dependents, and it will guarantee they are not forced to pay Federal income tax on survivor benefits after their loved ones have given the ultimate sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Sheriff REICHERT, my colleague, and I want to thank Congressman PASCRELL for their bipartisan leadership of the Law Enforcement Caucus and standing up for this legislation and the other bills we have heard today on the floor. I also want to thank Senator AYOTTE for her leadership in the Senate. It was this legislation that was a passion project of hers ever since the IRS went after one of her constituents' survivor benefits.

The bill is endorsed by many different law enforcement organizations: The Fraternal Order of Police, the National Association of Police Organizations, the National Conference on Public Employee Retirement Systems, the National Troopers Coalition, the Sergeants Benevolent Association, the International Union of Police Associations, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, and the Major County Sheriffs' Association.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will close by just asking my colleagues to support this legislation for the families of those police officers, firefighters, and first responders who help keep us safe.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I inquire of Mr. PASCRELL if he has any additional speakers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey has yielded back his time.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, currently the IRS has not ruled on the tax treatment of State payments, instead allowing any dispute, as Mr. PAULSEN just pointed out, to be resolved via what they call a private letter ruling.

This bill will provide clarity and relief to surviving dependents, guaranteeing they are not forced to pay an excessive tax after their loved ones have given the ultimate sacrifice.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that we are together on this. I wish we were together on a lot of other things, but we are together on this because we will do anything to support our law enforcement officers in the United States of America, the greatest country in the world.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to agree with the comments made by Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. PAULSEN on how important this legislation is to the families who have lost a loved one. They should not be burdened further with additional taxes on the benefits that that family should be receiving, the sad loss of their loved one in service to their community. This is the second bill tonight that we are considering in support of and showing our appreciation for and honoring those who serve across this country today and who have lost their lives in service to this country and all the communities across this great Nation.

In fact, the first piece of legislation that we considered earlier was the Blue Alert legislation, and that was one of the recommendations that came out of the President's own police and community task force. So, as Mr. PASCRELL said, not only are the Members of the House and the Senate in agreement here, but also the administration, which is a moment that we all need to pause and appreciate that we are all together on this. We see how important and how critical this legislation is and how important and critical it is to show our support for those men and women who leave their families each and every day to keep us safe.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, as we pass the bipartisan Don't Tax Our Fallen Public Safety Heroes Act, I'd like to share with you a little bit about fallen Michigan State Trooper Paul K. Butterfield II. On September 9th, 2013, Trooper Butterfield was shot on a routine traffic stop.

Responding units located Trooper Butterfield on the ground suffering from a gunshot wound to the head. He was then flown to a regional hospital, where he eventually succumbed to his wounds while in surgery.

Trooper Butterfield was a dedicated public servant; after serving in the U.S. Army, he joined the Michigan State Police where he served for 14 years until his death in the line of duty. Family and friends remember him for being soft-spoken, kind, and always smiling.

This bill honors the legacy of not only Trooper Butterfield, but all first responders who have laid down their lives. Several hundred first responders die every year in the line of duty. These officers, and their families, should know that we support them and what they do. I am proud to cosponsor this bipartisan legislation to ensure that families of public safety officers will receive the full benefits they deserve should their loved ones succumb to the ultimate sacrifice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 606.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

DEFENDING PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2146) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2146

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Defending Public Safety Employees' Retirement Act''.

SEC. 2. EARLY RETIREMENT DISTRIBUTIONS TO FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS, FIREFIGHTERS, AND AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS IN GOVERNMENTAL PLANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 72(t)(10)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking the period at the end and inserting '', or'',

(2) by striking ''means any employee'' and inserting the following: ''means—

''(i) any employee'', and

(3) by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(ii) any Federal law enforcement officer described in section 8331(20) or 8401(17) of title 5, United States Code, any Federal customs and border protection officer described in section 8331(31) or 8401(36) of such title, any Federal firefighter described in section 8331(21) or 8401(14) of such title, or any air traffic controller described in 8331(30) or 8401(35) of such title.''.

(b) APPLICATION TO DEFINED CONTRIBUTION PLANS.—Section 72(t)(10)(A) of such Code is amended by striking ''which is a defined benefit plan''.

(c) DISTRIBUTIONS NOT TREATED AS MODIFICATION OF SUBSTANTIALLY EQUAL PAYMENTS.—Section 72(t)(4)(A)(ii) of such Code is amended by inserting ''or a distribution to which paragraph (10) applies'' after ''other than by reason of death or disability''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to distributions after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 3. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2146 currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Defending Public Safety Employees' Retirement Act, H.R. 2146, is a straightforward bill that would simply ensure fairness to public safety officials by extending the same treatment that applies to State and local public safety officials to Federal public safety officials as well.

I spent 33 years in law enforcement. I know from my own experience and from those with whom I worked just how strenuous a job protecting our fellow Americans can be. You never know when or what kind of situation you might be called to intervene in. It is taxing both mentally and physically. I could tell lots of stories here tonight over my 33-year career to illustrate that point, but I won't put Congress through that. Sometimes it is so mentally and physically draining that many law enforcement officials are subject to mandatory retirement at young ages. Think of someone who has spent an entire lifetime, 30, 35 years, in law enforcement, and the things that they have witnessed and seen.

I was a homicide detective. I, unfortunately, was in an assignment where you had to process the scenes of murder victims and collect the remains of people who had been victims of serious assaults resulting in death. Those memories never leave you. The stress of responding to a ''person with a gun'' call, a ''man with a knife,'' a domestic violence call, and never knowing what is going to happen day after day after day in responding to those calls—it is a stressful job. Through no fault of their own, they may need to access savings earlier than a standard retirement age. So we should ensure they are granted access without penalty.

Under the current law, Mr. Speaker, individuals who attempt to access their retirement savings before the age of 59½ are hit with a 10 percent tax. In 2006 Congress removed this penalty for State and local government public safety officers accessing their retirement accounts at the age of 50. This legislation would give Federal law enforcement officers, Federal firefighters, and air traffic controllers, who often must retire early, the same treatment. They are treated equally as local officials and officers. We previously recognized the need for this to happen at the State and local level, and it is just common sense that Federal public safety officials should receive the same opportunity.

When it comes down to it, these men and women have spent a majority of their lives protecting us, and because of that, we should be able to protect them from the IRS.

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

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

I want to thank Mr. REICHERT for all the work he has done on this legislation to bring it to the floor this evening. We are talking about H.R. 2146.

Law enforcement officers face physically demanding work day in and day out. Current law recognizes this by making Federal law enforcement officers and firefighters eligible to retire after 20 years and at age 50.

By the way, if I may say something on this, Mr. Speaker, I don't particularly like this idea because it is a way to get rid of experienced police officers throughout the United States of America. If you dump on them the fact that

what we are going to do is we are going to play games with their pension funds, you force even more out. We are not saving any money, and we are not saving any time when we push the most experienced officers off the payroll.

A flaw in the system makes it impossible for many of these retirees to access their earned benefits in their fifties. Most Federal employees—we are talking about Federal here—receive retirement benefits through the Federal Employees Retirement System. This three-part system is made up of a defined pension plan, a defined TSP contribution plan, and Social Security.

However, although Federal law enforcement officers can retire at 50 and access two-thirds of their retirement benefits, they face a 10 percent tax penalty if they withdraw from the defined contribution plans like TSP before the age of 59½. State and local law enforcement officers do not face the same penalty because Congress rightly recognized they should not be penalized after a physically taxing career protecting our communities.

Federal law enforcement officers do not enjoy these same protections. This bill would bring equity to the men and women carrying out their sworn duty to protect and serve. It would address a fundamental unfairness in the U.S. Tax Code by removing Federal law enforcement from the 10 percent penalty provisions that currently apply to early withdrawals from government plans.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the bill would ensure that the penalty-free withdrawals apply to both governmental defined benefit and defined contribution plans like the Federal Thrift Savings Plan.

There is no justifiable reason that Federal law enforcement officers and firefighters from a diverse array of agencies and missions must wait up to 9½ years longer than their State and local counterparts before they can fully access their savings without incurring a penalty.

□ 1815

The brave men and women who work in our law enforcement agencies, fire departments, and others who sacrifice themselves each day deserve equitable treatment under the Tax Code.

Let's stand up for their fair treatment and well-deserved retirement benefits for the men and women who work so hard to protect us.

The American Federation of Government Employees writes:

> On a daily basis, Federal firefighters, BOP correctional workers, Customs and Border Protection officers, and Federal law enforcement officers secure our Federal buildings' safety, handle the most dangerous offenders behind bars, and patrol our Nation's borders. When these Federal employees meet all of the established requirements for Federal retirement, they deserve full access to their government retirement plan.

Let's honor the faithful commitment these officers have shown us by showing our commitment to them here on the floor of Congress.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in support of this very commonsense bill, as Mr. PASCRELL just laid out, to correct an inequity that exists within the retirement system for Federal law enforcement officers.

Public safety employees are often subject to mandatory retirement upon reaching a certain age. Unfortunately, for many Federal law enforcement officers, this forced retirement occurs a couple of years before they are able to legally access their retirement accounts without a penalty.

It makes no sense to force these officers who protect us and who serve our communities to then retire without being able to access their own money that they have earned and diligently saved. The Defending Public Safety Employees' Retirement Act corrects this inequity and gives these public safety officers the certainty they deserve after years of service.

I want to thank Sheriff REICHERT for his leadership on this issue and look forward to its passage.

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

I wanted to just comment on some of the words from my friend, Mr. PASCRELL. Again, I appreciate his partnership in co-chairing the Law Enforcement Caucus with me and all those who are members of the Law Enforcement Caucus in recognizing this is a very important week, a sad week, for a lot of families that are here in Washington, D.C., putting names of their loved ones on the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial.

On Thursday night, there will be a candlelight vigil at the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial. On Friday afternoon, with the President, there will be a service on the front lawn of the Capitol recognizing those who lost their lives in service to their communities across this country with all of those family members present in the audience.

There are three bills tonight that we considered that have come together to really, I think, show bipartisan support from the administration, to the House of Representatives, to the Senate, both Democrats and Republicans coming together to show their support for the men and women who wear the badge and the uniform across this country.

There are still things that we can do, and people wonder what the Federal Government can do for local law enforcement. Well, we showed three things tonight that we can do to help local law enforcement and show our support for them.

Mr. PASCRELL pointed out, I think, one other, and that is the retirement issue. I think that is another thing that we can work on. I agree with Mr. PASCRELL on that issue.

I think that there is another issue that we can work on that some Members may not be fully aware of, and that is the delayed payment of death benefits for those killed in the line of duty.

For example, Mr. Speaker, in my community, a police officer died in the line of duty over 3½ years ago—3½ years ago—and, as far as I know, today, his family has still not received the death benefit that is due. Three-and-a-half years is too long for a family to wait when their loved one has lost their life in service to this country.

Mr. PASCRELL and I will continue to work together with the law enforcement organizations across this country looking for ways that we can support them and show that we care and show the families that we care.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, as we vote on H.R. 2146 in the House today, I would like to share with you the dire reality facing our brave first responders who put their lives on the line for the safety of the American people.

The health-related risks associated with the work of our first responders, though rarely considered by the average American, are largely due to stress and overexertion. The United States Fire Administration (USFA) tracks the number of first responder fatalities each year and has provided valuable analysis for nearly four decades. The data shows that over the course of the past 10 years, 757 first responders in the United States have suffered from heart-related fatalities; including heart attacks, due to the extremely stressful nature of their work.

While firefighting can be an incredibly rewarding profession for a first responder—make no mistake—it is also one of the deadliest. High rates of cancer and heart attacks plague our public safety defenders. Under our current law, first responders can retire at the age of 50, as long as they have completed 20 years of service. Those 20 years are consumed by immediate midnight response calls, the physical toll of carrying heavy equipment, ventilating smoke-filled areas, salvaging building contents, rescuing victims and administering emergency medical care.

H.R. 2146 is a bipartisan proposal that would reform federal tax law by allowing firefighters, federal law enforcement officers and air traffic controllers, to access funds from their government plans after age 50 and without facing a 10 percent penalty fee. These first responders have more than earned their ability to access their retirement after over 20 years of strenuous service. We should feel ashamed for penalizing our public safety defenders by levying penalties and fees on those who are entitled and deserve to retire.

When our lives are on the line and we call 911, we expect help to come without hesitation and our brave first responders do not fail in their duty. For this reason we must not fail them after a lifetime of service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr.

REICHERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2146, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1831

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Iowa) at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

DON'T TAX OUR FALLEN PUBLIC SAFETY HEROES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 606) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain compensation received by public safety officers and their dependents from gross income, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 0, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 216]

YEAS—413

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

NOT VOTING—18

Barletta
Capps
Crawford
DesJarlais
Engel
Fincher
Fleischmann
Gutiérrez
Hinojosa
Katko
Lieu, Ted
Lynch
Marchant
Meng
Rokita
Ruiz
Rush
Sewell (AL)

□ 1857

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. TIPTON changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 6, 2015.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a facsimile copy of a letter received from Mr. Robert A. Brehm and Mr. Todd D. Valentine, Co-Executive Directors of the New York State Board of Elections, indicating that, according to the preliminary results of the Special Election held May 5, 2015, the Honorable Dan Donovan was elected Representative to Congress for the Eleventh Congressional District, State of New York.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk.

Enclosure.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
STATE BOARD OF ELECTIONS,
Albany, NY, May 6, 2015.

Hon. KAREN HAAS,
Clerk, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. HAAS: This correspondence is being sent to advise that the unofficial results as calculated after the close of polls at the Special Election held on Tuesday, May 5, 2015 for Representative in Congress from New York's 11th Congressional District are as follows: Vincent J. Gentile received 15,808 votes, Dan Donovan received 23,409 votes, James C. Lane received 527 votes.

Absentee and provisional ballots will be counted pursuant to New York's statutes, beginning on Wednesday, May 13, 2015, Absentee ballots mailed to eligible voters numbered 5,528 and voted ballots returned to date number 2,922. The number of absentee and

provisional ballots will not alter the outcome of this special election.

To the best of our knowledge, there is no pending litigation that would alter the outcome of this contest,

As soon as official results are certified to this office by the boroughs of Richmond and Kings in the City of New York, constituting the 11th Congressional District, our official Certification of Election will be prepared and transmitted, as required by law.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. BREHM.
TODD D. VALENTINE.

□ 1900

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE DANIEL M. DONOVAN, JR., OF NEW YORK, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York, the Honorable Daniel M. Donovan, Jr., be permitted to take the oath of office today.

His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will Representative-elect Donovan and the members of the New York delegation present themselves in the well.

All Members will rise and the Representative-elect will please raise his right hand.

Mr. DONOVAN appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 114th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE DANIEL M. DONOVAN, JR., TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANGEL. My dear friends, the good people of Staten Island and Brooklyn of the great city and State of New York have sent to us a man to represent the Empire State of New York, the open door for immigrants who have come here historically from all over the world, and we welcome him on behalf of this delegation, as well as the good Democrat and Republican Members of this House of Representatives.

I welcome him to the House and look forward to the great contribution he will make to our city, our State, the Congress, and our great country.

I would like to introduce someone also of good democratic stock from the great State of New York, PETER KING, who will join with me in welcoming our friend from Richmond County.

Mr. KING of New York. Thank you, Congressman RANGEL.

It is my privilege to introduce a man who has been a friend for many years. He has been a career prosecutor. For 12 years, he was district attorney in Staten Island. He was overwhelmingly elected. He is a true public servant. He is universally respected and is a man of unquestioned integrity. He is going to be an outstanding Congressman.

It is my privilege to introduce the Congressman from Brooklyn and Staten Island, the Honorable Dan Donovan.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join you, and I am humbled by the confidence that the people of the 11th Congressional District of New York have placed in me.

I want to thank all of my volunteers and supporters for helping me get here. I want to thank my family for everything that they have done for me. I promise to make all of them proud of my representation of them here as a Member of the greatest legislative body in the world.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from New York (Mr. DONOVAN), the whole number of the House is 433.

REGULATORY INTEGRITY PROTECTION ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 231 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1732.

Will the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. YOUNG) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1903

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1732) to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes, with Mr. YOUNG of Iowa in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 114–98 offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. EDWARDS

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 248, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 217]

AYES—167

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
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
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—248

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)

Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOT VOTING—17

Barletta
Beyer
Capps
Crawford
DesJarlais
Fincher
Fleischmann
Gutiérrez
Hinojosa
Lieu, Ted
Lynch
Marchant
Meng
Rokita
Ruiz
Rush
Sewell (AL)

□ 1910

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) having assumed the chair, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1732) to preserve existing rights and responsibilities with respect to waters of the United States, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 231, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the adoption of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. AGUILAR. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. AGUILAR. I am, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Aguilar moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1732 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 4. PROTECTING THE SUPPLY OF WATER FOR SAFE DRINKING, TO MITIGATE AGAINST WESTERN DROUGHT, FOR AGRICULTURAL USES, AND FOR PROTECTION FROM FLOODING.

In the process of rulemaking required by this Act, the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall protect the quality and integrity of surface waters and wetlands that are available:

(1) For public water supplies, which are a significant source of drinking water for municipalities, including in the Great Lakes where the Lake Erie algal bloom has forced cities such as Toledo, Ohio, to rely on bottled water.

(2) To mitigate against the harmful impact of drought in California and other western States, which has reached historic proportions.

(3) For agricultural uses, including irrigation.

(4) To mitigate against the adverse impacts of flooding and coastal storms, such as the Mississippi River Flood of 2011 and Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Sandy.

Mr. AGUILAR (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1915

Mr. AGUILAR. Madam Speaker, this is a final amendment to the bill which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

This motion is simple. It requires the Army Corps and the EPA to ensure that important surface waters and wetlands are protected during the new rulemaking process this bill starts.

This motion requires that the quality of public water supplies be protected. Around the country, we have seen drinking water sources contaminated, like the algal bloom in Lake Erie that forced Toledo, Ohio, to use bottled water.

In California, the historic drought has reduced many surface waters to stagnant pools of water. Seven million Californians rely on these streams for their drinking water. We need to make sure these drinking water sources are protected to keep families and communities healthy.

The drought in California has reached emergency levels, and this motion ensures that waters and wetlands that help mitigate the drought in the West are protected. These waters need protection under this rule because, if they are contaminated, then we have few other options to ensure communities in southern California have access to water sources.

California is implementing water use restrictions to deal with the drought, but it doesn't make sense to take these steps if we don't make sure the wetlands and waters that recharge them are protected.

Finally, this motion guarantees that water used for agriculture, including for irrigation, are safeguarded. California's agriculture industry depends on clean water, and this motion preserves the exemptions agriculture already gets under regulations.

In short, this is a commonsense amendment to the bill to guarantee protections for water used for the public's drinking supply, for lessening the impact of the drought in California and the West, and for agriculture.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I strongly oppose this motion to recommit.

First of all, it has nothing to do with drought. Second, it is just a backdoor attempt to allow the EPA to take control of all the waters in America. In addition to that, my colleagues from California have tried, time and time again, to work with their colleagues on the other side of the aisle to solve this drought problem in California, but my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have refused to work together. Again, this has nothing to do with drought.

The purpose of H.R. 1732 is to uphold the Federal-State partnership in regulating the Nation's waters by maintaining the balance between the States and the Federal Government in carrying out the Clean Water Act.

H.R. 1732 restricts the administration's current administrative efforts to expand Federal jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act and requires the Agency to engage in federalism consultation with their State and local partners to implement the Clean Water Act.

However, this motion is designed to undermine the legislation by giving the EPA unfettered discretion in making State water quality determinations in order to allow the EPA to continue to implement this flawed rule.

In effect, the amendment says that the underlying bill will not apply virtually anywhere the EPA decides that the bill should not apply. This amendment would further erode the Federal and State partnership that H.R. 1732 seeks to preserve.

Let me remind my colleagues that 32 States have said revise or eliminate this rule. My colleagues, all day, have talked about we haven't seen the final rule, but we have seen the proposed rule, and the proposed rule is going to be very similar to the final rule. We have seen this happen time and time again.

We have to stop this rule. I urge my colleagues, all 435 Members of this body, to take notice. This is another attempt by the executive branch to take Congress' constitutional authority away from us. We should all take this as a serious challenge.

For too long, this body has allowed the executive branch to take our authority granted to us by the constitution. I say, whether it is a Republican or Democrat administration, we have to stop that.

The bill, H.R. 1732, is a step in the right direction. It is a good bill that maintains the balance of regulation and of our Nation's water.

We must preserve the Federal-State partnership that exists under the Clean Water Act, which has been for 40 years, until this administration's attempting to impose an overbearing EPA on our States.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, and the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2146.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 175, nays 241, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 218]

YEAS—175

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
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
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—241

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

NOT VOTING—16

Barletta
Capps
Crawford
DesJarlais
Fincher
Fleischmann
Gutiérrez
Hinojosa
Lieu, Ted
Lynch
Marchant
Meng
Rokita
Ruiz
Rush
Sewell (AL)

□ 1926

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 261, noes 155, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 219]

AYES—261

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost

Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carney
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Clyburn
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Torres
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—155

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

NOT VOTING—16

Barletta
Capps
Crawford
DesJarlais
Fincher
Fleischmann
Gutiérrez
Hinojosa
Lieu, Ted
Lynch
Marchant
Meng
Rokita
Ruiz
Rush
Sewell (AL)

□ 1932

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEFENDING PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2146) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 5, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 220]

YEAS—407

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Babin
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Benishek
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Bost
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Gosar
Gowdy
Graham
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hahn
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Quigley
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross

Rothfus	Smith (NE)	Visclosky
Rouzer	Smith (NJ)	Wagner
Roybal-Allard	Smith (TX)	Walberg
Royce	Smith (WA)	Walden
Ruppersberger	Speier	Walker
Russell	Stefanik	Walorski
Ryan (OH)	Stewart	Walters, Mimi
Ryan (WI)	Stivers	Walz
Salmon	Stutzman	Wasserman Schultz
Sanchez, Loretta	Swalwell (CA)	Waters, Maxine
Sanford	Takai	Watson Coleman
Sarbanes	Takano	Weber (TX)
Scalise	Thompson (CA)	Webster (FL)
Schakowsky	Thompson (MS)	Welch
Schiff	Thompson (PA)	Westerman
Schrader	Thornberry	Westmoreland
Schweikert	Tiberi	Whitfield
Scott (VA)	Tipton	Williams
Scott, Austin	Titus	Wilson (FL)
Scott, David	Tonko	Wilson (SC)
Sensenbrenner	Torres	Wittman
Serrano	Trott	Womack
Sessions	Tsongas	Woodall
Sherman	Turner	Yarmuth
Shimkus	Upton	Yoder
Shuster	Valadao	Young (AK)
Simpson	Van Hollen	Young (IA)
Sinema	Vargas	Young (IN)
Sires	Veasey	Zeldin
Slaughter	Vela	Zinke
Smith (MO)	Velázquez	

NAYS—5

Amash	McClintock	Yoho
Massie	Ribble	

NOT VOTING—20

Barletta	Grijalva	Rokita
Capps	Gutiérrez	Ruiz
Crawford	Hinojosa	Rush
DesJarlais	Lieu, Ted	Sánchez, Linda T.
Fincher	Lynch	
Fleischmann	Marchant	Sewell (AL)
Goodlatte	Meng	Wenstrup

□ 1941

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN HONOR OF OFFICERS LIQUORI TATE AND BENJAMIN DEEN OF HATTIESBURG, MISSISSIPPI

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

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the lives of the two police officers who were killed in the line of duty in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, on May 9, 2015, Officer Benjamin Deen and Officer Liquori Tate.

I am joined tonight by my fellow colleagues and Mississippians, Congressman GREGG HARPER and Congressman BENNIE THOMPSON. We would like to take this time to lend our prayers to the families of these two young men, to the Hattiesburg Police Department, and to the community for their loss.

This week, our Nation observes National Police Week, and we recognize the bravery, fortitude, and sacrifice demonstrated by police officers nationwide. They put their lives on the line to defend our communities and our citizens against criminals and thugs.

I ask the House to join us tonight in honoring the lives of Liquori Tate and Benjamin Deen by joining me in a moment of silence.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H.R. 1735, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to file a supplemental report on the bill H.R. 1735.

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

There was no objection.

WIOA TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS ACT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and the Workforce be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 1124) to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to improve the Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1124

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''WIOA Technical Amendments Act''.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO WORKFORCE INNOVATION AND OPPORTUNITY ACT.

(a) DESIGNATION OF AREAS SERVED BY RURAL CONCENTRATED EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS AS LOCAL AREAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 106(b) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3121(b)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (5) and (6) as paragraphs (6) and (7), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

''(5) AREAS SERVED BY RURAL CONCENTRATED EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS.—The Governor may approve, under paragraph (2) or (3), a request for designation as a local area from an area described in section 107(c)(1)(C).''.

(b) LOCAL WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARDS.—Section 107(i)(1)(B) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3122(i)(1)(B)) is amended by striking ''the day before the date of enactment of this Act'' and inserting ''the day before the date of enactment of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998''.

(c) PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM.—Section 116 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3141) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)(A)(iv), by striking ''clause (i)(IV)'' and inserting ''clause (i)(VI)''; and

(2) in subsection (g), by striking ''for a program described in subsection (d)(2)(A)''.

(d) STATE ALLOTMENTS.—Section 132(b) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3172(b)) is amended, in paragraphs (1)(B)(iv)(I) and (2)(B)(iii)(I), by inserting ''less than'' after ''fiscal year that is''.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 102(b)(2)(D)(i)(III) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3112(b)(2)(D)(i)(III)) is amended by striking ''section 106(b)(5)'' and inserting ''section 106(b)(6)''.

(2) Section 129(b)(1)(C) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3164(b)(1)(C)) is amended by striking ''subsections (b)(6) and (c)(2) of section 106'' and inserting ''subsections (b)(7) and (c)(2) of section 106''.

(3) Section 134(a)(2)(B)(ii) of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3174(a)(2)(B)(ii)) is amended by striking ''section 106(b)(6)'' and inserting ''section 106(b)(7)''.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 400(b) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 780(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b)(1) Each member of the National Council shall serve for a term of 3 years.

''(2)(A) No member of the National Council may serve more than two consecutive full terms beginning on the date of commencement of the first full term on the Council. Members may serve after the expiration of their terms until their successors have taken office.

''(B) As used in this paragraph, the term 'full term' means a term of 3 years.

''(3) Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which such member's predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect as if enacted 1 day after the date of enactment of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1945

EXPRESSING THE CONDOLENCES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE DEATH OF THE HON. JAMES CLAUDE WRIGHT, JR., FORMER SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 254) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 254

Resolved, That the House has learned with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable James Claude Wright, Jr., former Member of the House for 18 terms and Speaker of the House of Representatives for the One Hundredth and One Hundred First Congresses.

Resolved, That in the death of the Honorable James Claude Wright, Jr. the United States and the State of Texas have lost a valued and eminent public servant and citizen.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the House adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair

will postpone further proceedings today on the additional motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

FALLEN HEROES FLAG ACT OF 2015

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 723) to provide Capitol-flown flags to the immediate family of fire fighters, law enforcement officers, members of rescue squads or ambulance crews, and public safety officers who are killed in the line of duty.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 723

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Fallen Heroes Flag Act of 2015''.

SEC. 2. PROVIDING CAPITOL-FLOWN FLAGS FOR FAMILIES OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AND RESCUE SQUAD WORKERS KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—At the request of the immediate family of a fire fighter, law enforcement officer, member of a rescue squad or ambulance crew, or public safety officer who died in the line of duty, the Representative of the family may provide the family with a Capitol-flown flag, together with the certificate described in subsection (c).

(b) NO COST TO FAMILY.—A flag provided under this section shall be provided at no cost to the family.

(c) CERTIFICATE.—The certificate described in this subsection is a certificate which is signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Representative providing the flag, and which contains an expression of sympathy from the House of Representatives for the family involved, as prepared and developed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''Capitol-flown flag'' means a United States flag flown over the United States Capitol in honor of the deceased individual for whom such flag is requested; and

(2) the term ''Representative'' includes a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress.

SEC. 3. REGULATIONS AND PROCEDURES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Clerk shall issue regulations for carrying out this Act, including regulations to establish procedures (including any appropriate forms, guidelines, and accompanying certificates) for requesting a Capitol-flown flag.

(b) APPROVAL BY COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION.—The regulations issued by the Clerk under subsection (a) shall take effect upon approval by the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years 2015 through 2020 such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act, to be derived from amounts appropriated in each such fiscal year for the operation of the Capitol Visitor Center, except that the aggregate amount appropriated to carry out this Act for all such fiscal years may not exceed $30,000.

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date of its enactment, except that no flags may be provided under section 2 until the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives approves the regulations issued by the Clerk of the House of Representatives under section 3.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in the RECORD on the consideration of this bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 723, the Fallen Heroes Flag Act. The bill before us would allow Members of Congress to honor a firefighter, law enforcement officer, member of a rescue squad or ambulance crew, or public safety officer who died in the line of duty by providing the family of the deceased individual, at their request, a United States flag flown over this Capitol.

Our Nation's flag would be accompanied by a certificate containing an expression of sympathy for the family of the individual who passed away, signed by both the Speaker of the House and the individual's Representative here in Congress.

This measure, authored by the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) allows our House to express its gratitude and recognition for an individual who made the ultimate sacrifice in the name of public service to this great country.

Many in our country put their lives on the line every day to serve others. They are the firefighters who charge into burning buildings in order to save life or property; they are the police officers and other law enforcement officers who respond to incidents and through their actions shield others from harm; they are the members of rescue squads or ambulance crews who spend countless hours perfecting lifesaving skills and rush to the scene of a disaster; and they are the public safety officers who work to patrol our roads, man the dispatch communication lines, and work within our justice system to accomplish countless other safety services for our communities.

Our Nation is exceedingly blessed to have individuals who answer the call to dedicate their lives serving others. We are very grateful to be surrounded by individuals who work hard each day to save and protect lives. Each swore an oath to uphold our laws, and each sacrifices safety in the defense of others.

These individuals are our daily heroes. The rescue workers and law enforcement officers are our sons and daughters, they are our mothers and fathers, they are our sisters and brothers who each day rise up and stand in the defense of others. And in some cases, these heroes pay the ultimate sacrifice, and they are killed in the line of duty, just as we heard earlier. It is a tragedy in the truest sense of the word when one of these extraordinarily fine individuals loses their life, most especially while in the act of saving the life of another.

I stand here, Mr. Speaker, not just as a Member representing my congressional district but also as someone who knows firsthand the sacrifices that these men and women put forward to serve their communities. Before I came to Congress, I served my community as a police officer, as a deputy sheriff, and eventually as a sheriff in a county in Florida. I know what it means for so many men and women to come to work every day not knowing—you can never predict the events of the day and what those events may hold for you. But one thing is certain: you will answer the call for help with everything you have got. When you kiss your wife or husband goodbye or your children goodbye, when you start your shift, they want to know you are going to come home. But they also know that the realities of life are it is possible that you may make the ultimate sacrifice for your community.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that we recognize their selfless efforts of sacrifice and offer this meaningful token as an expression of our Nation's gratitude. It is an honor to stand here today in support of this legislation. Each Member of Congress should have the ability to recognize these brave individuals for their heroism and to extend a gesture of sympathy and gratitude to their immediate families.

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

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleague across the aisle, Congressman NUGENT, in support of H.R. 723, the Fallen Heroes Flag Act.

This sensible bill provides for Capitol-flown flags in memory of firefighters, police, and emergency response personnel who are tragically killed in the line of duty.

While we can never fully convey our gratitude to public safety and emergency personnel who risk their lives practically every day, it is my hope that this small gesture brings some level of comfort to the families of those who have given the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty.

We recognize their sacrifice and that of their families and loved ones. We are

eternally grateful. As Members of Congress, we often have the sad duty and solemn responsibility of expressing condolences to families who have lost a loved one in the line of duty. At no expense to these families, this is one small way to express our condolences and gratitude for their service.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support H.R. 723, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING). He is the distinguished sponsor of this bill.

Mr. KING of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his years of service in law enforcement and for his dedication here in the United States Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. I think it is particularly appropriate that this bill will be passed during National Police Week at a time when we honor those who put their lives on the line every day. This isn't just an abstraction. This is really very real, as we saw tonight with the delegation from Mississippi acknowledging their two police officers who were murdered on Saturday night. And just last week in New York a neighbor and constituent of mine, Brian Moore, a member of the NYPD, was shot down. He was murdered in Queens Village in Queens, New York, a young man, 25 years old. He already had 150 arrests. He was a member of an elite anticrime unit. He was shot down in the prime of life. His father was a retired police sergeant. His cousins were on the NYPD and also the Nassau County Police Department.

So these are real, Mr. Speaker. These are real lives. These are real lives that are lost. These are real people putting their lives on the line, and there are real families who suffer when they are left behind. That is why it is so important, I think, that we in Congress acknowledge that. One way to do that is by being able to present a flag signed by the Speaker and by the Member of Congress who represents the person who was killed in the line of duty.

Tonight we had a new Member of Congress sworn in, DAN DONOVAN from Staten Island. DAN was with me on Friday at the funeral of Brian Moore. Also, we had two tragic deaths in December, Wenjian Liu and Rafael Ramos, two NYPD officers who were murdered in Brooklyn. DAN and I were at that funeral along with thousands and thousands, in fact, tens of thousands of officers from all over the country.

So it is important that we stand in solidarity with the men and women of blue. They come under terrible onslaughts and attacks. So much of it is untrue, so much of it is slanderous, and so much of it is carried on by the media. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact is these men and women are out there every day. They are out there doing their job, and it is really important that we stand with them. The very least we can do is stand here in Congress and support them and also then pay them the tribute of standing with their family with the flag when that terrible moment comes that they lose their lives in the line of duty.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I again thank the gentleman for his leadership, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his bipartisan spirit, and I strongly urge support of this legislation.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say how proud I am to stand with Mr. NUGENT as well as with my fellow Notre Dame alumnus, Mr. KING, in backing this very sensible and decent piece of legislation. I would also say, as he was mentioning the unfortunate tragedies that have happened to members of the NYPD, as a proud resident of the city of Philadelphia, I have only been a Member of Congress for a few months, but I have been in elective office for 6 years, and during that time we, unfortunately, lost more Philadelphia police officers killed in the line of duty, as well as three Philadelphia firefighters killed in the line of duty. That was more than in any 5- or 6-year period in the city's history, which dates to 100 years before the founding of our country.

So it is a sad and solemn reminder of the sacrifice that they are willing to make on our behalf each and every day.

I believe that supporting this legislation is a proper gesture that we can make here in this House, and I am happy to support it. With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is a proud day. Mr. BOYLE, I do appreciate your comments in regard to those who serve us. Mr. KING, I think your reputation precedes you in regard to caring about those who care for us every day.

It is a thankless job a lot of times to be a fireman or a police officer or an EMT. Those folks go to work because they want to help people. They don't go to work because they want to hurt someone. They are driven by this desire to do right and to do good every day.

It is really easy sometimes, I think, that we forget that these are men and women who, whether they wear the badge of a law enforcement officer or a firefighter or an EMT or any other public safety officer, do their job because they are committed to their community. They do it because they love their community. So when some folks want to rush to judgment, I would just suggest that until you walk in their shoes, until you know what it is like to serve in that capacity, I would ask that people use a little restraint and maybe wait until investigation is complete before we start making decisions in regards to guilt or innocence.

I had to do that as sheriff. I had deputies who were involved in fire fights where other folks were killed. But you wanted to make sure that—listen, we want to know the facts. We want to know the truth. And if a police officer does something that is wrong, then he should be dealt with. But not all police officers do things wrong. They are human beings, and sometimes they do make mistakes.

Mr. Speaker, this particular bill talks to those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice, no matter how they served this great country, whether it was in the fire service or the law enforcement service or public safety in any manner. This is about recognizing them and their families for their service. These first responders and public safety officers stand side by side with each other supporting each other in a common goal. Whether you are a fireman or a police officer, it is a common goal to do the right thing.

They and their families live with these risks. They know what the job brings, the risks that are incurred, but they do that selflessly. Every time they put on that uniform to go to work, they do it knowing that something bad could happen to them that could change the lives of their children and their families forever.

Mr. Speaker, this bill allows us in Congress to offer a simple yet meaningful expression, I believe, of sympathy. We can't make up the family's loss to them, but we can remember these fallen heroes, and we can offer their families our gratitude as we honor those loved ones' memories, as I think this body should do every day because there are folks that stand the line for us, whether it is fighting a fire, rescuing us from a trapped vehicle at a scene of horrific destruction, whether it is tornadoes or earthquakes, law enforcement officers have to go places that no other folks want to go.

□ 2000

I just thank you, Mr. KING, for bringing this bill forward. I want to thank my good friend on the other side of the aisle, Mr. BOYLE, for standing for what is right, and I appreciate that.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. NUGENT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 723.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

(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, last week was National Small Business Week; and, while back in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District, I attended a ceremony honoring Jim and Colleen Small for receiving the 2015 Western Pennsylvania District Small Business Persons of the Year Awards.

For Jim and Colleen, pursuing a second career as businessowners trumped an early retirement, so they decided to open UPS Store #5642 in State College, Pennsylvania.

Like many small-business owners starting out, Jim and Colleen faced challenges, but through community outreach, a dedicated staff, and lots of hard work, the Smalls now run a very successful small business.

Mr. Speaker, small businesses are the backbone of our economy, and I couldn't think of a better way to celebrate National Small Business Week than by recognizing two outstanding local small-business leaders.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. and Mrs. Small on receiving this well-deserved award, and I thank them for all that they do for our community.

UCR BOURNS COLLEGE 25TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the University of California, Riverside's Bourns College of Engineering. In 1990, UCR opened its new public engineering college to educate the next generation of engineering leaders. Since then, the college has produced over 5,600 engineering graduates and is ranked first among public universities of the same size.

Not only does the UCR Bourns College of Engineering offer a quality engineering education, it is committed to recruiting students who are a true reflection of the ethnic and cultural diversity of the world in which we live.

The college is also home to world-class engineering researchers who are leveraging Federal dollars to improve air quality, predicting wildfires, discovering alternative energy fuels, and developing new materials that will change our lives.

I want to applaud UCR's chancellor, Kim Wilcox, and dean of engineering, Reza Abbaschian. I know they will lead the Bourns College of Engineering down an even more successful path over the next 25 years.

THANKING UNNAMED GARLAND POLICEMEN

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, this is National Police Week, and I did want to rise in recognition of the brave law enforcement officers of the police department in Garland, Texas.

Mr. Speaker, just a little over a week ago, May 3, two heavily armed assailants opened fire outside an event at the Curtis Culwell Center in Garland, Texas. Thankfully, some of Texas' finest police officers were on hand to protect the innocent lives inside.

Traffic police and SWAT officers from the Garland Police Department did their job. They subdued these two would-be mass murderers before they were able to take a life.

To date, these heroes remain unnamed, but we cannot overlook their bravery and their willingness to put their lives on the line to protect ours. They kept this crisis from becoming a tragedy, and they averted what likely could have been the largest mass casualty situation north Texas has ever seen.

Mr. Speaker, I extend to the Garland Police Department my sincerest appreciation for their service and their bravery. These heroes deserve our deepest appreciation for their selfless preservation of human life.

TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to bring light to the secretive, job-killing global trade pact called the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the TPP. Supporters want to rush it through Congress using a procedure called fast-track authority, which forces a vote with no opportunity to amend the deal. This should alarm all Americans.

In its current form, this deal would outsource even more of America's good jobs out from under our working families, degrade global environmental and working standards, and cause investor rights to override worker rights. It propels a global race to the bottom.

The trade ambassador and the administration assert that the TPP has strong and enforceable labor standards and environmental commitments. The TPP includes four nations—Mexico, Brunei, Vietnam, and Malaysia—that are notorious labor and human rights violators.

They are already out of compliance with the standards supposedly in TPP. Frankly, our U.S. Trade Representative has had a bad habit of sweeping trade violations right under the rug.

Our history of trade agreements in Guatemala, Honduras, and Colombia show the need for stronger obligations and a rigorous plan for implementing and overseeing them.

Including commitments in the final agreement is not enough. These nations have to change their laws and practices, and we have to enforce them.

Mr. Speaker, we should vote against TPP because what is going to happen is more American workers will be cashed out, and exploited workers around the world will find life gets harder.

NEED FOR LONG-TERM HIGHWAY BILL

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

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to act swiftly to prevent the highway transit trust fund from expiring. If we do not act, this critical program will expire in just 7 legislative days.

I am proud to be a member of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and my district in Illinois is a central hub for the shipment of goods and people over road, rail, water, and air.

I truly believe that, by investing in our infrastructure, we are making a down payment on our Nation's long-term economic well-being. These investments not only create jobs, but they create jobs that cannot be outsourced. By investing in our infrastructure now, as opposed to punting the ball down the field, we are saving money in the long term.

Over half a million good-paying construction jobs hang in the balance, and construction on 6,000 critical projects across the country could be put on hold. This is unacceptable and why we must act now to provide certainty that our local communities, businesses, and hard-working families deserve.

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Hello, America. Do you know what is going to happen in just a few days? In 7 legislative days, the United States highway trust fund runs out of money—kaput, it is over—a fund established by President Eisenhower in the 1950s, out of money.

What is the House of Representatives doing? What is your Representative and your Senator doing? Well, I suspect debating the Trans-Pacific Partnership—the TPA—when, in fact, this is the big jobs issue.

The trade negotiations, you can debate it forever; but if you really want to create jobs in America, pay attention to this, America. Pay attention to the fact that the Federal highway trust fund expires in 7 legislative days. We have got work to do here; we have got a lot of work to do, and it is not happening.

I am a Californian. I represent the State of California. We have a pretty high opinion of ourselves in California, maybe deserved or not; but what it means to us when the highway trust fund shuts down, what it means is a lot of jobs. 73,572 jobs will be jeopardized at the end of this month of May. We are looking at 5,692 active highway and transit projects will stop, red light stop, don't go forward.

For California, in just 7 legislative days, a very, very important thing happens—actually, far, far more important than the Trans-Pacific Partnership or the trade promotion authority. This is where the big jobs are in America. Building the infrastructure of America is how you create jobs today and on into the future because you lay the foundation for economic growth.

If you couple those transportation programs with another long, longstanding American law, which is Buy America, Make It In America, you not only create the foundation, but you also create immediate manufacturing jobs of all kinds. From the bulldozers, to the tractors and the backhoes, to the steel and the concrete, you buy it in America; you build the infrastructure in America, and you create immediate jobs.

How many? Well, I think we all know Duke University. It is more than a basketball school. It also happens to be one of the more thoughtful research institutions in the United States. They produced a little book that about 535 of the Representatives of the American people ought to be reading.

This ought to be the bedtime reading for the Senators and the Members of Congress: ''Infrastructure Investment Creates American Jobs,'' Duke University Center on Globalization, Governance, and Competitiveness.

I am going to read just a few things here just to drive this point home.

Old and broken transportation infrastructure makes the United States less competitive than 15 of our major trading partners and makes manufacturers less efficient in getting goods to market.

You want to get goods to market, build the infrastructure.

Underinvestment costs the United States over 900,000 jobs, including more than 97,000 American manufacturing jobs.

You want to Make It In America, build the infrastructure.

Maximizing American-made materials when rebuilding infrastructure has the potential to create even more jobs. Relying on American-made inputs can also mitigate safety concerns related to large-scale outsourcing.

It is our Make It In America policy. It is the agenda that we have been driving for the last 5 years here. Build the infrastructure, Buy America, Make It In America.

Competitiveness, a lot of talk, everybody wants to talk about the Trans-Pacific Partnership, or the TPA. You want to be competitive; you build the American infrastructure—again, Duke University.

The United States boasts the world's largest stock of transportation infrastructure as measured by combined bridges, airports, seaports, and miles of road, rail, pipeline, and inland waterways.

It is a very good start, foundation.

The United States is not well positioned compared to its major trading partners in terms of quality of transportation infrastructure. Global assessments of transportation infrastructure place the United States in 16th place out of 144 nations.

You want to improve our competitiveness, you want to create jobs, build the infrastructure.

□ 2015

The quality of transportation infrastructure affects the United States' competitiveness, point No. 6, and here is what we can do about it.

Instead of the administration's spending all of its energy and all of its time talking about how we are going to deal with international trade that, in all likelihood, will create fewer jobs in America—so much so that they have to put into that Trans-Pacific Partnership a provision that would actually pay American workers who have lost their jobs—why don't they talk about their own GROW AMERICA Act?

This is the Department of Transportation. This is the President's program, the GROW AMERICA Act. It is, really, a good piece of legislation. It is not yet introduced, unfortunately, but it calls for $7.6 billion to fix our highway system—this is all annual—$6.8 billion to improve public transportation, $3.4 billion to strengthen our rail systems—Amtrak and other kinds of rail systems—and $1 billion to accelerate our freight support system. If you really want to do international trade, you really have to build the freight management system in this Nation. It has got to go out, not just in, and you can't do it with the antiquated freight systems that we have in the United States. This is $476 billion over a 4-year period of time. It is a good project—it is fully paid for—but we are not even talking about it here.

We have got work to do. The purpose of this 1 hour, which will, actually, be significantly less than an hour, is to say, ''Hello, America. Wake up. Ask your Members of Congress: 'What are you doing about transportation? What are you doing in 7 legislative days to fix the transportation system? Are you paying attention? Are you paying attention to your State? to your community that you represent? to the jobs that you are going to see and the highway projects and the transit projects? Are you paying attention?''' In 7 legislative days, at the end of this month, the Federal highway trust fund terminates along with the projects that are supported by it. It is a problem. It is our problem. We need the courage to act, and we need to pay attention to what is really important, which happens to be the transportation infrastructure of this great Nation. We need to rebuild it.

Joining me this hour is the gentlewoman representing the Capital of the United States, Washington, D.C., Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, the ranking member of the Highways and Transit Subcommittee of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Delegate NORTON, thank you for joining us tonight. I am looking forward to your presentation.

Ms. NORTON. I want to thank my good friend from California because it is you who have done a great service to the Nation's infrastructure and transportation by taking out this hour virtually every week. Sometimes it is a lonely hour, but I want you to know that some of us notice.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I am not lonely tonight with you. I am glad you have joined us.

Ms. NORTON. I will say that the way in which you have persisted is really a model for how Members get things done in this House, so I have come down, first, to thank and honor you for what you have done.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you.

Ms. NORTON. I have to say, in listening to you, I simply can't figure it out, as your one-man show alone should have been enough to get this bill reauthorized. It is a very unusual way for one Member to take one issue and just not let it rest. Our committee and this Congress owe you a great debt of thanks particularly when you consider, Mr. GARAMENDI, that you are talking about a bill that has strong bipartisan support in a Congress that is not known for bipartisanship. So I thank you from the bottom of my heart for what you have done.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you. Thank you for your leadership on the Highways and Transit Subcommittee, because you are carrying the weight of this particular piece of legislation.

Ms. NORTON. And it is weighing us down. I am afraid we are not getting anywhere, but if we keep trying and if we keep following your leadership and the leadership of Mr. SHUSTER on that side of the aisle and of Mr. DEFAZIO on this side of the aisle, you couldn't have a better partnership in this Congress. I can't believe we won't be able to get something done, but May 31, my friend, looms, as you said in 7 days—or is it 6? The fact is that we are counting down, and there are some of us coming on the floor with you each day to count down. I was here on a 1-minute earlier today, and I think Members are beginning to understand the obligation that they have to take on, the obligation that you have taken on as a lonely Member for months now.

Mr. GARAMENDI. It has to be done. We absolutely have to do this with your leadership on the subcommittee in trying to find a path to build the infrastructure and in looking for ways to pay for it.

Actually, the administration in the GROW AMERICA Act found a way to pay for it—with the earnings of American corporations that are overseas. Bring those back; tax them; and we would have enough money, together with the existing excise tax, to build our infrastructure over the next 4 to 5 years, so we have got to do it.

Ms. NORTON. And that would give us a long-term bill. The administration admits that it, too, is not the answer because, after that, we still have to come up with a new way to pay for transportation and infrastructure. You, yourself, talked about when this

all started, which was in the Eisenhower administration. We have gotten so efficient now. I drive a hybrid car, which doesn't use much gas. So we have got to be prepared to really think through an entirely new way of funding transportation and infrastructure.

You mentioned the GROW AMERICA Act. I will be introducing that act soon.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Good.

Ms. NORTON. The administration does want it introduced. Mr. GARAMENDI, we need it, if for nothing else but as a marker. What are we talking about? If nothing has been introduced, I am not sure the American people will recognize just how far we have to go.

Mr. GARAMENDI. You have to lay down the marker. You laid down the first proposal, and it is really good. I said 4 years. Actually, it is a 6-year bill—$478 billion—and it covers all of the elements. All of the elements are there. If somebody has got a better idea, we haven't heard it.

I am delighted. When you introduce that bill, count me as one of the coauthors of it, and I look forward to working with your leadership to push it along.

Ms. NORTON. Oh, you would be the very first one given what you have done on this floor, and I am glad you mentioned some parts of the bill and its cost. Yes. Guess what? It costs money; it costs something to do transportation and infrastructure; but the administration has had many Members' support of bringing back untaxed funds abroad that want to come back and of using it for something that everybody is for.

I understand that our ranking member, Mr. DEFAZIO, has written Mr. RYAN of Ways and Means to ask for a joint hearing of our committee with the Ways and Means Committee so that we can work together, and there are rumors, because that is all we hear about of this bill these days, that there may be one in June. You will notice that that is after May 31.

Mr. GARAMENDI. This is a major concern in that it seems as though the most common thing that happens here in Congress is a game that we used to play as children. It is called ''kick the can.'' You would get an old No. 16 can, and you would kick it around the yard. We kick the can down the road here so often instead of really gripping the issue and saying, ''Okay. Let us do something that lays out a long-term, 6-year plan where the States and the counties and the cities can actually project projects and know that the funding is going to be there so they can be efficient and effective and prioritize.'' Instead of doing that, we just kind of kick the can down the road.

They are talking about a 6-month, until the end of September, with the same level of funding. We are going to lose a lot of jobs, and the opportunity to build the systems that we absolutely have to have in order to grow our economy is not going to happen. I just go, ''Why would we do that? We have a good model.''

I am looking forward to the introduction of the GROW AMERICA Act that you are going to introduce. Tell us what is wrong with this. Tell us where it doesn't meet the needs.

My Republican colleagues and Democratic colleagues, what is missing? What improvements should there be? Tell us what it is. We will deal with it.

The funding source, as you said, makes sense. American corporations—Apple and others—have billions of dollars—almost $1 trillion—of profits overseas that are not taxed. Bring it home. Use that to invest in America. Bring the capital home so that you can put labor and capital together, starting with infrastructure, and build this Nation. Mr. DELANEY, our colleague from Maryland, has a good proposal, a bipartisan proposal, that does that.

Run with it, Congress. Run with it, Senate. Let's do something.

Ms. NORTON. Oh, you have made such an important point because you say, if not this, what?

The Democrats—we on this side of the aisle—are willing to sit down with you to come up with whatever bill we can compromise on. We just have to be shown a bill. The reason I am going to introduce the GROW AMERICA Act is so that we can begin there. Maybe they don't want that. Okay. Let's bargain down from there, but we can't do nothing. We can't go home and say, ''Well, we did nothing,'' and we certainly can't simply wait for our friends on the other side of the aisle.

Now, I want my friend from California to know that representatives of the states were in the House today and I went to say a few words to them. They were in one of our committee rooms—a group that calls itself the ''Big Seven.'' They were the leaders in the States. They were the Governors, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the National League of Cities, the United States Conference of Mayors. They were begging for this bill, so they had their own meeting here.

I think that it behooves us to ramp up the pressure, we who are on the inside. When you see that those who represent the infrastructure we are talking about are on the Hill, pleading, without an answer from either side, well, our side is trying to answer; and because there is so much bipartisanship, there is just no reason that we shouldn't be sitting down and trying to figure this out.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We really must do that.

Yesterday, I was in the Central Valley—Modesto, California—for a meeting, and I had to drive to San Francisco for a speech over Interstate 580, the Altamont Pass, and it is so broken up. There is the fast lane on the Altamont Pass, as you go up over the mountain, that actually has about a 6-inch crack in the fast lane. As you drive down, you are driving down on one side of the crack. You have one wheel on one side and the other wheel on the other side of this crack, and you say, ''Whoa, I hope I can make it through here.'' That is a major transportation route with tens of thousands of cars traveling on it every day. So the state of good repair? Not in California.

What does it mean? If we were to take the GROW AMERICA Act that you are going to introduce, it would mean that, compared to this year, 2015, we would have $7.6 billion more across the Nation to repair the highways in our Nation. The Altamont Pass, it is downright dangerous—I was shocked—but they don't have any money to fix it. There would be $7.6 billion for all of this Nation to do it.

Then the buses, the transit agency in San Francisco. I was parked in San Francisco, waiting for a stoplight. A bus pulls up, and it had to be a 1950 bus. It was rusted out, and I am sure the seats were torn apart. All good credit to San Francisco for trying, but across the Nation, it is the same way—here in Washington, D.C., with the transit agencies, Amtrak.

By the way, Amtrak came to Congress. They wanted money—this is some good news—and we actually passed an Amtrak bill out of the House of Representatives a couple of months ago. Yet do you know what they wanted to do? They wanted to get a waiver on the Buy America provisions. They have to build, I think, 28 locomotives and train sets—high-speed—and they didn't want to buy it in America. I am going, no, no way. If we are going to spend American taxpayer money, spend it on American-made equipment, on American jobs. Make It In America. No way are you going to get out of that.

□ 2030

I also want to talk about this, but you have got a bridge behind you.

Ms. NORTON. I do. You talked about the project in your district, and that project with the crack in the road is emblematic of what is happening in the United States.

Mr. GARAMENDI, they can't even start on that repair because that is a major project. So another patch, as we call it, or short-term funding, means that the backlog of major projects remains. You can't start what America needs, which are major projects. If we could put them all here in this Chamber, they would pile up to the ceiling. They simply have to sit there with 6-month patches or even a 1-year patch. Yours is a major Federal highway, and California can't do anything about it.

I went to such a highway in my own city, and that is why I brought this poster. The Washington Post picked it up and says, ''Norton Uses Bridge to Make a Point.'' It is interesting. Although this bridge also has real defects, I was using it to make another point, that every form of transportation depends upon this bridge in the

Nation's Capital: the intercity buses; the intracity buses; the street car, if you are going to a major highway; the Metro—all of it comes to a head there.

A point that you touched upon, which is seldom made here, is a point I tried to make when I went to the H Street—or Hopscotch—Bridge, and that is that the failure to rebuild that bridge is keeping a complete overhaul of Union Station from occurring, not to mention a whole new community that would be built over it, because they can't move on those major economic development projects until the bridge is done, and it will take 5 years to rebuild that bridge.

So you see, Mr. GARAMENDI, we are not just holding up obvious infrastructure projects; we are holding up major economic development projects that simply can't get started until the roads and bridges are fixed.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, you couldn't be more accurate, and you certainly did make the point. I was looking at the picture there. You have got the Northeast corridor, the entire Amtrak system underneath that bridge into Union Station, which I think is probably just to what I would say stage left, and the rail system goes through there, and then the highway system. I didn't realize that this is holding up the reconstruction of Union Station.

Ms. NORTON. So that we can get high-speed rail. So you can't get high-speed rail unless you dig down. You can't do that unless people can get over this bridge. You talked about billions of dollars of highway bridge and transit that is being held up. I don't even want to begin to try to calculate how much economic development that depends upon our fixing those major road projects is not getting done.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, also, the lives of our citizens. I don't have the placards with me, but in previous presentations I have shown pictures of the Interstate 5 bridge that collapsed in Washington State near the Canadian border. It shut down commerce going north. You were not going north on that bridge because it collapsed. And then there was the bridge over the Mississippi River in the Twin Cities, in Minneapolis. That bridge collapsed. I think five people lost their lives there. This is an ongoing issue, one that we need to deal with.

The solution is at hand. The solution is at hand. Every community in this Nation has a transportation issue of one sort. It might be a transit, a bus, a train, or a bridge, or a highway, but we all have it.

I am going to make one more point, and this will be my last, and then I will let you wrap it up. I am going to go back to what is the discussion of the day here in Washington, the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the TPA, the authorization of the fast track legislation. Ninety-nine percent of our trade goes through the ports, and this is part of the GROW AMERICA Act. It is part of the freight system. I don't think this trade bill should pass, but should it become law, you have to have the infrastructure that goes with it, and you cannot have a robust trade program unless you have a well-built port system.

By the way, one of the things that is going to happen is, because of our energy boom, the United States is creating an enormous amount of natural gas. That natural gas is in the process of being transported, shipped overseas in what is known as liquefied natural gas. You supercool, you supercompress the natural gas; you put it into a tanker, a big ship, and you transport it.

A new facility will go online in Louisiana, and it is called the Cheniere facility at Sabine Pass. It will take 100 tankers, ships, to handle the volume of that one export facility, and there are five others that are in the permitting process. I am saying, Wait a minute, that is a strategic national asset; that is part of our infrastructure. Why don't we ship that strategic asset on American-built ships with American sailors? If we passed a simple law here, which actually replicates the North Slope oil law back in the 1960s, we could replicate that and simply say: If we are going to export liquefied natural gas, do it on American-built ships with American sailors. We would build over the next two decades more than a hundred ships in American shipyards with American-built equipment and Americans doing the welding and building those ships, probably well over 100,000 jobs; and the seamen, the merchant marine, they would be American.

It all fits together. It is part of our transportation infrastructure. It is using our great national assets, improving them, the transportation system, and then using those assets to create American jobs. Buy America, make it in America, transport that natural gas on American-built ships with American mariners, and take what will be your legislation, the GROW AMERICA Act, and build the infrastructure.

I am looking forward to the introduction of your legislation. I am looking forward to your leadership in making this happen. We have got to talk about this every single day until we wake up, until America wakes up, and says: Wait a minute, guys, do something for our Nation; build the foundation of economic growth.

Thank you so very much for joining us, Delegate. I will let you close.

Ms. NORTON. Well, again, Mr. GARAMENDI, you have my thanks, and you should have the thanks of this entire House. I am glad you closed with the program you did—you talked about the ports—because in the GROW AMERICA Act is a multimodal freight program. This is the first time it has ever been in the transportation bill.

Now, you gave an example: multimodal, because we are trying to make sure that rail and highway and port projects are coordinated together. That is the efficient use of all modes of transportation together. Here on the East Coast, The Panama Canal is coming and now you have every single port trying to get that business, and you have the private sector investing like mad in railroads because they want that business, and the buses want that business.

The private sector, Mr. GARAMENDI, is doing its job, but you can't, in fact, in the States do the ports and the freight all by yourself or with the private sector alone. And so this bill, the GROW AMERICA Act, brings it all together, gives us for the first time something that we have had in ground transportation, multimodal, but we have not had it in freight transportation so that those ports you are focusing on would grow, and we grow them here, just as you said, buying American.

I thank you once again for all you have done.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you so very much. I thank you for your leadership. I am looking forward to the introduction of the bill and to push that through. Whether we can do it in 7 days or not—we could. It is possible. All the language is written. You will introduce it. The way of paying for it is known. We have just got work to do.

I am just thinking about the greatness of this Nation and the enormous potential that we have, and how we just let that slip away, for lack of solid programs that really build this Nation. I think about Eisenhower and what he did with the great highway system that we have, the Interstate Highway System. There is much to be done. I look forward to your leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I notice that our Republican colleagues have been listening to our debate and have decided to come and take the next hour and carry forth to Make It in America, build the infrastructure and the foundation for economic growth. I look forward to hearing the gentlemen.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL). The gentleman yields back the balance of his time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Do you have more you wish to say?

Ms. NORTON. Yes, I certainly do.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thought we had completed, but I guess I am not yielding back quite yet.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized.

Ms. NORTON. Again, I thank the gentleman for the leadership he has taken on not only this bill but on infrastructure in our country. I did want to say a few more words because in these last 6 days we can't leave words unsaid.

I want to say that what my chief frustration is—there is really no serious thinking going on in this House about ways to replace the highway trust fund except what is in the GROW AMERICA Act, and that, of course, would be for one 6-year period. The reason I bring this up is because I want

the American people to help us think about what has happened to the highway trust fund. We have got to bring it together this time and grow America with repatriated taxes that would otherwise not be there.

But let's think of why we have to do that. The efficiency that we now have and we ought to be proud of that, but it means that that 1950s approach, which worked so magically, is now entirely out of date, and there have got to be other ways to fund transportation and infrastructure. I was very frustrated that in the last bill, we call it MAP–21, there were not even pilots to guide us, like the so-called VMT miles driven that all of us, even those of us who are in hybrid cars, those who therefore don't contribute as much on the present highway fund, would play our part.

We need to sit around a table right here in the House and figure out what to do in the long run because we didn't do that last July when this bill was extended. There are even some people talking about, well, it can go to July because it runs out in July. Yeah, it runs out in July, and then look what happens. Treasury funds will have to be transferred just to make sure that we keep level funding going, and that level funding, meaning just base funding, will mean that no new major projects will be started in the States because of what has come to be called lack of certainty. I know of no major project that can be finished in 6 months. If it takes you 2 or 3 years, leave alone the 5 years like my H St Bridge project I spoke about, then you don't start it at all. So the money just lies fallow. It goes to no good major need.

So who is to blame? They are going to look to us and say, What are you doing? That is why we are coming on this floor. They are going to look to us to stop doing the same thing over and over again and think of something that we didn't do the last time. These short term patches are what we did the last time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, we have done it over and over again, and the general talk around this building is that we are going to kick the can down the road yet again, probably for another 6 months, just like we extended the last one for 9 months. It is not the way to do it, and the result is bad public policy and an inability to really build the foundation for our economic future.

You mentioned the funding, the notion of a joint committee hearing between the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Ways and Means to discuss the funding options that you just described, and so we should talk about what the options are, and then select the one that makes the most sense for this Nation's well-being.

□ 2045

We can do that. That is what we were hired to do and what the voters put us here for.

Ms. NORTON. Meanwhile, as you indicated, GROW AMERICA would be a way to do it for at least 6 years.

I went to speak with the various organizations representing the States that were here today. I had my staff look at what the States are doing. Frankly, I found the States in a desperate position. There are States that have already done gas tax increases or reforms of their own. You have got to be pretty desperate to raise your own tax and leave ours where it was 20 years ago.

Iowa, Wyoming, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Virginia, Vermont, the District of Columbia, South Dakota, these State have nothing in common, except that they couldn't continue to go on without funding.

Six States are making progress on trying to raise their own gas tax in the absence of our doing something. Those States, in the same way, don't have anything in common. When I say ''making progress,'' it generally means one House has at least done it, and they are trying to get the other House to raise the gas tax. They are Georgia, Michigan, North Carolina, Utah, and Washington State.

Then there are another seven States which are considering changes because they just can't wait any longer to get long-term projects going: Idaho, Kentucky, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, South Carolina, and Vermont.

When I came into the meeting today, there was someone from the South Dakota Department of Transportation speaking, and it was interesting because they raised the gas tax in South Dakota, a very red State, and it included an amendment also to raise the speed limit by 5 miles an hour. I think that would make it something like 80 miles an hour out there.

He said—and he just laughed at this—that, although they had raised the gas tax on the residents in the legislature, nobody talked about anything except the increase the speed limit. That is how little the notion that you shouldn't raise your gas tax had become in a State like South Dakota.

The States are way ahead of us and looking to us for leadership. These 6-month increments are the exact opposite of leadership—delaying, as I indicated before, Mr. GARAMENDI, billions of dollars of other infrastructure that the Federal Government wouldn't have to pay for often, that can't get done, like a road or a bridge. That is why I went to such an example in my own district.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to submit for the RECORD a list of the top five critical infrastructure projects in my own district, the Nation's Capital. The National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board has also written to this region's bipartisan delegation, and I would like to have its resolution also included in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

TOP FIVE CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STALLED UNTIL THERE IS A LONG-TERM SURFACE TRANSPORTATION REAUTHORIZATION

1. Rehab of 14th St NW, Thomas Circle to FL Ave.
2. Safety & Geometric Improvements to I–295/DC295
3. 11th St. SE Bridge (various components)
4. Improved Signal System and Communication Network
5. Intersection of PA Ave. and Potomac Ave. SE

NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION,
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD,
April 27, 2015.

Hon. JAMES INHOFE,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, Washington DC.
Hon. BARBARA BOXER,
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, Washington DC
Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington DC.
Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Washington DC.

DEAR CHAIRMEN INHOFE AND SHUSTER, AND RANKING MEMBERS BOXER AND DEFAZIO: On behalf of the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board (TPB) at the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG), I transmit the attached board resolution and policy principles for the reauthorization of the federal transportation programs.

Our policy principles represent a commonsense approach to reauthorization. We urge Congress to enact legislation that will fund priority needs and promote effective planning and project development.

As we face the expiration of MAP–21, this moment offers an opportunity to demonstrate that our nation is still capable of taking care of its most basic needs as we plan for future generations. We urge Congress to act decisively and comprehensively.

Sincerely yours,

PHIL MENDELSON,
Chairman.

NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

The Honorable Ben Cardin, United States Senate, Maryland.

The Honorable Barbara Mikulski, United States Senate, Maryland.

The Honorable Don Beyer, United States House of Representatives, 8th District, Virginia.

The Honorable Barbara Comstock, United States House of Representatives, 10th District, Virginia.

The Honorable Gerald Connolly, United States House of Representatives, 11th District, Virginia.

The Honorable Robert Wittman, United States House of Representatives, 1st District, Virginia.

The Honorable Tim Kaine, United States Senate, Virginia.

The Honorable Mark Warner, United States Senate, Virginia.

The Honorable John Delaney, United States House of Representatives, 6th District, Maryland.

The Honorable Donna Edwards, United States House of Representatives, 4th District, Maryland.

The Honorable Steny Hoyer, United States House of Representatives, 5th District, Maryland.

The Honorable Christopher Van Hollen, United States House of Representatives, 8th District, Maryland.

The Honorable Eleanor Holmes Norton, United States House of Representatives, District of Columbia.

NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION,
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD,
Washington, DC, April 15, 2015.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE POLICY PRINCIPLES FOR THE 2015 REAUTHORIZATION OF FEDERAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS

Whereas, the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board (TPB), which is the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for the Washington Region, has the responsibility under provisions of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP–21) for developing and carrying out a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process for the Metropolitan Area; and

Whereas, since 2000 the TPB has been calling attention to the region's long-term transportation funding shortfall, and has documented its unmet preservation, rehabilitation and capacity expansion needs for the region's highway and transit systems; and

Whereas, federal funding for transportation infrastructure plays a significant role in the National Capital Region; projects such as the interstate system and the Metro system could never have been built without the leadership, long-standing commitment, and financial support of the federal government; and

Whereas, the Washington region continues to face the challenges of accommodating growth in people and employment, more pervasive congestion on highways and transit systems, and delays in completing critical rehabilitation needs and key expansion projects; and

Whereas, MAP–21 was enacted on July 6, 2012 as a two-year bill, and was extended on August 8, 2014 through May 31, 2015, which was the ninth time in the last decade that Congress has enacted a short-term extension of the federal highway and transit programs.

Whereas, it is anticipated that Congress will likely again enact a short-term extension prior to the May 31st expiration of MAP–21, but the need for sustained and long-term federal funding could remain unaddressed; and

Whereas, the lack of predictability in federal funding programs has undermined the ability of state and local implementing agencies to effectively plan and build transportation facilities that are vital to meet the challenges of the future; and

Whereas, the lack of sustained and adequate federal funding for transportation undermines economic growth in our region and across the nation and hinders our global competitiveness; and

Whereas, both Maryland and Virginia took historic steps in 2013 to address their transportation funding shortfalls by raising new revenues, and the District of Columbia took similar steps five years ago, but nonetheless, the inadequacy of sustainable federal funding remains a critical concern; and

Whereas, the TPB has regularly communicated its positions regarding federal transportation legislation to Congress, including policy principles in 2002 and 2008, and a letter on May 21, 2014 calling upon Congress to protect the Highway Trust Fund from insolvency; and

Whereas, at the November 19, 2014 meeting, the TPB directed staff to develop a set of policy principles for the reauthorization of the federal surface transportation program that the Board might communicate to the U.S. Congress; and

Whereas, on April 3, 2015, the TPB Technical Committee received a briefing and commented on draft proposed policy principles: Now,therefore, be it

Resolved that the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board approves the attached 2015 Policy Principles for the Reauthorization of Federal Surface Transportation Programs'' and further, be it

Resolved that the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board calls on the United States Congress to reauthorize an enhanced federal surface transportation program for a full six-year period, consistent with the attached Policy Principles.

NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD,
April 15, 2015.

2015 POLICY PRINCIPLES FOR THE REAUTHORIZATION OF FEDERAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS

The federal government has an historic interest in transportation. The benefits of federal investment in a balanced, multimodal transportation system have long been recognized as critical to our national interest, promoting economic growth and providing access to opportunities for all individuals. In addition, the federal government has a unique obligation to support interstate commerce and to meet critical emergency and security requirements, and thus should provide an equitable contribution towards the cost of maintaining, operating and building our transportation infrastructure.

The National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board supports the following policy principles as a common-sense approach for reauthorization of the federal surface transportation programs.

1. Increase Federal Transportation Funding

A substantial increase in federal surface transportation funding levels is needed to address the current under-investment in the maintenance, operations and expansion of the nation's transportation system.

All reasonable and predictable strategies for sustained long-term funding should be pursued, including:

Increases in federal fuel taxes or other user-based taxes and fees;

Indexing fuel taxes and user fees to inflation so as to maintain the buying power of transportation funds;

Implementing pricing strategies enabled by emerging technology for all modes of travel, including rates that vary by time of day, type of vehicle, level of emissions, and specific infrastructure segments used;

Incentivizing federal support and coordination of innovative financing techniques, including public/private partnerships;

Utilizing savings from tax reform legislation; and

Creation of national infrastructure banks or bonding programs.

2. Fund Priority Needs

An explicit program focus, with enhanced funding, is needed to put and keep the nation's transportation infrastructure in a state of good repair.

Federal transportation policy should provide for increased federal funding focused on metropolitan congestion and other metropolitan transportation challenges, with stronger partnerships between federal, state, regional and local transportation officials.

The federal commitment to balanced multi-modal transportation systems must be reaffirmed including by restoring parity between the transit commuter benefit and the parking commuter benefit. As communities seek to reduce dependency on driving and serve non-drivers, alternatives must be developed and supported. In particular, federal funding for public transit and safe pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure should be enhanced.

3. Promote Effective Planning and Project Development

More timely, detailed, and flexible requirements to comply with MAP–21's mandate for performance based planning and programming should be promulgated. Adequate and timely federal support, including funding, should be provided to the states and metropolitan areas to adopt and implement the program requirements.

The current set of performance measures outlined in MAP–21 should be allowed time to take effect and be evaluated before enhancements are considered.

Streamlining federal planning and environmental review processes, outlined in MAP–21, that are aimed at ensuring timely delivery of transportation projects, should be supported.

Given the critical role of goods movement in our economy and the demands of freight on our infrastructure, a national freight program should be a key component of a long-term reauthorization act.

Ms. NORTON. I want to emphasize, as we approach the end, how little of a partisan problem we are talking about this evening. Republican Governors have signed the laws that I have referred to.

The committee—Mr. GARAMENDI will remember this—had Republican Governors, State department of transportation executives, cities, counties, regional councils, and the rest before us, and the notion of devolution came up.

This hearing was interesting because when devolution has come up, and devolution simply means that if States are raising their gas tax. Well, let's stop doing a Federal highway or surface transportation bill.

These States are raising their gas tax, and they are waiting for us to raise ours so that the partnership that is represented by State gas taxes and Federal gas taxes will remain whole until we find some other way to do this.

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

PASS A SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining in the hour?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 16 minutes remaining.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. GARAMENDI spoke about the Eisenhower years, which gave us the present highway trust fund. Its lasting effects make it a monumental contribution to American law. Our generation has the obligation to move on, now that we have become so efficient that the highway trust fund, as set up 50 years ago, is obsolete.

I remind the House that, during the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln built the railroad system. How could you do that during a time when the country is split apart, and in this House, we can't figure out a way to get a highway surface transportation bill passed?

I looked up the latest figures—actually, 2015—on how our country ranks today. We ought to compare that to what Lincoln did, now going on 150 years ago, and what Eisenhower did 50 years ago.

We now rank 25th in the world for infrastructure quality. We are behind every last one of our allies, and now, we see some developing countries creeping forward. We better watch out for China. They are not in the top 30 now, but they are going to get there soon.

I remind this House that the way in which this country became the heavyweight that it is in the world was through the development of its infrastructure. We had to somehow create a seamless infrastructure that would go from across the continental United States, from east to west and from north to south.

With that, everything else became possible. Without that, we are simply going to be overtaken by nations that are far behind us now but, as I indicated are getting caught up.

I wanted to say a word about at least one other section of the GROW AMERICA Act because it relates to transit systems which are under special strain and which, interestingly enough, are embraced by people, from big cities to the smallest towns.

When I say ''transit systems,'' I am talking about everything from light rail and street cars that we have here in a big city like the Nation's Capital to rapid transit and buses that rural America depends upon and that are simply breaking down and unable to handle the traffic.

There is a very special provision of $115 billion to invest in these transit systems. The reason that this investment would be so acceptable is that there is no part of America that it does not touch.

I am not talking about, for example, subway systems of the kind we have in the District of Columbia and New York. I am talking about light rail and street cars and buses and rapid transit buses that small-town America uses and depends upon, and that is in the GROW AMERICA Act.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the Democrats on the Transportation and Infrastructure committee are having a roundtable where each member is going to discuss a project that is stuck because we have not passed a surface transportation bill. What we are trying to do at 2:30 p.m. tomorrow is put a face on what infrastructure means.

What infrastructure means, for example, in the District of Columbia, is the H Street or Hopscotch Bridge. I didn't take on one of the bridges that is simply falling down. There are altogether 31 projects in the District of Columbia that are awaiting funding. I have asked that the projects be put into the RECORD. Some of you would be interested if you were from the District, but it doesn't matter. You all have projects like this in your districts.

Unless we raise the ante, unless we make this an offer that this House cannot refuse, we are going to keep patching this bill until there is nothing left to patch.

This is a House that does not move, even in a crisis. We saw that with the Department of Homeland Security appropriation, that they simply would not give up. Finally, when the administration wouldn't change its immigration executive order, they simply had to let it pass. That is how we figured that one out.

Surely, there is a more rational way to figure out a surface transportation bill. I am working—at least on my side of the aisle—with 1-minutes this week, with the Special Order hour Mr. GARAMENDI has taken out, with social media, and with our work with the many organizations who have come here because this is National Highway and Transportation Week, as they have so declared. We are trying our best.

In this case, we are not trying to reach a compromise. We are simply trying to get to a bill so that we can simply sit down and talk about it. If you don't want to talk about the GROW AMERICA bill, put your own version of a bill, but don't insult the American people by giving us nothing except another patch.

I appreciate that, at least on my own committee, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, there is an earnest effort to find a solution to this crisis. I commend Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for working together in search of a solution. I call upon the Ways and Means Committee, through whom the funds must come, to do their job.

Together, we can do this. We are not going to let this House rest; we are not going to drop this issue, even on May 31, when the funds are set to run out and we have to find a patch. We are going to keep coming to this floor so that the American people know that there are at least some Members of this House who are struggling to get a surface transportation bill, are earnest about it, and won't give up.

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

□ 2100

CONSTRUCTION OF THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to talk for a little while tonight about some challenges that we are facing as a nation.

Mr. Speaker, I have never run for office before, and I will tell you I never had intentions of running for office. After sitting home watching from my home State of Louisiana, watching what is happening in Washington, and watching the dysfunction in this Nation, I think that the major motivation for running for office was more out of frustration than anything else—the disparity, the inconsistency in policies, decisions being made that lack, I think, the public interest and are being made more so as a result of political decisions.

Unfortunately, what I am going to talk about tonight I don't think will be the only subject that I end up coming back and talking about over the next several months.

It seems that, oftentimes, the Federal Government's decisions, their policies, their regulations seem to lack any type of connectivity to what is actually happening on the ground—decisions being made in a vacuum, decisions lacking, I think, the true expertise. What I am going to talk about tonight is an example of that.

This picture right here is a picture or the result of bad Federal policy. Now, the administration would lead you to believe that this picture is what is going to happen by building the Keystone pipeline.

This is oil, Mr. Speaker. This is oil in all of these bags that was recently picked up, but the administration would make you think that this is what is going to result from constructing, from building the Keystone pipeline.

The irony is that these bags don't have anything to do with the Keystone pipeline. This was actually oil that was picked up just in the last few months from an oil spill that happened in the Gulf of Mexico, the Deepwater Horizon oil spill 5 years ago—5 years ago, Mr. Speaker.

This administration has been asked over and over and over again by the State of Louisiana and by the coastal parishes in our State to force the responsible parties to go clean up the oil, and it is not happening. It hasn't happened. They haven't been held accountable.

It is unbelievable to me that we have an administration out there talking about their opposition to the Keystone pipeline because they are concerned about the environmental consequences at the exact same time—and over the last 5 years—allowing this to continue. It is hypocrisy. It is absurd, and it is obviously not in the public interest, Mr. Speaker.

The only reason that the White House, the only reason that the State Department is involved in any decisionmaking whatsoever in the Keystone pipeline is a result of the fact that the pipeline actually crosses the border between Canada and the United

States. That is the one thing that actually introduces the Federal Government into this decision.

For the most part, pipelines can be permitted and built by States, with State approval. They don't need interaction or approval from the Federal Government.

Now, by not building the Keystone pipeline or not approving it, many folks in the administration would lead you to believe that that is actually going to benefit the environment, that it will result in less oil consumption, that it will result in less greenhouse gases being released into the environment, into the atmosphere. The reality is that that is not accurate at all.

The reality is that, first of all, if you don't build the Keystone pipeline, you are still going to transport that oil. The Canadians will still be producing that oil, but what is going to happen is they will use other modes of transportation. They will use things like barges. They will use things like rail.

I think it is noteworthy to look at the statistics, to look at the historic performance of these other modes of transportation, which clearly indicate that transporting by pipeline is actually the safest means, the safest mode of transportation to get this product into the United States.

It is safest in regard to different incidents. It is safest in regard to spills, impacts on individuals, on communities, on the economy, on the environment. The safest way to transport is doing it by pipeline.

I mentioned that the oil will still be transported. Here is an example of what happens when you transport through other modes, when you don't transport by pipeline. This is an example of what happens.

As a result, you have had additional oil being transported by rail lines. Look at the extraordinary spike. Look at the extraordinary spike in the spills and the impacts to the environment as a result of transitioning to that mode of transportation.

Mr. Speaker, we have all seen in the news the various accidents that have happened all over the Nation as a result of this flawed policy of refusing to allow for this pipeline to proceed.

The State of Louisiana is a logistics—it is an intermodal hub. We have five of the top 15 ports in the United States. We have enough pipelines in our offshore region that they would go around the Equator if you put them end on end.

We have an extraordinary network of pipelines, demonstrated right here. You can see this high concentration of pipelines that are all over our State and in the adjacent State of Texas and in all 48 States in this graphic here very, very clearly.

I will say it again. The only reason the administration is involved in the Keystone pipeline decision is because that pipeline crosses the U.S. Canadian border. It is the sole reason.

All of these pipeline networks in here probably did not include Federal approval in regard to crossing over international borders. Take a look at this, Mr. Speaker. Take a look at, as I recall, 1.5 million miles of pipelines across the country.

The reality is that major components of the Keystone pipeline are actually already built or can be built without the approval of the Federal Government. That 1-foot section crossing over our Canadian border on the north is the only reason, again, that the administration is involved in this.

The fact remains, number one, by building the Keystone pipeline, it will not result in additional greenhouse gases being released. The Canadians are going to continue to produce the oil. The oil will be sent either through other modes of transportation in the United States, or it will be sent to other countries.

I remind you, Mr. Speaker, the Clean Air Act regimes of these other nations, in most cases, is not as stringent or as strict as it is in the United States, so resulting in a net increase in the greenhouse gases that this administration is so concerned about.

I will say it again. By not approving this pipeline, you are going to force the oil onto barges, onto trucks, onto rail, or other less safe means of transportation.

I certainly have nothing against those other modes of transportation. They are all critically important, but to see this administration hide behind the oil spill or the suggested oil spill impacts of the pipeline is simply absurd. Facts prove otherwise.

As you see here, the majority of this pipeline, by far, can be built without the Federal Government's approval. It is simply nonsensical. It is nonsensical to watch this administration hide behind false excuses to drag this decision out for years, whenever it is contrary to our economy.

What is going to happen if we don't build this pipeline? In addition to using other means of transportation, we will be importing oil, not from the North American continent, but from other countries like Venezuela, like Nigeria and Middle Eastern nations that make up the top 10 nations that export oil to the United States.

In many cases, Mr. Speaker, I will say again, Venezuela, countries that don't share American values; yet we are exporting hundreds of billions of dollars and thousands and thousands of jobs to other countries.

Who is running this place?

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate passed a bipartisan bill that was going to allow for the pipeline to be approved, for us to put this behind us and move towards other things, towards higher priority things that actually should have the attention of the United States Congress and the White House, as opposed to these things, decisions that should have been made years ago, and we should have passed on from there.

As a result of these ridiculous decisions, all these tortured reports, all the involvement of various agencies—including the EPA, the State Department, and other agencies—we are continuing to go through this long process, dragging this out, resulting again in less safe means of transportation.

Whether it is coming in through ships from other countries, across the Atlantic Ocean, or it is coming in on rail lines, it is coming in tugs and barges on our waterways, it is being transported to the United States, through less safe means of transportation.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, in closing, that this is what happens when you have bad Federal policy, when you are making bad Federal decisions. This is what happens.

You result in thousands of pounds of oil, in miles and miles of shoreline, tens of miles of shoreline, still oil in our home State of Louisiana, as a result of bad Federal policy.

We are watching a similar bad Federal policy unroll right now as the administration continues to invent impediments to what makes sense, to what statistically makes the most sense—by approving a pipeline and getting out of the way—and obstructing our economy development, jobs for Americans, and North American energy independence.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2215

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS) at 10 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1735, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 36, PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2048, USA FREEDOM ACT OF 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Ms. FOXX from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114–111) on the resolution (H. Res. 255) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel

strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 36) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2048) to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BARLETTA (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and the balance of the week on account of a successful procedure to clear a blocked artery.

Mr. RUIZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of jury duty.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 136. An act to amend chapter 21 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that fathers of certain permanently disabled or deceased veterans shall be included with mothers of such veterans as preference eligibles for treatment in the civil service; To The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

S. 179. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14 3rd Avenue NW, in Chisholm, Minnesota, as the ''James L. Oberstar Memorial Post Office Building''; To The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

S. 994. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1 Walter Hammond Place in Waldwick, New Jersey, as the ''Staff Sergeant Joseph D'Augustine Post Office Building''; To The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

S. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent Resolution stating the policy of the United States regarding the release of United States citizens in Iran; To The Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order and pursuant to House Resolution 254, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 13, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honorable James Claude Wright, Jr.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

> ''I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.''

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 113th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

DANIEL M. DONOVAN, JR., Eleventh District of New York.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first quarter of 2015, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SHUWANZA GOFF, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 27 AND APR. 4, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Shuwanza Goff	3/28	4/4	Burma		2,079.00		15,126.10				17,205.10
Committee total					2,079.00		15,126.10				17,205.10

SHUWANZA GOFF, Apr. 21, 2015.

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, EMILY MURRY, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 27 AND APR. 4, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Emily Murry	3/28	4/4	Burma		2,079.00		15,226.10				17,305.10 −310.00
Committee total					2,079.00		15,226.10				16,995.10

EMILY MURRY, May 4, 2015.

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE UNITED KINGDOM, JORDAN, KUWAIT, IRAQ, SAUDI ARABIA, ISRAEL, AND SPAIN, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 27 AND APR. 3, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. John Boehner	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	(3)					540.00
Hon. Rodney Frelinghuysen	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	(3)					540.00
Hon. John Kline	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	(3)					540.00
Hon. Devin Nunes	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	(3)					540.00
Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	(3)					540.00
Hon. Ken Calvert	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	(3)					540.00
Hon. Mike Simpson	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	(3)					540.00
Hon. Tom Cole	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	(3)					540.00
Hon. Martha Roby	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	(3)					540.00
Hon. George Holding	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	(3)					540.00
Mike Sommers	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	(3)	890.00				1,430.00
Jen Stewart	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	(3)					540.00
Michael Ricci	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	(3)					540.00
Jeff Shockey	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	(3)					540.00
Rob Blair	3/27	3/28	United Kingdom		540.00	(3)					540.00
Hon. John Boehner	3/28	3/30	Jordan		586.00	(3)					586.00
Hon. Rodney Frelinghuysen	3/28	3/30	Jordan		586.00	(3)					586.00
Hon. John Kline	3/28	3/30	Jordan		586.00	(3)					586.00
Hon. Devin Nunes	3/28	3/30	Jordan		586.00	(3)					586.00
Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen	3/28	3/30	Jordan		586.00	(3)					586.00
Hon. Ken Calvert	3/28	3/30	Jordan		586.00	(3)					586.00
Hon. Mike Simpson	3/28	3/30	Jordan		586.00	(3)					586.00
Hon. Tom Cole	3/28	3/30	Jordan		586.00	(3)					586.00
Hon. Martha Roby	3/28	3/30	Jordan		586.00	(3)					586.00
Hon. George Holding	3/28	3/30	Jordan		586.00	(3)	5,885.00				6,471.00
Jen Stewart	3/28	3/30	Jordan		586.00	(3)					586.00
Michael Ricci	3/28	3/30	Jordan		586.00	(3)					586.00
Jeff Shockey	3/28	3/30	Jordan		586.00	(3)					586.00
Rob Blair	3/28	3/30	Jordan		586.00	(3)					586.00
Hon. John Boehner	3/30	3/31	Kuwait		369.00	(3)					369.00
Hon. Rodney Frelinghuysen	3/30	3/31	Kuwait		369.00	(3)					369.00
Hon. John Kline	3/30	3/31	Kuwait		369.00	(3)					369.00
Hon. Devin Nunes	3/30	3/31	Kuwait		369.00	(3)					369.00
Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen	3/30	3/31	Kuwait		369.00	(3)					369.00
Hon. Ken Calvert	3/30	3/31	Kuwait		369.00	(3)					369.00
Hon. Mike Simpson	3/30	3/31	Kuwait		369.00	(3)					369.00
Hon. Tom Cole	3/30	3/31	Kuwait		369.00	(3)					369.00
Hon. Martha Roby	3/30	3/31	Kuwait		369.00	(3)					369.00
Jen Stewart	3/30	3/31	Kuwait		369.00	(3)					369.00
Michael Ricci	3/30	3/31	Kuwait		369.00	(3)					369.00
Jeff Shockey	3/30	3/31	Kuwait		369.00	(3)					369.00
Rob Blair	3/30	3/31	Kuwait		369.00	(3)					369.00
Hon. John Boehner	3/31	4/02	Israel		1,000.00	(3)					1,000.00
Hon. Rodney Frelinghuysen	3/31	4/02	Israel		1,000.00	(3)					1,000.00
Hon. John Kline	3/31	4/02	Israel		1,000.00	(3)					1,000.00
Hon. Devin Nunes	3/31	4/02	Israel		1,000.00	(3)					1,000.00
Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen	3/31	4/02	Israel		1,000.00	(3)					1,000.00
Hon. Ken Calvert	3/31	4/02	Israel		1,000.00	(3)					1,000.00
Hon. Mike Simpson	3/31	4/02	Israel		1,000.00	(3)					1,000.00
Hon. Tom Cole	3/31	4/02	Israel		1,000.00	(3)					1,000.00
Hon. Martha Roby	3/31	4/02	Israel		1,000.00	(3)					1,000.00
Jen Stewart	3/31	4/02	Israel		1,000.00	(3)					1,000.00
Michael Ricci	3/31	4/02	Israel		1,000.00	(3)					1,000.00
Jeff Shockey	3/31	4/02	Israel		1,000.00	(3)					1,000.00
Rob Blair	3/31	4/02	Israel		1,000.00	(3)					1,000.00
Hon. John Boehner	4/02	4/03	Spain		250.00	(3)					250.00
Hon. Rodney Frelinghuysen	4/02	4/03	Spain		250.00	(3)					250.00
Hon. John Kline	4/02	4/03	Spain		250.00	(3)					250.00
Hon. Devin Nunes	4/02	4/03	Spain		250.00	(3)					250.00
Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen	4/02	4/03	Spain		250.00	(3)					250.00
Hon. Ken Calvert	4/02	4/03	Spain		250.00	(3)					250.00
Hon. Mike Simpson	4/02	4/03	Spain		250.00	(3)					250.00
Hon. Tom Cole	4/02	4/03	Spain		250.00	(3)					250.00
Hon. Martha Roby	4/02	4/03	Spain		250.00	(3)					250.00
Jen Stewart	4/02	4/03	Spain		250.00	(3)					250.00
Michael Ricci	4/02	4/03	Spain		250.00	(3)					250.00
Jeff Shockey	4/02	4/03	Spain		250.00	(3)					250.00
Rob Blair	4/02	4/03	Spain		250.00	(3)					250.00
Committee total					37,351.00		6,775.00				44,126.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. JOHN BOEHNER, May 4, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO TUNISIA, UKRAINE, GERMANY, AND FRANCE, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 26 AND APR. 2, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Kevin McCarthy	3/27	3/29	Tunisia		576.00		(3)				576.00
Hon. Mike Conaway	3/27	3/29	Tunisia		576.00		(3)				576.00
Hon. Kay Granger	3/27	3/29	Tunisia		576.00		(3)				576.00
Hon. Fred Upton	3/27	3/29	Tunisia		576.00		(3)				576.00
Hon. Peter Welch	3/27	3/29	Tunisia		576.00		(3)				576.00
Hon. Diane Black	3/27	3/29	Tunisia		576.00		(3)				576.00
Hon. Erik Paulsen	3/27	3/29	Tunisia		576.00		(3)				576.00
Hon. Tom Graves	3/27	3/29	Tunisia		576.00		(3)				576.00
Natalie Buchanan	3/27	3/29	Tunisia		576.00		(3)				576.00
Barrett Karr	3/27	3/29	Tunisia		576.00		(3)				576.00
Kelly Dixon	3/27	3/29	Tunisia		576.00		(3)				576.00
Robert Karem	3/27	3/29	Tunisia		576.00		(3)				576.00
Hon. Kevin McCarthy	3/29	3/31	Ukraine		769.00		(3)				769.00
Hon. Mike Conaway	3/29	3/31	Ukraine		769.00		(3)				769.00
Hon. Kay Granger	3/29	3/31	Ukraine		769.00		(3)				769.00
Hon. Fred Upton	3/29	3/31	Ukraine		769.00		(3)				769.00
Hon. Peter Welch	3/29	3/31	Ukraine		769.00		(3)				769.00
Hon. Diane Black	3/29	3/31	Ukraine		769.00		(3)				769.00
Hon. Erik Paulsen	3/29	3/31	Ukraine		769.00		(3)				769.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO TUNISIA, UKRAINE, GERMANY, AND FRANCE, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 26 AND APR. 2, 2015—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Tom Graves	3/29	3/31	Ukraine		769.00		(3)				769.00
Natalie Buchanan	3/29	3/31	Ukraine		769.00		(3)				769.00
Barrett Karr	3/29	3/31	Ukraine		769.00		(3)				769.00
Kelly Dixon	3/29	3/31	Ukraine		769.00		(3)				769.00
Robert Karem	3/29	3/31	Ukraine		769.00		(3)				769.00
Hon. Kevin McCarthy	3/31	3/31	Germany		N/A		(3)				N/A
Hon. Mike Conaway	3/31	3/31	Germany		N/A		(3)				N/A
Hon. Kay Granger	3/31	3/31	Germany		N/A		(3)				N/A
Hon. Fred Upton	3/31	3/31	Germany		N/A		(3)				N/A
Hon. Peter Welch	3/31	3/31	Germany		N/A		(3)				N/A
Hon. Diane Black	3/31	3/31	Germany		N/A		(3)				N/A
Hon. Erik Paulsen	3/31	3/31	Germany		N/A		(3)				N/A
Hon. Tom Graves	3/31	3/31	Germany		N/A		(3)				N/A
Natalie Buchanan	3/31	3/31	Germany		N/A		(3)				N/A
Barrett Karr	3/31	3/31	Germany		N/A		(3)				N/A
Kelly Dixon	3/31	3/31	Germany		N/A		(3)				N/A
Robert Karem	3/31	3/31	Germany		N/A		(3)				N/A
Hon. Kevin McCarthy	3/31	4/2	France		937.00		(3)				937.00
Hon. Mike Conaway	3/31	4/2	France		937.00		(3)				937.00
Hon. Kay Granger	3/31	4/2	France		937.00		(3)				937.00
Hon. Fred Upton	3/31	4/2	France		937.00		(3)				937.00
Hon. Peter Welch	3/31	4/2	France		937.00		(3)				937.00
Hon. Diane Black	3/31	4/2	France		937.00		(3)				937.00
Hon. Erik Paulsen	3/31	4/2	France		937.00		(3)				937.00
Hon. Tom Graves	3/31	4/2	France		937.00		(3)				937.00
Natalie Buchanan	3/31	4/2	France		937.00		(3)				937.00
Barrett Karr	3/31	4/2	France		937.00		(3)				937.00
Kelly Dixon	3/31	4/2	France		937.00		(3)				937.00
Robert Karem	3/31	4/2	France		937.00		(3)				937.00
Committee total					27,384						27,384

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. KEVIN McCARTHY, May 1, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO CAMBODIA, VIETNAM, BURMA, KOREA, AND JAPAN, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 26 AND APR. 4, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Hon. Charles Rangel	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Hon. Sander Levin	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Hon. Anna Eshoo	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Hon. Zoe Lofgren	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Hon. Mike Thompson	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Hon. Doris Matsui	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Hon. Dan Kildee	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Hon. Mark Takai	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Wyndee Parker	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Katherine Monge	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Drew Hammill	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Kate Knudson Wolters	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Bina Surgeon	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Rachel Klay	3/28	3/30	Cambodia		622.00		(3)				622.00
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Hon. Sander Levin	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Hon. Charles Rangel	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Hon. Anna Eshoo	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Hon. Zoe Lofgren	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Hon. Mike Thompson	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Hon. Doris Matsui	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Hon. Michael Fitzpatrick	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Hon. Dan Kildee	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Hon. Mark Takai	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Wyndee Parker	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Katherine Monge	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Drew Hammill	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Kate Knudson Wolters	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Bina Surgeon	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Rachel Klay	3/30	4/1	Vietnam		555.45		(3)				555.45
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Hon. Charles Rangel	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Hon. Sander Levin	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Hon. Anna Eshoo	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Hon. Zoe Lofgren	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Hon. Mike Thompson	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Hon. Doris Matsui	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Hon. Michael Fitzpatrick	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Hon. Dan Kildee	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Hon. Mark Takai	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Wyndee Parker	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Katherine Monge	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Drew Hammill	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Kate Knudson Wolters	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Bina Surgeon	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Rachel Klay	4/1	4/1	Burma				(3)				
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Hon. Charles Rangel	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Hon. Sander Levin	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Hon. Anna Eshoo	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Hon. Zoe Lofgren	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Hon. Mike Thompson	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Hon. Doris Matsui	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Hon. Michael Fitzpatrick	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Hon. Dan Kildee	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Hon. Mark Takai	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Wyndee Parker	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO CAMBODIA, VIETNAM, BURMA, KOREA, AND JAPAN, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 26 AND APR. 4, 2015—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Katherine Monge	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Drew Hammill	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Kate Knudson Wolters	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Bina Surgeon	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Rachel Klay	4/1	4/3	Korea		706.00		(3)				706.00
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	4/3	4/4	Japan		338.00		(3)				338.00
Hon. Charles Rangel	4/3	4/4	Japan		338.00		(3)				338.00
Hon. Sander Levin	4/3	4/4	Japan		338.00		(3)				338.00
Hon. Anna Eshoo	4/3	4/4	Japan		338.00		(3)				338.00
Hon. Zoe Lofgren	4/3	4/4	Japan		338.00		(3)				338.00
Hon. Mike Thompson	4/3	4/4	Japan		338.00		(3)				338.00
Hon. Doris Matsui	4/3	4/4	Japan		338.00		(3)				338.00
Hon. Michael Fitzpatrick	4/3	4/4	Japan		338.00		(3)				338.00
Hon. Dan Kildee	4/3	4/4	Japan		338.00		(3)				338.00
Hon. Mark Takai	4/3	4/4	Japan		338.00		(3)				338.00
Wyndee Parker	4/3	4/4	Japan		339.00		(3)				339.00
Katherine Monge	4/3	4/4	Japan		339.00		(3)				339.00
Drew Hammill	4/3	4/4	Japan		339.00		(3)				339.00
Kate Knudson Wolters	4/3	4/4	Japan		339.00		(3)				339.00
Bina Surgeon	4/3	4/4	Japan		339.00		(3)				339.00
Rachel Klay	4/3	4/4	Japan		339.00		(3)				339.00
Committee total					$34,927.20						$34,927.20

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. NANCY PELOSI, May 1, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Collin C. Peterson	1/29	2/1	Panama		789.00		160.00		611.48		1,560.48
Committee total					789.00		160.00		611.48		1,560.48

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Magan Milam Rosenbusch	1/11	1/13	Romania		251.10						251.10
	1/13	1/15	Poland		568.12						568.12
	1/15	1/17	Ukraine		741.38						741.38
Commercial airfare							2,721.50				2,721.50
Paul Terry	1/11	1/13	Romania		251.10						251.10
	1/13	1/15	Poland		568.21						568.21
	1/15	1/17	Ukraine		741.38						741.38
Commercial airfare							2,620.82				2,620.82
Hon. Rodney Frelinghuysen	3/6	3/9	Egypt		1,151.45				284.90		1,436.35
	3/9	3/10	Cyprus		257.79				284.77		542.56
	3/10	3/12	Ukraine		738.59				222.69		961.28
	3/12	3/15	United Kingdom		1,743.18				878.98		2,622.16
Hon. Peter Visclosky	3/6	3/9	Egypt		1,151.45				284.90		1,436.35
	3/9	3/10	Cyprus		257.79				284.77		542.56
	3/10	3/12	Ukraine		738.59				222.69		961.28
	3/12	3/15	United Kingdom		1,743.18				878.98		2,622.16
Hon. Kay Granger	3/6	3/9	Egypt		1,151.45				284.90		1,436.35
	3/9	3/10	Cyprus		257.79				284.77		542.56
	3/10	3/12	Ukraine		738.59				222.69		961.28
	3/12	3/15	United Kingdom		1,162.12				878.98		2,041.10
Commercial airfare							1,034.80				1,034.80
Hon. Ken Calvert	3/6	3/9	Egypt		1,151.45				284.90		1,436.35
	3/9	3/10	Cyprus		257.79				284.77		542.56
	3/10	3/12	Ukraine		738.59				222.69		961.28
	3/12	3/15	United Kingdom		1,743.18				878.98		2,622.16
Hon. John Carter	3/6	3/9	Egypt		1,151.45				284.90		1,436.35
	3/9	3/10	Cyprus		257.79				284.77		542.56
	3/10	3/12	Ukraine		738.59				222.69		961.28
	3/12	3/15	United Kingdom		1,743.18				878.98		2,622.16
Hon. Steve Womack	3/6	3/9	Egypt		1,151.45				284.90		1,436.35
	3/9	3/10	Cyprus		257.79				284.77		542.56
	3/10	3/12	Ukraine		738.59				222.69		961.28
	3/12	3/15	United Kingdom		1,743.18				878.98		2,622.16
Hon. Marcy Kaptur	3/6	3/9	Egypt		1,151.45				284.90		1,436.35
	3/9	3/10	Cyprus		257.79				284.77		542.56
	3/10	3/12	Ukraine		738.59				222.69		961.28
	3/12	3/15	United Kingdom		1,162.12				878.98		2,041.10
Commercial airfare							1,636.70				1,636.70
Hon. Steve Israel	3/10	3/12	Ukraine		738.59				222.69		961.28
	3/12	3/14	United Kingdom		1,162.12				878.98		2,041.10
Commercial airfare							6,130.10				6,130.10
Paul Juola	3/6	3/9	Egypt		1,151.45				284.90		1,436.35
	3/9	3/10	Cyprus		257.79				284.77		542.56
	3/10	3/12	Ukraine		738.59				222.69		961.28
	3/12	3/15	United Kingdom		1,743.18				878.98		2,622.16
Tim Prince	3/6	3/9	Egypt		1,151.45				284.90		1,436.35
	3/9	3/10	Cyprus		257.79				284.77		542.56
	3/10	3/12	Ukraine		738.59				222.69		961.28

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	3/12	3/15	United Kingdom		1,743.18				878.98		2,622.16
Brooke Boyer	3/6	3/9	Egypt		1,151.45				284.90		1,436.35
	3/9	3/10	Cyprus		257.79				284.77		542.56
	3/10	3/12	Ukraine		738.59				222.69		961.28
	3/12	3/15	United Kingdom		1,743.18				878.98		2,622.16
Kaitlyn Eisner-Poor	3/6	3/9	Egypt		1,151.45				284.90		1,436.35
	3/9	3/10	Cyprus		257.79				284.77		542.56
	3/10	3/12	Ukraine		738.59				222.69		961.28
	3/12	3/15	United Kingdom		1,743.18				878.98		2,622.16
Hon. Harold Rogers	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345.36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749.00				1,262.07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
Hon. Mike Simpson	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345.36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749.00				1,262.07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
Hon. Ander Crenshaw	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345.36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749.00				1,262.07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
Hon. Tom Cole	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345.36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749.00				1,262.07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
Hon. Diaz Balart	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345,36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749,00				1,262,07		2,011.07
Commercial airfare							1,382.90				1,382,90
Hon. Chris Stewart	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345,36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749,00				1,262,07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
Hon. David Jolly	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345,36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749,00				1,262,07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
Hon. Sanford Bishop	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345,36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749,00				1,262,07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
Hon. Charles Dutch Ruppersberger	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345,36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749,00				1,262,07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
Hon. Henry Cuellar	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345,36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749,00				1,262,07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
William Smith	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345,36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749,00				1,262,07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
Dale Oak	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345,36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749,00				1,262,07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
B.G. Wright	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345,36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749,00				1,262,07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
Anne Marie Chotvacs	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345,36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749,00				1,262,07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
Steve Marchese	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345.36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749.00				1,262.07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
Clelia Alvarado	3/6	3/9	United Kingdom		1,622.76				722.60		2,345.36
	3/9	3/12	Morocco		749.00				1,262.07		2,011.07
	3/12	3/12	Tunisia						25.14		25.14
	3/12	3/15	France		1,355.00				1,044.93		2,399.93
Hon. Chaka Fattah	3/10	3/11	Israel		439.00				2,652.54		3,091.54
Commercial airfare							2,786.36				2,786.36
Hon. Nita Lowey	3/7	3/10	India		906.00						906.00
	3/10	3/13	China		911.00						911.00
	3/13	3/15	Taiwan		546.00						546.00
Commercial airfare							1,135.00				1,135.00
Erin Kolodjeski	3/7	3/10	India		906.00						906.00
	3/10	3/13	China		911.00						911.00
	3/13	3/16	Taiwan		648.00						648.00
Commercial airfare							1,094.80				1,094.80
Jennifer Hing	3/6	3/10	Bahrain		1,022.22				142.92		1,165.14
	3/10	3/13	Jordan		1,066.23				264.65		1,330.88
Commercial airfare							12,012.00				12,012.00
Megan Milam Rosenbusch	3/6	3/10	Bahrain		1,022.22				142.92		1,165.14
	3/10	3/13	Jordan		1,066.23				264.65		1,330.88
Commercial airfare							12,012.00				12,012.00
Ground transportation							105.44				105.44
Tom O'Brien	3/6	3/10	Bahrain		1,022.22				142.92		1,165.14
	3/10	3/13	Jordan		1,066.23				264.65		1,330.88
Commercial airfare							12,012.00				12,012.00
Andrew Cooper	3/6	3/10	Bahrain		1,022.22				142.92		1,165.14
	3/10	3/13	Jordan		1,066.23				264.65		1,330.88
Commercial airfare							12,012.00				12,012.00
Ground transportation							95.06				95.06
Committee total					118,554.95		68,791.48		71,575.00		258,921.43

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. HAROLD ROGERS, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Adam Kinzinger	1/29	1/31	Panama		526.00		569.35		611.48		1,706.83
Hon. Markwayne Mullin	1/29	2/1	Panama		789.00		160.00		611.48		1,560.48
Hon. Marsha Blackburn	2/13	2/18	England		1,808.54		1,098.10		455.40		3,362.04
Jessica Wilkerson	2/13	2/18	England		2,069.28		1,035.00				3,104.28
Hon. John Shimkus	3/8	3/12	Lithuania		826.72		8,003.90		963.84		9,794.46
Committee total					6,019.54		10,866.35		2,642.20		19,528.09

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. FRED UPTON, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Robert Dold	1/29	2/1	Panama		665.72		(3)		771.48		1,437.20
Hon. Luke Messer	3/7	3/10	India		906.00		(3)				906.00
Hon. Luke Messer	3/10	3/13	China		911.00		(3)				911.00
Hon. Luke Messer	3/13	3/15	Taiwan		546.00		1,135.00				1,681.00
Committee total					3,028.72		1,135.00		771.48		4,935.20

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. JEB HENSARLING, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Gregory Meeks	2/14	2/15	Georgia		305.00		(3)				305.00
	2/15	2/17	Singapore		914.00		(3)				914.00
	2/17	2/18	Malaysia		274.58		(3)				274.58
	2/18	2/21	Japan		1,214.51		344.43				1,558.94
Sophia Lafargue	2/14	2/15	Georgia		305.00		(3)				305.00
	2/15	2/17	Singapore		844.00		(3)				844.00
	2/17	2/18	Malaysia		261.64		(3)				261.64
	2/18	2/21	Japan		1,214.51		344.43				1,558.94
Thomas M. Hill	3/09	3/10	Belgium		294.59		4,004.30				4,298.89
	3/10	3/12	Latvia		448.31						448.31
	3/12	3/14	Poland		550.13						550.13
Timothy Mulvey	3/09	3/10	Belgium		294.59		4,039.30				4,333.89
	3/10	3/12	Latvia		448.31						448.31
	3/12	3/14	Poland		550.13						550.13
Douglas Seay	2/15	2/18	Poland		825.00		5,784.20				6,609.20
Kyle Parker	2/15	2/17	Poland		562.10		7,127.70				7,689.80
	2/19	2/21	Belgium		633.67						633.67
	2/17	2/19	Germany		639.17						639.17
Amy Porter	1/18	1/20	Democratic Rep. of Congo		837.00		15,785.00				16,622.00
Worku Gachou	1/18	1/20	Democratic Rep. of Congo		827.00		15,785.00				16,612.00
Hon. Tom Emmer	2/24	2/24	Guantanamo Bay, Cuba				(3)				
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	3/12	3/13	Kuwait		393.00		15,728.00			* 575.00	16,696.00
	3/13	3/16	Egypt		1,353.50					* 4,636.00	5,989.50
Hon. Reid Ribble	3/10	3/11	UK		369.00		20,560.20				20,929.20
	3/12	3/13	Kuwait		393.00						283.00
	3/13	3/15	Egypt		725.00						725.00
Paul Behrends	3/12	3/13	Kuwait		393.00		17,593.80				17,986.80
	3/13	3/16	Egypt		1,353.50						1,353.50
Hon. Darrell Issa	3/19	3/22	Belgium		1,134.00		2,410.20				3,544.20
Hon. Tom Marino	3/19	3/23	UK		1,656.59		1,026.60				2,683.19
Hon. Eliot Engel	2/06	2/08	Germany		819.85		(3)				819.85
	2/06	2/06	Tunisia				(3)				
Hon. Edward R. Royce	3/07	3/10	India		831.00		(3)			* 7,175.07	8,006.07
	3/10	3/13	China		911.00		(3)			* 7,770.05	8,681.05
	3/13	3/15	Taiwan		495.00		1,135.00			* 6,586.60	8,216.00
Hon. Matthew Salmon	3/07	3/10	India		906.00		(3)				906.00
	3/10	3/13	China		911.00		(3)				911.00
	3/13	3/15	Taiwan		546.00		1,135.00				1,681.00
Hon. Ami Bera	3/07	3/10	India		746.00		(3)				746.00
	3/10	3/13	China		751.00		(3)				751.00
	3/13	3/15	Taiwan		386.00		1,135.00				1,521.00
Shelley Su	3/07	3/10	India		881.00		(3)				881.00
	3/10	3/13	China		841.00		(3)				841.00
	3/13	3/16	Taiwan		501.00		1,094.80				1,595.00
Jennifer Hendrixson White	3/07	3/10	India		843.00		(3)				843.00
	3/10	3/13	China		817.00		(3)				817.00
	3/13	3/15	Taiwan		556.00		1,097.00				1,653.70
Elizabeth Heng	3/07	3/10	India		852.00		(3)				852.00
	3/10	3/13	China		911.00		(3)				911.00
	3/13	3/16	Taiwan		587.00		986.00				1,573.80
Hunter Strupp	3/07	3/10	India		856.00		(3)				856.00
	3/10	3/13	China		861.00		(3)				861.00
	3/13	3/16	Taiwan		819.00		1,097.70				1,916.70
Peter Freeman	3/07	3/10	India		856.00		(3)				856.00
	3/10	3/13	China		861.00		(3)				861.00
	3/13	3/16	Taiwan		819.00		1,097.70				1,916.70
Greg Simpkins	2/15	2/20	Ethiopia		648.00		6,259.32				6,907.32
	2/16	2/20	South Sudan		1,414.50					*300.00	1,714.50
Travis Adkins	2/15	2/20	Ethiopia		653.00		6,259.32				6,912.32
	2/16	2/20	South Sudan		1,455.00						1,455.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Committee total					43,238.18		131,831.50			* 27,042.72	202,112.40

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.
* Indicates Delegation Costs.

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MICHAEL T. McCAUL, Chairman, Apr. 28, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Bob Goodlatte	3/06	3/15	*		869.00		(3)		2,472.00		3,341.00
Hon. Jim Sensenbrenner	3/06	3/15	*		869.00		(3)		2,472.00		3,341.00
Hon. Tom Marino	3/06	3/15	*		869.00		(3)		2,472.00		3,341.00
Hon. Jerrold Nadler	3/06	3/15	*		869.00		(3)		2,472.00		3,341.00
Hon. Zoe Lofgren	3/06	3/15	*		869.00		(3)		2,472.00		3,341.00
Hon. David Cicilline	3/06	3/15	*		869.00		(3)		2,472.00		3,341.00
Susan Jensen	3/06	3/15	*		869.00		(3)		2,472.00		3,341.00
Shelley Husband	3/06	3/15	*		869.00		(3)		2,472.00		3,341.00
Allison Halataei	3/06	3/15	*		869.00		(3)		2,472.00		3,341.00
George Fishman	3/06	3/15	*		869.00		(3)		2,472.00		3,341.00
John Manning	3/06	3/15	*		869.00		(3)		2,472.00		3,341.00
Committee total					9,559.00				27,192.00		36,751.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.
[4] Countries visited: Ireland, Turkey, Cypress, Jordan, Israel and the West Bank.

HON. BOB GOODLATTE, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Pete Sessions	3/7	3/10	India		906.00		(3)				906.00
	3/10	3/13	China		911.00		(3)				911.00
	3/13	3/15	Taiwan		546.00		(3)				546.00
Committee total					2,363.00						2,363.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. PETE SESSIONS, Chairman, Apr. 21, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Steve Chabot	3/10	3/12	Chile		473.00						473.00
	3/12	3/13	Argentina		342.00				* 273.20		615.20
	3/13	3/14	Uruguay		247.00				* 1,907.00		2,154.00
Commercial airfare							11,020.49				11,020.49
Kevin Fitzpatrick	3/10	3/12	Chile		473.00						473.00
	3/12	3/13	Argentina		342.00				* 273.20		615.20
	3/13	3/14	Uruguay		247.00				* 1,907.00		2,154.00
Commercial airfare							12,027.39				12,027.39
Committee total					2,124.00		23,047.88		4,360.40		29,532.28

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
*Transportation and overtime and translator incurred by each traveler.

HON. STEVE CHABOT, Chairman, Apr. 22, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JEFF MILLER, Chairman, Apr. 29, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Paul Ryan	2/14	2/15	Georgia		305.00				1,561.10		1,866.10
	2/15	2/17	Singapore		914.00				2,277.51		3,191.51
	2/17	2/18	Malaysia		274.59				4,723.52		4,998.10
	2/18	2/21	Japan		1,021.20		344.33		15,761.86		17,127.40
Hon. David G. Reichert	2/14	2/15	Georgia		305.00						305.00
	2/15	2/17	Singapore		844.00						844.00
	2/17	2/18	Malaysia		261.64						261.64
	2/18	2/21	Japan		1,021.21		344.33				1,365.54
Hon. Vern Buchanan	2/14	2/15	Georgia		305.00						305.00
	2/15	2/17	Singapore		914.00						914.00
	2/17	2/18	Malaysia		274.58						274.58
	2/18	2/21	Japan		1,021.21		344.33				1,365.54
Hon. Adrian Smith	2/14	2/15	Georgia		305.00						305.00
	2/15	2/17	Singapore		914.00						914.00
	2/17	2/18	Malaysia		274.58						274.58
	2/18	2/21	Japan		1,021.20		344.33				1,365.53
Hon. Patrick J. Tiberi	2/14	2/15	Georgia		305.00						305.00
	2/15	2/17	Singapore		844.00						844.00
	2/17	2/18	Malaysia		261.64						261.64
	2/18	2/21	Japan		519.40		6,245.13				6,764.53
Angela Ellard	2/14	2/15	Georgia		248.00						248.00
	2/15	2/17	Singapore		787.00						787.00
	2/17	2/18	Malaysia		204.64						204.64
	2/18	2/21	Japan		964.20		344.33				1,308.53
Geoff Antell	2/14	2/15	Georgia		277.50						277.50
	2/15	2/17	Singapore		816.50						816.50
	2/17	2/18	Malaysia		234.14						234.14
	2/18	2/21	Japan		993.70		344.33				1,338.03
Steve Claeys	2/14	2/15	Georgia		277.50						277.50
	2/15	2/17	Singapore		816.50						816.50
	2/17	2/18	Malaysia		234.14						234.14
	2/18	2/21	Japan		993.70		344.33				1,338.03
Brendan Buck	2/14	2/15	Georgia		223.25						223.25
	2/15	2/17	Singapore		762.25						762.25
	2/17	2/18	Malaysia		179.89						179.89
	2/18	2/21	Japan		939.45		344.33				1,283.78
Austin Smythe	2/14	2/15	Georgia		207.50						207.50
	2/15	2/17	Singapore		746.50						746.50
	2/17	2/18	Malaysia		181.64						181.64
	2/18	2/21	Japan		906.20		344.33				1,250.53
Hon. Charles W. Boustany	2/14	2/15	Georgia		305.00						305.00
	2/15	2/17	Singapore		914.00						914.00
	2/17	2/18	Malaysia		274.58						274.58
	2/18	2/21	Japan		1,021.21		344.33				1,365.54
Hon. George Holding	3/7	3/10	India		906.00						906.00
	3/10	3/13	China		911.00						911.00
	3/13	3/15	Taiwan		546.00		1,135.00				1,681.00
Hon. Sander M. Levin	2/14	2/15	Colombia		2,069.00		222.97		4,595.00		6,886.97
	2/15	2/15	Panama		99.00				885.00		984.00
Committee total					29,946.25		11,046.40		29,803.99		70,796.63

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. PAUL RYAN, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Michael Pompeo	2/6	2/6	Africa								
	2/6	2/8	Europe		819.85						
							(3)				819.85
Hon. Devin Nunes	2/6	2/8	Middle East		710.81						
	2/8	2/9	Asia		388.00						
							(3)				1,098.81
Jeffrey Shockey	2/6	2/8	Middle East		710.81						
	2/8	2/9	Asia		388.00						
							(3)				1,098.81
Hon. Devin Nunes	2/18	2/21	Asia		771.02						
Commercial airfare							13,752.20				14,523.22
Hon. Michael Quigley	3/10	3/13	Middle East		1,455,00						
Commercial airfare							13,337.10				14,792.10
Amanda Rogers Thorpe	3/10	3/13	Middle East		1,455,00						
Commercial airfare							13,604.70				15,059.70
Hon. Devin Nunes	3/27	3/28	Europe		543.21						
	3/28	3/30	Middle East		710.82						
	3/30	3/30	Middle East								
	3/30	3/31	Middle East		368.94						
	3/31	3/31	Middle East								
	3/31	4/2	Middle East		1,000,00						
	4/2	4/3	Europe		233.26						

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
							(3)				2,856.23
Jeffrey Shockey	3/27	3/28	Europe		543.21						
	3/28	3/30	Middle East		710.82						
	3/30	3/30	Middle East								
	3/30	3/31	Middle East		368.94						
	3/31	3/31	Middle East								
	3/31	4/2	Middle East		1,000.00						
	4/2	4/3	Europe		233.26						
							(3)				2,856.23
Committee total					12,410.95		40,694.00				53,104.95

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HON. DEVIN NUNES, Apr. 28, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. PAUL RYAN, Chairman, Apr. 20, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, U.S. COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Janice Helwig	2/9	3/31	Austria	Euro	15,830.00		11,675.50				27,505.50
Robert Hand	2/16	2/21	Austria	Euro	1,348.58		1,775.40				3,123.98
Hon. Chris Smith	2/18	2/20	Austria	Euro	337.15		4,705.10				5,042.25
Mark Milosch	2/18	2/21	Austria	Euro	674.29		1,810.40				2,484.69
Nathaniel Hurd	2/18	2/21	Austria	Euro	674.29		1,775.50				2,449.79
David Kostelancik	2/25	3/3	Tajikistan	Somoni	1,486.00		6,626.80				8,112.80
Mischa Thompson	3/17	3/24	Belgium	Euro	2,505.51		1,710.00				4,215.51
			Paris	Euro							
Alex Johnson	3/24	3/27	Serbia	Dinar	600.00		3,782.10				4,382.10
Commitee total					23,455.82		33,860.80				57,316.62

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, Chairman, Apr. 29, 2015.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1419. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Subpart J — Value-Added Producer Grant Program (RIN: 0570-AA79) received May 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1420. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting the Export-Import Bank's export report for April 2015; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1421. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Annual Report on Federal Government Energy Management and Conservation Programs, Fiscal Year 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1422. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 2014 Performance Report to Congress, required by the Animal Generic Drug User Fee Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1423. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Food and Drug Administration's FY 2014 Animal Generic Drug User Fee Act Financial Report, required by the Animal Generic Drug User Fee Act, as amended; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1424. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Food and Drug Administration's FY 2014 Performance Report to Congress for the Animal Drug User Fee Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1425. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Food and Drug Administration's FY 2014 Animal Drug User Fee Act Financial Report, required by the Animal Drug User Fee Act, as amended; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1426. A letter from the Deputy Director, ODRM, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Organ Procurement and Transplantation: Implementation of the HIV Organ Policy Equity Act (RIN: 0906-AB05) received May 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1427. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval of Alabama's Request to Relax the Federal Reid Vapor Pressure Gasoline Volatility Standard for Birmingham, Alabama [EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0905; FRL 9927-16-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS58) received May 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1428. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Prevention of Significant Deterioration Permitting for Greenhouse Gases: Providing Option for Rescission of EPA-Issued Tailoring Rule Step 2 Prevention of Significant Deterioration Permits [EPA-HQ-OAR-2015-0071; FRL-9926-98-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS57) received May 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1429. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Bacillus thuringiensis Cry1A.105 Protein in Soybean; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0454; FRL-9926-23] received May 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1430. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Washington: Infrastructure Requirements for the Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality

Standards [EPA-R10-OAR-2014-0744; FRL-9927-45-Region 10] received May 6, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1431. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2014-0908; FRL-9925-42] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received May 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1432. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide and 2012 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2014-0910] received May 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1433. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Concentration Averaging and Encapsulation Branch Technical Position, Revision 1 received May 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1434. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Census Bureau, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Foreign Trade Regulations (FTR): Reinstatement of Exemptions Related to Temporary Exports, Carnets, and Shipments Under a Temporary Import Bond [Docket No.: 140821699-5179-02] (RIN: 0607-AA53) received May 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1435. A letter from the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction, transmitting the twenty-seventh quarterly report to the Congress on Afghanistan Reconstruction, pursuant to Public Law 110-181, Sec. 1229; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1436. A letter from the Chair, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's Semiannual Report to Congress for the six-month period ending March 31, 2015, as required by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1437. A letter from the Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting the Corporation's FY 2014 annual report, pursuant to Sec. 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1438. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-50, ''Pre-K Student Discipline Amendment Act of 2015'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1439. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-51, ''Health Benefit Exchange Authority Financial Sustainability Amendment Act of 2015'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1440. A letter from the Director, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's FY 2014 annual report, pursuant to Sec. 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1441. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's updated Strategic Plan for the period 2015 through 2019, in accordance with the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1442. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's summary presentation of final rules — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-82; Introduction [Docket No.: FAR 2015-0051, Sequence No.: 2] received May 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1443. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation: Equal Employment and Affirmative Action for Veterans and Individuals with Disabilities [FAC 2005-82; FAR Case 2014-013; Item I; Docket 2014-0013, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM76) received May 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1444. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Review and Justification of Pass-Through Contracts [FAC 2005-82; FAR Case 2013-012; Item II; Docket No.: 2013-0012; Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AM57) received May 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1445. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Enhancements to Past Performance Evaluation Systems [FAC 2005-82; FAR Case 2014-010; Item III; Docket No.: 2014-0010, Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AM79) received May 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1446. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Technical Amendments [FAC 2005-82; Item IV; Docket No.: 2015-0052; Sequence No.: 1] received May 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1447. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-82; Small Entity Compliance Guide [Docket No.: FAR 2015-0051, Sequence No.: 2] received May 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1448. A letter from the Executive Director, Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, transmitting the Commission's audited Seventy-Third Financial Statement for the period of October 1, 2013 to September 30, 2014, pursuant to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act and the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1449. A letter from the Board of Trustees, National Tropical Botanical Garden, transmitting the Garden's financial statements and schedules for the years 2012 and 2013, with the independent auditors' report, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1535; Public Law 105-225, Secs. 153510 and 10101; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1450. A letter from the Chair, United States Sentencing Commission, transmitting the Commission's amendments to the federal sentencing guidelines, policy statements, and official commentary, with reasons for amendment, in conformance with the Commission's statutory obligations under 28 U.S.C. 994(o); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1451. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the General Counsel, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's direct final rule — Patents and Other Intellectual Property Rights [Docket No.: NASA-2015-0001] (RIN: 2700-AE02) received May 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

1452. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft bill, the ''Department of Veterans Affairs Purchased Health Care Streamlining and Modernization Act''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1453. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Corrections to the North American Free Trade Agreement Uniform Regulations [CBP Dec. 15-07] (RIN: 1515-AE04) received May 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1454. A letter from the Deputy Director, ODRM, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Medicare Program; Changes to the Requirements for Part D Prescribers [CMS-6107-IFC] (RIN: 0938-AS60) received May 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Armed Services. Supplemental report on H.R. 1735. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–102, Pt. 2).

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2250. A bill making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes (Rept. 114–110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 255. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military constructions, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 36) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2048) to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes; and providing

for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (Rept. 114–111). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself and Mr. HARRIS):

H.R. 2247. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide for transparent testing to assess the transition under the Medicare fee-for-service claims processing system from the ICD-9 to the ICD-10 standard, 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 Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. LANCE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 2248. A bill to provide that service of the members of the organization known as the United States Cadet Nurse Corps during World War II constituted active military service for purposes of laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed 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 Ms. GABBARD (for herself, Mr. TAKAI, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 2249. A bill to amend title IV of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 to restore Medicaid coverage for citizens of the Freely Associated States lawfully residing in the United States under the Compacts of Free Association between the Government of the United States and the Governments of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 2251. A bill to prohibit the National Telecommunications and Information Administration from relinquishing responsibilities with respect to Internet domain name functions unless it certifies that it has received a proposal for such relinquishment that meets certain criteria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HURD of Texas (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.R. 2252. A bill to clarify the effective date of certain provisions of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida (for herself and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 2253. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend the application of the Medicare payment rate floor to primary care services furnished under Medicaid and to apply the rate floor to additional providers of primary care services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 2254. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include certain Federal positions within the definition of law enforcement officer for retirement purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas):

H.R. 2255. A bill to make participation in the American Community Survey voluntary, except with respect to certain basic questions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BENISHEK:

H.R. 2256. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit an annual report on the Veterans Health Administration and the furnishing of hospital care, medical services, and nursing home care by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 2257. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the reproductive treatment provided to certain disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUCK (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. COOK, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 2258. A bill to amend section 320301 of title 54, United States Code, to modify the authority of the President of the United States to declare national monuments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RIGELL (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mr. BABIN):

H.R. 2259. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to provide that a member of the armed forces and the spouse of that member shall have the same rights regarding the receipt of firearms at the location of any duty station of the member; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. POLIS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. BASS, Mr. MEEKS, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California):

H.R. 2260. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to provide leave because of the death of a son or daughter; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE (for himself, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. BABIN):

H.R. 2261. A bill to facilitate the continued development of the commercial remote sensing industry and protect national security; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. MCCARTHY (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. POSEY, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. BABIN, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. MOOLENAAR):

H.R. 2262. A bill to facilitate a pro-growth environment for the developing commercial space industry by encouraging private sector investment and creating more stable and predictable regulatory conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. BABIN):

H.R. 2263. A bill to rename the Office of Space Commerce and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2264. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish a space-available transportation priority for veterans of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected, permanent disability rated as total; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 2265. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the work opportunity credit for hiring veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Ms. HAHN, Ms. MENG, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. TAKAI, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. BERA, and Ms. TSONGAS):

H.R. 2266. A bill to extend the low-interest refinancing provisions under the Local Development Business Loan Program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York (for himself and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 2267. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to provide an exception to the avoidance of transactions by bankruptcy trustee under section 548 where the transaction was a good faith payment by a parent of post secondary education tuition for that parent's child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 2268. A bill to end the use of corporal punishment in schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FARR, Mr. POLIS, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 2269. A bill to expand the workforce of veterinarians specialized in the care and conservation of wild animals and their ecosystems, and to develop educational programs focused on wildlife and zoological veterinary medicine; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. HECK of Washington (for himself, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. COLE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HONDA, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 2270. A bill to redesignate the Nisqually National Wildlife Refuge, located in the State of Washington, as the Billy

Frank Jr. Nisqually National Wildlife Refuge, to establish the Medicine Creek Treaty National Historic Site within the wildlife refuge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina):

H.R. 2271. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act with respect to critical electric infrastructure security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. JORDAN):

H.R. 2272. A bill to amend section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, to require that the annual budget submissions of the Presidents include the total dollar amount requested for intelligence or intelligence related activities of each element of the Government engaged in such activities; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 2273. A bill to amend the Colorado River Storage Project Act to authorize the use of the active capacity of the Fontenelle Reservoir; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 2274. A bill to authorize the National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 2275. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs the Veterans Economic Opportunity and Transition Administration and to improve employment services for veterans by consolidating various programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. POSEY, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):

H.R. 2276. A bill to establish a moratorium on oil and gas-related seismic activities off the coastline of the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 2277. A bill to prohibit employers from compelling or coercing any person to authorize access to a protected computer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 2278. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the diversity immigrant program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 2279. A bill to establish a moratorium on oil and gas-related seismic activities off the coastline of the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 2280. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to direct the Administrator of General Services to incorporate bird-safe building materials and design features into public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 2281. A bill to provide for the elimination of the Department of Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 2282. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the enrollment of veterans in certain courses of education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed 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 Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIMES, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 2283. A bill to require face to face purchases of ammunition, to require licensing of ammunition dealers, and to require reporting regarding bulk purchases of ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2284. A bill to provide for the retention and future use of certain land in Point Spencer, Alaska, to support the mission of the Coast Guard, to convey certain land in Point Spencer to the Bering Straits Native Corporation, to convey certain land in Point Spencer to the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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 Georgia:

H.J. Res. 50. A joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the Health Care Compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H. Res. 254. A resolution expressing the condolences of the House of Representatives on the death of the Honorable James Claude Wright, Jr., a Representative from the State of Texas; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H. Res. 256. A resolution expressing support for designation of May as Stroke Awareness Month; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUIZ, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. TORRES, and Ms. SPEIER):

H. Res. 257. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Nurses Week on May 6, 2015, through May 12, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 258. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives supporting the Federal workforce; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself and Mr. NEAL):

H. Res. 259. A resolution expressing support for designation of September 2015 as ''National Brain Aneurysm Awareness Month''; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 2247.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 2248.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE I

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 2249.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. GRAVES of Georgia:

H.R. 2250.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: ''No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made byLaw . . . .'' In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: ''The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . .'' Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2251.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HURD of Texas:

H.R. 2252.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:
H.R. 2253.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution
By Mr. KING of New York:
H.R. 2254.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 6
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. POE of Texas:
H.R. 2255.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution
By Mr. BENISHEK:
H.R. 2256.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. MILLER of Florida:
H.R. 2257.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. BUCK:
H.R. 2258.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
SUCH AS Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill. The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.
By Mr. RIGELL:
H.R. 2259.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The 2nd Amendment of the Constitution of the United States
By Mr. ISRAEL:
H.R. 2260.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution
By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:
H.R. 2261.
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 Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.
By Mr. McCARTHY:
H.R. 2262.
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 Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.
By Mr. ROHRABACHER:
H.R. 2263.
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 Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.
By Mr. BILIRAKIS:
H.R. 2264.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, section 8, clause XII–XIV of the Constitution of the United States, which gives Congress the authority to:
To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;
To provide and maintain a Navy;
To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;
By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:
H.R. 2265.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Amendment XVI to th U.S. Constitution.
By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:
H.R. 2266.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Art. 1, Sec. 8 ''The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.''
By Mr. COLLINS of New York:
H.R. 2267.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. HASTINGS:
H.R. 2268.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to the Congress by Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. HASTINGS:
H.R. 2269.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3
The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among several States, and with Indian Tribes.
By Mr. HECK of Washington:
H.R. 2270.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: ''The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States . . .''
By Mr. LATTA:
H.R. 2271.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;
By Mrs. LUMMIS:
H.R. 2272.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.
By Mrs. LUMMIS:
H.R. 2273.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.
By Mr. LYNCH:
H.R. 2274.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1 section 8 Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. MILLER of Florida:
H.R. 2275.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:
H.R. 2276.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.
By Mr. PERLMUTTER:
H.R. 2277.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Amendment IV
By Mr. POSEY:
H.R. 2278.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which states that Congress has the power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization.
By Mr. POSEY:
H.R. 2279.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
By Mr. QUIGLEY:
H.R. 2280.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Section 8 of Article I of the Constituion
By Mr. ROUZER:
H.R. 2281.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution states that ''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 of Officer thereof.''
By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:
H.R. 2282.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
The above mentioned legislation is based upon the following Section 8 statement:
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 Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:
H.R. 2283.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2284.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.J. Res. 50.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 10, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution:

No State shall, without the Consent of Congress, lay any Duty of Tonnage, keep Troops, or Ships of War in time of Peace, enter into any Agreement or Compact with another State, or with a foreign Power, or engage in War, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent Danger as will not admit of delay.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 36: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 91: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HIMES, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. ESTY, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 93: Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 114: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 140: Mr. FORBES and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 160: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 188: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 201: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 232: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 235: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. YODER, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. FARR, Mr. BLUM, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. FOXX, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 288: Mr. WALZ and Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 290: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 303: Mr. PETERS, Ms. MCSALLY, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 310: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 333: Mr. WALDEN, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. JONES, and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 343: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.

H.R. 353: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 374: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 375: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 411: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 449: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 474: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 483: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 504: Mr. OLSON, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.

H.R. 528: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 532: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 560: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 565: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 571: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 578: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 590: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 604: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 624: Mr. DESAULNIER and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

H.R. 628: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 653: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 662: Mr. MICA.

H.R. 690: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 699: Ms. MOORE and Mr. BOST.

H.R. 702: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.

H.R. 711: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 721: Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LONG, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 723: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 726: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 802: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HIMES, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 815: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 817: Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 835: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 837: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 842: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 845: Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 863: Mr. BENISHEK and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 864: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 866: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 868: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 880: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. NUNES, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 915: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 920: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 923: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. RIGELL.

H.R. 990: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 999: Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 1018: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1057: Mr. COHEN and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 1062: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 1073: Mr. COOK and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 1086: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1114: Mr. BABIN, Mr. BUCK, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 1117: Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 1125: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 1131: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1133: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1151: Mr. PETERS, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 1171: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 1173: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1188: Mr. WOODALL, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1190: Mr. HANNA, Mr. KATKO, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. WALKER, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 1197: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TONKO, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. MOORE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GIBSON, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BLUM, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROSS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1209: Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1221: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 1222: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 1227: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1233: Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 1234: Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 1249: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 1250: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1258: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1269: Mr. CONYERS and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1283: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 1284: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1300: Mr. WALKER, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 1301: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. OLSON, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 1309: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1310: Mr. KATKO and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1331: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1340: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1384: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 1399: Mr. ISRAEL and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1404: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1434: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 1453: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1461: Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 1462: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. GUTHRIE, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 1464: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 1475: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 1478: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 1479: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1482: Mr. YARMUTH and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1504: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 1507: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1515: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1516: Mr. WALZ, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 1517: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1528: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1531: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1532: Mr. KLINE, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 1548: Mr. COHEN, Mr. BEYER, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mrs. Napolitano.

H.R. 1559: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. JOLLY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. BEYER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 1571: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. KIND, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1587: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1599: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MESSER, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 1600: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1602: Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. HAHN, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 1604: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 1608: Mr. NORCROSS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. KIND, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1610: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 1611: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. WALZ, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 1615: Mr. PERRY and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 1634: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 1635: Mr. STEWART and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1637: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
H.R. 1640: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 1644: Mr. BARR, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.
H.R. 1650: Mr. JONES, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 1654: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1655: Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. KEATING, Mr. NUNES, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1657: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1664: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 1669: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1674: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1677: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 1708: Ms. MOORE and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1713: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 1718: Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 1722: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 1734: Mr. BOST and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 1737: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HILL, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MCHENRY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1739: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
H.R. 1742: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1752: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 1767: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
H.R. 1769: Mr. ROTHFUS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, and Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 1773: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 1785: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.
H.R. 1786: Mr. WELCH, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 1814: Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KATKO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1818: Mr. POCAN, Mr. GIBSON, and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 1832: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 1834: Mr. DOLD.
H.R. 1842: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 1846: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. JEFFRIES, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 1848: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 1853: Mr. HARPER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 1854: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1859: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 1884: Miss RICE of New York, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. REED.
H.R. 1901: Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 1902: Mr. CONYERS and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 1911: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 1919: Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 1932: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 1942: Mr. TAKAI, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. TSONGAS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 1948: Mr. HONDA and Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 1978: Ms. LEE and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 1982: Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 1986: Mr. MCHENRY.
H.R. 1989: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 1994: Mr. STEWART, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. DENT.
H.R. 2016: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 2017: Mr. UPTON, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.
H.R. 2025: Mr. RUIZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 2026: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. JONES, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 2042: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 2044: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 2050: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. BEATTY, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 2061: Mr. LONG, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 2066: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 2072: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2089: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2090: Mr. POCAN and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2110: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2123: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 2128: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 2140: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
H.R. 2142: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 2146: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 2156: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2173: Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. NOLAN, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2174: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
H.R. 2191: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 2192: Mr. FARR and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2193: Mr. HONDA and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2201: Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 2210: Mr. OLSON and Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 2213: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 2215: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. MEADOWS.
H.R. 2216: Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2227: Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 2236: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 2241: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.J. Res. 22: Mr. LEWIS, Ms. MENG, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. DELANEY.
H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. GARRETT, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 18: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. ROSKAM.
H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. DENHAM.
H. Res. 12: Mr. BEYER.
H. Res. 28: Mr. NORCROSS and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H. Res. 54: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. LATTA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. NOEM, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. MOULTON.
H. Res. 82: Mr. KILMER.
H. Res. 112: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H. Res. 130: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H. Res. 145: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KEATING, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H. Res. 147: Ms. MENG, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. CICILLINE.
H. Res. 161: Ms. DELBENE.
H. Res. 181: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, and Mr. PERRY.
H. Res. 193: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H. Res. 203: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. RUSH.
H. Res. 206: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H. Res. 209: Mr. HENSARLING.
H. Res. 227: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. KEATING.
H. Res. 232: Mr. POLIS and Ms. NORTON.
H. Res. 233: Mr. HONDA, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. POSEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MARINO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. SALMON, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H. Res. 235: Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 236: Mr. PERRY.
H. Res. 241: Mr. DOLD.
H. Res. 253: Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. HUFFMAN.