



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2015

No. 148

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 8, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN J. DUNCAN, Jr. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

MEDICARE PART B PREMIUM INCREASE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, we take to the floor to deal with the daily reminders of turmoil around the world: the unrest in the Middle East, especially in Syria and ISIS; the sad reality of an unending string of events regarding gun violence.

There is a certain amount of unrest here in the House, as our Republican colleagues right now are trying to

chart a path forward to reconcile differences of opinion within their own ranks that have some spillover effects for us. But in the background, there is a critical issue that we should be focused on that may not command the headlines; but it is, nonetheless, a critically important item.

We are faced with arcane formulas that govern dealing with Medicare—the rates that recipients pay for their services—that have a perverse impact on some of the lowest income seniors. Through no fault of their own, 7.7 million senior citizens are going to be treated very unfairly. These are the 30 percent of Medicare recipients who are going to pay the burden for all Medicare recipients for the cost increases.

We have a provision in place that holds harmless people who get no increase in their Social Security payments, and they are immune from premium increases. But that is not so for the other 30 percent. These are the people who are facing a 52 percent increase in that part B premium, over \$54 a month.

Now, remember, nobody gets an increase in their Social Security, and there is going to be about a \$76 increase per month in the deductible.

A typical Medicare beneficiary pays almost \$5,000 per year for premiums, cost sharing, and other services that aren't covered by insurance. For many, that is not an unreasonable contribution for their health care, but not for everyone.

More than half the beneficiaries have incomes of \$24,150. These 30 percent, the 7.7 million who will pick up the slack for everyone else, are going to be facing a significant impact, given their low incomes. It doesn't actually have to be this way.

There are proposals that are available for Congress to deal with. Representative DINA TITUS, Representative JAN SCHAKOWSKY, and Senator RON WYDEN all have proposals that would

eliminate or minimize the impact on these vulnerable senior citizens.

And, bear in mind, it will also impact the States \$2.3 billion in terms of Medicaid programs, which inevitably will translate into service reductions, again, for some of our most vulnerable.

It is time for Congress to empower negotiators in both parties, in both Chambers to act now. If we get involved with these potential solutions, the costs are going to be far less than if we wait until the next year, and we will be shielding some of our most vulnerable citizens from significant increases at a time when they can ill afford it. This is one area where there is overwhelming support on both sides of the aisle.

I would call upon my friends in the Republican leadership to take a break from this strange process they are going through and debate in the acrimony and the churn. Let's take a break and empower people to solve these problems now. Our senior citizens deserve no less.

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind us of the importance of the month of October as Breast Cancer Awareness Month.

Like any disease that affects people regardless of race, color, creed, or their status in society, cancer not only tests the mental and physical strength of the person fighting the disease, it has a deep and lasting impact on family, friends, and communities.

Currently, more than 100 different types of cancer exist, but, in my humble opinion, none is more wicked than breast cancer. This is most likely because breast cancer is one of the most common and deadly cancers among women.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H6895

In fact, one in eight women in America will be diagnosed with breast cancer in her lifetime. Breast cancer can be a cruel disease. It tears mothers from their children, wives from their husbands, and daughters from their parents.

In 2015, it is anticipated that, in our country alone, more than 40,000 women will die from breast cancer. While women are most at risk, we must remember that this disease does not just affect women; while less common in the United States, 2,350 men are diagnosed with breast cancer each year.

In the past 20 years, there have been incredible advances in the research and medicine surrounding breast cancer, but there is much left to be done. We can't rest until we can prevent or cure this horrible disease.

Again, we have already made huge strides in the fight against breast cancer. Death rates due to breast cancer have been declining since 1989, and women younger than 50 are now less likely to get breast cancer than ever before. This is largely due to the awareness that has been raised on the importance of self-exams and yearly doctor physicals.

However, currently, 29 percent of insured women are still not receiving mammograms; and for women without health insurance, the percentage is even higher, with 68 percent not receiving mammograms.

It is extremely important that we continue to place an emphasis on early detection so that we can catch this disease as early as possible and have the best shot at beating it.

While there are factors like genetics and age that can make someone more susceptible to the disease, breast cancer does not discriminate against education, upbringing, or wealth. From CEOs in New York City to a stay-at-home mom in small town Minnesota, this disease knows no bounds.

I expect that just about everyone who walks these halls and too many to count across our country have been impacted by breast cancer in some way. I am no exception. Fifteen years ago, I lost my sister, Bridget, to breast cancer. Bridget was only 38 years old when she left us. She left behind two beautiful daughters and a husband who loved her.

While her life was a lesson on how to get the most out of each second of every minute of every hour and every day, there is not a day that goes by when I don't wish there could have been a cure for her.

For those who have experienced personal loss and pain from breast cancer, and for everyone who is fighting this disease, we join with you this month not only to raise awareness about breast cancer but to sound a call to action, to strengthen our resolve, and to eradicate this disease once and for all.

In Congress, we can absolutely play a role in this effort. To the extent possible within our constitutional authority, we can and should encourage further advancement of medical research.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Accelerating the End of Breast Cancer Act of 2015, which will establish a commission to work to defeat this disease. The commission will consist of experts in cancer research who will work to identify opportunities and ideas to advance our quest to prevent and cure breast cancer for future generations.

October is a month to raise awareness. We have made progress, and we are making progress in our fight against this unforgiving disease. Let us use this month to rededicate ourselves to our shared goal of eradicating breast cancer once and for all.

WASHINGTON IS OUT OF STEP WITH AMERICA

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, as Donald Trump and Ben Carson have turned up the volume with more and more outrageous statements and policy proposals, Members of Congress have been trying to keep up.

Now, Republicans in the House not only have to play to the small, but extremely vocal, segment of the electorate that feels Washington is "out of step with the American people," but they have another audience to woo—each other—because a lot of our colleagues are currently running for leadership positions.

But is it really Washington that is out of step with America or is it the most vocal, most active, and most vitriolic elements of the Republican base that are out of step with America?

Last week's NBC News/Wall Street Journal poll was pretty startling. It shows in issue after issue that on the positions adopted by the leading GOP candidates, vast majorities of Americans disagree with Republicans. On abortion restrictions, immigration, LGBT equality, racial diversity, and reproductive health, some in the Republican base demand we go back to the Dark Ages. But it is not, in fact, the direction that most Americans want to go.

For most Americans, "Mad Men" was a good TV drama set before racial integration, before the women's movement really took hold, before gays and lesbians dared come out of the closet, and before we removed racial quotas from immigration. But some in the Republican Party aspire to turn it into a reality TV show.

The latest throw-down from the right has been over Planned Parenthood and reimbursing this respected organization for health services it provides to women across the country.

In many cases, Planned Parenthood is the only source of affordable and accessible reproductive health care, contraception, HIV and STD testing, cancer screenings, and basic health care for women.

Under Federal law, our tax dollars cannot pay for abortions, and there are

no credible claims that this is being violated. Under law, abortion is legal in the United States, despite all of the restrictions imposed and proposed by my Republican colleagues. But this goes further than abortion rights and a woman's right to control her own health care and reproduction.

Some Americans here and around the country are, frankly, not too comfortable with the whole family planning thing. In my family, I have two daughters who are brilliant and whom I trust to make decisions for themselves. They were born 8 years apart and not by accident.

My wife and I planned her pregnancies around her career as an investment banker and had our children when we were ready. That is an option that opened the world of opportunity and self-determination to my wife that my mother never had. Puerto Rican women in this country in my mother's day had one thing forced on them by the government, and that was sterilization, period.

So when I hear talk about shutting down the government to appease the far right on Planned Parenthood, I think of the progress we have made from my mother's generation to my wife's generation and now to the world in which my daughters live.

It seems to me that we should not be looking for ways to limit choices women have, to force them into back alleys or across State lines for health care or to treat them as if only wise men in Washington can make decisions for the women of America.

But that desire to turn the clock backwards, to undo the progress of our lifetimes, and to punish America for evolving over time is basically at the heart of the Republican agenda, as driven by their most active and vocal base. Republicans run for office and legislate as if they want gay people back in the closet, as if they want Latinos and Asians to become invisible, as if they wish women were just in the kitchen or in the bedroom, as if we could go back to those golden days before the Civil Rights Act, the Voting Rights Act, Brown v. Board of Education, when everything was separate and some people were more equal than others.

Well, with all due respect to Mr. Carson and Emperor Trump, every poll indicates that the American people are not with them, and that is especially true of young people in America. Dr. Carson must be nostalgic for the anti-Catholic days before John Kennedy was elected because he is now raising doubts that people of certain religions are qualified to serve their country as President.

Senator CRUZ must look at the old days when we turned away refugees from Europe because of their religion, as we did in the 1930s and 1940s when anti-Semitism gripped this country. Now he wants to send Muslims back to die in Syria.

And now there is Donald Trump. He wants to deport about a quarter of the

50 million Latinos in the United States. If mass deportation was good enough for President Eisenhower, he feels it should be good enough for America today.

□ 1015

I will agree with one leading candidate, Jeb Bush, who recently said that “stuff happens.” Stuff does happen. A lot of stuff has happened since the 1950s when I was born and the 1960s when I grew up in America.

Our laws and our culture have evolved to become more inclusive, and we have a more diverse and egalitarian society because of it. Many Republicans call that stuff the problem. I call that stuff progress.

LOSING A GENERATION TO GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am tired. I am tired of, once again, being asked to rise to honor the victims of gun violence.

Not even a month ago, I stood at this very podium on behalf of gun violence victims. With nearly 300 mass shootings in less than 300 days, this Congress has proven that there is no appetite to end gun violence.

I am tired because we will have more moments of silence in honor of gun victims, and then we will have moments of action from leaders working to stop gun violence.

To my colleagues who came here on the platform of caring about children, to my colleagues who came here for peace, to my friends on the left and right of the aisle, can't we own up to our responsibility to stop this violence? Can't we own the fact that we are losing a generation of Americans to gun violence?

Every year, over 100,000 people are shot in America, more than 30,000 of them fatally. This is a crisis that demands more than a moment of silence from Congress.

With every mass shooting, we hear every excuse in the book for inaction: it is a family problem; it is a mental health issue; it is a people problem. Apparently, it is everything but a gun problem. At this point, even our excuses are tired.

Let me share some headlines from my hometown this week:

From Sunday's Chicago Tribune, “Man Killed, 4 Injured in Shootings”;

Monday, CBS Chicago, “One Dead, 11 Wounded in Weekend Shootings Across Chicago”;

Tuesday, Chicago Sun Times, “Man and Woman Shot Near Douglas Park on West Side”;

Wednesday, Chicago Tribune, “One Dead, Eight Wounded in Shootings in Chicago.”

These aren't just headlines. They are deferred dreams and altered realities for countless families. This isn't a Chi-

cago problem, a Newtown problem, or an Oregon problem; it is an American problem.

Today, gun deaths are on pace to be the leading cause of death for Americans aged 15 through 24, not because our kids are leaving the home front for war, but because the home front is becoming a war zone. It is because military-style weapons are flooding our streets. It is because Hadiya Pendleton was in the wrong place at the wrong time, even though she had the right to be in the park. It is because Reverend Pinckney held Bible study, and a journalist and cameraman in Virginia woke up and did their job. It is because a couple of teens wanted to see an Amy Schumer movie.

We have had no votes on legislation to stop this. Mr. Speaker, for all the talk about needing to improve our mental health system, we have yet to take a single vote on a comprehensive mental health bill.

I have had multiple bills that will reduce gun violence; but the simplest one, H.R. 224, will require the Surgeon General to submit to Congress a report on the public health impact of gun violence.

Simple, right? After all, we can't have a conversation about gun violence without data on the death and disability it causes, its mental health effects, its community impact, and its economic costs. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has no appetite for conversations about gun violence. After all, there are A ratings to protect.

The American people are tired, tired of their representatives paying lip-service to tragedies they were elected to help prevent. They are tired of their peace of mind being held hostage by those we should be preventing from ever getting their hands on a gun in the first place.

I am calling everyone out here today. You have talked the talk; it is time to walk the walk. You say that you want to save lives, then do it.

Where is the background check legislation that 90 percent of Americans support, including NRA members?

Bring my bill, H.R. 224, up for a vote, and let the Surgeon General see if gun violence is a threat to public health, which I know it is. Show that you care. Stop pivoting. Stop punting. Start leading.

HIGHWAY BEAUTIFICATION ACT

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise on a lighter note, a very positive note because I represent a very beautiful and positive part of the United States: the central coast of California. This is a place where you hear the towns of Santa Cruz, Monterey, Pacific Grove, the beautiful fertile Salinas Valley, and the magnificent Big Sur coastline, which this poster here shows a photograph of.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today because the House of Representatives, 50 years ago, passed marvelous legislation called the Highway Beautification Act, and that act came about because the States were ruining the aesthetics of America. It was a bill that First Lady Lady Bird Johnson so much supported. In fact, it became known as Lady Bird's bill.

So 50 years ago, this House of Representatives took a bold move to protect and improve our scenic highways. Why are those important?

We sell scenery where I live. This is another picture of a scenic highway in the South, in the Southern States. When you drive through these, you don't see any billboards, you don't see the urban clutter, or, as my friend Ansel Adams said: “You don't see the urban acne that is covering our roads.”

It is Big Business that we are fighting, because the billboard lobby in the United States is very powerful. It was powerful then, but the First Lady was more powerful.

I have a personal story in that because my father, who was in the California State Senate, authored the first legislation to create the California Scenic Highway Program. In 1966, this time of the year, Lady Bird Johnson came all the way to California, not to campaign for a Governor or United States Senator, but to recognize the work that my father, State Senator Fred Farr, had done by dedicating Highway 1 in California, the Big Sur highway, as California's first State scenic highway and perhaps the first State scenic highway in the United States. It was a great day.

What Congress did is they ensured that States would be able to have money to enforce this billboard ban. They would give them more money if they would incorporate in their State, county, and city laws billboard bans.

Now, we have a \$7 billion industry out there, the outdoor advertising industry, and it has been fighting highway beautification for over 50 years. They have been unsuccessful at repealing the Federal law, but they have made incredible progress in being able to find exemptions for it.

They have prevented the 10 percent penalty that States would receive for not adopting highway beautification. They have encouraged localities to change zoning laws in rural areas, calling them commercial or industrial or anything to bypass the act. And they have been able to loosen the rules on repairing old signs, allowing them to remain forever rather than being torn down.

We now have approximately 700,000 billboards in the United States, and yet this is a country that will be celebrating its 100th anniversary of our National Park System. We advertise around the world: “Come to beautiful America. See the scenery of America.” In many places in America, all you see is billboard scenery.

So as we celebrate the 50th anniversary of this act—which is not well

known in Congress, nor in the country, yet is a very significant act because of what it did to empower States and local communities to have the ability to prevent billboards from going up and giving them funds for taking them down and to make sure that people are sensitive to why this is important for our scenery—let's recommit to strengthening the program.

As I said, we sell scenery. We sell watchable wildlife. The economy of the central coast depends on the beauty. As long as the beauty is there, people are going to come to the Carmels and Pacific Groves and Montereys, where California history began.

People are spending more money on watchable wildlife. More people are watching wildlife in America than watch all of the sports combined. It is an unbelievable figure: of all the sports, all the football, all the baseball, all the hockey, basketball, you name it, more people look at wildlife.

So let's protect what is really unique to America, something that God gave us and only we can destroy. These hundreds of thousands of signs are robbing America of its scenic view, of its iconic images that once defined the open road.

I would like to quote Ogden Nash, who summed it up wonderfully in a poem, "Song of the Open Road":

I think that I shall never see,
A billboard as lovely as a tree.
Indeed, unless the billboards fall,
I will never see a tree at all.

Let's help protect America's beauty.
Let's ban billboards.

GTMO TRANSFERS TO COLORADO

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

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Obama administration's announcement last week that the President is considering transferring detainees held at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, into my home State of Colorado.

Closing Guantanamo Bay was an ill-advised campaign promise in 2007 made by the President, a promise made before he began receiving classified intelligence updates.

In fact, as of March 2015, the Director of National Intelligence reported that 29 percent of detainees released from Guantanamo have engaged in or were suspected of engaging in terrorist or insurgent activity. Those who remain in Guantanamo are "worst of the worst." So it is safe to presume that, if released, an even higher percentage of them will remain a threat to our national security.

I struggle to understand why we would close the Guantanamo Bay detention camp only to finance the incarceration of enemy combatants within the United States.

Ever since 2012, Congress has passed and President Obama has signed annual restrictions against the transfer

of prisoners at GTMO to the United States. The same restrictions are found in the FY 2016 National Defense Authorization Act passed by the House last week, despite President Obama's promise to veto that bill.

There is broad bipartisan opposition to President Obama's plans to transfer GTMO prisoners into the United States, both among Members of Congress and the American people.

For our Nation's security, I implore President Obama to sign the National Defense Authorization Act when it reaches his desk and halt his reckless plan to place many of the world's worst terrorists on U.S. soil, where they will have all of the due process protections provided to the American people and, thus, could be released through our court system.

CRISPUS ATTUCKS MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

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

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the 1955 Crispus Attucks men's basketball team, the first all-African American high school athletic team to win a championship, not only in the great Hoosier State, but in the United States.

Although the school was initially constructed out of pressure to segregate Indianapolis high schools, Crispus Attucks High School quickly became a source of pride for the African American community in Indianapolis and across the great Hoosier State.

However, despite its historic championship victory, the Crispus Attucks High School basketball team did not receive the praise and recognition traditionally bestowed upon previous State champions.

After its win, the team took the traditional ride on a fire truck from Butler Fieldhouse to Monument Circle in downtown Indianapolis, but the team was not allowed to get off the truck at the Circle for the traditional photo sessions. Instead, the fire truck took one more lap and then headed back into the city's Black neighborhood.

□ 1030

Now, Mr. Speaker, 60 years later I stand along all Hoosiers to recognize these men for their trailblazing efforts in bringing our city together through high school sports. Their win was a major first step for African American athletes across our country, breaking the barriers of segregation and setting the stage for the diversity that we see today.

Mr. Speaker, today I am joining my colleague in the Senate, Senator JOE DONNELLY, to give these men the recognition they deserve. It is long overdue, but I hope it helps to bring some attention to their amazing accomplishments.

I ask that my colleagues join us today in recognizing the 1955 Crispus

Attucks men's basketball team and thank them for bringing tremendous pride to the citizens of Indianapolis and to people of all races across our great country.

ZADROGA ACT REAUTHORIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could count how many times Members of Congress have come to this floor about the need to "never forget" September 11, 9/11, its victims, and our first responders.

Members have offered resolutions, have given speeches, have come to the floor with shocking images that are already seared into our minds forever. Through it all, we hear this refrain of "never forget." I know I will never forget. I will never forget the friends and the family member I lost that day.

I have constituents who will never forget. They will never forget the phone call they may have received that day of a loved one lost or the neighbor they saw for the very last time. When I visit a firehouse in Woodside, in Maspeth, in Sunnyside in Queens, or in Throgs Neck in the Bronx, I know they will never forget.

I also know this is not just about my constituents, not just about my city of New York, not just about my State of New York, but this is about the United States of America. I know that Americans will never forget the days, the weeks, the months spent, by the men and women who worked on the pile, trying to rescue and save lives, the recovery, and the eventual cleanup efforts that took place in Lower Manhattan.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the only people I believe who seem in danger of forgetting are my colleagues right here in the House of Representatives. That is the only explanation I can give for why they let the James Zadroga 9/11 Health Act expire last week.

They are forgetting the promise that this Congress, that our country, made to these first responders, the survivors, and other volunteers in the days that followed September 11.

We all made a promise to them that they would not be left behind, they would not be ignored, left to fend for themselves. It took far too long for the Zadroga Act to become a law in the first place.

Those are difficult years to have to keep telling 9/11 heroes: Just wait a little longer. We will get there. But, eventually, we did get it done because it was the right thing to do.

It would be easy for my colleagues to shrug their shoulders and say they did their part, to think that we have wiped our hands of the entire issue. But the need is still there. The pain and the suffering are still there. So we must act and we must act now.

A few weeks ago hundreds of first responders came to Washington, D.C.,

from all over the country—not just New York—who were affected by 9/11 to look Members of Congress in the eye and ask them to renew this worthy program. They had meetings. They held press conferences. They even brought a celebrity spokesperson to draw attention to their cause.

Toward the end of the day, one gentleman said that he probably wouldn't be coming back to push Congress on this issue in the future. Now, I wish that none of them would have to come back because we would be able to tell them that we took action and permanently established this program.

But the reason he is not going to be coming back is because he has stage 4 cancer, stage 4 cancer as a result of his work on the pile, looking for his friends. He may not be coming back at all. That is what this is about. That is who we are talking about.

Every day first responders, cleanup workers, and volunteers are struggling with health conditions caused by the effects of the attack of 9/11. They have doctors' appointments, tests, treatments, chemotherapy.

And they can't do it alone. That is why we put this program in place in the first place, to help those who can't do it alone, to not just thank them for their service, but to give back to them what they have given to us.

These heroes should be thanked every day for what they have done. They deserve our thanks. They deserve to be honored and applauded and to have floor speech after floor speech given in their name.

But they deserve more than just words. They deserve action by this House, action that we must—not just should—but we must take to ensure that this program will continue to be there for those who need it.

Our heroes deserve better. We hear a lot about "never forget." I want to suggest that we never use the term "never forget" here on the floor, "never forget 9/11," until we pass a permanent extension of the James Zadroga Health Act.

GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I am sick to my stomach this morning because we have just witnessed the 45th school shooting this year. There have been more than 294 mass shootings this year, and we have only had 272 days this year.

I am not going to stand for another moment of silence on this floor unless it is joined with meaningful action. It is a hollow gesture to act like we care for these families when the truth is we don't care enough to act.

Twenty-six times since Sandy Hook we have paused on this floor, we have paused to give our prayers and our sympathy to the families who have lost loved ones. But what are we doing for the next set of families that are going to lose loved ones?

We are going to do nothing, absolutely nothing. In fact, we create more credibility in the fictionalized "death panels" than we do about the actual deaths of innocent schoolchildren, college students, and moviegoers.

This is the truth: In America, more preschoolers are shot dead each year than police officers killed in the line of duty. Ninety-two Americans are shot to death each and every day. Ninety-two will be shot to death today. Do we care enough to do anything?

If there were that many people dying each day due to terrorism, disease, faulty consumer products, you bet we would do something, but not when it comes to guns. When it comes to guns, we can only muster enough to stand up on this floor and be silent. What a tragedy.

Our inaction means we are willing to let thousands of our fellow citizens die so we can prop up the myth that gun violence measures, which the Supreme Court has ruled ironclad under the Constitution, will somehow undermine the Second Amendment.

By refusing to adopt the mental health and background check measures supported by 90 percent of the population and 74 percent of NRA members, we are doing the bidding of the NRA lobbyists and the gun manufacturers. We are not standing side by side with the victims of Umpqua and Charleston and Sandy Hook. We are shrugging and saying, "Eh, stuff happens."

Stuff does not just happen. As you can see on this chart, gun violence is dramatically down in States that have passed strong gun violence prevention laws. You can see the trends in other industrialized countries that have reacted wisely to gun violence.

Australia had 13 mass shootings over 18 years. But then they put in strong laws to protect against gun violence, and they haven't had one mass shooting since then.

In Canada and Norway, also, they tightened their gun laws in the wake of mass shootings, and gun violence rates are a fraction today of what they were. These countries are our closest allies. They are not Fascist regimes. If they can do it, we can do it.

We need to make mental health reporting laws universal and enforce the ones already on the books. It is shameful that eight States have no mental health reporting laws and 13 States have submitted fewer than 100 mental health records each to the national background check system.

By the way, Senate Majority Whip JOHN CORNYN says that his measure is the solution. He has even introduced his own bill, but he and his Caucus have declined to advance it.

We have to make background checks universal by closing the gun show loophole and the loophole for online sales. These loopholes allow criminals, drug abusers, and mentally ill people who are already banned from having guns to get guns. Finally, we need to lift the ban on NIH and CDC research.

Mr. Speaker, I will not stand for another one of these hypocritical moments of silence, but I will stand up for any effort we make to pass sensible and genuine gun safety laws. Lipservice alone is a disservice to these families and the next families who don't want our prayers, but want the lives of their loved ones back.

CALIFORNIA DROUGHT CAUSING SUFFERING

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

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, today I had the opportunity and the honor to represent my district on the Senate side in a committee to talk about water, and it was to talk about the bill that we passed off this House floor just a few months ago back in June. Obviously, I was very excited to move that forward and excited to see the debate move forward. This is something that I think we need to talk about a little bit more here on the floor, not just in the Senate because I think people need to remember what we are talking about.

I had this picture taken just last week in my district. When people say a picture is worth a thousand words, you look at this picture, and you try to think of just a few different words that this brings to mind. You see houses here in the background, but you obviously see shacks here. You see a child's stroller, a child's toy, cans of food, a box from one of our local food banks.

These are people who are suffering today. This is in the United States of America. These are people who so many in this body claim to represent, so many in this body talk about, but when we see so many in this body sign letters, speak out in opposition to legislation that could help solve this problem, these people are suffering not because of a lack of the will to work but because we are facing a drought, and also because of legislation, because laws are in place that prevent us from delivering water to these communities.

These are people who want to make a difference. A lot of them might be immigrants. Some of them probably are people born in this country, but they are people that want to achieve the American Dream. A couple weeks ago when the Pope was here, he said so many things that both sides agreed with and some things that both sides disagreed with, but what he said was that every man has the right to work, to earn an honest day's wage. These people are being denied that opportunity.

Just beyond these shacks, you see homes. They look relatively new. You see a business here. You see trucks. Those are all people who have the ability to support themselves, but they are also people who right behind, in their own backyard, that don't have the ability to work that honest day's wage, to supply for their family, to buy new toys for their kids, to actually afford

food that was grown and produced by their own hands. Some of these food products might even be from other countries.

When we have that conversation here about helping the less fortunate, do we just throw money at a problem? Is that what Washington does? Is that what we expect to have here? Is that what builds a great society? Or is it people working hard, providing for their families, educating their next generation on what it is like to actually grow food, what it is actually like to put in a hard day's work, to inspire and actually show what it is to work hard and produce something for yourself?

□ 1045

The pride that comes with earning that paycheck and purchasing that house or purchasing those vehicles or purchasing food for your family is what we want to provide for Americans. That is something that I think every single person—immigrant or American citizen by birth or who has been here for 20 generations, whatever it may be—wants to have, the opportunity to provide for their families and for a better life.

When you look at this picture, it is insane that this is going on today. And when people sign and put their names on or trash legislation that can help solve this problem, I think it is an embarrassment for this House and for this country.

There was water flowing through the delta that we had the opportunity to pump earlier this year. Would it have solved all of our problems? No, because we are in a drought. But there was still some water there. We missed out on that opportunity because of laws that are in place today.

These people don't have to be in this position. These people don't have to live like this. Their children do not have to live in those shacks and play with their toys outside of their home. Think of what type of society allows this to happen, by allowing legislation or laws to take effect that have done nothing to actually protect the species they claim to protect, as that species continues to be in decline. We see what is going on here and how it does nothing for these people.

We talk about the environment. Is this an environment to raise a family? How are these children going to be successful in school? I have got three young children of my own. I have nieces and nephews. I would never, ever want to see this happen to them, and I would never want them to see this happen to their friends.

This is something that is happening today because of the laws that this building protects. And we have got to continue to fight and we have got to continue to work together so that we can deliver solutions that actually help these people have that American Dream, just like the rest of us want for our children.

Today, at the end of my speech to a Senate committee, I invited the Sen-

ators to come take some time and meet with some of these folks or see what it is like to actually live like this. I extend that invite to every Member of this House, especially those who speak out in opposition to legislation that can help prevent things like this from happening.

I want them to come, knock on these doors, and talk to these people and see what they want more than anything. Do they want a handout or do they want the ability to produce and to provide for their families and show their children what the next generation should do, which is work hard and help build that American Dream for all of us?

I want every single person who speaks out in opposition to take a good, hard look at this and see what we have created in the United States unless we speak up and do what is right: pass legislation that can help solve this problem so we can deliver water for these families, for these farmers, for our communities, and do what is right for our Nation and do what is right for the American people.

HONORING OUR WWII MERCHANT MARINERS ACT OF 2015

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, words cannot explain the singular honor it is to stand in the well of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today on a mission of mercy. I believe a brief vignette can best explain what a mission of mercy is as I apply it to the circumstances for which I rise.

Mr. Speaker, prior to coming to Congress, I served for more than a quarter of a century as a judge of a small claims justice court. I can remember an occasion when a mother testified on behalf of her son. Her appeal to me was along these lines. She said: Judge, I am not asking you for justice. I know he was wrong. But he is my son. I know he was wrong. I am not asking for justice. I am asking you for mercy. You have within your power to do justice or you can grant mercy, and I beg that you grant mercy to my son.

That was her hue and cry.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I rise today, I rise in support of H.R. 563, sponsored by the Honorable JANICE HAHN. I rise in support of this legislation, which is the Honoring Our WWII Merchant Mariners Act of 2015.

This bill would establish the Merchant Marine Equity Compensation Fund. It would accord each person who served between certain dates—December 7, 1941, through December 31, 1946—a sum of \$25,000.

Why should they receive the \$25,000? Well, Mr. Speaker, when they served in World War II, they were not accorded the benefits other members of the various Armed Forces were. In fact, it

took litigation to bring them under the purview of benefits that the other members of the Armed Forces have received and are now receiving.

It was in 1988 that they finally, after litigation, received these benefits, but the benefits were not applied retroactively. As a result of them not being applied retroactively, some of them didn't receive GI Bill benefits. They didn't receive home loans. Many of them, still alive, can be compensated if we grant mercy.

I know that there are those who would say that they already received their just compensation as a result of the litigation and as a result of being brought within the purview of the laws that allow them to receive certain benefits, but they didn't get them retroactively.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, they served honorably. As a matter of fact, approximately 9,500 of them died in service. They served their country. They bled the same blood as others when they were attacked and assaulted and when they lost limbs and their lives.

They are Americans, Mr. Speaker. And I believe we should show some mercy to these Americans. We ought to accord them the opportunity to have these benefits because they were willing to risk their lives so that we could have the quality of life that we have today.

So I make this hue and cry and appeal. I base it upon mercy, not justice. The arguments can be made as to whether just compensation has been accorded; but I believe that, if we show mercy, we will do the right thing for people who have done the right thing for their country.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 52 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

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

During these contentious and unsettling days during which an important transition is taking place within the House, we ask Your presence in this assembly.

Imbue each Member with confidence that they are called not to be successful in any one pursuit but, rather, faithful to the pursuit of the welfare of

the United States and faithfulness to its Constitution as they have taken oaths to do.

May they, with confidence, use their abilities to best perform their duties and obligations.

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

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. MCNERNEY 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution providing for corrections to the enrollment of the bill H.R. 1735.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 623. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the Department of Homeland Security to establish a social media working group, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 32. An act to provide the Department of Justice with additional tools to target extraterritorial drug trafficking activity, and for other purposes.

S. 2162. An act to establish a 10-year term for the service of the Librarian of Congress.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1301

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. WOMACK) at 1 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of October being Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

Domestic violence affects people across the Nation, including one in four women and one in seven men who have suffered severe physical violence.

In my district, I want to recognize the efforts of the Clothesline Project, an initiative which features T-shirts decorated by domestic violence survivors. In preparation for Domestic Violence Awareness Month, people from across the Clarion County, Pennsylvania, area have participated in this project, decorating shirts which were displayed during last Saturday's Autumn Leaf Parade in Clarion.

Mr. Speaker, this is such an important effort because last year 97 people died as a result of domestic violence in Pennsylvania. It is a wide age range. In fact, one was an infant.

I appreciate the efforts of the Clothesline Project and all the non-profit and community organizations across my district working to bring attention to this critical issue.

RECOGNIZING 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF PHINEAS BANNING HIGH SCHOOL

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 90th anniversary of Phineas Banning High School in Wilmington. It was named after General Phineas Banning, known as the "Father of the Port of Los Angeles," thus the school's mascot, the Pilots.

Banning has earned a reputation as an athletic powerhouse. The Pilots hold the title for the second-most CIS championships in the entire city of Los Angeles.

Over the past 90 years, Banning High School hasn't lost sight of its core mission: to educate the young people of Wilmington and to prepare them for their future.

It is an impressive alumni that have gone on to be NFL stars, Olympic athletes, actors, CEOs, scientists, and educators. Many of my friends and members of my staff went to Banning High

School. They can trace lifelong friendships and some of their fondest memories to their time there.

Tomorrow night Banning will celebrate its milestone at its homecoming football game against the San Pedro Pirates. Both schools are in my district, however; so, I am not taking sides. But I want to wish both teams good luck and wish the Pilots a happy 90th birthday.

LIFTING THE CRUDE OIL BAN

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

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of lifting the ban on crude oil exports. It means jobs, 500,000 to 1 million jobs across the country and 2,400 jobs in Montana, with a revenue of at least \$120 million.

As a former Navy SEAL commander, I understand the importance of national security. I do not want this Nation to be reliant on foreign energy sources and be held hostage by foreign countries for our energy needs.

It has been a longstanding policy of this country to be energy independent, and lifting the crude oil ban is part of that.

Lowering gas prices: All estimates look at lowering the gas prices by 1.5 to 13 cents a gallon. That is real savings to every American family.

I urge the Senate to take this up. This is not a partisan issue. This is not a Republican or a Democrat issue. This is a national security issue. So I ask the Senate to take it up. I am confident it will come out of the House in numbers that are bipartisan.

Anyone who votes against releasing the ban—there is only one country on the face of the planet that has a ban on crude oil, and that is here. Even Iraq and Iran can export their crude.

ENDING GUN VIOLENCE

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, last week we experienced the 45th school shooting in 2015. Nearly 10,000 people have been killed by guns this year alone; yet, too many leaders respond with absolute indifference. They tell us that "stuff happens," that we should just move on.

Are the 20 kids killed at Sandy Hook Elementary School just stuff happening? Are the 32 murdered at Virginia Tech just stuff happening? Are the 12 people gunned down in the Aurora, Colorado, movie theater just stuff happening? What about the 9 people killed at Umpqua Community College on Friday?

This stuff has real costs to families, to friends, to our whole community, to our country. It does not have to happen.

Let's make gun trafficking in illegal weapons a Federal felony and have universal background checks.

Let's end the moments of silence on the floor and have, instead, votes on the floor to end gun violence.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize October as Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

Violence against women is not a partisan problem. It is an American problem. So it demands a bipartisan solution.

As a father, son, and husband, to me, this issue is about protecting families, plain and simple. Unfortunately, debate in Washington is often dominated by the same tired politics, divisive rhetoric, and by the misguided notion that some issues are just too tough to take on.

We can't allow this gridlock to stop us from working to ensure that every woman feels safe and every child lives free from fear.

That is why I helped introduce the Zero Tolerance for Domestic Abusers Act. This bill is a commonsense solution to bring Federal law in line with over 30 States that already have protections in place to keep guns out of the hands of abusers, to protect families, and to curb domestic abuse by preventing domestic violence from becoming domestic murder.

Together, we can make our country safer, which is why I encourage my colleagues to join me on this important legislation, supporting safety and security for all Americans.

HONORING DOLORES HUERTA FOR A LIFETIME OF SERVICE AND THE 85TH ANNIVERSARY OF HER BIRTH

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

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise during this Hispanic Heritage Month to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Dolores Huerta for a lifetime of service and honor her on the 85th anniversary of her birth.

Living in Stockton, California, she witnessed the unjust exploitation and suffering of migrant workers. Refusing to stay silent in the face of brutal working conditions, Dolores joined Cesar Chavez to co-found what is now United Farm Workers, the leading advocacy voice for the migrant community.

Dolores' actions were essential to pass the 1975 California Agricultural Labor Relations Act. Her tenacity is captured in the resonating chant, "Si, Se Puede" that still gives voice to today's civil rights movement.

In 2012, Dolores received the distinguished Presidential Medal of Freedom. She continues to organize com-

munities to fight for social justice as president of the Dolores Huerta Foundation.

For her lifetime of service, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Dolores Huerta.

LIFTING THE CRUDE OIL BAN

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 702, to lift the outdated ban on U.S. crude oil exports.

This 40-year-old ban was enacted during the time of oil scarcity in the 1970s in an effort to preserve domestic oil reserves and discharge foreign imports. Today the ban is driving up the price at the pump while discouraging American energy independence.

The United States is now the largest oil producer in the world, producing more barrels per day than Saudi Arabia or Russia, but we cannot take full advantage of this strength without the ability to export crude oil as the boom in domestic oil production has surpassed the ability for our domestic refiners to process crude oil for export.

The ban on crude oil exports was created in reaction to market conditions at the time. These conditions no longer exist. While the President is opening up oil markets for Iran with a nuclear agreement, U.S. oil producers should have the same access to the global market.

It is time to lift the ban on crude oil exports. I urge my colleagues to support lifting the crude oil ban.

HONORING THE LATE ALMA BEATTY OF NEWARK

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Alma Beatty, a longtime vice president of Community Affairs at Newark Beth Israel Medical Center who passed away earlier this year.

Ms. Beatty was born in Newark, New Jersey, and became one of the city's most beloved citizens through her 45 years of service at "The Beth."

Under Ms. Beatty's leadership, "The Beth" became a model of excellence in protecting the most vulnerable among us. Thanks to her vision, "The Beth" instituted a number of community service programs that continue to this day, including Adopt a Child Christmas Program.

Last month, I had the honor of participating in a ceremony to change the name of Newark's Osborne Terrace to "Alma Beatty Way." It is a fitting recognition to Ms. Beatty's contributions to the city of Newark, the county of Essex, the State of New Jersey, and the United States of America.

To Ms. Beatty's family I send my thoughts and prayers and continued

love for the work that she has done in our community.

RECOGNIZING JERRY HARTZ FOR HIS OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO THE CONGRESS

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the leadership of a consummate civil servant, a skilled strategist and an astute adviser for his outstanding service to the Congress for the better of three decades, a proud son of Iowa who is deeply dedicated to our country, to advancing the Democratic agenda on the House floor, and to strengthening our democracy, an exemplary professional whom I have had the privilege to have on my staff for the past 13 years. I speak of—respected on both sides of the aisle—Jerry Hartz.

Jerry is a master of House rules and parliamentary procedure. Over the years, Jerry has managed influential and consequential debates on the House floor. He played a vital role in advancing our Democratic efforts to improve the lives of Americans by moving forward vital legislation.

We simply could not have done without you, Jerry.

On the most challenging and critical legislative issues of our day, Jerry consistently exhibited the wisdom, the creativity, and the fairness needed to improve our world.

Though we will miss his experience and his expertise, I am proud that Jerry will continue to contribute shaping our Nation at the National Democratic Institute.

Thank you to Jerry's wife, Jennifer, who is with us today, and their daughters, Alicia and Evelyn, for sharing Jerry with us all these years.

Earlier this morning we had a huge number of Members of Congress come pay their respects to Jerry and to Jennifer, a large number of staff from both sides of the aisle who recognize Jerry's sense of fairness.

Thank you, Jerry, for your long and excellent service to the Democratic Caucus, to this House, and the United States Congress and, in doing so, to the United States of America. Thank you for your patriotism and your leadership.

□ 1315

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 538, NATIVE AMERICAN ENERGY ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 702, ADAPTATION TO CHANGING CRUDE OIL MARKETS

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 466 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 466

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant

to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 538) to facilitate the development of energy on Indian lands by reducing Federal regulations that impede tribal development of Indian lands, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-30. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 702) to adapt to changing crude oil market conditions. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in this section and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-29. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the

order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 466 provides for consideration of H.R. 538, the Native American Energy Act, and H.R. 702, which would repeal the ban on exporting crude oil. H. Res. 466 calls for a structured rule which makes in order 12 total amendments, including 7 minority amendments and 2 bipartisan amendments. Both of these bills deal with easing the regulatory burden when it comes to the energy sector.

Being from coastal Alabama, I have a great appreciation for the impact the energy sector has on our economy, and I am a strong supporter of an all-of-the-above approach to energy production. Unfortunately, Washington has a bad habit of putting up costly barriers that make it harder for the energy sector to grow and create new jobs. Today is about getting some of these barriers out of the way and unlocking our Nation's energy potential. One of the bills, the Native American Energy Act, would roll back the overregulation of Indian lands and encourage energy development by Indian tribes and Alaska Native Corporations.

From streamlining duplicative Federal processes to increasing tribal control over natural resource development, this bill includes important reforms to unlock the precious energy resources on tribal land and to allow these tribes to take more control of their energy assets. In fact, a 2015 re-

port from the Government Accountability Office found that "Indian energy resources hold significant potential for development, but remain largely undeveloped."

Mr. Speaker, they remain largely undeveloped because the Federal Government is standing in the way. This has resulted in lost revenue for Indian tribes, and it is time we fix this problem.

This commonsense legislation has strong support from tribes across the Nation, including the Southern Ute Indian Tribe, the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, the Intertribal Timber Council, the Navaho Nation, Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota, and the National Congress of American Indians. It is time the Federal Government gets out of the way and allows tribal nations to manage their land how they see fit, without the heavy hand of government getting in the way.

The second bill covered by this rule would end the outdated ban on crude oil exports. The ban was first put in place in 1975 as a response to the Arab oil embargo, but it is clearly no longer necessary, and it is tying our hands both economically and strategically around the world.

Over the last decade, the United States has become the leading producer of oil and natural gas in the world, which is good news for the countless Americans who work in the oil industry, and it is even better news for the American economy.

Mr. Speaker, there is broad, bipartisan support for lifting the 40-year-old ban on crude oil exports. Leading economists, including former Obama economic policy adviser Lawrence Summers, and leading scholars at Harvard University support lifting the ban. Former U.N. Ambassador and Energy Secretary under President Clinton Bill Richardson said that the U.S. needs to export our oil and gas in order to "help us geopolitically in Eastern Europe against Russia."

Recently, 135 senior legislative leaders from 40 States and Puerto Rico sent a letter calling on Congress to lift the ban. The letter notes that "the outdated Federal export restrictions on crude oil and LNG are detrimental to American workers, our collective security, and economic recovery in our States." There were three signers of the letter from Mr. HASTINGS' home State of Florida.

Numerous editorial boards around the country, including those at The Wall Street Journal, The Washington Post, The Detroit News, The Denver Post, The Washington Times, and the Houston Chronicle have touted the benefits of ending the ban.

Most notably, 69 percent of American people support lifting this ban. Shouldn't we stand with the American people?

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's talk about some of the benefits from lifting the outdated ban.

First, it is estimated that this legislation would create 630,000 additional U.S. jobs by 2019. Lifting the ban would also benefit U.S. manufacturers and boost our GDP.

Second, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that lifting the ban would generate \$1.4 billion from oil and gas leases over the next 10 years. That is really a significant number.

Third, the Government Accountability Office found that lifting the ban would lower gas prices by anywhere from 1.5 to 13 cents per gallon. Even President Obama's own Department of Energy found that increased oil exports would help lower gas prices.

Fourth, lifting the ban will allow the United States to help our allies abroad. For example, Russia has continuously used their control over oil to pressure European countries to comply with Russia's wishes. If a country refused, Russia would threaten to cut off their energy supply. By lifting the ban, the United States can begin supporting our allies and, in turn, weaken Russia's grip on many European countries.

Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting that this administration has worked hard to open up oil export capabilities for Iran, yet they are refusing to allow the United States to do so. By allowing Iran to export oil, the President has essentially given the Ayatollah a leg up in the global marketplace, placing the strategic interests of Iran over those of the United States. This is yet another example of the President of the United States standing with the people of Iran and the Ayatollah and not standing up for the people of America. These are four very clear benefits for repealing the ban and unlocking our Nation's energy potential.

Now, the White House has said they believe lifting the oil export ban is a decision that should be made by the Commerce Department, not by Congress. So let me get this straight: The Obama administration would rather unelected, unaccountable Federal bureaucrats at the Department of Commerce make this decision instead of the democratically elected Congress? I think that speaks to a far larger problem with this White House and how they believe our government should work.

Ultimately, Mr. Speaker, both of these bills are about empowering the American people and getting the government out of the way. These bills both have broad support, and I urge my colleagues to approve this rule. Let's move forward on passing these commonsense bills.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for consideration of both H.R. 702, legislation to adapt to the changing crude oil market conditions, and H.R. 538, the Native American Energy Act.

As we have seen time and again in what can only be described as typical Republican fashion, we have again skirted regular order. As a matter of fact, whatever happened to regular order in this institution? It seems to have gone by the boards. Here we are considering two unrelated pieces of legislation under one grab-bag rule.

What is more, instead of striving to roll back environmental protections, we should be working in a bipartisan manner to avoid a government shutdown in December, address the debt ceiling, pass a long-term transportation bill so that we can rebuild our crumbling infrastructure and put Americans back to work, and reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, the charter of which Republicans allowed to expire 100 days ago.

Mr. Speaker, the 1973 oil embargo sparked a crisis in our country that continues to influence our energy policies today. H.R. 702, the first of the bills we are debating today, makes significant changes to the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, the primary statute for restricting the export of domestically produced crude oil that was enacted in the wake of the embargo.

It goes without saying that the energy situation in the United States is far different today than it was in the 1970s when the oil export ban began. Global crude oil prices fell to 6½-year lows in August. We have such a surplus of oil that the number of rigs drilling for oil in the United States dropped to 614 last week, down from 1,609 last October. Based on these facts, it would behoove us to reexamine this export ban.

□ 1330

But, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 702 unwisely repeals the authority of the President to restrict the export of petroleum products or natural gas and prohibits any Federal official from imposing or enforcing restrictions on the export of crude oil.

Last night in the Rules Committee I asked the question whether President Obama deserves any credit for the lower gas prices. Certainly, when gas prices were higher, he received an awful lot of criticism and blame. It would seem to me that, with the increased number of leases that he has allowed, he should get some credit at least.

Moreover, the bill makes it virtually impossible to limit exports of coal, natural gas, petroleum products, and petrochemical feedstocks. Repealing this authority would eliminate our ability to restrict the export of any of these products.

Lifting this ban would provide a gift to oil companies on top of the decades of lucrative subsidies the industry already receives by the American taxpayers. Enough is enough.

I would also note that the term—and I brought it up in the Rules Committee last night and didn't get a clear answer—the term “restriction” is unde-

finied. Let me quote my good friend FRANK PALLONE of New Jersey, the ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

He said: Since the term “restriction” is undefined, any Federal action that could potentially impede the efficient exploration, production, storage, supply, marketing, pricing, and regulation of energy resources—including fossil fuels—could be considered a restriction.

For instance, an order to shut down a pipeline that has been determined to be a hazard to public safety and the environment under the Pipeline Safety Act could be seen as a restriction.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 538 suffers from similar deficiencies. H.R. 538 has the stated purpose of empowering Native American tribes to utilize and develop energy resources on their lands.

I hesitate because I don't understand what part of sovereignty with reference to Native Americans in this country we do not understand; therefore, they should not have to be here hat in hand about their own resources.

But tribal lands often hold great potential for domestic energy production; yet, tribes often cannot harness the full economic development potential of their natural resources. But this bill tries to solve this problem by undercutting important environmental protections.

In the name of encouraging energy production on tribal lands, this bill severely restricts public involvement and comment on proposed energy projects, prevents the recovery of attorneys' fees in cases challenging these new energy projects, effectively chilling the public's ability to bring bona fide claims to seek judicial redress for environmental harms in their community.

And just for good measure, this legislation blocks any commonsense hydraulic fracturing rules. Instead of undermining the bedrock of our Nation's vital environmental protections, we should focus on real, constructive reforms that will achieve tribal self-determination in energy development without sacrificing commonsense environmental laws.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the esteemed gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE).

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 538, the Native American Energy Act.

Mr. YOUNG, my esteemed colleague from Alaska, I commend him on his efforts over the years. This represents a significant step for tribes across the country, especially in my State of Montana.

I have only been in the seat for a few months, and I can tell you that the Federal Government has infringed on the sovereignty of our tribes to develop their own natural resources.

What is sovereignty? Sovereignty is not going through a labyrinth of rules that are far greater than other Federal

lands or State lands. It is not right. It is not right for the Crow people. It is not right for every Indian nation across this land.

The government has infringed. The GAO report examines it and states as much. The Crow tribe, a proud tribe in Montana, wants to be self-sufficient. They want to make sure that they have a prosperous economy and do right by their people; yet, the chairman, Old Coyote, has said a war on coal is a war on the Crow people. And he is right.

There is no better job on the Crow reservation than a coal job. There is no better future than to have access to the 9 billion tons of coal that are locked in the ground that they can't develop and they can't develop in the interest of their own people because the Federal Government is in the way.

This bill doesn't skirt environmental rules or laws. What it does is it streamlines a position, streamlines their sovereignty and their rights, and that is important.

So, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, this is not a Democrat or a Republican issue. This is an American issue, and it is about respect.

I ask all Members to respect the native tribes, respect their right to sovereignty, respect their right for self-determination.

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

Background checks are the first line of defense to keep guns out of the hands of criminals. If we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation that would expand the current background check system to include all commercial sales of firearms.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), my good friend, to discuss our proposal. He is the chair of the House Gun Violence Prevention Task Force.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule today and in support of bringing the bipartisan King-Thompson background check bill to the floor for a vote.

Let me give you some numbers: 278, the number of mass shootings in our country since Newtown; 275, the number of days this Congress has been in session; 16, the number of gun-related moments of silence Congress has held since the start of last year; and 0, the number of votes this body has taken to help prevent or lessen gun violence.

Just a week ago we endured another mass shooting. This time it was nine

people at a community college in Oregon. Six weeks ago it was a news reporter and cameraman in Virginia. Five weeks before that it was two people at the movies in Lafayette. Five weeks before that it was a prayer group in Charleston.

Every single time a mass shooting happens we go through the same routine—thoughts and prayers are sent; statements are made; stories are written; moments of silence are held—and nothing changes. No action is taken. No votes are cast.

It has been said that insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results. The majority leadership has done nothing over and over again. Predictably, the results have been the same: more innocent lives lost, more families forever changed, and more mass gun violence.

The five Republican coauthors of our background check bill notwithstanding, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have done nothing as mass gun violence has become commonplace. No bills have been brought to the floor. No ideas have been brought to the table. No proposals have even been considered.

You have the majority in the House and in the Senate. You have a White House and a Democratic Caucus willing to work with you. You are presumably here to govern and lead. A big part of that means stepping up when children, students, and families are routinely put in danger.

Gun violence takes the lives of 30-plus Americans every single day. It constitutes a public health emergency that demands action from the public's leaders. We have it in our power to do something. Let's not waste that.

We don't know what laws could have prevented the shooting in Oregon or Virginia or Charleston, but we do know that every day background checks stop more than 170 felons, some 50 domestic abusers, and nearly 20 fugitives from buying a gun. We know they help keep guns from dangerous people, and that saves lives.

This isn't about the Second Amendment. I am a hunter and I am a gun owner. I support the Second Amendment. If the King-Thompson background check bill undermined the rights of gun owners, my name wouldn't be on it.

This is about keeping guns from criminals, domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill. It is about taking a simple, commonsense step to keep spouses, kids, and communities safe.

All this bill does is require a background check for people buying a gun online or at a gun show. Why would anyone not want to make sure the people buying guns on the Internet or at a gun show are sane, law-abiding citizens? We do it at licensed dealers, why not for all commercial sales? Why do we want to give criminals, domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally

ill a huge loophole through which they can buy guns? It makes no sense.

We can do one of two things here today. We can wait out the new cycle, allow the horror of Oregon to fade into our minds, do nothing, wait for the next tragedy, and then offer thoughts and prayers. That would be nothing new.

It is what the majority did with Newtown. It is what they did with Navy Yard. It is what they did with Isla Vista, Charleston, and Virginia. This time could be different. We could actually pull together and do something to make our country safer.

No legislation will stop every shooting. But passing commonsense gun laws like background checks will at least stop some, and that makes it worth doing. Don't sit here and let America's new normal become mass gun violence followed by thoughts and prayers, but no action. We are here to govern. This is happening on our watch, and it is within our power to save some lives. Let's do it.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), who is a tireless advocate for the energy interests of his State of Louisiana.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, let's look at the facts. I support this rule and I support the underlying legislation, H.R. 702, which would lift the ban on oil exports for this country.

The United States is the only oil-producing country that has a self-imposed ban, and it makes no sense. It doesn't fit within our own views of open trade, open energy markets.

Why did this come about? It came about because in the 1970s we moved into an age of scarcity with regard to energy. Our producers could not keep up with demand.

American innovation, American technology, has solved that. Now we have moved into an era of abundance. This is a time where we can actually change the entire landscape of energy security not only for the United States, but also for our allies, and reap major economic benefit by lifting the ban.

When we came out of the recession, energy jobs helped lift us out of that recession. The shale revolution was a major factor. What we are seeing now with slack demand and the abundance and a lot of oil sitting that is not being used in refineries has caused slacking in prices and job loss.

We can reverse that by lifting the ban and giving American producers access to the market, just like everybody else that produces oil. Why should the Iranians be able to sell oil on the open market and we have a self-imposed ban on American energy producers? It makes no sense at all.

Secondly, if we lift the ban, this is a first and necessary step, I believe, in building out a whole new energy strategy for the United States that leads to an American view, an American imprint, on energy security, not a Russian and not an OPEC view of this.

Why? Because we embrace open markets, we embrace diversity of sources, we embrace transparency and pricing. That is what we want. Lifting the ban is that first step.

□ 1345

Thirdly, if we couple this with building out more pipelines that help us integrate the Mexican energy market and the Canadian, the North American area can clearly take care of all of our domestic demands collectively and have plenty to export.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, this will then move us in a position of dominating energy strategy globally, putting OPEC and Russia on the defense. They cannot keep up with American energy producers. They don't have the innovation; they don't have the technology; and they are running budget deficits that are harmful to their countries. They will have to change, and we will dominate the energy sector.

Further, if we integrate this with our trade policies, we then start to eliminate the abusive practices that national oil companies perpetrate and put American open-market companies, multinational companies, back in the driver's seat. But we also help American producers and producers in my home State of Louisiana, small companies that are suppliers, small companies that provide the services: the boat companies, the maritime companies that help facilitate all of this.

This is about job creation. This is about American energy production; it is about American energy security; and it is about having leverage in our foreign policy. That is why I support this first step of lifting this ban on crude exports.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, before yielding, I would like to speak very briefly about process, because a lot of times people don't understand that the base bill that we are discussing today, the two rules, the process allows the minority an opportunity to present a motion. One is a motion to recommit. One of the parts of that process that we are discussing here today has to do with gun violence. Mr. THOMPSON, who just spoke about it eloquently, I add to what he had to say.

Here in Washington, D.C., in the last 6 days, five people have been killed by guns. In Chicago and in my hometown and around this Nation, in addition to the mass killings, there have been a number of killings.

David Satcher was Surgeon General of the United States from 1998 to 2002. In the year of 2000, he was the first person that I know that raised publicly the fact that we have a gun violence epidemic in this country. There were people that wanted to run him out of office because of that. We need to pay attention.

For the purpose of discussing this further, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY), someone who has had a real experience with gun violence.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and in support of the opportunity to vote for common-sense, bipartisan gun violence prevention legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I represent Newtown, Connecticut; and on December 14, 2012, almost 3 years ago, 20 precious children and 6 dedicated educators were ripped from us by gun violence.

After Newtown, America said "never again." But just 2 days ago, we observed another moment of silence in this House, this time for the community of Roseburg, Oregon.

As with every other mass shooting since Newtown, families and first responders in my district are retraumatized. In fact, by my count, we have held 16 moments of silence on the House floor to honor those Americans taken from us by gun violence since the tragedy at Sandy Hook. Sixteen times we in this House have come together and bowed our heads in silence and then refused to do anything substantial to prevent gun violence.

Mr. Speaker, we can and we must do better. We must be allowed a vote on the bipartisan bill that will close background check loopholes and save lives.

Ninety percent of Americans support background checks. Background checks keep guns out of the hands of dangerous people. That is why every gun purchase should be allowed only after a successful background check.

We are not dealing with a natural disaster. This is not an earthquake. This crisis is manmade, and it is up to us to take action to save lives.

The time has passed for moments of silence. We need hours of action. I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote today to bring the bipartisan background check to the House floor.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I think what the gentleman from Florida said at the beginning was inaccurate. He said that we brought two things together in this rule that are not related to one another. They are. They are both related to energy production in this country, and that is what the rule is about.

Now, I am standing here today as the grandson of a man who was shot and killed by someone who was mentally ill in 1920. I know the importance of that issue. I know what it means to families who have been victimized by it. There may be a day and a time for us to have this debate, but it is not today.

Today, we are talking about the energy security of our country. Today, we are here to talk about freeing up the American economy and freeing up domestic producers so that they can sell their product abroad, as we are now going to allow Iran to sell their product abroad. I would like for us to get back to the debate on energy. That is what we are here today about.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman doesn't have the prerogative of what the minority has, and that is an opportunity to offer a motion to recommit.

He is correct that there are two bills that are being brought here in this grab-bag rule, but if he says that today is not the day for us to discuss gun violence, then I want to ask him: What day is it that we are supposed to discuss gun violence? People are being killed all over this Nation, and we have an epidemic, and we are constantly not doing anything about it. If it is not today, when? And if it is not us, who?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), my distinguished colleague and good friend.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say I agree with my colleague. If not now, when? We have been asking that for many, many generations.

Because of the mass shootings, American families are demanding Congress to act. They want action, but Congress has not heard any bills. They refuse to hear them. There is nothing. There is no opportunity to have the light of day or to have some transparency to it.

The last meaningful gun violence prevention bill was in 1994, and that was the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act.

Shootings, as was pointed out, are now an everyday occurrence. It is commonplace, so people are becoming numb, except for those who are immediately affected and are asking us to move and pass legislation, give it the light of day, discuss it, bring it up, start some methodology to be able to understand what this House is looking at doing for our American people, for our children, and for our families.

Now, collective action, we need it. Transparent discussion is necessary and much needed. Enough of skirting this issue. What is more important, gas and oil or the lives of human beings?

Keep guns away from people that should not have them and/or would use them to harm others.

H.R. 1217 mandates universal background checks for all purchases. It is a step in the right direction. It would move our country forward in beginning the process of addressing this epidemic that we are facing.

We need real, constructive legislation. We need to prevent and lessen violence. We must keep guns out of the hands of people who should not have access to them, such as the dangerously mentally ill. Now, domestic abusers and people with violent histories also should not have access to them, and they currently do.

Now, without stigmatizing those with mental illness because then you have a problem on your hands, we need to inform, educate, and help young people, families, and educators. We need to help those who are exhibiting emotional disturbances and help them

learn how to access information and assistance.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I don't want to disrespect in any way the minority's opportunity that they have, but I did come here to talk about the energy bills.

I chose to go last on this side because I would like to address some of the thoughtful concerns that were raised by Mr. HASTINGS from Florida. I call them concerns because I didn't hear real objections. I think they are legitimate concerns that some people have had, and they deserve discussion. We are talking about the rule here.

He made a suggestion that somehow this lifting of the oil export ban bill, H.R. 702, takes the President's prerogative away to deal with a situation at all costs or in every situation. The reality is it does reserve a right for the President to reinstate the ban in some sort of an emergency. I want to make sure that that is clarified.

I also want to clarify that he mentioned we are not in regular order, and perhaps he is referring to the Native American Energy Act. I know we have had a couple of hearings since I have been in Congress on that, perhaps not this Congress. I don't know. I am not on that committee.

I can tell you that the Energy and Commerce Committee has had a hearing on H.R. 702, and two other committees have had hearings on similar bills: the Agriculture Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee. So this has been a thoroughly vetted issue. In fact, with the admonition of Speaker BOEHNER, we really did take a long time with this issue to help educate one another, those of us from energy States. So I do think we have had a thorough debate on the topic, and I think it is time to have this discussion.

Coming from North Dakota, I just want to tell you that I come from a State that, prior to the energy revolution, or the Bakken revolution, the shale revolution, we were experiencing outmigration and low personal per capita income. Today, we have the second highest personal per capita income in the country. We can't accept people fast enough to deal with the jobs that are available. We are at a bit of a standstill right now because we are overproducing light sweet crude in this country, which is the type of crude that the global markets are demanding, but our domestic markets, because of our refining capacity, are not.

This is the time to lift this ban, and this is the body to do it. I hope we can get to it this afternoon.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, before yielding, I would like to correct myself.

When I spoke, I spoke about the minority's right for a motion to recommend, which indeed we do have; but in this particular instance, it is the minority's right to offer up the previous

question, and that is what we are proceeding under.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), a gentleman I have known a very long time in this institution and care greatly about, a very thoughtful Member.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and in protest to the Republican leadership's failure to bring commonsense legislation to the floor to stem our Nation's tide of gun violence.

In the wake of seemingly endless mass shootings, Americans of all backgrounds and diverse political beliefs are urging elected officials to stop merely wringing our hands and actually do something that protects our communities.

One measure that has virtually unanimous support is background checks to keep guns out of the hands of criminals, domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill. The problem is that our current background check system is rife with loopholes: background checks are not required at gun shows; they are also not required when individuals purchase weapons online.

The bipartisan King-Thompson background checks bill would close these egregious loopholes. It is an entirely sensible reform that would have a measurable impact on the safety of our schools and neighborhoods without preventing law-abiding citizens from using guns for self-defense or for recreational purposes.

I wholeheartedly reject the defeatist notion that we cannot do anything about our Nation's gun violence. I ask my colleagues: How much longer must we wait? How many more people have to die to get our attention? How many more American towns and cities must be added to the growing list of places like Columbine, Aurora, Charleston, and Newtown?

In the last 3 years, we have had some 20 moments of silence here on the House floor to honor victims of gun violence in the United States. Moments of silence are not enough. Thoughts and prayers are not enough. We need action, and I call on my colleagues to bring the background checks bill to the floor for a vote and to do it now.

□ 1400

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER), my good friend and a former member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago I was here for a moment of silence on behalf of the 12 killed and the 70 injured in the Aurora movie theater. Since that time, we have had at least 55 mass shootings where four or more people were killed and we have had at least 22 moments of silence.

How many more senseless acts of violence and hatred must occur before we

stand up and take action? How many more young, bright lives are going to be cut short because of loopholes in the law? How many more times must we stand on this floor in moments of silence, solemnly remembering another victim? How many more times must the flags be lowered at half staff in honor of servicemembers gunned down in their own backyard?

As important as these moments of reflection are, they happen with such regularity, we become numb to their significance. When will this violence end? Why is it we are paralyzed by the very laws that are meant to protect us?

It is incumbent upon us, as Members of Congress, to act and protect our citizens from unnecessary gun violence. I appreciated the gentleman from Alabama mentioning the violence that his own family has experienced.

It is time for a dialogue in the spirit of civility and compassion, bringing all Americans together to have a discussion about peace and safety in our schools, churches, and community centers. We have to begin. We can do this. It requires courage, but we can act to reduce this violence by passing meaningful gun violence prevention legislation that respects the Second Amendment.

Last week I joined 147 other Members of this body in writing to the Speaker, demanding action on gun violence prevention legislation. We demand a vote. Action is needed. I urge the defeat of the rule.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to advise how much time is remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 8 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Alabama has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), a good friend of mine. He is the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the rule, and in particular I oppose H.R. 702. Apparently, we have learned nothing over the past 40 years because this bill asks that we forget about oil shortages, oil recessions, and painfully high energy bills.

Do we really believe that the days of \$100 per barrel of oil are gone? Do we really believe that our military will never again be called upon to keep vital oil trade routes or production areas open? I wish that were true, but I doubt it.

Until we reduce our dependence on oil, we should retain control over our domestic oil resources. Our Nation is not energy independent. We still use a great deal of oil and other petroleum products.

Our transportation sector is still extremely vulnerable to price increases, whether we are talking about certainly

individual drivers, certainly our airlines or freight companies.

Our manufacturing sector is vulnerable, also. China may now be the largest importer of oil, but we are still the world's largest consumer of oil. This policy is not just about whether we open up trade on another commodity. It is a matter of national security and economic security. It is in our national interest that we can and do export crude oil and refined petroleum products now.

When we export refined products, we gain the extra benefit of jobs in the refining industry as well as those in oil production. This bill eliminates Presidential authority to restrict trade in crude oil.

It allows decisions about oil exports to be made by the oil companies, and they put a higher value on their profits than on our national security, our United States consumers, or our environment.

The oil companies see this window of low global oil prices as the opportunity to lift the ban on crude exports. The advocates for this policy point to the current slowdown in new drilling activity as evidence that our export policy is eliminating jobs in oil production.

The fact remains that oil is a global commodity and the global market price for a barrel of oil is no better than the price here in the United States. When oil is under \$50 per barrel, wells that are marginal or with higher costs will be capped until the price rises. That situation will not change by exporting to any already oversupplied global market.

But what happens when Asia's demand for oil increases, as it surely will, and the global price again climbs into the \$100 per barrel range? That is an excellent opportunity to sell as much as possible on the global market, a windfall for the oil companies and an economic downturn for us.

This policy change benefits a few of the wealthiest companies on this planet. There is no benefit for consumers. We will put our national security at risk, and certainly jobs and infrastructure in the refining industry and other industries as well will be hurt.

Exports of oil, in fact, and any of our strategically important resources should be in our national interest. Big Oil gets more than their share of subsidy from the United States' taxpayers. They do not need this additional windfall, and consumers and taxpayers cannot—simply cannot—afford to provide it.

I urge you to reject this rule and to oppose H.R. 702.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I was listening to the gentleman talk, and he was talking about how this might have a negative impact on American consumers with regard to gas prices. I would remind the House that even President Obama's own Department of Energy found that increased oil exports would help lower gas prices.

The gentleman also mentioned what this might do to the security of the

United States. A member of President Clinton's Cabinet has said this will enhance the security of the United States by strengthening our hand in Central and Eastern Europe.

I have listened to the gentleman. I respect his views, but I must say that I think the evidence that comes to us from Democratic administrations proves that what he said is really not accurate.

Mr. Speaker, we have no additional speakers. So if the gentleman is prepared to close, he may do so. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

My Republican friends argue that these bills will encourage growth and investment in our Nation's energy markets, local communities, and economy and are, therefore, important measures that we must address even as we face a highway trust fund that will become insolvent in a matter of weeks as well as another looming government shutdown in December.

All the while, those same individuals refuse to authorize the Export-Import Bank's charter, an entity that has created and sustained 1.5 million American jobs since 2007 at no cost to the taxpayer.

Passing a responsible budget, delivering on a long-term transportation bill, and reauthorizing the Ex-Im Bank will encourage the growth and investment that my friends speak of. The time to deliver on our promises to the American people is long overdue.

I call on House Republicans to stop wasting our time with legislation that rolls back long-held environmental protections—and stand almost certain veto threats—and take up the important measures that I mentioned.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to return to this notion of the previous question with reference to gun violence.

I believe in the Second Amendment. I own a gun. When I was a child, at age 7, I had a Red Ryder BB gun. When I was 12, I had a single-shot .22 rifle. I believe in every citizen's right to own a gun, and I believe my colleagues here on this side believe the same thing.

If every man, woman, and child is accounted for in the estimate of guns that are in this country, that would be more than 330 million. There are some people in our society who believe that somebody is going to come and take their guns. I wonder who that person would be.

Would it be a President of the United States? Would it be the military? Are they going to go and take the guns from their moms, their brothers, their sons, their fathers? That is foolish.

We need to stop this madness. Doing nothing in the face of all of this epidemic violence that we are experiencing allows that not only is this House dysfunctional in many of its particulars, but it is frozen in its indifference to the gun violence in this country.

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

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

American technology is a marvel in the world. We Americans figure out how to solve problems by using technology.

Just a few years ago we were struggling with how we were going to get enough energy into this country from other places, and now, because of the changes to the American people, we figured out the technologies it takes to be able to exploit energy resources right here.

It is almost like a miracle. We get to become energy independent where we won't have to get energy from other places. In fact, we found so much energy that we are in a position where we can export it and benefit our economy and people in America with more jobs.

Now, I have got to tell you something: I am proud to be American for a lot of reasons, but there is a great reason right there.

Our ingenuity solved this problem and created opportunities that we couldn't have dreamt of, but the Federal Government is standing in the way. We can't fully do what we need to do here.

There are many things in the way, but we are trying to deal with just two of them today. One of them is the limitations we put on the sovereign tribal nations that my friend from Florida so eloquently spoke about.

We put limitations on them and their ability to develop energy resources on their land. It is their land. Let them develop it. There are a couple good things from that. One of them is all of us in America get the benefit from that. As we develop any part of our energy sector, it benefits all of us.

Secondly, it benefits those people in those tribal nations. They are not asking for the Federal Government to give them something. They are asking for the Federal Government to get out of the way so they can do something for themselves. I think we ought to celebrate that in America and give them that opportunity.

The second bill removes a decades-old ban on oil exports. I am old enough to remember the 1970s. I remember waiting in a gas line and not being able to get gas, but that was then with the technology we had then, not now with the technology and the proven reserves we have now.

I don't want to shoulder my children with limitations based upon technology or technological understanding we had when I was their age. As they tell me all the time: Daddy, we have moved on. We have moved on in a very positive way in this particular aspect.

So it is time to get the dead hand of the past off of our energy industry so it can start doing the things it has so miraculously proven that it can do.

I urge everybody in this House to support this rule. I urge everybody in this House to support both of these underlying bills.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 466 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1217) to protect Second Amendment rights, ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, and provide a responsible and consistent background check process. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1217.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 183, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 541]

YEAS—244

Abraham	Brady (TX)	Collins (GA)
Aderholt	Brat	Collins (NY)
Allen	Bridenstine	Comstock
Amash	Brooks (AL)	Conaway
Amodei	Brooks (IN)	Cook
Babin	Buchanan	Costello (PA)
Barletta	Buck	Cramer
Barr	Buschon	Crawford
Barton	Brooks (AL)	Crenshaw
Benishek	Byrne	Culberson
Bilirakis	Calvert	Curbelo (FL)
Bishop (MI)	Carter (GA)	Davis, Rodney
Bishop (UT)	Carter (TX)	Denham
Black	Chabot	Dent
Blackburn	Chaffetz	DeSantis
Blum	Clawson (FL)	DesJarlais
Bost	Coffman	Diaz-Balart
Boustany	Cole	Dold

Donovan	Kline	Roe (TN)
Duffy	Knight	Rogers (AL)
Duncan (SC)	Labrador	Rogers (KY)
Duncan (TN)	LaHood	Rohrabacher
Ellmers (NC)	LaMalfa	Rokita
Emmer (MN)	Lamborn	Rooney (FL)
Farenthold	Lance	Ros-Lehtinen
Fincher	Latta	Roskam
Fitzpatrick	LoBiondo	Ross
Fleischmann	Long	Rothfus
Fleming	Loudermilk	Rouzer
Flores	Love	Royce
Forbes	Lucas	Russell
Fortenberry	Luetkemeyer	Ryan (WI)
Fox	Lummis	Salmon
Franks (AZ)	MacArthur	Sanford
Frelinghuysen	Marchant	Scalise
Garrett	Marino	Schweikert
Gibbs	Massie	Scott, Austin
Gibson	McCarthy	Sensenbrenner
Gohmert	McCauley	Sessions
Goodlatte	McClintock	Shimkus
Gosar	McHenry	Shuster
Gowdy	McKinley	Simpson
Granger	McMorris	Smith (MO)
Graves (GA)	Rodgers	Smith (NE)
Graves (LA)	McSally	Smith (NJ)
Graves (MO)	Meadows	Smith (TX)
Griffith	Meehan	Stefanik
Grothman	Messer	Stewart
Guinta	Mica	Stivers
Guthrie	Miller (FL)	Stutzman
Hanna	Miller (MI)	Thompson (PA)
Hardy	Moolenaar	Thornberry
Harper	Mooney (WV)	Tiberi
Harris	Mullin	Tipton
Hartzler	Mulvaney	Trott
Heck (NV)	Murphy (PA)	Turner
Hensarling	Neugebauer	Upton
Herrera Beutler	Newhouse	Valadao
Hice, Jody B.	Noem	Wagner
Hill	Nugent	Walberg
Holding	Nunes	Walden
Huelskamp	Olson	Walker
Huizenga (MI)	Palazzo	Walorski
Hultgren	Palmer	Walters, Mimi
Hunter	Paulsen	Weber (TX)
Hurd (TX)	Pearce	Webster (FL)
Hurt (VA)	Perry	Wenstrup
Issa	Pittenger	Westerman
Jenkins (KS)	Pitts	Westmoreland
Jenkins (WV)	Poe (TX)	Whitfield
Johnson (OH)	Poliquin	Williams
Johnson, Sam	Pompeo	Wittman
Jolly	Posey	Womack
Jones	Price, Tom	Woodall
Jordan	Ratcliffe	Yoder
Joyce	Reed	Yoho
Katko	Reichert	Young (AK)
Kelly (MS)	Renacci	Young (IA)
Kelly (PA)	Ribble	Young (IN)
King (IA)	Rice (SC)	Zeldin
King (NY)	Rigell	Zinke
Kinzinger (IL)	Roby	

NAYS—183

Adams	Conyers	Graham
Aguilar	Cooper	Grayson
Ashford	Costa	Green, Al
Bass	Courtney	Green, Gene
Beatty	Crowley	Grijalva
Becerra	Cuellar	Gutiérrez
Bera	Cummings	Hahn
Beyer	Davis (CA)	Hastings
Bishop (GA)	Davis, Danny	Heck (WA)
Blumenauer	DeFazio	Higgins
Bonamici	DeGette	Himes
Boyle, Brendan	Delaney	Hinojosa
F.	DeLauro	Honda
Brady (PA)	DelBene	Hoyer
Brown (FL)	DeSaulnier	Huffman
Brownley (CA)	Deuth	Israel
Bustos	Doggett	Jackson Lee
Butterfield	Doyle, Michael	Jeffries
Capps	F.	Johnson (GA)
Capuano	Duckworth	Johnson, E. B.
Cárdenas	Edwards	Kaptur
Carney	Ellison	Keating
Carson (IN)	Engel	Kelly (IL)
Cartwright	Eshoo	Kennedy
Castor (FL)	Esty	Kildee
Castro (TX)	Farr	Kilmer
Chu, Judy	Fattah	Kind
Ciulline	Foster	Kirkpatrick
Clark (MA)	Frankel (FL)	Kuster
Clarke (NY)	Fudge	Langevin
Clay	Gabbard	Larsen (WA)
Clyburn	Gallego	Larson (CT)
Cohen	Garamendi	Lawrence

Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan

Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David

Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Cleaver
Connolly
Dingell

Hudson
Sinema
Vela

Wilson (SC)

□ 1442

Mr. RIGELL changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR THE VICTIMS OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA FLOOD

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of Congress, the people of South Carolina have faced an unprecedented, catastrophic weather event, also known as a 1,000-year rain, exceeding 20 inches virtually overnight, causing flooding and widespread damage. We are grateful for your thoughts and prayers.

The flooding and rain destroyed homes and roads, collapsed bridges, and broke dams across the State; 400 roads and bridges are still closed. Tragically, to date, the flooding has claimed the lives of nearly 20 citizens across the Carolinas. We ask for your thoughts and prayers for their families.

We are grateful for the strength of the people of South Carolina, led by Governor Nikki Haley and Adjutant General Bob Livingston.

We are inspired by people like Aaron and Amy Dupree, with their four small children, who were rescued by boat from their home in Columbia's Lake Katherine community by their neighbor, Brian Boyer.

You will hear stories of incredible acts of volunteerism, like Kassy Alia, the widow of Forest Acres Police Officer Greg Alia who was murdered last week, leaving her and their 5-month-old son, Sal. Despite her grief, she joined others in distributing food to those in need.

Wherever you go, you will find heroes like these and hear about the service of the first responders, emergency per-

sonnel, officials, and State employees who have worked tirelessly to aid our community.

We appreciate that Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson will lead a fact-finding delegation with members of our delegation to our State tomorrow.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN). If he is not available, I just want to thank him for his service. We look forward to being on the delegation with him tomorrow.

God bless South Carolina, and I ask my colleagues to stand and join me in a moment of silence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will rise for a moment of silence.

Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 244, noes 185, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 542]

AYES—244

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis

DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)

Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin

Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)

Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
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

NOES—185

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

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

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

NOT VOTING—5

Cleaver	Gibson	Sinema
Dingell	Hudson	

□ 1456

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIVE AMERICAN ENERGY ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill H.R. 538.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 466 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. 538.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1458

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. 538) to facilitate the development of energy on Indian lands by reducing Federal regulations that impede tribal development of Indian lands, and for other purposes, with Mr. ROUZER 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 Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

□ 1500

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 538 has been in the works for several years. This is not a bill that came out of nowhere. Its provisions are the result of oversight hearings and consultation with Indian tribes and Alaska Native Corporations. The bill streamlines Federal permitting for, and increases tribal control over, energy and other natural resource development on Indian lands. It gives tribes options to perform or waive appraisals of their lands and prohibits the Interior Department's hydraulic fracturing from applying to Indian lands without the consent of the tribe.

It also contains provisions to streamline judicial review and deter frivolous lawsuits concerning Federal permit-

ting for Native American energy projects. The judicial review provisions are crucial for Alaska Natives, whose ability to develop their land claims settlement lands has been abused by special interest groups filing lawsuits.

The bill also authorizes a pilot project for the Navajo Nation to handle mineral leasing of its trust lands if Interior approves its tribal leasing program.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 538 promotes tribal forest stewardship contracting on Federal lands adjacent to Indian reservation land to provide a full supply of biomass energy for the tribes.

This summer, the GAO issued a report called "Indian Energy Development—Poor Management by BIA Has Hindered Energy Department on Indian Lands." Here a couple of the highlights:

"The BIA does not have comprehensive data to identify ownership and resources available for development, does not have a documented process or data to track and monitor its review and response times, and some offices do not have the skills or adequate staff resources to effectively review energy-related documents."

"In 2012, Interior's inspector general found that weaknesses in BIA's management of oil and gas resources contributed to a general preference by industry to acquire oil and gas leases on non-Indian lands over Indian lands."

This is a jobs bill. It provides energy for America, and more than that, it takes care of the tribal community that has been blessed with resources. In some Indian reservations, where unemployment rates are 50 percent, energy jobs are the only high-wage, private sector jobs available for members. These energy jobs dollars go a long way in supporting families.

The Native American Energy Act is strongly supported by a broad array of Native organizations as well as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, specifically, the National Congress of American Indians, the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians, the Intertribal Timber Council, Navajo Nation, Southern Ute Indian Tribe, Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, and the Ute Tribe of Utah.

I am a little bit surprised that the White House has issued a statement against this bill. Really, it is not anything new. I always listen to this administration's "all of the above but none of the below" as far as energy goes. In other words, the administration promotes only wind and solar, while opposing oil, gas, and coal on Nations' lands—Nations' lands.

In the Dakotas, it takes 15 permits on tribal lands and 2 off of tribal lands. That is a disgrace, and I suggest, with 56 million acres of land, there ought to be the ability to be self-determined, be the first Americans, with the ability to take and produce energy, and help their tribal members out.

Those that oppose this, it is the same old story: don't get too smart; we will give you a side of beef and a blanket. Don't let us help ourselves, let the government tell you what to do.

This is a good piece of legislation. This did not come from me. This came from the Native tribes themselves. It is an example, as we have trust authority, we should let them control their own destiny.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, frankly, we are still not addressing the most pressing needs in Indian Country. Six years later, the Carcieri decision still has not been fixed, despite much lipservice that has been given to it from the majority.

Our colleague Mr. COLE and our colleague Ms. MCCOLLUM both have legislation, bipartisan legislation, that would deal with that immediately. We should call that up. We should have a hearing, and we should deal with this decision that has left so much doubt and confusion in Indian Country.

Sacred sites are in need of identification and protection rather than midnight riders attached to unrelated legislation that violates tribal sacred site protections, as has happened already. Lack of funding from this body coupled with sequestration has left Indian health and education really with no relief in site.

Yes, barriers to energy development on Indian land are among the most pressing needs, both as an economic driver for tribes and for the energy needs of the United States. But this bill does not address the real energy needs on tribal lands, and while we are wasting time on it, these other, and even more pressing needs, just continue to grow more urgent.

The legislation claims to facilitate energy development, but, instead, it short-circuits the review process set up by the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, and limits judicial review of development decisions. Instead of helping tribes develop energy resources on their lands, this approach will lead to less environmental protection on Indian lands and less judicial recourse to those affected.

These proposals are not new. We have seen and debated them before as part of the failed Republican energy bills last Congress, and here they are again. The legislation would amend NEPA, one of the Nation's bedrock environmental laws, to limit review of and comment on proposed projects to members of the affected Indian tribe and other individuals residing within an undetermined affected area. This limitation severely restricts public involvement in proposed Federal projects that may affect the environment, a central tenet of NEPA.

Arbitrarily limiting such review and comment would prevent even other Indian tribes with cultural ties in the so-

called affected area from commenting on a proposed project. Limiting the universe of members of the public who can participate in the NEPA process but then failing to actually define that universe is not reform. It is not reform at all.

Additionally, this restriction is not just applicable to energy projects; it applies to any major project on Indian lands. This could mean proposed mining contracts, proposed water development projects, construction of solid waste facilities, and even construction of tribal class III gaming facilities all would slip through this undefined loophole. Nontribal partners would also reap this benefit as well, as long as the project is located on Indian lands.

The legislation also throws up insurmountable barriers to those seeking to hold the Federal Government accountable for its actions in court. It prevents the recovery of attorney's fees in cases challenging energy projects, and it makes a claimant who fails to succeed on the merits of a suit potentially liable to the defendant for attorneys' fees and costs. This makes it extremely difficult, if not impossible, for members of the public—even tribal members whose homelands may be impacted by a major Federal action of any kind—to seek judicial review.

The other side will say this is in response to frivolous lawsuits that have been filed in these cases in the past, but according to the Department of the Interior Solicitor's Office, very few approved energy-related projects have ever been challenged in court. This is truly a solution in search of a problem. It is clear the real intent of this provision is to chill legitimate litigation and to undermine the real teeth of NEPA by making the availability of injunctive relief all but disappear.

Furthermore, this applies even to non-Indian land. If an energy company is developing natural resources anywhere in the United States and they get a tribal partner, they can fall under this provision. This could incentivize energy companies to partner with tribes simply for the benefit of skirting NEPA and profiting from restricted judicial review.

The legislation is opposed by the administration, as well as many environmental and conservation groups. I enter the following letter of opposition to this legislation into the RECORD, which has been signed by the Alaska Wilderness League, Center for Biological Diversity, Defenders of Wildlife, Earthjustice, Green Latinos, The Lands Council, League of Conservation Voters, National Parks Conservation Association, Natural Resources Defense Council, Northern Alaska Environmental Center, San Juan Citizens Alliance, Sierra Club, Western Environmental Law Center, and The Wilderness Society.

ALASKA WILDERNESS LEAGUE, CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY, DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE, EARTHJUSTICE, GREEN LATINOS, THE LANDS COUNCIL, LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS, NATIONAL PARKS CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION, NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, NORTHERN ALASKA ENVIRONMENTAL CENTER, SAN JUAN CITIZENS ALLIANCE, SIERRA CLUB, WESTERN ENVIRONMENTAL LAW CENTER, THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY,

September 9, 2015.

Chairman ROB BISHOP,
Ranking Member RAÚL GRIJALVA,
House Natural Resources Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BISHOP AND RANKING MEMBER GRIJALVA: On behalf of our millions of members and supporters, we write to express our strong concerns with H.R. 538, the "Native American Energy Act." The bill purports to promote and encourage increased energy production on tribal lands by reducing government barriers and streamlining burdensome procedures. While we are not opposed to the development of energy projects on tribal lands under the law, this bill goes far beyond that by severely limiting public involvement in the development of any major project on tribal lands, as well as by insulating potentially environmentally devastating energy projects on tribal lands (or even projects done in partnership with an Indian tribe on non-tribal lands) from judicial review. It further erodes the public interest by diminishing its full authority to conduct appraisals, especially in the context of land exchanges between the federal government and an Alaska Native Corporation. Given the problems with these provisions, we ask that you oppose H.R. 538.

We are particularly concerned with Sections 2, 4, and 5 of this legislation.

Section 2 would diminish the public interest by allowing state-chartered, for-profit corporations to gain full authority to conduct appraisals, especially in the context of land exchanges between the federal government and an Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) corporation. Many land swaps have been very controversial in Alaska, including in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Section 4 would amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) by mandating that Environmental Impact Statements (EISs) for any federal action on tribal lands by an Indian tribe "shall only be available for review and comment by the members of the Indian tribe and by any other individual residing within the affected area." This provision would severely undermine one of the most basic tenets of NEPA: to facilitate public involvement in decision making. Additionally, this limitation is applicable to more than energy projects; it applies to any major project on tribal land by a native community. By its terms, section 4 applies to the lands of Native Corporations transferred under the provisions of ANCSA, or associated land trades. For example, if passed into law, this section would limit public participation in a broad range of EISs: Clean Water Act 404 permits for any purpose; highway projects; energy or any other federal project; or funding of any project on tribal lands by a native community. Furthermore, the provision would allow for significantly limiting the defined "affected area" such that some members of the public would be excluded from commenting on a draft EIS. This would artificially limit what the agency might learn about the potential impacts of its project, leading to uninformed decision making.

Section 5 aims at insulating energy related projects from judicial review by placing severe restrictions on the time in which to file claims and making the pursuit of any legal challenge overwhelmingly cost-prohibitive. In addition to curtailing the amount of time an individual or group has to challenge the decision to only 60 days, Section 5 further restricts judicial review by requiring plaintiffs to pay the attorney's fees and costs of the defendants if they do not "ultimately prevail." Furthermore, even where plaintiffs are successful in their challenge, this section precludes them from winning awards typically provided for through the Equal Access to Justice Act (EAJA) and the Treasury Department's Judgment Fund. EAJA and the Judgment Fund costs are incredibly important in cases which seek non-monetary relief, such as those involving environmental protection and public health issues. These funds make the courts accessible to the individual citizen, non-profit organization, small business, or public interest group that would otherwise lack the financial ability to challenge large corporations or the federal government, who are harming their communities or environment in the name of energy development. For over three decades, the financial backstop provided for under EAJA and the Judgment Fund has meant that access to the courts is not limited to those with deep pockets. By eliminating the ability of parties to utilize EAJA or the Judgment Fund, H.R. 538 prevents such individuals or organizations from bringing cases that challenge harmful or illegal energy related projects. Section 5 creates insurmountable barriers to justice at the expense of the American public and rejects equal access to the courts in favor of a perverse pay-to-play system.

Additionally, Section 5 defines "energy related action" broadly so as to ensure the restrictive judicial review provisions of this section apply equally to projects on tribal land as well as those energy projects on non-tribal lands where at least one tribe is involved. This invites the partnering of energy corporations with native communities for the purpose of limiting judicial review.

Finally, Section 9 of the bill would eliminate health and environmental protections established by the Department of the Interior in rules regarding hydraulic fracturing. Those living on and near tribal lands would possibly be subjected to heightened risk of spills, underground contamination from toxic chemicals, weakened air quality, reduced well construction standards, and other benefits from DOI's updates to long out-of-date rules.

We recognize the self-determination framework for federally recognized tribal governments and tribal members, but it is important to ensure that development decisions adequately address all of the impacts of those decisions, some of which occur well beyond the project site, and that the public has the ability to participate. H.R. 538 eliminates broad public participation for projects on tribal land, including ANCSA Corporation lands. Further, it will have a significant chilling effect on the ability of the public (including tribal members) to seek judicial review of a decision related to an energy project on Indian land or proposed by (or done in partnership with) an Indian tribe to ensure that the project complies with the law. For these reasons, we ask that you oppose H.R. 538.

Sincerely,

Alaska Wilderness League, Center for Biological Diversity, Defenders of Wildlife, Earthjustice, Green Latinos, The Lands Council, League of Conservation Voters, National Parks Conservation Association, Natural Resources Defense Council, Northern

Alaska Environmental Center, San Juan Citizens Alliance, Sierra Club, Western Environmental Law Center, The Wilderness Society.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, instead of using energy development on Indian land as an excuse to weaken NEPA and judicial review, we should be concentrating our efforts on real reform that would achieve tribal self-determination and energy development. We should be dealing with the disparities in the Tax Code that stymie investments in Indian Country and create an unfair playing field. Tax credits and incentives for energy development that cities and communities have long used to their benefit, these need to be available to tribes as well. We should be encouraging investment in the future of renewable energy on tribal lands.

According to the Department of Energy Office of Indian Energy, Indian land contains an estimated 5 percent of all renewable energy resources, and the total energy potential from these resources is almost 14 percent of the total U.S. potential. In my home State of Arizona, there is a great potential for solar, wind, and geothermal energy on Indian land. We just need to fix the real issues that prohibit the investment in these projects.

But this bill doesn't do that. Instead, the majority is here today to once again attack NEPA and judicial review, this time attempting to use this as a wedge issue, attempting to drive a wedge between people that care about tribal self-determination as well as environmental stewardship.

Picking between tribal sovereignty and responsible energy development is a false choice. We can have both. We can have successful energy development in Indian Country while retaining the environmental protections that will ensure future generations of Native Americans that they, too, can enjoy the benefits of that economic development.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to abandon this irresponsible proposal in favor of a real tribal energy bill. In the meantime, I would plead with my colleagues to bring legislation to the floor addressing Indian health care, Indian education programs, a codified process for tribal consultation with Federal agencies that respects sovereignty and upholds the trust responsibility that we have to Indian Country, and a fix—finally, a fix—for the current cloud hanging over the status of so many trust lands.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I would like to mention one thing. I do have an amendment for a future day—I am speaking to the gentleman—on NEPA. We don't change the NEPA policy at all, other than the fact that only those affected can have comments on how it affects their land, not a bunch of people from New York or Maine or Dallas or Florida. So that is

really a red herring that was drug across this bill. This is to help the tribes.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), my good chairman of the full committee.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Alaska yielding.

There are some Native American tribes that do not rely on gaming alone for their source of revenue. They can't. It is amazing how often we hear, dealing with North American Native tribes, all of a sudden give lipservice that we would like to empower them, until they actually have a chance to do so; and then, all of a sudden, we change. We are talking about a lot of tribes who have a great deal of land but very little employment.

This bill, in fact, is based on recommendations that come from Indian Country. By that, I don't mean the Bureau of Indian Affairs, because they, shamefully, oppose this bill. I do mean groups like Southern Utah Utes, the Confederated Tribes of Colville, the National Congress of American Indians, the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians, and community groups like the Chamber of Commerce. All of those people are realizing the importance of this particular bill in empowering Native Americans in this Nation.

I hope we do not turn this into a partisan affair by saying, by voting "no" on this bill, you might get three Democrat callers on C-SPAN to support your vote. But it still does not make that right. We need to do something differently.

In these areas in which the potential employment is based on agriculture, mining, and energy, we don't need more regulations on the Native Americans than there are on everybody else. We don't need duplicative regulations on them more than anybody else. Instead, we need to streamline that so they can be successful in charting their own destiny and making their own choices.

Far too often we have too many people, unfortunately, with titles around this place that still have a paternalistic attitude toward Native Americans. That attitude has to change. This is what this bill does.

It is amazing. Sometimes when this administration says, well, if it deals with marijuana, they are a Native tribe, they are a sovereign country, let them do what they want to; but if it deals with agriculture and mining, well, not so fast. That is public lands. We still need to have some kind of control over that.

That is the problem: pot, yes; energy, no. That doesn't work. We need these people to be able to make decisions for themselves.

I appreciate the chairman of the subcommittee mentioning that he does have an amendment on NEPA which does solve those problems. This is not a NEPA issue. This is an issue on wheth-

er we truly believe in empowering Native Americans so they can make decisions for themselves and help their own people.

□ 1515

I had a chairman of a tribe who sat in my room and wisely said: I don't care what game we play. I just want to know what the ball looks like.

This bill gives them a chance to see the ball. It gives the Native Americans a chance to approve the design of the ball. More importantly, it gives them a chance to win.

So, Lucy, please, just before contact, don't pull the ball away. Let the Native Americans win. This bill gives them an opportunity to win and chart their own destiny. That is why they support it, and that is why we should vote for it.

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

The GAO report has mentioned many times about the rationale behind and the catalyst behind this particular legislation; yet, the conclusion, which I agree with, is that we are not living up to our responsibilities as it applies to energy development on Indian land.

But reading the recommendations, nowhere does it say that the solution to the problem is to gut NEPA or to stifle judicial recourse. Instead, the recommendations talk about resources that are needed by Indian Country to successfully fulfill their obligations and responsibilities to their members. It talks about staffing shortages, outdated mapping systems, and the need to ensure that the BIA can provide support to the tribes on energy programs.

These are things the BIA has asked for in their budget and that the President's budget sent over has requested time and time again. Funding these requests go unheeded by this majority.

So it is disingenuous, as the majority does time and time again, to starve an agency or a program of needed funding and then to complain that that agency program is ineffective.

It is also disingenuous to say that the responsibility to work with and honor our trust responsibility to Indian Country is down to the choice in this legislation whether you vote "yes" or "no."

As I stated in my opening statement, there is a litany of pressing issues that face Indian Country and Native Americans in our Nation, a litany of benign neglect for many, many years, of which all bear responsibility.

But with that responsibility comes also the opportunity to act. The fix is necessary so that fact is quelled on a bad Supreme Court decision. We need the adequate funding so that the trust responsibility that we inherit as Members of Congress is upheld.

We need programs of infrastructure in Indian Country. We need many, many issues to address not only the human need, but the economic needs of Indian Country.

To say that this bill is the watershed moment that is going to turn all that benign neglect and irresponsibility backwards is disingenuous at best.

I would suggest let's talk about a real comprehensive approach to the issue of Indian Country and the support this Congress needs to give to our trust responsibility.

If we do that, I am sure all of us collectively can come to the same conclusion, that we need to do something and that there is before us legislation from both sides of the aisle that begin to address it.

This legislation is not it. It is not a panacea. And to pit the trust responsibility this Congress has and to question whether sovereignty is supported or not by Members that oppose this is not fair.

The fairness in this would have been an energy bill that is comprehensive. The fairness would have been not to gut NEPA, judicial review, and present a bill that is clean and upholds bedrock environmental laws and—and it is not complicated—uphold the trust responsibility that we have when we swear an oath of office to serve in this Congress.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS).

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Native American Energy Act.

Having an all-of-the-above energy policy means all people in all communities. Each community across the country should have the opportunity to unleash the natural resources closest to them to help meet their energy needs. For those of us in the Pacific Northwest, it means encouraging biomass.

We have just had a devastating wildfire season, and the issue of forest health continues to be on the forefront. Fallen trees, overgrowth, and general mismanagement have led to worsening fire seasons.

By encouraging forest products for biomass, we would add and have a benefit of reducing forest fire risk by keeping our lands healthier, in addition to creating a stable energy source.

This legislation allows a pilot project to encourage greater biomass production on tribal forestland. In my district in eastern Washington, it would help the confederated tribes of the Colville Reservation, who already play a very active role in forest management, get new tools at their disposal to maintain the health of the adjacent forest to the reservation. It would help them develop energy and, most importantly, help them protect their homeland.

I am proud to support this legislation and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to

the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON).

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to give my voice in strong support for the Native American Energy Act.

I would also like to be able to thank Chairman YOUNG and Chairman BISHOP for their leadership and support of Native American energy development.

Energy resource development on Native American lands is important and becoming increasingly significant year after year. For example, in 2014, responsible conventional energy development on Native American lands alone generated revenues of \$24 billion.

This revenue figure does not include renewable energy development on tribal lands, which is the potential to increase revenues, jobs, and household incomes for Native American communities.

I am privileged to be able to represent the Southern Ute Indian Tribe located in southwest Colorado. Some of my colleagues know that the Southern Ute Indian Tribe is a model of tribal governance and economic development. The tribe is widely known as the premier natural gas developer and the largest employer in the region.

I am extremely proud that the Southern Ute Indian Tribe continues to take the lead in demanding that the Federal Government respect self-determination and tribal decisionmaking when it comes to energy and environmental regulation.

To his credit, Chairman YOUNG continues to hold numerous oversight hearings and legislative hearings to allow tribal leaders to illustrate the challenges they face daily as they attempt to develop their natural resources so that they can provide programs, services, and jobs for their nations.

The result is H.R. 538, which will remove a number of these barriers. The legislation streamlines the appraisal process that must be undertaken by the Department of Interior because the status quo has resulted in delays that have caused the tribe to miss out on royalty payments totaling more than \$95 million.

The legislation also amends the Tribal Forest Protection Act of 2004, to direct the Department of Interior to enter into agreements with tribes to carry out demonstration projects that promote biomass energy production on Native American forestland and in nearby communities by providing tribes with reliable supplies of woody biomass from Federal lands.

It also prohibits the Interior rule regarding hydraulic fracturing from having any effect on land held in trust or restricted status for Native Americans, except with the express consent of the Indian beneficiaries. The Southern Ute's repeated attempts to ensure tribal lands were not included in this misguided rule were completely disregarded by this administration.

Fortunately, H.R. 538 promotes Native American self-determination,

strengthens tribal sovereignty, and reinforces our commitment to tribal self-sufficiency.

I urge my colleagues to support this vital legislation.

Once again, I thank Chairman YOUNG for his leadership and Chairman BISHOP on this issue.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support of this commonsense legislation.

This bill empowers Native Americans to invest in their communities, their people, and their resources as they see fit without the heavy hand of Washington bureaucracy trying to insert itself between them and their own land.

Under current policy, potential resource development on tribal lands face many obstacles that projects on private or State lands do not.

Before entering into a lease agreement with energy developers on their own land, a tribe must first attempt to navigate the long, slow, and duplicative process of the Department of Interior's approval. This process can be fraught with litigation and delays that chase away potential investments and crush otherwise viable projects.

The Native American Energy Act streamlines many of the duplicative Federal regulatory hurdles that prevent tribes or individuals from profitably developing energy resources on their land.

This will provide tribes with greater control over how they best develop their own natural resources and allow them to do so in ways that will best benefit their communities, not a D.C. bureaucrat's ideology.

Because of the commonsense and empowering reforms it contains, this bill has widespread support from the Indian tribes. It is odd that the only groups on record in opposition to this bill are the Obama administration and some Democratic members of the Natural Resources Committee.

Why does the administration continue to insist that bureaucrats from their comfy leather chairs and marble offices in Washington, D.C., know more about how to manage Indian land than the tribes themselves?

If Congress is actually serious about supporting tribal efforts to generate high-paying jobs and improving the everyday standard of living in American Indian communities, this bill is a real, concrete way to empower them to do so.

I commend the chairman and the committee for their work on this bill. I strongly urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alaska for bringing this legislation forward.

In my hometown of Hobbs, New Mexico, truck drivers are making \$100,000 a year. They don't have to have a college degree, not even a high school diploma. And, yet, we limit this sort of opportunity on tribal lands. This bill is fairly simple. Simply let them free. Let them free to develop their lands in the way they want to.

I heard one of my colleagues say that there are no frivolous lawsuits. Just this week the WildEarth Guardians were found to have filed a frivolous lawsuit on matters such as these, trying to stop development, trying to hold things up. The judge said this is frivolous. It is the WildEarth Guardians v. Kirkpatrick decision that is very recent.

We are told that there are a litany of issues that we should be dealing with. I will tell you that Native Americans are sophisticated enough to take care of their own problems. They just need the opportunity to have jobs. They need the opportunity for economic development inside their own nations.

Just recently we hosted in New Mexico a gathering of different tribes who are looking at investments in oil and gas. One lady said: My son is working in North Dakota for \$60,000 a year, and he should be working here on the reservation in the oil and gas industry for \$60,000 a year. That is the urgency that I am sensing on the reservations.

The reservations are beginning to build their own houses, and they are doing magnificent work. They are becoming self-determined. But we here in Washington say we know better. Mr. YOUNG's bill says that we don't know better.

Just let them develop what they want. Take the shackles off, take the chains loose, and let the American spirit that is on the reservations live and breathe. It is a very simple concept, but one some have a very difficult time accepting.

I say vote for H.R. 538 and put them free.

□ 1530

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I just want to note that the Democrats on the Natural Resources Committee filed several amendments to this bill. We felt our Members were squarely within the House rules.

Sadly, the majority on Rules failed to make any of their amendments in order. One of these rejected amendments would have fixed the terrible mess created by the decision in Carcieri.

If you want to help tribes in a legitimate, coequal way control their own lands and move closer and closer to self-determination, you have to address

this problem. It is telling that my friends on the other side have refused to even address the bill or to have a legitimate hearing on the bill.

Let me just in closing address the Statement of Administrative Policy.

While the administration supports the need to facilitate energy development in Indian Country, it does not support H.R. 538, the Native American Energy Act. This bill would undermine public participation and transparency of review of projects on Indian lands under the National Environmental Policy Act, set unrealistic deadlines, and remove oversight for appraisals of Indian lands or trust assets, and prohibit awards under the Equal Access to Justice Act or payment of fees or expenses to a plaintiff from the judgment fund in an energy-related action.

By foreclosing the judgment fund, this provision would negatively impact the Indian Affairs budget that is intended to serve all tribes. In addition, this bill's changes to mineral leasing loss applicable to Navajo Nations land may adversely affect energy development on these lands.

The bill also stipulates that Indian lands are exempt from the Department of the Interior's hydraulic fracking rule. That rule already contains the provision allowing for variances from the rules requirements when tribal laws meet or exceed the rule standards.

The rule approach both protects environmental and trust resources while also protecting decisionmaking of the tribes. Overall, H.R. 538 would not ensure diligent development of resources on Indian land.

The administration appreciates the committee's efforts to address energy needs in Indian Country. Income from energy development is one of the largest sources of revenue generated from trust lands, and delays in development translate to delays in profits to Indian mineral rights owners.

The administration has been taking meaningful action to update the leasing process for lands held in trust for Indian tribes and is actively working to expedite appraisals, leasing, and permitting on Indian lands, and to provide resources to ensure safe and responsible development.

The administration looks forward to working with Congress to develop the reforms necessary to support this development.

The point is that this legislation is a rush to judgment. It is a gift, in a sense, when you exempt from the judicial review and from NEPA the exploration and production of energy on Indian land. As coequals, these environmental protections and public processes are intended for all.

So rather than be patronizing, as coequals and within our trust responsibility, this bill should be rejected. We should work on comprehensive energy opportunity legislation that truly recognizes self-determination for all members of tribes, provided the environmental, public health, and judicial processes would guarantee them that they would be treated equal under the law.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, I suggest one thing. This bill came from the tribes, not from the Sierra Club and not from the friends of this and not from the friends of that. All 28 organizations had nothing to do with the tribes.

I have said all along—and I am pretty well related to the Athabascan Tribe in Alaska—it is time they are given the opportunity to fulfill the self-determination act that we passed. Words do not do that.

This administration has these great conferences, and we invite everybody down and wink, wink, and now have a good time. Nothing happens administratively.

Now, I know there is some legislation and I am working very hard to get legislation, but I can't do it all. I have to do it one little step at a time.

This bill is requested by American Indians to have more control over their land.

I have to remind this Congress that I sit in that we are now ranked in the nations around the world 20th in the freedom category. We have gone from number 1 to 20th. Think about that. The American Indians, our first people, are 13th in freedom because of our so-called free government. Now, there is something wrong with that.

We are doing an indirect thing, as trustees, by not allowing them to expand their God-given right, their ability, their intellectual capability, to expand their self-worth and keep their identity.

Every time we try to bring a bill to the floor to do that, it is, first of all, "We can do it better administratively." That is why they are ranked 13th in freedom because of our government.

Now, I want everybody to think about this in Congress, from number 1 freest nation in the world to right now 20. That is not a good thing.

In the last 5 years, we have dropped three spaces in that freedom chart, mainly because of overreach, regulation, and dictation by our government. That is what it is based on. Individual freedoms are lost.

Try that as a tribe and have to go through all the other steps that the other person doesn't have to. Well, they dropped down to 13th.

I am asking the people in this body to support this bill if you believe in self-determination, if you believe in self-sufficiency, if you believe in the right to get ahead, especially in nations by this Congress that gave them the ability to be self-determined. They really take it away.

So this is a good piece of legislation, a piece of legislation that should be voted "yes" on. We should give a chance for the American Indian to go forth as I know they have the capability of.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Chair, today I will vote against H.R. 538, the Native American Energy Act. The bill makes needed changes to allow tribes to fully manage their lands which I strongly support. Unfortunately, it goes too far by weakening bedrock environmental protections, and makes it difficult for those with legitimate legal grievances to seek justice.

Technically the 2005 Energy Act allows tribes to enter into energy development leases

through what are called Tribal Energy Resource Agreements, which must be approved by Interior. I say technically because no tribe has ever been successful in doing so. Tribes have submitted proposals that have sat with Interior for as long as eight years and then were never approved. Interior has never clarified what requirements are needed to gain approval. Potential business partners cannot and will not sit wait to see if the federal government will do its job. They will find partners that are able to move forward.

One of most laudable parts of the bill is the creation of biomass demonstration projects. Our forests are overgrown and are infested with insects and disease. Fuel reduction is vital to forest health and reducing the severity of fires. Often overgrowth is not suitable for timber production, but can be suitable for energy production. Many tribes are ready to take advantage of these resources; they have their own processing facilities, trained work force and infrastructure in place to discover benefits to improve forest health, maintain fish and wildlife habitat, and create renewable energy.

Tribes, lest we forget, are sovereign nations. Yet they regularly encounter obstacles not experienced by private landowners. The federal government already has the tools to solve this inequity, but refuses to do so. The lack of urgency to correct what amounts to bureaucratic indifference is not acceptable. America's first stewards of the land have the right to manage and develop their lands, and the federal government's inaction to ensure their rights is deplorable.

Because the bill goes beyond necessary reforms by curtailing environmental and judicial review, the president has issued a veto threat. I look forward to the Senate removing those provisions which unnecessarily hinder what could be a good bill and sending it back to the House.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. FOXF). All time for general debate has expired.

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

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-30. 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. 538

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 "Native American Energy Act".

SEC. 2. APPRAISALS.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Title XXVI of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 2607. APPRAISAL REFORMS.

"(a) OPTIONS TO INDIAN TRIBES.—With respect to a transaction involving Indian land or the trust assets of an Indian tribe that requires the approval of the Secretary, any appraisal relating to fair market value required to be conducted under applicable law, regulation, or policy may be completed by—

"(1) the Secretary;

"(2) the affected Indian tribe; or

"(3) a certified, third-party appraiser pursuant to a contract with the Indian tribe.

"(b) TIME LIMIT ON SECRETARIAL REVIEW AND ACTION.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretary receives an appraisal conducted by or for an Indian tribe pursuant to paragraphs (2) or (3) of subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

"(1) review the appraisal; and

"(2) provide to the Indian tribe a written notice of approval or disapproval of the appraisal.

"(c) FAILURE OF SECRETARY TO APPROVE OR DISAPPROVE.—If, after 60 days, the Secretary has failed to approve or disapprove any appraisal received, the appraisal shall be deemed approved.

"(d) OPTION TO INDIAN TRIBES TO WAIVE APPRAISAL.—

"(1) An Indian tribe wishing to waive the requirements of subsection (a), may do so after it has satisfied the requirements of paragraphs (2) and (3).

"(2) An Indian tribe wishing to forego the necessity of a waiver pursuant to this section must provide to the Secretary a written resolution, statement, or other unambiguous indication of tribal intent, duly approved by the governing body of the Indian tribe.

"(3) The unambiguous indication of intent provided by the Indian tribe to the Secretary under paragraph (2) must include an express waiver by the Indian tribe of any claims for damages it might have against the United States as a result of the lack of an appraisal undertaken.

"(e) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'appraisal' includes appraisals and other estimates of value.

"(f) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall develop regulations for implementing this section, including standards the Secretary shall use for approving or disapproving an appraisal."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13201 note) is amended by adding at the end of the items relating to title XXVI the following:

"Sec. 2607. Appraisal reforms."

SEC. 3. STANDARDIZATION.

As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall implement procedures to ensure that each agency within the Department of the Interior that is involved in the review, approval, and oversight of oil and gas activities on Indian lands shall use a uniform system of reference numbers and tracking systems for oil and gas wells.

SEC. 4. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS OF MAJOR FEDERAL ACTIONS ON INDIAN LANDS.

Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332) is amended by inserting "(a) IN GENERAL.—" before the first sentence, and by adding at the end the following:

"(b) REVIEW OF MAJOR FEDERAL ACTIONS ON INDIAN LANDS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For any major Federal action on Indian lands of an Indian tribe requiring the preparation of a statement under subsection (a)(2)(C), the statement shall only be available for review and comment by the members of the Indian tribe and by any other individual residing within the affected area.

"(2) REGULATIONS.—The Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality shall develop regulations to implement this section, including descriptions of affected areas for specific major Federal actions, in consultation with Indian tribes.

"(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, each of the terms 'Indian land' and 'Indian tribe' has the meaning given that term in section 2601 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (25 U.S.C. 3501).

"(4) CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY.—Nothing in the Native American Energy Act, except sec-

tion 6 of that Act, shall give the Secretary any additional authority over energy projects on Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act lands."

SEC. 5. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) TIME FOR FILING COMPLAINT.—Any energy related action must be filed not later than the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date of the final agency action. Any energy related action not filed within this time period shall be barred.

(b) DISTRICT COURT VENUE AND DEADLINE.—All energy related actions—

(1) shall be brought in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia; and

(2) shall be resolved as expeditiously as possible, and in any event not more than 180 days after such cause of action is filed.

(c) APPELLATE REVIEW.—An interlocutory order or final judgment, decree or order of the district court in an energy related action may be reviewed by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. The D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals shall resolve such appeal as expeditiously as possible, and in any event not more than 180 days after such interlocutory order or final judgment, decree or order of the district court was issued.

(d) LIMITATION ON CERTAIN PAYMENTS.—Notwithstanding section 1304 of title 31, United States Code, no award may be made under section 504 of title 5, United States Code, or under section 2412 of title 28, United States Code, and no amounts may be obligated or expended from the Claims and Judgment Fund of the United States Treasury to pay any fees or other expenses under such sections, to any person or party in an energy related action.

(e) LEGAL FEES.—In any energy related action in which the plaintiff does not ultimately prevail, the court shall award to the defendant (including any intervenor-defendants), other than the United States, fees and other expenses incurred by that party in connection with the energy related action, unless the court finds that the position of the plaintiff was substantially justified or that special circumstances make an award unjust. Whether or not the position of the plaintiff was substantially justified shall be determined on the basis of the administrative record, as a whole, which is made in the energy related action for which fees and other expenses are sought.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) AGENCY ACTION.—The term "agency action" has the same meaning given such term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) INDIAN LAND.—The term "Indian Land" has the same meaning given such term in section 203(c)(3) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-58; 25 U.S.C. 3501), including lands owned by Native Corporations under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (Public Law 92-203; 43 U.S.C. 1601).

(3) ENERGY RELATED ACTION.—The term "energy related action" means a cause of action that—

(A) is filed on or after the effective date of this Act; and

(B) seeks judicial review of a final agency action to issue a permit, license, or other form of agency permission allowing:

(i) any person or entity to conduct activities on Indian Land, which activities involve the exploration, development, production or transportation of oil, gas, coal, shale gas, oil shale, geothermal resources, wind or solar resources, underground coal gasification, biomass, or the generation of electricity; or

(ii) any Indian Tribe, or any organization of two or more entities, at least one of which is an Indian tribe, to conduct activities involving the exploration, development, production or transportation of oil, gas, coal, shale gas, oil shale, geothermal resources, wind or solar resources, underground coal gasification, biomass, or the generation of electricity, regardless of where such activities are undertaken.

(4) **ULTIMATELY PREVAIL.**—The phrase “ultimately prevail” means, in a final enforceable judgment, the court rules in the party’s favor on at least one cause of action which is an underlying rationale for the preliminary injunction, administrative stay, or other relief requested by the party, and does not include circumstances where the final agency action is modified or amended by the issuing agency unless such modification or amendment is required pursuant to a final enforceable judgment of the court or a court-ordered consent decree.

SEC. 6. TRIBAL BIOMASS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

The Tribal Forest Protection Act of 2004 is amended by inserting after section 2 (25 U.S.C. 3115a) the following:

“SEC. 3. TRIBAL BIOMASS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—For each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020, the Secretary shall enter into stewardship contracts or other agreements, other than agreements that are exclusively direct service contracts, with Indian tribes to carry out demonstration projects to promote biomass energy production (including biofuel, heat, and electricity generation) on Indian forest land and in nearby communities by providing reliable supplies of woody biomass from Federal land.

“(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—The definitions in section 2 shall apply to this section.

“(c) **DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.**—In each fiscal year for which projects are authorized, the Secretary shall enter into contracts or other agreements described in subsection (a) to carry out at least 4 new demonstration projects that meet the eligibility criteria described in subsection (d).

“(d) **ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.**—To be eligible to enter into a contract or other agreement under this subsection, an Indian tribe shall submit to the Secretary an application—

“(1) containing such information as the Secretary may require; and

“(2) that includes a description of—

“(A) the Indian forest land or rangeland under the jurisdiction of the Indian tribe; and

“(B) the demonstration project proposed to be carried out by the Indian tribe.

“(e) **SELECTION.**—In evaluating the applications submitted under subsection (c), the Secretary—

“(1) shall take into consideration the factors set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 2(e) of Public Law 108–278; and whether a proposed demonstration project would—

“(A) increase the availability or reliability of local or regional energy;

“(B) enhance the economic development of the Indian tribe;

“(C) improve the connection of electric power transmission facilities serving the Indian tribe with other electric transmission facilities;

“(D) improve the forest health or watersheds of Federal land or Indian forest land or rangeland; or

“(E) otherwise promote the use of woody biomass; and

“(2) shall exclude from consideration any merchantable logs that have been identified by the Secretary for commercial sale.

“(f) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—The Secretary shall—

“(1) ensure that the criteria described in subsection (c) are publicly available by not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this section; and

“(2) to the maximum extent practicable, consult with Indian tribes and appropriate intertribal organizations likely to be affected in developing the application and otherwise carrying out this section.

“(g) **REPORT.**—Not later than one year subsequent to the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that describes, with respect to the reporting period—

“(1) each individual tribal application received under this section; and

“(2) each contract and agreement entered into pursuant to this section.

“(h) **INCORPORATION OF MANAGEMENT PLANS.**—In carrying out a contract or agreement under this section, on receipt of a request from an Indian tribe, the Secretary shall incorporate into the contract or agreement, to the extent practicable, management plans (including forest management and integrated resource management plans) in effect on the Indian forest land or rangeland of the respective Indian tribe.

“(i) **TERM.**—A stewardship contract or other agreement entered into under this section—

“(1) shall be for a term of not more than 20 years; and

“(2) may be renewed in accordance with this section for not more than an additional 10 years.”.

SEC. 7. TRIBAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS.

Unless otherwise explicitly exempted by Federal law enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act, any activity conducted or resources harvested or produced pursuant to a tribal resource management plan or an integrated resource management plan approved by the Secretary of the Interior under the National Indian Forest Resources Management Act (25 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.) or the American Indian Agricultural Resource Management Act (25 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.), shall be considered a sustainable management practice for purposes of any Federal standard, benefit, or requirement that requires a demonstration of such sustainability.

SEC. 8. LEASES OF RESTRICTED LANDS FOR THE NAVAJO NATION.

Subsection (e)(1) of the first section of the Act of August 9, 1955 (25 U.S.C. 415(e)(1); commonly referred to as the “Long-Term Leasing Act”), is amended—

(1) by striking “, except a lease for” and inserting “, including leases for”;

(2) in subparagraph (A), by striking “25” the first place it appears and all that follows and inserting “99 years.”;

(3) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period and inserting “; and”;

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) in the case of a lease for the exploration, development, or extraction of mineral resources, including geothermal resources, 25 years, except that any such lease may include an option to renew for one additional term not to exceed 25 years.”.

SEC. 9. NONAPPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN RULES.

No rule promulgated by the Department of the Interior regarding hydraulic fracturing used in the development or production of oil or gas resources shall have any effect on any land held in trust or restricted status for the benefit of Indians except with the express consent of the beneficiary on whose behalf such land is held in trust or restricted status.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 114–290. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 114–290.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Chair, I have an amendment that was made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, strike lines 9 through 15, and insert the following:

“(1) **REVIEW AND COMMENT.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the statement required under subsection (a)(2)(C) for a major Federal action regarding an activity on Indian lands of an Indian tribe shall only be available for review and comment by the members of the Indian tribe, other individuals residing within the affected area, and State, federally recognized tribal, and local governments within the affected area.

“(B) **EXCEPTION.**—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to a statement for a major Federal action regarding an activity on Indian lands of an Indian tribe related to gaming under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 466, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Chairman, this amendment clarifies who may submit public comments on a NEPA study concerning a Federal permit or land approval for Indian lands. It also preserves current NEPA requirements concerning tribal gaming proposals.

When a NEPA study is done on Federal action, like a mineral lease approval on Indian lands, the agency must consider comments received by any member of the public, regardless of whether they are affected. This is unfair to the tribe because tribal lands are not public land. They are private lands.

Section 4 of the bill limits public comment in these situations to the tribe and individuals who live within the affected area of the project.

Section 4 was drafted. We expected an individual living within the affected area would include State, tribal, and county officials, but no one from New York or San Francisco. It is none of their business.

To address any ambiguity, the amendment would clarify that tribe, States, and county governments within the area affected may have their comments considered along with those of individuals.

Finally, the amendment provides that section 4 will not affect Federal actions related to tribal gaming. Gaming is a unique area of law. Gaming facilities have a significant impact outside the local area.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I rise to claim time in opposition to the manager’s amendment, although I am not in opposition.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I just want to tell Chairman YOUNG that I appreciate the lipstick on this particular

piece of legislation, but the content is still haphazard.

It does not fix the underlying problem with public review and judicial review. We are not in opposition, but I appreciate the lipstick.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Chair, I hope it is the right color for Ranking Member GRIJALVA.

I yield back the balance of time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM OF NEW MEXICO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 114-290.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Madam Chair, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 12, after line 6, insert the following:

“SEC. 4. TRIBAL FOREST MANAGEMENT DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

“The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may carry out demonstration projects by which federally recognized Indian tribes or tribal organizations may contract to perform administrative, management, and other functions of programs of the Tribal Forest Protection Act of 2004 (25 U.S.C. 3115a et seq.) through contracts entered into under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.).”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 466, the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Madam Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise in support of my amendment that allows the Forest Service to establish a pilot program to execute contracts with tribes under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, known as 638 contracts. 638 contracts allow tribes to manage and implement Federal programs in Indian Country.

When I was the New Mexico Secretary of Health, I witnessed how successful and beneficial these contracts can be at efficiently delivering services to tribes. Through these contracts, tribes can operate hospitals, health clinics, mental health facilities, and a variety of other community health services.

Having tribes manage and operate programs in their communities not only recognizes tribal self-determination and self-governance, but it also helps ensure that tribal needs are being met through traditionally and culturally appropriate methods.

Although several agencies have the authority to execute 638 contracts,

such as the Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Reclamation, Bureau of Indian Affairs and Indian Health Services, the Forest Service does not have this authority. Several tribes have expressed to me that they would like to see the Forest Service have this authority.

Many of the Pueblos in New Mexico have land and tribal forests adjacent to national forests, and we know that wildfires in the past can quickly affect entire regions, regardless of who owns the land.

In fact, the Las Conchas wildland fire, which was one of the largest wildfires in New Mexico history, started on June 26, 2011, in the Santa Fe National Forest and burned more than 156,000 acres in New Mexico, including land belonging to Pueblos of Santa Clara, Ohkay Owingeh, San Ildefonso, Pojoaque Jemez, Cochiti, and Kewa.

So it is imperative that the Forest Service and tribes actively work together to co-manage forests.

This amendment previously passed by voice vote as part of the Resilient Federal Forest Act, which the House passed this July.

I urge my colleagues to once again support my amendment, which will improve the Forest Service's ability to partner with tribes to work on projects that impact tribal lands and forests.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Chair, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I do not oppose the amendment. I just want to congratulate the lady on backing up what is in the bill, making this correct.

We have had testimony from a lot of the timber tribes on how well they have managed their timber, and right next door will be the Forest Service land that is managed terribly. That is a threat to the tribal timber, too.

I really think, if we want to get back on this track of the freedoms I was talking about, if we allow the tribes to contract with the Forest Service, make it a contract for thinning, encouraging growth, managing growth for future timber needs—you know, the native tribes are doing so much better than the Federal tribes. So I compliment the lady on this deal.

□ 1545

I compliment the gentlewoman on this view, and I accept the amendment. I think the gentlewoman is doing a great job, and I appreciate it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) having assumed the chair, Ms. FOXX, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 538) to facilitate the development of energy on Indian lands by reducing Federal regulations that impede tribal development of Indian lands, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 466, she reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Ben Ray Lujan of New Mexico moves to recommit the bill H.R. 538 to the Natural Resources Committee, 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. 10. PHYSICAL INTEGRITY OF SACRED SITES. Nothing in this Act shall contravene the authority of the President to avoid adversely affecting the physical integrity of any site, identified as sacred by virtue of established religious significance to, or ceremonial use by, an Indian religion, under Executive Order 13007 (May 24, 1996).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which does not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer an amendment to protect sacred sites across America. This issue is not a new one. We have been part of many debates here on the floor and in committee on this important issue.

The amendment is straightforward. It reads: “Nothing in this Act shall contravene the authority of the President to avoid adversely affecting the physical integrity of any site, identified as sacred by virtue of established religious significance to, or ceremonial use by, an Indian religion, under Executive Order 13007.”

Mr. Speaker, as we come from different faiths, we all have respect for one another. Just as we worship in different places, like churches or temples, so, too, should we have respect for these sacred places. Just as we would honor the sanctity of where our loved ones have been laid to rest, so, too, should we honor the sanctity of tribal sacred sites.

Sacred sites are an essential part of the culture and heritage of tribal communities, and the degradation of these sites means a loss of identity as well as disrespect for the faith and religion and the culture and the history of our tribal brothers and sisters who are connected to these lands. Sacred sites should not be desecrated. They should be protected.

I know it is a sentiment that many of us in this Congress share. Protecting sacred sites is the right thing to do. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this very important amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in this act that changes the President’s authority. I go back to self-determination. These are tribal lands owned by the tribes, controlled by the tribal council, and they will make a decision about the sacred sites; not somebody, again, in Miami or New York that wants to stop the project.

These are tribal sites, and that is the thing I don’t quite understand. This affects nothing of the present law. If they decide this is a sacred site, that will be their decision, instead of someone else.

I urge people to reject his motion to recommit, and let’s pass this legislation, this one little, tiny step forward for our first Americans. This bill came from them and they support it. They are not worried about these sacred sites because they will control them, not somebody who is an official. We take no authority away from the President.

Very frankly, Mr. Speaker, this is a motion to recommit to slow the bill down. They say it doesn’t, but this is an attempt to do so. I urge a “no” on the motion to recommit and a “yes” on the passage for that little, tiny step for the American Indians, our first people.

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. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 184, nays 239, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 543]

YEAS—184

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

NAYS—239

Abraham	Barr	Blackburn
Aderholt	Barton	Blum
Allen	Benishkek	Bost
Amash	Bilirakis	Boustany
Amodei	Bishop (MI)	Brady (TX)
Babin	Bishop (UT)	Bridenstine
Barletta	Black	Brooks (AL)

Brooks (IN)	Hill	Poliquin
Buchanan	Holding	Pompeo
Buck	Huelskamp	Posey
Bucshon	Huizenga (MI)	Price, Tom
Burgess	Hultgren	Ratcliffe
Byrne	Hunter	Reichert
Calvert	Hurd (TX)	Renacci
Carter (GA)	Hurt (VA)	Ribble
Carter (TX)	Issa	Rice (SC)
Chabot	Jenkins (KS)	Rigell
Chaffetz	Jenkins (WV)	Roby
Clawson (FL)	Johnson (OH)	Roe (TN)
Coffman	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Cole	Jolly	Rogers (KY)
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Rohrabacher
Collins (NY)	Joyce	Rokita
Comstock	Katko	Rooney (FL)
Conaway	Kelly (MS)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cook	Kelly (PA)	Roskam
Costello (PA)	King (IA)	Ross
Cramer	King (NY)	Rothfus
Crawford	Kinzinger (IL)	Rouzer
Crenshaw	Kline	Royce
Culberson	Knight	Russell
Curbelo (FL)	Labrador	Ryan (WI)
Davis, Rodney	LaHood	Salmon
Denham	LaMalfa	Sanford
Dent	Lamborn	Scalise
DeSantis	Lance	Schweikert
DesJarlais	Latta	Scott, Austin
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner
Dold	Long	Sessions
Donovan	Loudermilk	Shimkus
Duffy	Love	Shuster
Duncan (SC)	Lucas	Simpson
Duncan (TN)	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)
Ellmers (NC)	Lummis	Smith (NE)
Emmer (MN)	MacArthur	Smith (NJ)
Farenthold	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Fincher	Marino	Stefanik
Fitzpatrick	Massie	Stewart
Fleischmann	McCarthy	Stivers
Fleming	McCaul	Thompson (PA)
Flores	McClintock	Tiberi
Forbes	McHenry	Tipton
Fortenberry	McKinley	Trott
Fox	McMorris	Turner
Franks (AZ)	Rodgers	Upton
Frelinghuysen	McSally	Valadao
Garrett	Meadows	Wagner
Gibbs	Meehan	Walberg
Gibson	Messer	Walden
Gohmert	Mica	Walker
Goodlatte	Miller (FL)	Walorski
Gosar	Miller (MI)	Walters, Mimi
Gowdy	Moolenaar	Weber (TX)
Granger	Mooney (WV)	Webster (FL)
Graves (GA)	Mullin	Wenstrup
Graves (LA)	Mulvaney	Westerman
Graves (MO)	Murphy (PA)	Westmoreland
Griffith	Neugebauer	Whitfield
Grothman	Newhouse	Williams
Guinta	Noem	Wilson (SC)
Guthrie	Nugent	Wittman
Hanna	Nunes	Womack
Hardy	Olson	Woodall
Harper	Palazzo	Yoder
Harris	Palmer	Yoho
Hartzler	Paulsen	Young (AK)
Heck (NV)	Pearce	Young (IA)
Hensarling	Perry	Young (IN)
Herrera Beutler	Pitts	Zeldin
Hice, Jody B.	Poe (TX)	Zinke

NOT VOTING—11

Brat	Hudson	Sinema
Cleaver	Payne	Stutzman
Dingell	Pittenger	Thornberry
Hinojosa	Reed	

□ 1621

Messrs. RYCE, AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, FINCHER, POMPEO, and RYAN of Wisconsin changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mses. LEE, LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Messrs. HIGGINS, CONYERS, DOGGETT, and McDERMOTT changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BRAT. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 543 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACK). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 254, nays 173, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 544]

YEAS—254

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

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

NAYS—173

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

NOT VOTING—7

Cleaver	Hudson	Sinema
Dingell	Payne	
Hinojosa	Pittenger	

□ 1630

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION DAY IN VENEZUELA

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, last month in Venezuela, the president

of the national association of opposition mayors issued a message to the international community—including here in the United States, obviously—stating many of the obstacles being faced leading up to Venezuela's legislative elections, which are scheduled to take place on December 6.

According to their statement, Venezuelan regime employees are obligated and harassed to attend public events to demonstrate support for pro-regime candidates. Socialist Party militants are dispatched to intimidate voters under the guise of assistance. And the Maduro regime is using military forces to keep citizens from voluntarily auditing electoral precincts, as it is stated by law.

As the Maduro regime continues to refuse allowing international monitors, the United States must be even more vigilant of the threat of the fraud before and during election day in Venezuela.

We should also be ready to sanction any regime official who perpetuates human rights violations because of this electoral process.

REPUBLIC OF CHINA NATIONAL DAY AND HO FENG-SHAN

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Taiwan's National Day, or Double Tenth Day, on Saturday, October 10.

Taiwan and the United States have shared a close relationship since passage of the Taiwan Relations Act in 1979. With deep trade ties and close security cooperation between our two countries, Taiwan is going to be an important regional and global actor and friend to the United States.

One famous diplomat from the Republic of China, Mr. Ho Feng-Shan, perfectly embodied the bravery and the heroism of so many in this country. Mr. Ho, consul general in Vienna during Nazi occupation, defied orders from his superiors and issued hundreds of visas to Jews who, without his efforts, would have been forbidden from leaving Austria and would likely have fallen victim to Hitler's plans to exterminate the Jews.

For his selfless and courageous actions, he rightfully earned the title of Righteous Among the Nations from the Yad Vashem Holocaust Museum.

Please join me in celebrating Taiwan's National Day and paying tribute to Mr. Ho's sacrifices and actions.

LIFT CRUDE OIL EXPORT BAN

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, with just one change in the law, we could create nearly 400,000 American jobs, potentially help lower gas prices, and

exert soft power that keeps bad actors around the world from destabilizing the price of oil. That change would be lifting the ban on crude oil exports.

With all of these benefits for America, it makes sense that we should embrace that change and put it on the President's desk right away. The export ban is a relic of the past that needs to be lifted to help establish the United States as a preeminent energy leader in the world.

The United States is the only country in the world that has a ban on exporting oil. With countries like Iran and Russia flexing their muscle on the world stage, lifting the ban would help enhance both our energy and our national security. But even more than that, removing the crude oil export ban means helping our economy with more good-paying jobs for hardworking Americans.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to lift the crude oil export ban.

HONORING HO FENG-SHAN

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Republic of China on Taiwan's National Day and recognize the heroism of Ho Feng-Shan, a Chinese diplomat stationed in Vienna during World War II. At great risk to his own life, Feng-Shan issued thousands of Chinese visas to Jews, allowing them to escape Nazi camps. Ho Feng-Shan's courage is just one example of the Republic of China's proud heritage celebrated on National Day.

A vital U.S. trading partner, Taiwan helps maintain peace and stability in the western Pacific and shares our values for freedom, democracy, and respect for human rights. Rooted in our history of mutual interests and common goals, the U.S.-Taiwanese relationship will continue to flourish.

I pay tribute to Ho Feng-Shan and wish the people of Taiwan a happy National Day.

EARTH SCIENCE WEEK

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

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, next week marks the 18th annual international Earth Science Week. Today I am introducing a House resolution to recognize Earth Science Week to highlight the importance and broad impact of earth science research.

Geoscientists and researchers in our country continually push the frontier of human knowledge; help develop and incubate the concepts and programs that keep us at the innovative forefront of the world's economy; and inspire future generations of researchers, scientists, and informed citizens. Earth science funding is a stimulant to the American economy and an investment into our future global leadership.

The devastating drought in my home State of California highlights the need for earth science research, which can address major gaps in our understanding of water availability, quality, and dynamics. Having a better understanding of natural systems allows for more informed policy.

I am committed to working with my friend and fellow science advocate, Chairman CULBERSON, to ensure that Federal earth science research is given robust support and is not hindered by misguided legislation that micromanages and places funding caps on these critical fields. It is critical that we study and understand our "pale blue dot," our one and only home.

REMEMBERING SENIOR AIRMAN QUINN JOHNSON-HARRIS

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to mourn the six servicemembers and five civilians killed in the recent crash of an Air Force transport plane in Afghanistan. Yesterday, the House held a moment of silence to mark their sacrifice.

One of those who died was Senior Airman Quinn Johnson-Harris, whose family now calls Milwaukee, Wisconsin, their home. He and his fallen comrades join the list of the 2,300 heroes who have given their lives in Afghanistan.

As a Member of Congress, there is no more difficult moment in our jobs than this. My heart and prayers go out to family.

There is no question that Quinn made our community in Milwaukee stronger and our Nation safer because of his service. This young man made a difference wherever he went. I hear it in the stories that have come out after his death from his family, his friends, his teachers, and others about his dedication to them and his country.

His mother said: "Quinn dared to be different. He beat by his own drum."

When his family, community, or country called, this young man stood up and did not shrink back. According to his sister, when she heard he was being deployed to Afghanistan, "he was ready to go," and this surprised no one.

He came from a military family. His grandfather served in Vietnam. His older brother was a marine, and another older brother is a 2015 graduate of West Point and is in the Army.

Mr. Speaker, I join his family, his friends, and his fellow servicemen in mourning his life, yet celebrating the life of this young hero, Senior Airman Quinn Johnson-Harris.

MEDICARE PREMIUM FAIRNESS ACT

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

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, without congressional action, Medicare premiums and deductibles will increase in 2016 by 52 percent for an estimated 7.5 million American seniors and people with disabilities. Because these folks will not be receiving a Social Security cost of living adjustment for 2016, 30 percent of beneficiaries will not be held harmless, and their premiums will increase from \$104 to \$159 per month.

To stop rates from increasing, I have introduced the Medicare Premium Fairness Act, which will protect seniors and people with disabilities by capping premiums at 2015 levels for a year. I urge my colleagues to join me in co-sponsoring this important legislation.

Seniors in our communities worked hard all their lives and saw our country through a war, Depression, and dramatic social change. At a time when every dollar counts, this critical legislation will ensure that seniors can put food on the table and buy lifesaving medication.

So let's stand up for America's seniors.

□ 1645

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BABIN). The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China:

Mrs. BLACK, Tennessee

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUAL TO THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 451 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (Pub. L. 113-128), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following individual on the part of the House to the National Council on Disability:

Lt. Colonel Daniel M. Gade, Ph.D.,
New Windsor, New York

THE PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, this past spring Congress passed legislation that authorized the President to negotiate and sign sweeping trade agreements with limited input from Congress.

When I say “the President,” I am not just talking about Mr. Obama, Mr. Speaker. I am talking about anyone who sits in the Oval Office from now on.

This body then went on to pass a trade adjustment assistance package that falls far short of what is necessary and, in and of itself, acknowledges the loss of employment that comes from the trade agreement. Those steps set the stage for the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the final language of which was announced earlier this week. That deal was built from years of secret negotiations between corporations and trade representatives, with little to no input from the working families who will have to bear the loss of jobs here at home.

Mr. Speaker, back in New Jersey, we know what happens when trade deals don't consider American workers. Factories close, employees are laid off, and whole cities that used to pump out products for consumers around the world are suddenly faced with stunted economies and incomprehensible unemployment.

While I am not opposed to free trade, our priority can't simply be corporate gains under the guise of economic growth; it must be the welfare of working families. But working families are going to find themselves out of luck if they are forced to compete with salaries of just cents an hour overseas.

TPP is a very bad deal. It lacks prohibitions to address currency manipulation; it lacks environmental standards that will keep manufacturers accountable and ensure we are preventing some of the human causes of climate change; and it lacks labor standards that protect the human rights of workers in places like Mexico, Vietnam, and Malaysia, running against even the most basic human American values. It does all this based on the flawed philosophy that supporting multinational corporations somehow helps the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, let me state for the record that no trade deal is ever crafted to support the American middle class, and any suggestion otherwise is a flat-out, bold-faced lie.

International trade is always marketed as the key to economic growth, but we are told that opening new markets means more opportunities for U.S. businesses. That is true in part. But the businesses that profit most are multinational corporations, and part of that profit comes from sending American jobs overseas. We will allow those same companies to continue to enjoy tax loopholes that maximize their bottom line and allow them to keep much of their profits stashed away elsewhere. If NAFTA and CAFTA are any exam-

ple, these profits will never make it down the line to Americans striving to get to the middle class.

If we are serious about growing our economy in a way that supports every American, there are plenty of policy changes that we could make:

We could give our workers a living wage that would allow them to support their families;

We could provide better primary and secondary education and more affordable higher education;

We could offer employment through the hundreds of thousands of jobs we could create by investing in infrastructure repairs and upgrades;

And we could do a lot better than TPP.

So before we move forward, my congressional Progressive colleagues and I have come to the floor to urge Members on both sides of the aisle to take what limited time we have to change the course. We have just one last opportunity to fix this deal, to protect American workers, and to ensure a deal that will actually boost our economy, not just the profit margins of multinational corporations, and we need to take that time.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to a Member who has been as outspoken as any of us as we talk about the need to reexamine this flawed agreement. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), our ranking member on the Rules Committee.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the gentlewoman yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is a debate I seem to have had before. I was here for the NAFTA debate.

Congressional districts throughout this country, including my own of Rochester, New York, will find it very difficult to survive another trade deal that sends our jobs overseas to countries that ignore human rights violations and undermine our laws in public health here at home. During my time in Congress, I have never seen a trade agreement that the United States participated in that benefited either the American manufacturer or the American worker, and everything I know about Trans-Pacific Partnership suggests it will be more of the same.

Despite a bipartisan push by 158 Democrats and Republicans in the House of Representatives, the trade deal announced this week will do nothing to address the largest trade barrier our manufacturers face, which is currency manipulation. As with past trade deals, a side agreement in the TPP related to currency manipulation is window dressing that is unlikely to be enforced at all, as most of the NAFTA side agreements were not, and will do little to stem the flow of American jobs overseas. As with past trade deals, this will force American manufacturers to compete with foreign companies that receive unfair advantages from their governments. For this reason, Ford Motor Company has come out in opposition to this trade agreement.

The TPP has been negotiated under a cloud of secrecy—by the way, they all are—by multinational conglomerates, and we know from the United States, the financial services industry and the pharmaceutical companies—both have only one priority, their bottom line—were very important in those negotiations. Now that an agreement has been reached, the negotiators will no longer be able to keep the contents of the bad trade deal hidden from the public.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, were any of us to look at the trade bill that they did make available over here, we were not able to take a pencil or paper with us. We had to have somebody with security clearance go with us—our own staff could not go—and we could not speak about it. That is some strange idea, I think, of democracy.

I have been in conversations with parliamentarians from Australia and from Canada who have had the very same problem. As a matter of fact, in Australia, if any of the parliamentarians wanted to see the trade bill, they had to sign a paper they would not discuss it for 4 years. For three of the greatest economies and democracies in this trade agreement—the United States, Canada, and Australia—to allow their parliamentarians to be put into that kind of restraint is one of the most egregious parts of these trade agreements.

Now that we will be able, since it has been signed, to look at it, negotiators are going to have a lot of explaining to do. Because as Americans learn more in the coming weeks and months about how this agreement will impact their day-to-day lives with things like unsafe food imports—we are pretty certain about that because we already turned around a great number, tons of seafood coming in; 98 percent of the seafood that we eat is imported, and about 2 to 3 percent of it is inspected—the momentum of a bad trade deal will continue to grow.

Let me tell you why we, the Canadians, the Australians, the European Union, and the United Nations are upset about this. There is a thing called the investor-state dispute settlement, and it is onerous. It gives to three corporate lawyers the right to settle disputes.

Any investor-state in this agreement can bring a case against any of the other countries in the agreement if they think that a law or a practice in that country affects their bottom line. We know that everybody is worried about that here because one committee of the House, just in talking about it, did away with country-of-origin labeling.

So, as I have pointed out, both the United Nations and the European Union have done papers on the fact that this is a very bad way to run anything, to let three corporate lawyers make that decision; but we are going to be stuck with that, unfortunately, unless we can kill the bill.

What is even more abhorrent is that some of our trading partners, Malaysia—Malaysia has the worst human rights record on the face of the Earth. We know that. The State Department has always given them a very low grade. They have slave labor. We know that they do sex trafficking, and they just recently took the Prime Minister off on some kind of charges. There is no reason in the world that we would include them in a trade agreement. Then there is also Brunei, which practices sharia law. These two countries, under the investor-state dispute settlement, can make sure that our laws do not interfere with their making a profit.

We are better people than that, Mr. Speaker. We are going to be looking at this very closely. It is really not a trade deal. In my view, it is a race to the bottom.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from New York for her comments and for being with us today as part of the Progressive Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to a Member who has been outspoken on behalf of working families and American workers, Mr. POCAN from Wisconsin.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am really glad to be here today with the Progressive Caucus Special Order hour, and I would like to thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) for all her hard work on behalf of the Progressive Caucus and on behalf of this issue on the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

As we know, over the weekend and all last week, the U.S. Trade Representative Office's cooks have been in the kitchen, and they have told us now the Trans-Pacific Partnership is done; but from everything that we can tell, it is not fully baked. In fact, at best, it is half-baked when it comes to labor, environmental, and consumer concerns.

Now that a final deal has been reached, we asked the administration to let the American public immediately see the full text of this agreement. This negotiating process has not been transparent up to this point, despite claims from the U.S. Trade Representative Office. We know that about 600 people, largely corporate CEOs, have been involved in the drafting of the Trans-Pacific Partnership, but not Congress, and certainly not members of the public. The secretive nature of these negotiations is compounded by the pressure to throw together this deal based on the political timelines of our negotiating partners rather than with the regard of the U.S. worker in mind.

Reports throughout the course of the negotiating process have raised serious questions about the impact of this agreement on a number of areas ranging from workplace and environmental protections to food safety, but, most importantly, jobs and wages. We all know this economy has been rebounding. The stockmarket is significantly

up from the 2008 crash. Corporate profits are up. CEO pay is up. Productivity is up. But wages for the American worker have, unfortunately, been dead flat, and the Trans-Pacific Partnership will lead to the loss of good-paying jobs right here in the U.S.

Through several decades of unfair trade rules, corporations have outsourced production and offshored jobs, and the TPP will only exacerbate this problem. In fact, on Tuesday, in its initial analysis, The Wall Street Journal has projected an increase in the manufacturing trade deficit of \$38.2 billion. That means jobs and wages right here in the United States.

□ 1700

Additional reports have also said that the labor standards will remain subpar, that currency manipulation has not been adequately addressed, rules of origin for autos have been weakened, and human rights issues with countries like Malaysia and Brunei have not been dealt with properly.

Among these concerns, corporations still have the ability to supersede laws of our country through the investor-state dispute settlement process, something that Representative SLAUGHTER explained very aggressively in her comments.

This agreement has nothing to do to effectively address currency manipulation, which that alone has contributed to the loss of up to 5 million U.S. jobs.

Despite claims by the administration that this agreement is the most progressive high standard deal that we have ever negotiated, the labor environmental rules in our free trade agreements are rarely enforced in our partner nations.

In fact, 4 years ago, when we passed the Colombia Free Trade Agreement, to the letter of the law the Colombian Government has put the provisions within Colombian law and not one bit of that has actually been implemented and over 100 labor leaders in the last 4 years have been killed just in Colombia.

So these trade agreements haven't worked based on past practice, and without changes they are not going to work in future progress as well.

In addition, the administration has gone out of its way to help cover up human rights atrocities in order to conclude these negotiations.

Malaysia was demoted in the State Department's 2014 Trafficking in Persons Report due to its grossly inadequate response to the perverse tracking of minority groups throughout the country.

By downgrading them within the same year that mass graves were found of workers in Malaysia is an insult to human rights conditions, and to include them and countries like Brunei that still stone gays and lesbians and single mothers is a further evidence that this deal is not ready for the public or for Congress to accept for the public.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership is neither free trade nor fair trade. In reality, it is a system of rules crafted by multi-national corporate interests and their lobbyists that work for a select group of powerful people at the expense of everyone else. This just isn't about jobs or wages. This is an agreement about corporate profits. Past trade deals have been a disaster for American workers. So it is imperative that Congress rigorously review this deal to ensure that the American people aren't yet taken for a ride again.

Again, I will renew my call and the Progressive Caucus' call to immediately release the text of the agreement. Six hundred corporate CEOs know what is in the deal, but the 435 Members of this House and the American public don't. That is simply wrong.

If this deal is as good as they say it is, put the language on the table and let's review it with the public. My fear is that it is not. If it is going to cost American jobs and wages, it is the wrong thing to do, and we have to reject the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for taking the time to be with us to talk about what is such an important issue for us.

Mr. Speaker, it isn't often that we get a second bite at an apple in realtime, but this is one of those opportunities that we do have. There have been a number of issues that have been raised that I believe validate from our perspective that this is not a good deal.

It is not a good deal for American families. It is not a good deal for American workers. It is only a good deal for multi-national corporations.

We are engaging in a trade relationship with countries whose values we do not share and who, on occasions, we have actually had the opportunity to shame.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we, as Members of Congress, can find this as an opportunity to work together to do something collectively, which is better for the American family and the American worker. We can do that at the same time we have an opportunity to have fair trade agreements and just trade agreements.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), a Member who has been as outspoken as any other Member in this House about the need to turn back from this flawed agreement, a leader on workers' rights and human rights and women's rights and building an economy that works for average Americans.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I want to say thank you to my colleague and what an honor for me to join with you and to thank you for your steadfast efforts in fighting for working families, for the American workers, men and women, and not being afraid to stand up and say no to what would be injustice for our American workers and their families.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 4 days since the Trans-Pacific Partnership was announced. We have not yet been shown the text, but we have heard a chorus of spin about the supposed benefits of this secret agreement.

After more than 5 years of talks, the parties have announced a deal without having released a single word to the public. The negotiations took place under unprecedented secrecy.

Corporate special interests had a place at the table. Congress and American families were locked out. The American people and their elected representatives in Congress are forced to rely on leaks to find out what is in this agreement.

But the truth is that, on vital issues like workers' rights, environment, and human rights, the standards are only valuable if they are enforced. If experience is any guide, we will do little to enforce those provisions.

I remember in 2007 when my Democratic colleagues in this Chamber forced the Bush administration to renegotiate a number of trade agreements to include enhanced labor standards.

In the 8 years since, neither the current administration nor its predecessor has taken meaningful action to enforce those provisions. So dozens of Colombian union organizers are being murdered despite labor provision in the U.S. Colombia Free Trade Agreement. Thousands of acres of Peruvian forests are being destroyed despite the environmental provisions in the U.S.-Peru Free Trade Agreement.

Why would we assume that the Trans-Pacific Partnership will be any different when it comes to Brunei's persecution of LGBT people, Malaysia's human trafficking and forced labor, or Vietnam's abundant use of child labor?

In fact, the administration has already shown us how little regard it pays to these issues by upgrading Malaysia's classification on human trafficking in order to sign the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement.

Past experience tells us what to expect in other areas as well. The last big trade deal, the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement, cost this country 75,000 jobs in just 3 years, according to the Economic Policy Institute.

The TPP will be even worse. Not only is it far bigger, it will throw Americans into competition with Vietnamese workers who make less than 65 cents per hour. These provisions will offshore jobs, lower our wages, and increase income inequality. Americans workers have seen this happen to them year after year after year.

To compound these problems, it has been reported that the TPP will remove support from green jobs and American industry by outlawing buy American and buy local standards in government procurement contracts and potentially opening the door for Chinese state-owned enterprises to take those contracts.

In common with every previous trade agreement, the TPP does nothing to

curb currency manipulation, which basically allows countries to keep their goods and the price of their goods at artificially low prices. That means, if they lower their prices and their currency, ours are more expensive.

This abuse, not in my words, but in the words of economists C. Fred Bergsten at the Peterson Institute, Jared Bernstein at the Center for American Progress—they believe that currency manipulation and its practice by China, by Singapore, and Vietnam, who are all part of the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement—that currency manipulation has led to the loss of almost 5 million jobs in the United States of America.

One of the biggest historical manipulators, as I said, Japan, is a member of the TPP. The administration has even floated the idea of adding China, probably the worst currency manipulator in history.

China's recent devaluation just a few short weeks ago of the yuan cost up to 640,000 American jobs, according to the Economic Policy Institute. And after the administration decided to take no action against China, TPP partner Vietnam followed suit, and they devalued their own currency.

In other words, with this agreement, we are rewarding the cheats. No currency forum, as the administration has talked about, because currency and enforceable currency regulations are not in the legislation.

But they say there is going to be a forum, that we will have the opportunity to discuss this. Well, you can have a lot of forums, but unless you have an enforcement mechanism to say no, it is not going to be fixed. It has to be fixed in the agreement, and it is not. So the forum is meaningless.

The predictable calamities do not end there. Earlier this year, WTO trade agreements led to the dismantling of American food labeling laws, country of origin labeling, so that the American public will know where their food is coming from.

Again, the TPP goes even further by allowing multi-national corporations, as well as foreign governments, to challenge U.S. law. It will not be long before we start to see challenges to our food safety system, a system already strained to the breaking point by a flood of tainted contaminated seafood from the TPP countries like Malaysia and Vietnam.

Finally, we know that the TPP will establish rules that give Big Pharma different monopoly periods across partner nations. That makes no sense in a free trade agreement. Why would you do this? That is only to keep drug prices high.

One commonly used combination of HIV drugs cost \$10,000 per year when bought from a Big Pharma monopolist, from the big pharmaceutical company, but as a generic, it only costs \$250. What this agreement will do is to delay generics coming to the market.

And by locking in these corporate monopolies, the agreement com-

promises our access to medicines for the people who need it the most: your constituents, my colleague, and mine, and all of our colleagues.

President Obama said on Monday that the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement "reflects American values." But the administration's approach has been the opposite. It has put corporate special interests before the interests of the American people instead of learning from past experience. We are being railroaded into yet another trade agreement that risks our jobs, our wages, and the health of our family.

But, under the law, there is still time for Congress to reject the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement, and that is what we need to do in a bipartisan way. There are people on both sides of the aisle in this institution that oppose this agreement.

We need to come together and we need to come together for the sake of the working men and women that we represent all over this country. That is what our job is to do right now. We have a moral responsibility. We have an obligation to the people who elect us and send us here to represent their best interests.

Everything that we know from past agreements and what limited amount of information we know from this agreement will put the economic security at risk for American families.

I want to say to my colleague, thank you for doing this. We need over the next several weeks to be doing this every single day because the word has got to go out to the American public of just what is at stake in this trade agreement, and they will be calling their representative and telling them to vote "no."

Thank you very, very much for the opportunity to participate tonight.

□ 1715

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut for her eloquent and compelling words. Whenever she speaks up for the American people, she does so in such a convincing way and a way that is backed by empirical data, not just anecdotes and not just sort of dreams, but that which she already knows.

So I appreciate and feel particularly honored to represent the Congressional Progressive Caucus here this evening to speak out on issues that we know are very important, vitally important, to the well-being of the American worker and our American families.

I do pray that our congressional body can come together around an issue that affects all of us in any district that we might represent, in any corner of the United States of America, and at any economic strata that we might represent.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I have no more speakers who want to address this issue this evening. I thank you for your indulgence.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LIFTING BAN ON OIL EXPORTS

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the leadership allowing me to visit with you about something that is near and dear to my heart. I hope we spend the better part of the next hour discussing a bill tomorrow that will be before this body, which is H.R. 702, which would lift the 40-year-old, decades-old ban on exporting a domestic product, a domestic commodity, called crude oil.

As you look at the things that America buys and sells around the world, the only commodity that we produce here in the United States that we cannot export is crude oil. It harkens back to 40 years ago, and I will talk about it in a second.

There are no restrictions on imports. You could import all the crude oil that you would like, but we have a restriction on exporting that crude oil.

Now, the administration recently signaled a bit of a change in that in that they licensed a swap of certain number of barrels of heavy crude from Mexico for light sweet crude coming to the United States. So there was at least one opportunity recently where the Department of Commerce authorized that swap and, in effect, began to export some of this crude that we produce every single day.

Forty years ago the Arab oil embargo and all the things that happened with that—most of the folks in this Chamber, except maybe you and I, don't necessarily recall the long lines at the gas station and the rationing and the way that even-numbered license plates were okay one day and odd-numbered license plates were okay the next day to buy gasoline.

I can remember living in Dallas at the time. I would have to get up at 5 o'clock in the morning and go sit in line at a gas station in order to fill up the car so that I could make it downtown and back and forth. It was somewhat disruptive to our quiet lives.

The price of oil went from \$3 a barrel to \$12 a gallon, a fourfold increase. That shock hammered the economy with a lot of things that were going on.

As a part of that response, in addition to the response, just before the Arab oil embargo in the 1973–1974 timeframe, the United States had, through a secret study, determined that American crude oil production may have peaked in 1970 and that the wells in the United States that were then producing and the new ones that were going to be drilled and brought online—that the daily production in the United States would slowly decline from that point on and that that scarce resource of strategic value needed to stay here in the United States.

So while we were even a net importer at that point in time, the wisdom of

this House, the Senate, and the President at the time was: Let's just don't export any U.S. crude. Let's use all of it here. And then we will buy from other folks the crude oil that we need to make up the difference in our refinery loads.

That held true for 35 years. Then something pretty stunning happened, and that was this incredible renaissance in the oil and gas business that has occurred over the last 5 years.

When history writes about this era of the oil and gas business, it will talk about these incredible breakthroughs in technology and the science associated with it and the risk taking of the private sector.

The current President likes to brag about the oil and increased production. Quite frankly, this has all come in the private sector, private lands, and private initiatives, where this has happened. Permitting on public property, public lands, has slowed down, and actual production off our Federal lands has shrunk from where it has been.

So for 35 years it was a policy that was out there. It was never an issue because we didn't produce enough every day to export.

Then about 5 years ago this process of increased production was driven by the shale oil play in the Bakken, the shale oil play in west Texas, and the shale oil play in the Eagle Ford shale in south Texas, big frac jobs, technologies that broke the rock up or allowed the oil to escape out of that rock in quantities heretofore not really contemplated or known.

The oil was in the rock. Everyone knew that. They just didn't know how to get it out of the rock. This wonderful renaissance began to occur, and U.S. production began to increase every day to the point now that the estimates, had the price not dropped, were that, by 2020, we would be the largest exporter and that we would have an excess.

So we already had a bit of an excess of crude oil in the United States because it had to go through U.S. refineries. U.S. refineries are set up to process heavy crude, which is not what is produced out of this oil shale. That is light, sweet crude. So, consequently, we had more light sweet. We are still importing crude every day from Venezuela and other countries that feed heavy crude into our refineries.

So it got on everybody's radar screen that we need to figure out a way to unlock this market and eliminate the inefficiencies associated with not being able to export U.S. crude.

As a result of that, there are two sets of prices in the world markets. There is a Brent price of crude, which is North Sea crude, and there is also a West Texas Intermediate price that is in the markets.

There has been for a long time now a differential between those two prices. The West Texas Intermediate price, which is what our local American producers get, was less than the Brent crude.

That differential was driven by the fact that we had no market for U.S. crude, other than U.S. refineries, given the laws and the restrictions that were in place. So the movement began to explore the opportunity for lifting this decades-long ban on crude oil.

Throughout the years that HARRY REID was in charge of the Senate, it was a nonstarter because it was not likely we could get a bill like we are going to vote on tomorrow in the House through the Senate. With the Republican victory last November and control in the Senate by Republicans, it then became an opportunity for us to examine this policy and see if it makes sense.

Just to set the record straight, even without the bad deal the President has foisted on us, we treat Iran better than we treat American producers. Because even before the sanctions are lifted in Iran, they can produce and export about a million barrels of crude oil a day. The U.S. is zero.

So as you step back to look at the big picture, we treat Iran—with all the mischief they do and the bad actor they are and the threat to world peace that they are, they get better treatment than domestic producers, and that makes no sense whatsoever when you look at the overall issue.

So we are at a point now where, with this drop in prices to almost half of what it was, we have begun to see that crude oil production will probably tail off here in the United States this quarter.

But the oil is there. We know how to get it. The science is available. It is just simply driven by the price. Recovering the drilling and completion costs is what is causing the current decline in production, but we know where it is and how to go get it.

When a well comes online, from day one, it will begin to produce less oil today than it did yesterday. That process, that decline, will move forward throughout the life of that well until it reaches its economic limit.

The economic limit of a producing well is driven by the price versus how much it costs you to get it out of the ground, the taxes associated with the barrel, the royalties associated with it. Those have got to be in positive circumstances or it doesn't make any sense to produce that crude oil.

In the drilling and the completion of a well, you have got to be able to recover that investment from the total number of barrels that you expect to produce out of that well. When you know those fixed costs going in, there are very few of those costs that are recoverable once you drill a well.

Your only return is to sell the crude oil. And given how much you think that each well will produce, it has got to be at a price where you can recover that investment as well as cover your incremental costs each day of producing that crude oil.

So there are some sound economic reasons why, at current prices of crude

oil, there is less drilling going on and certainly less completions going on in the market.

That oil is not going anywhere. That shale is just the way it was when the prices were a lot higher. So if prices were to recover and it made sense, then our American domestic producers could go back to producing more and would then reset that decline on an upward slope so that we are, in fact, producing more oil each day than we did yesterday because we are bringing on more wells every single day to offset the natural decline that each well will experience. While we have got this window of opportunity, it is time now to lift this crude oil ban.

Mr. Speaker, I am joined by my neighbor, who represents the southern two-thirds of New Mexico. More importantly, he represents my three grandsons who live in Las Cruces, New Mexico. So I watch him like a hawk to make sure he is doing a good job representing my grandsons.

I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to attention that we are engaged in a very important activity here. We are talking about American jobs.

Now, some people dismiss jobs as being a four-letter word. Well, I mean it kind of is, but not that kind of four-letter word. It is an important piece.

When I was born, my father was a sharecropper. In 1947, the year I was born, he made \$200. The next year, the drought year, he made 50 bucks.

Mom said, "We are leaving the farm." She jumped in the pickup truck. Dad jumped in the back, along with us kids. There were three kids at that time, later to become six.

They headed to the West. I don't think they knew where they were going. I guess they would have stopped when they got to California. But they got 75 miles down the road and broke down 3 miles outside of Hobbs, New Mexico. They hitchhiked into Hobbs, and that is where I grew up.

Dad was able to find a job almost immediately in the oilfield. He got in at the lowest level, a roustabout, making \$2.62 an hour.

Now, to them, to my family who had made \$200 for a full year's work and \$50 for the next year's work, \$2.62 an hour was the absolute pinnacle.

They never moved from Hobbs. They stayed there and raised their six children on \$2.62 an hour. And, of course, it graduated through the years.

That is why I am passionate about this export ban. Because right now we have people in my home county who are being laid off because our oil is sitting in the pipelines. The pipelines going to Houston are filled up. And so companies are having to shut down wells. They are having to stop production.

Now, some of the countries in the Baltics have come to Eddy County, which is one of the counties I rep-

resent, and they have said, "We would buy your light, sweet oil. That crude oil is better than what we buy from Russia. We would stop buying from Russia and buy from you," except we have this ban in place. We can't ship oil out of this country.

Now, we have to understand that 95 percent of the world's consumers are outside the United States. So when we have this self-imposed problem, this self-imposed restriction on sending a product that is very needed out there, know that we are penalizing American jobs.

The President has been very, very ardent in his willingness to create Iranian jobs because he insists that Iran should be able to export their oil while all the time saying that he is opposed to the idea of this bill.

□ 1730

We are going to consider this bill tomorrow, and I think in my heart that we are doing things that would benefit people like my parents, people who did not have the option to move to New York and be on Wall Street. They didn't have the option to move to Albuquerque or Dallas. They were where they could get to, and they were able to find work and raise a family. That is the people that I am fighting for, the people that don't have other choices.

Now, the oilfield provides very good jobs. In this current energy revolution that is taking place in the country, this explosion of shale oil production, truck drivers in my hometown were receiving \$100,000 a year to drive a truck. If you wanted to work overtime, you could get up to \$120,000. That is the sort of job that is now available to people like my father. If he were still working, those jobs would be out there.

But it is not just the people in the oil and gas industry. It is the people who work in the convenience store at the corner. They are busy 24 hours a day, and the local convenience store operator may have to pay \$15 an hour just to attract people in. It benefits everyone, regardless if they are in oil and gas or not.

In New Mexico, oil and gas provides about 40 percent to our State's budget. I tell teachers on the other side of the State: With no oil and gas, you should be vitally interested in this export bill because, if we put people back to work in the oil industry, that money goes straight to the State government, and it helps pay your salary.

Up and down the spectrum, people are benefited when we have a vital energy economy.

If we are going to allow our light sweet crude to be exported, people wonder: Are we going to run out of energy? Absolutely not. It is not going to get more expensive.

Back when my father was working for Humble, which later became Exxon, they had a company philosophy. They were the largest energy company in the world. They simply said this area, the Permian Basin here in New Mexico, is

going to run out of oil in the late 1980s, so they sold every producing well in that area. They simply moved out.

Just a couple of years ago, a discovery was made in southern New Mexico—keep in mind, some of the majors moved out, said there was no more future in this area; it is going to be out of oil—and a discovery was made that is going to produce more oil from that one field than has been produced in New Mexico through the whole of New Mexico in all of its history, from one field that was discovered recently.

We have this kind of thing where people are saying, well, we have got to worry and we have got to think about the future and save it for the future. No, there is as much oil out there unused as we have used in New Mexico. So let us have New Mexico jobs. Let us continue to export now instead of allowing the oil to fill up the pipelines and shut down jobs. That is the main reason that I am supporting this.

Obviously, I appreciate the fact that energy is national security. The low energy prices now are rebuilding the manufacturing economy. As we drive the price of oil down—and keep in mind that the consumers benefit from that. Gasoline had gotten to over \$4. Now, then, it is right down in the \$2 range. So it benefits the consumers.

It is also attracting back industries that manufacture. That is essential for that kind of business. If you are going to manufacture, you need affordable, reliable energy. Firms are moving back here in order to produce. That is creating even other jobs that don't even seem associated with the energy business.

So, again, you have many, many reasons for supporting this energy export bill, and I urge my colleagues to do that.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico for his thoughts and comments. He and I are blessed to share a group of people who work across that State line between Texas and New Mexico—our districts are contiguous with each other—who live in one State, work in the other, vice versa, some of the hardest working, most dedicated, patriotic folks on the face of the Earth, like his dad and his mom who have built wealth, raised a family, protected that family, and produced a U.S. Congressman. It makes them easy to talk about and easy to defend.

I want to flush out this idea of the geopolitical aspects of lifting the ban. I was recently in a Baltic country in conversations with one of the top two leaders, and I had the chance to ask a question of the Prime Minister. I said: Mr. Prime Minister, if you could buy crude oil directly from the United States, would it make your issues with Putin and all the mischief and things he is up to less difficult to deal with?

He lit up like a Christmas tree. He said: Oh, absolutely, absolutely. We would love to buy U.S. crude and not spend that money with Putin and Russia and help lift the boot—the Russian

boot off their neck—that is driven by crude oil and natural gas.

If they could supply to these countries that can't supply themselves, then there is absolutely no reason whatsoever that they shouldn't be running our light sweet crude through their refineries at this point in time.

Steve talked about his dad. My dad was the same way in the sense that if rigs—he was a roughneck, and rough-necks are that hardy group of individuals who work on a drilling rig. It is dangerous. It is hard. It is 24 hours a day. They work 8-hour shifts.

My dad would pull doubles in order to get the extra time and a half so the cash flow to the family would be enough to feed my brother, sister, me, and my mom. He lost a part of a finger as a part of that experience. If the rigs were running in Borger, Texas—we lived in Borger, Texas, where I was born. If the rigs were running in Odessa, Texas, we moved to Odessa, Texas, because my dad thought it was more important to have a job than necessarily where we lived because that was key.

In the early 1990s, I was part of a group that did a needs assessment in Midland, Texas. And we sometimes lose sight of why jobs are important because we talk a lot about it. But that needs assessment did a scientifically sound, statistically sound survey of Midland, asking folks what are the issues within your home, what are the issues within your neighborhood, what are the issues within your community that have a problem, that create this problem? We then winnowed those down to the top 10.

If you looked at that list of top 10 needs of Midland, Texas, at the time, 9 of those would have been positively impacted by somebody having a job. Whatever that need was, it was less of a problem if a family had a job than if they didn't have a job.

The jobs that this will create, jobs that this will protect and maintain are important. The unemployment rate in Midland, Texas, is still in the 3, 2 range, and Odessa is the lower 4. That hides some other issues associated with this problem; and that is, before the drop in the price of oil, not only were there a lot of jobs, but a lot of those jobs were providing some 10, 15, 20 hours of overtime each week to the people that were working. Overtime is a real boost because it is time and a half.

Now, then, these folks still have a job, and with the decreased activity, the decreased drilling and all the other activity associated with the crude oil business, that overtime has evaporated. These folks still have a job, but they built commitments and bought trucks and other things based on that overtime, and they are now not getting it. So while they still have a job, the cash flow to their families is impacted.

I had another opportunity to see the impact of that recently when I toured our local food bank and was discussing

with them what was going on. They said that the elderly population coming to the food bank had dramatically increased over the last 4 or 5 months as a result of this drop in prices.

I asked, Well, why is that? They said that many of these adults, these elderly adults, their families had been helping them with their monthly bills. Because they had this extra overtime, they had extra money that they were able to help their families with, and now that that has evaporated, that trickle-down effect is impacting these elderly who are on fixed incomes and are having to now go to the food bank. Creating jobs, you just can't overstate how important that is.

I have now been joined by my fellow Texan from the Dallas area, PETE SESSIONS, current chairman of the Committee on Rules. I yield to my good friend.

Mr. SESSIONS. Chairman CONAWAY, I want to thank you for leading this effort tonight as we talk to the American people about what we are not only doing in Washington, D.C., but about what we began several years ago, a process of talking to our colleagues about how important it was that America have a strong energy policy. America is the only nation in the world that has a provision that does not allow the export of crude oil.

Crude oil is something that we have been told for a long, long time, since the mid-1970s, that we are running out of. It is a natural resource that America has an abundance of, but over the years that we are running out of oil, we are running out and depleting what we have.

Then a few years ago, some bit of reality took place because a change in technology, a change in technology that was called horizontal drilling, allowed those people who were in the oil patch actually drilling and doing the hard work necessary to extract this gift that we have in this country, developed a process that would allow them to get 60 percent more oil than what had previously been provided for through those existing processes.

Overnight, Americans saw that we also gained the advantage of getting more natural gas. The proven reserves of not only natural gas, but also crude oil shot up dramatically; and it became very apparent not only to the marketplace, because we have seen consumer prices fall over the last few years from over \$4.40 per gallon in lots of places to last week, in Dallas, Texas, 2 weeks ago, gasoline at \$1.97. It is true, last weekend that I was home, it was \$2.18. Mr. Speaker, I would sooner be paying between \$1.99 and \$2.18 for the gasoline that I use as opposed to the scare tactics of where we were just a few short years ago of over \$4.

What does this mean to the American consumer? What does this mean to families all over the United States? More importantly, what does it mean to America? It means that in testimony that was gathered yesterday at

the Committee on Rules, on which I have a chance to serve as the chairman, that we heard that they are expecting at least 400,000 regular jobs that would be added to the economy. That would be all across the United States of America—New York, Illinois, Florida, North Carolina, all over this country—because it would encourage us to do more work, to be able, instead of taking these places and putting a stop on their production, we would now do more production, get it into the worldwide market, sell it overseas, and it becomes a product just like a farm product that can be sold around the world that would help America's exports.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today to thank not only Chairman JOE BARTON, but also Chairman MICHAEL CONAWAY for the hard work that they have done to sell the ideas and the reality that America can have it both ways, and that is: we can produce our natural products; we can get more than 60 percent more out of the ground than we were getting before because of the technology; and we can help the American consumer, moms and dads who need to get to work, who need to go to softball and football practice, and also to work and back and church and back, all in a way that they can meet their budget.

I am pleased and proud to say, Chairman CONAWAY, you can count on me tomorrow, that I will be there to support this great piece of legislation. I want to thank you for allowing me to be with you to talk about the importance of this bill and to wish you good luck tomorrow.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules, PETE SESSIONS, for his kind words and also his support tomorrow.

I think the bill that went through the Committee on Energy and Commerce that started life as a Joe Barton bill will be the one that makes it to the floor tomorrow.

We are expecting to have a really solid, bipartisan vote, by the way. This is not a partisan issue, per se, but the White House might try to make it that. This is a bipartisan issue.

I yield to my colleague from Arkansas, FRENCH HILL. FRENCH.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this commonsense bill, which has been a long time in coming.

I want to thank Mr. CONAWAY for his leadership in bringing it to the floor tomorrow, and the process the committee used, which was a series of hearings through the process, supported by our chairman, supported by members on both sides of the aisle.

I want to thank JOE BARTON and Mr. CUELLAR of Texas for their leadership in recruiting cosponsors, a large bipartisan group of cosponsors, to bring this longstanding bill to the floor and the positive efforts it will have on our economy.

□ 1745

I would like to say to my friend, Mr. SESSIONS—and I invite him to come to

Little Rock—that I filled up last week for \$1.82. So, perhaps Arkansas is a more competitive gas pricing market than even Texas. That may be the biggest economic news of the day here on the floor.

We have touched on the importance of American jobs. All of our American jobs in the oil patch right now are suffering due to low prices and low development budgets. I don't have any doubt that when reserves are revalued September 30 for our publicly traded companies, their oil and gas exploration lines of credit will be down because of pricing in the U.S.; and, therefore, this is a boost for the economic opportunity for jobs in the United States in development.

I want to touch on the national security aspects of this bill that I think are so important, Mr. Speaker. Early in the year, this House passed ways to improve liquefied natural gas to be developed and shipped overseas to international markets. We have an abundant amount of natural gas in this country. We are now the world's leading producer, and we have the opportunity to provide natural gas in liquefied form around the world to our allies in Asia and Europe. Likewise, eliminating the ban on crude oil, long outgrown by North American production and our economic success, will allow us to now, from a national security point of view, to have liquefied natural gas and crude oil as export potential and as economic job potential for the U.S.

But more importantly, to our NATO allies and to our Asian allies, we offer them North American gas and crude oil as an alternative to the Mid East and, most importantly, Europe to Russia. For too long, our allies in Europe have been held hostage by the politics of the Mid East or the politics of Russia. This allows us to be a much better not only economic partner, but national security partner with our allies in Europe and our allies in Asia.

I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to come to the floor and speak in strong support of this bill to remove the export ban on crude oil in the United States. I urge my fellow Members, both Democrat and Republican, to provide a good, strong, bipartisan vote and send that message to the United States Senate to join us in passing this lifting of the ban, and to send a message to White House, Mr. Chairman, that a veto message here is not appropriate.

I invite the President and the OMB and the Department of Energy to reconsider that, in fact, this is a national security benefit to the United States and a jobs and economic benefit to the United States, and it is not the kind of thing that our President should issue a veto threat on.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his comments and opinions on this issue. I hope his support draws Members of the other side of the aisle to our arguments and to make this happen.

The gentleman mentioned the price he paid in Arkansas recently. I dare say, there is not another commodity in America that we don't check the price on more often than gasoline. You may not buy gas every day, but every time you drive by a gasoline station, you check the price because it is right there for everybody to see. We don't put the price of bread and milk up like that, but we do put the price of gasoline up.

I have got a district that has 29 counties and is 300 miles wide and 200-plus miles north to south. We do a lot of driving. My district director and I are always looking for that better gasoline price deal in the district as we are moving around, because hardwired into most all of us that drive very much is to check those prices.

This increased production in the United States will also help protect consumers from price shocks. I mentioned that in 1974, the price of crude oil went from \$3 a barrel to \$12 a barrel, a fourfold increase. The more production you have from a stable environment like the United States, the less whipsaw you will get in the market from disruptions in supplies from places and part of the world where it is not quite as stable, such as the Middle East and others.

So, this increased U.S. production will also help protect American consumers from being whipsawed by dramatic increases in the price of crude oil because we have got that supply.

I now yield to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), who is from another State benefitting from the shale play and someone that is probably more familiar with the Bakken Shale than anybody else.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, your leadership on this has been great.

As I think about what Mr. HILL from Arkansas was saying in expressing his appreciation for regular order and the committee process, this really is probably one of the greatest examples since I have been in Congress of a piece of legislation and a concept that has gone through the process the way it is supposed to go through the process. Because not only did the Energy and Commerce Committee have hearings on H.R. 702, which we are going to vote on tomorrow which lifts the ban, I know you had a bill that similarly lifts the ban. You had hearings in the Agriculture Committee, which I think, by the way, the hearing you had was probably the best hearing on the entire topic. You honed in on that impact on the consumer and the input costs for producing another important product: food.

And we are pretty good in the United States in places like Texas and North Dakota and lots of places in between at growing food—enough food to feed not just Americans, but a hungry world, and enhance our trade balance and enhance our economy in using the peaceful tool of food rather than weapons of war.

I think, similarly, the shale revolution presents the same opportunity that food does, and that is to use the peaceful tools of energy development in place of or to enhance weapons of war.

One doesn't need to be too creative to see that in the world today there is some chaos. When you have Vladimir Putin pushing further into Eastern Europe, when you have him now bombing in Syria, when you have him selling arms to Iran, you have Iran being able to get arms and now being able to sell their oil in the global marketplace, to have this stabilizing impact of U.S. production into the global marketplace, I think it can only benefit everybody. And that is true of not just stabilizing price, as we see the Brent global price much higher than the domestic WTI price. On average, over the last 5 years, that spread has been \$11—a spread that is not enjoyed by consumers, but certainly harms economic opportunity and job opportunity in the United States. Your hearing really honed in on that cost to consumers and the benefit to consumers. Also, the hearing in the Foreign Affairs Committee as well.

So we have had three committees of jurisdiction talking about this issue and this bill coming to the floor tomorrow, going through the Rules Committee, and the Rules Committee allowing a number of amendments to be debated and voted on tomorrow. Many amendments were introduced by Democratic Members as well as Republican Members. It has just been a rich experience. There are a number of issues related to it.

Coming from North Dakota, I can tell you firsthand that not that many years ago I was the economic development and finance director in the State of North Dakota at a time when we were just stabilizing out-migration. But part of the reason we were stabilizing it was because we lost so many of our young people. Our small towns were shrinking. While we were diversifying our economy a little bit here and there, the shale revolution that came along with the technology that combined fracking with horizontal drilling dramatically changed our State.

Probably my favorite anecdote of the whole situation—while there are many—is the fact that the little town of Killdeer hadn't had a football team for 20 years because they couldn't field enough young men, and now they have a football team. And that is just illustrative of what has happened in many of our small towns; because in the supply chain in the oil and gas industry, the jobs are not only numerous, they are really good. They pay, on average, 25 percent higher than the national average.

So it really is a grand opportunity that is somewhat being lost—certainly, its potential is being lost—because we are now sort of hemmed in with light sweet crude being produced more than we can use in our refineries in the

United States, especially the light sweet crude which our refineries are not set up to take, for the most part, but refineries outside the United States are set up to take, for the most part. In fact, 92 percent of the oil refined outside of the United States is light sweet crude. Only about 25, 30 percent of the refining capacity in the United States is set up to take light sweet crude. So that distinction is important to understand when you see that we are now overproducing for the refinery capacity we have in our country.

I want to address, Mr. Speaker, some comments made earlier this week by Secretary of Energy Ernie Moniz, a man I have great respect for—clearly, an intellect. He made some comments in the Senate Commerce Committee that, while technically accurate, I suppose were certainly incomplete. He had said that now is not the time to lift the oil export ban; and he said that according to the EIA, somehow we weren't really hemmed in because we were still importing some oil.

It ignores so many things, not the least of which is that distinction between light sweet and heavy sour that I talked about just moments ago; the fact that our refineries, for the most part, in the United States are set up for the heavy sour that we aren't producing an excess of—and, by the way, about 30 percent of which are owned by vertically integrated companies outside of the United States who have more of an interest in buying their oil than ours. But the world is really where the opportunity exists.

The other thing that he ignores in his statement saying that we are not yet hemmed in, he ignores just the natural order of things, that global markets, global demand being accessible to domestic producers, U.S. producers, will grow the production. You can't expect people to produce more of something than they can sell or than can be used in their limited market. If we have access to the global demand, of course we are going to produce more—that is the whole point—creating more jobs, more entrepreneurial opportunities.

The other thing that bothers me about what Secretary Moniz said about now not being the time is that it ignores so many things. It ignores the fact that we still have a very low workforce participation rate in this country. We need more jobs. We have many people that are either underemployed, unemployed, no longer looking for work, and these are good, high-paying jobs up and down the supply chain.

And lest we forget, they are not just jobs in the oil patch. It is not just in west Texas; it is not just in Houston; it is not just in North Dakota or Oklahoma or New Mexico. These jobs are in every State in the country.

In fact, according to the Energy Equipment and Infrastructure Alliance, which did a vast study on this, the third leading recipient of new jobs, if this export ban is lifted, is the State

of Illinois. And you might wonder, well, why is it? Well, because Illinois has a lot of manufacturing, especially a lot of large equipment manufacturing. Those manufacturing jobs are great for families. They are great for the economy. They are great for startup business opportunities. So it is every State in the country that benefits. Secretary Moniz certainly dismisses that, or at least ignores it, in his statements.

I want to wrap up with this point. I always like to say that America's national security and America's economic security are tied directly to America's energy security. I touched on it earlier, but there has never been a time certainly in my public service when the world was in a more fragile state, and certainly chaos is reigning.

I talked about Vladimir Putin's push into Eastern Europe, his bombing of Syria, his alliance with Iran.

Iran, by the way, is another major producer of oil, who, as per the Iran nuclear deal, now gets to sell their oil onto the global marketplace. But our President thinks it is a better idea for them than he does for United States producers. He ignores the opportunity that, again, the peaceful development of oil and gas and the production of it and then the marketing of it in the global marketplace, the opportunity that has to spread influence and create peace in places that desperately need it, especially for our allies.

It is interesting. I doubt that the folks that scheduled the floor time for tomorrow's bill had this in mind, because this was more of a process of regular order than it was the calendar; but we are, right now, in the middle of the 42-year recognition of the Yom Kippur War.

□ 1800

The Yom Kippur War was what sort of began, really started, the energy crisis that led to the 1973 embargoes. We are reliving, in many respects, some of the geopolitical aspects of that time and that situation.

Our friends in Israel are not sure whether we are with them or not as a country, whether we are going to be with them on big issues, dependent on Russian oil largely, a Russia that is playing bad in the neighborhood, and uncertainty as to who is going to fill the leadership vacuum in places like Syria, a very important player, 42, 43 years ago.

There is a lot adding up to this being a very, very important vote tomorrow on lifting the export ban on H.R. 702. There are things adding up that we didn't even contemplate at the time that the bill was introduced.

But it is a grand opportunity to secure America's economy, secure America's national security while at the same time spreading our influence of freedom and free enterprise around the world.

So I am looking forward to, hopefully, a lot of bipartisan votes tomorrow, a big vote, so that we can send

that over to the United States Senate, who I know has a different standard than we have. But, hopefully, we can show them the way.

I thank the gentleman for yielding so much time to me.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman from North Dakota, clearly, a State that is a major player in this oil and gas renaissance that has occurred over the last 5 years.

I would also like to point out that the oil and gas business, per se, is an incredibly fertile ground for small business development. And my dad, I mentioned earlier, was a great example of this.

There are lots of narrow-focused aspects of the service side of the business. We all think of the drilling rigs and the big investments there, but there are various aspects, whether it is hauling things or mud or whatever is the deal, where entrepreneurs, men and women who want to take a little risk, can put a little capital together, put some tools together, and begin servicing an aspect of the business that is there.

So it is incredibly fertile in terms of setting up new businesses. I have got one group in Eastland, Texas, that, just as the renaissance was beginning to start, they thought it was a good idea to get into some aspect of the fracking business and, over a very short period of time, built that business into a multi-billion-dollar deal and sold it.

So incredible wealth was created as a result of small businesses turning into a medium-sized business, turning into a big business, and then, ultimately, sold to another bigger business for an awful lot of money.

And every time that happens there are jobs created associated with that and wealth created with that that benefits not only those individual communities, but all of us that are involved.

We failed to mention that there is no ban on exporting product. Crude oil that is refined, turned into gasoline, turned into diesel, there is no ban on that.

So refiners today can take that heavy crude that they use and the little bit of light, sweet crude that they use, turn that into a product that they then can sell into the world market, and the same folks can sell it back into our communities for us to use in our cars and in our trucks.

That gasoline, in the main, particularly by folks, individuals, is bought with after-tax dollars. That means they have had to earn a buck, pay the taxes on it, and then take what is left out of that dollar to actually buy gasoline.

As we have seen over the last several months, these lower gasoline prices have been a big boon to folks in our country that have to drive a car to get to work or take their kids to school, whatever it might be.

So if you have got a \$1 or a \$2 drop in the price of gasoline and you are buying 15 gallons a week or 15 gallons

every so often, that is \$15 to \$30 of after-tax dollars that you can then spend somewhere else to benefit you and your family.

Another aspect of what is happening is not related to what will go into the bill tomorrow, but it is something we have talked about on this floor ad nauseam, and that is the XL Pipeline. This pipeline is designed to haul Canadian oil sand oil, bitumen oil, that is, in effect, heavy crude south to the United States.

This is the kind of crude that could run our refineries and our refineries would desperately like to have rather than buying the heavy crude from Venezuela and other places where the recipients of our checks when we buy that crude oil aren't necessarily friends of ours, aren't necessarily on the same geopolitical page that we are on.

So having that pipeline would be another aspect of freeing up this market. The more efficient you can make markets, the less artificial restraints, the less goofy things you have got in there, then the better pricing mechanisms you get, the better and the more efficient those markets are, and then everybody up and down that chain benefits from that.

As I mentioned earlier, we have got this odd circumstance where the producers in the United States sell on the West Texas Intermediate number to a refinery. That refinery then turns it into gasoline, and they sell it based on the Brent crude.

So there is a differential being made by somebody, and shrinking that differential is what will keep the price of gasoline and diesel from increasing.

One of the arguments for folks who don't represent producing provinces is: Why would I be in favor of something that would increase the folks I represent gasoline and diesel prices?

Every study has shown that that will not happen. Now, the price of gasoline and diesel will go up by the world market. But as a result of lifting this export ban, it will, in fact, not increase the price of gasoline as we produce it.

This is a win on every level. It is a win for consumers, as I have mentioned, it is a win for taxpayers, and it is a win for taxing entities.

My colleagues from North Dakota and from Arkansas mentioned that reserves in the ground are valued for property tax purposes, and those property taxes that are generated from that then support our schools and other county, city, and State functions.

As that developed crude oil is explored and those producing wells come online, that creates a property tax base that benefits all of the taxpayers in those particular entities.

So it is a win across the world. It is a win for our allies and the geopolitical issues that we have talked about. So it is good for this country. It is good for jobs. And it is something that I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle can thoroughly look at. They have had plenty of time to do it.

As was mentioned, it went through regular order, several hearings on the issue, actual legislation went through the subcommittee and the committee, the normal regular order, as we like to say around here, and everyone has had a chance to weigh in.

Tomorrow there will be some amendments made in order under the rule. Folks will be able to weigh in. Some of those I will support. Some of those I will be against. But they were all presented as a way to get someone else's idea about this issue to the floor to have us debate it. I think that is a healthy thing, that we will be able to do that tomorrow. Some of those will perhaps pass, and some of them won't.

But whatever happens, I have got great confidence that the bill that we will pass tomorrow with a big bipartisan vote can then go to the Senate and move the ball and move the initiative over there.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Texas, whose work on this issue started his career in this business and has just joined us and is the lead sponsor on the bill that we will be voting on tomorrow.

We have got probably 4 or 5 minutes left. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), my chairman emeritus of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the Dean of the Texas delegation, for whatever thoughts he might care to share with us.

Mr. BARTON. I thank the gentleman from Midland, Texas, the chairman of the Agriculture Committee and a stalwart original sponsor of the bill. I appreciate your leadership, and I appreciate you doing this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we are going to have a debate on H.R. 702. It is a bill to repeal the ban on crude oil exports. This is the last remnant of the 1970s era energy policy for America that said we were running out of energy and that the only way to use the energy we did have was to keep it in the United States.

As a consequence of the Arab oil embargo, we had price controls on oil. We had price controls on natural gas. We had limits on what natural gas could be used for. We had a very restrictive, defeatist, in my opinion, energy policy.

All that has been repealed except for one thing, and that is this ban on crude oil exports. There are a number of opinions about why that has not been repealed, but I think the primary reason is that, until the last 5 years, Mr. Speaker, we really didn't have a significant amount of oil that could be exported.

But a funny thing happened. Some engineers in Texas—I have to give my State credit—developed two technologies, one called hydraulic fracturing where you pressurize a formation, and another where you can turn the drill bit and drill horizontally.

The combination of hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling has transformed what were considered to be uneconomic reserves, i.e., these

tight shale formations in south Texas in the Eagle Ford, in North Dakota in the Bakken, in Louisiana, and up in through Pennsylvania, Ohio, and New York, into economically producible oil and gas formations.

The consequence is, in the last 5 years, U.S. oil production has doubled. It got as high as almost \$10 million a barrel about a year ago. Because of the collapse in oil prices, that production level has declined some, but the capacity is still there.

So we have created a surplus in the domestic market of this light, sweet shale oil, but we can't export it. So what has developed is a two-tiered price market. You have a domestic price for oil in the United States that is anywhere from \$2 to as much as \$30 below the world price, which is set by North Sea oil called Brent.

That price differential is causing wells in the United States to shut in. It is preventing new wells from being driven.

If we can pass our bill tomorrow and the Senate pass it and the President sign it, that price differential, Mr. Speaker, will go away, and we will be competitive to export oil into the world market.

If we are able to do that, good things happen. We create jobs in the United States. We put pressure on OPEC and Russia in the world market. We probably bring that world price down slightly, which will result in lower gasoline prices for United States consumers.

We will be competitive in the energy markets everywhere in this world. In Asia, in South America, in Western Europe, Central Europe, U.S. oil will be used as an economic product, but also as a strategic asset for the security of our country.

So, Mr. Speaker, we hope to have a big vote on that tomorrow, somewhere between noon and 1:00. We have, I think, 10 amendments the Rules Committee has made in order. Some of those we will accept. Some of them we will oppose.

But it has been an open process, hearings in a number of committees, including your committee, Mr. Chairman, the Agriculture Committee, open markup in subcommittee of Energy and Commerce, full committee, and amendments accepted from both sides of the aisle that will be on the floor tomorrow.

So H.R. 702 is good for America, good for the country. It is a job-creation bill, and we hope that we will get a big vote tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman.

I want to brag on the House for having conducted this business with respect to this bill the way it has.

If you go back to your grade school or your junior high civics classes, I'm a bill on Capitol Hill trying to become a law, this is exactly what happened with this deal. It went through the process the way it is supposed to, kind of the old-fashioned deal.

We hope to see tomorrow a big bipartisan vote so the American people can at least in this one glimmer look and say, hey, the House of Representatives functioned the way that the Founding Fathers intended it to and moved an important piece of legislation forward.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to a big vote tomorrow. I yield back the balance of time.

WATER PROBLEMS IN THE CITY OF FLINT, MICHIGAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Michigan). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I have 5 legislative days—and any other speaker who may arrive—to revise and extend remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today just to take a few minutes to call attention to a problem that I have been trying to raise in this body and in my work before I came to Congress for some time, specifically, to describe the conditions in my own hometown of Flint, Michigan.

The subject that I am addressing is the unique and really difficult challenges facing America's older industrial cities, cities like my hometown of Flint, Michigan, a city that is the birthplace of General Motors. It is where the first UAW contract was created, was signed. But it is a city that has really struggled as it has made this transition from the old to the new economy.

It is a city that had 200,000 people just a couple of decades ago and now hovers right around 100,000 citizens, a poorer city than it once was, a city that has lost 90 percent of its manufacturing jobs.

□ 1815

I raise this because I believe that this Congress and the Federal Government have an obligation to reinvest in these communities, communities that helped build this country and that can have a significant effect on our future. These are the cities where innovation took place and where it can take place again.

But my own hometown right now is struggling, struggling with a problem, unfortunately, that is not entirely of its own making. My home of Flint, a city that was once really the center of the auto manufacturing universe, can't even guarantee to its citizens one of the most essential functions of government. It can't guarantee to citizens that it can deliver clean, drinkable water to their households.

We have elevated lead levels in the city of Flint in their water system. It has been known for some time, for about a year that there have been significant problems with water quality in Flint. And despite protests, really, at the State and Federal levels, public officials saying that there is no problem with the water, that it is completely safe to drink—in fact, one State official told city of Flint residents that they just needed to simply relax.

It has been revealed recently through independent studies, now confirmed by the State government, that we have lead levels far in excess of what is allowed under the Federal lead and copper rules. This is completely unacceptable.

In fact, what makes this even more troubling is that this is a tragic set of circumstances that has public health implications for the citizens of my community that were completely avoidable, that are the result of decisions that were made by the State of Michigan when it took over control of this fiscally stressed city.

This is a city that is struggling in a lot of different ways. Twice in the last decade, it has been under the control of a receiver, of a State-appointed emergency manager that takes away the authority of local government officials to make decisions for themselves, takes away the authority of the Flint citizens to elect their own representatives to govern themselves, and places authority to control the city in the hands of a single master, an emergency manager.

Well, it was during the period of time that one of those emergency managers was in control that the State decided for the city of Flint that, for a temporary period of time, simply to save money, it would begin to draw water, rather than from the city of Detroit water system, which had a water source from Lake Huron, but it would begin to draw water from the Flint River, a small river that passes through our hometown, a river that is the namesake of our own community.

The sad thing is—and this tells you a little bit about how some folks in different levels of government at the Federal and State level think about these older cities. There was no robust review, no testing, no examination as to whether or not this river water would result in clean water being delivered to homes, drinkable water delivered to citizens. As a result, this water drawn from the Flint River is substantially more corrosive and has led to lead leaching from the pipes in the delivery system into the drinking water in Flint homes.

In fact, there was a study that was just done in the last day or two that shows that in Flint school district buildings, water being delivered to Flint schoolchildren has lead levels far above the actionable level under the EPA lead and copper rule.

Think about this. In the 21st century in the United States of America, we

have a city, a great, old city that was a part of the industrial revolution, that can't even deliver clean and safe drinking water to its citizens, not only because of our failure to invest in infrastructure in this country, which is a big part of the problem, but largely because officials at the State government simply decided, well, that Flint River water, that will be good enough. There was no real scientific research that determined whether or not that water would be safe—"it will be fine." And even when evidence was presented indicating that that water might be unsafe, Flint citizens were told by the State government to just relax; don't worry about it.

Well, that is a complete failure of government. It is a failure of government, frankly, at the Federal level because, for almost a year now, I have been asking the EPA to intervene; to, first of all, help this old city of Flint rebuild itself and rebuild its water system by providing some relief through the clean drinking water revolving loan fund, some degree of loan forgiveness, which is allowable under Federal law; but in this case, a technicality has prevented the EPA from allowing the State of Michigan to grant that kind of relief. That could make a huge difference for the city and its ability to rebuild its own infrastructure. But so far, all we get from the EPA is "no," and we asked for technical assistance from the EPA.

Now, recently we have had more attention; but, frankly, it is not enough. I mean, where is the urgency?

If the role of the U.S. EPA is to ensure adherence to this rule, this law that requires clean and safe drinking water to be available to its citizens, they ought to do more than sit back and offer opinion. They need to be engaged. So I call on the EPA to take a much more focused role in making sure that the citizens of Flint have clean drinking water.

I mentioned that this was not an accident. This decision to use this questionable water source was done when the city was under financial receivership, when an appointed emergency manager was making the decisions for the city of Flint. So here we had a situation where this emergency manager, this outside new management is appointed to come in and deal with the issue of fiscal insolvency and, by only looking at the short-term balance sheet, made a decision to get cheaper water that turned out to be dangerous for the residents of the city and, actually, potentially has handed the city a huge cost to fix what could be hundreds of millions of dollars of permanent damage to the water system as a result of that decision.

So an emergency manager comes in with the idea that somehow outside management is the only problem that this city faces, makes decisions that not only ruin the reputation of the city but also cause significant health risks,

and then hands the city a bill, potentially to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars, and at the same time, over the last decade, has continued to cut direct support to that very city. I mean, this just doesn't make sense.

The citizens of the city are not responsible for the fact that its infrastructure has been allowed to deteriorate. They are not responsible for the fact that at the Federal level and at the State level we have not supported redevelopment in these places. In fact, through transportation policy, housing policy, tax policy, land use policy at the Federal and State levels, we have actually, unfortunately, contributed to the hollowing out of these older cities, and now the citizens of this place have to pay the price.

The failure to reinvest in these older cities is not without victims; and right now, it is the people of the city of Flint that are the victims of a failure at the Federal, frankly, and at the State level. It is something that just cannot be tolerated.

So when we think about this question, when we think about this particular case of the city, my hometown of Flint, and the fact that these decisions have been made for them by people at the State capital, they are paying the price. And almost inexplicably, even though today in a complete reversal, an admission of failure by the State, the State has come in and said now they are going to help facilitate the reconnection temporarily to the Detroit water system until a permanent Lake Huron line can be established. Inexplicably, there they are actually asking the city government to empty out its remaining resources, financial resources, and put millions of dollars up to help contribute to pay for fixing a problem that the State government is actually responsible for making. The State broke the system, and now, yet again, it is the city residents who are being asked to contribute to pay for a problem that they did not create in the first place.

Sadly, while this may seem like an extreme case, it is a pretty consistent tale all across this country, but especially in the Northeast and Midwestern United States. But in the South and West as well, there are older cities that

have, in the past, contributed greatly to economic growth in this country and have been allowed—in some ways, encouraged—to wither, to be hollowed out, and we can't let this continue.

So here when we see before our very eyes 30, 40, 50 American cities—as I said, including my own hometown—continue to fall farther and farther behind, have their infrastructure continue to deteriorate, what do we spend our time talking about here in the United States Congress? Petty fights between Democrats and Republicans and, frankly, more recently, petty fights between Republicans and other Republicans.

We haven't even touched the idea of a big infrastructure bill that could help places not just like my hometown of Flint, but other places across the Midwest and across the country that could be much more productive if we simply had 21st century infrastructure, a water system that can deliver clean water to its residents.

There is no excuse. There is no excuse at the Federal level for us not providing the kind of help that would make a place like Flint a far more productive place with decent roads, good schools, and a water system that delivers clean water. I mean, that seems pretty fundamental, and it is. Without that, these older communities, these older cities have no chance of connecting to the new economy, no chance of contributing the way they are capable of to the next economy of this country. It is shameless that we haven't seen the urgency that I think is required in order to deal with this enormous problem.

There are victims of this failure. There are victims, individuals who have been really left behind because of the failure at the Federal and at the State level.

So, Mr. Speaker, I know I have taken a few moments. I don't need to take the full half hour that has been allotted to me because we will continue this discussion. We will continue this conversation.

I just want to make sure that the folks who are listening, the people in this body, people across the country understand that unless we take time, unless we make the effort in this body

to address the problems of these older cities, we will not have done our job. It is important that the American people know that this Congress is willing to stand up for them and stand up for America's cities.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HUDSON (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and October 9 on account of family reasons.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 32. An act to provide the Department of Justice with additional tools to target extraterritorial drug trafficking activity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary; in addition, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

S. 2162. An act to establish a 10-year term for the service of the Librarian of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on October 7, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 2835. To actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 9, 2015, at 9 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the third quarter of 2015, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO TIMOR-LESTE, INDONESIA, NEPAL, AND KOSOVO, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 11 AND AUG. 21, 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. Vern Buchanan	8/13	8/15	Timor-Leste	383.26	(9)	383.26
Hon. David Price	8/13	8/15	Timor-Leste	383.26	(9)	383.26
Hon. Adrian Smith	8/13	8/15	Timor-Leste	383.26	(9)	383.26
Hon. Jim McDermott	8/14	8/15	Timor-Leste	191.63	(9)	191.63
Hon. Dina Titus	8/13	8/15	Timor-Leste	383.26	(9)	383.26
Hon. Susan Davis	8/13	8/15	Timor-Leste	383.26	(9)	383.26
Justin Wein	8/13	8/15	Timor-Leste	383.26	(9)	383.26
Sean Brady	8/13	8/15	Timor-Leste	383.26	(9)	383.26

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO TIMOR-LESTE, INDONESIA, NEPAL, AND KOSOVO, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 11 AND AUG. 21, 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. Vern Buchanan	8/15	8/17	Indonesia		512.56		(*)				512.56
Hon. David Price	8/15	8/17	Indonesia		512.56		(*)				512.56
Hon. Adrian Smith	8/15	8/17	Indonesia		512.56		(*)				512.56
Hon. Jim McDermott	8/15	8/17	Indonesia		512.56		(*)				512.56
Hon. Dina Titus	8/15	8/17	Indonesia		512.56		(*)				512.56
Hon. Susan Davis	8/15	8/17	Indonesia		512.56		(*)				512.56
Justin Wein	8/15	8/17	Indonesia		512.56		(*)				512.56
Sean Brady	8/15	8/17	Indonesia		512.56		(*)				512.56
Hon. Vern Buchanan	8/17	8/19	Nepal		508.22		(*)				508.22
Hon. David Price	8/17	8/19	Nepal		508.22		(*)				508.22
Hon. Adrian Smith	8/17	8/19	Nepal		508.22		(*)				508.22
Hon. Jim McDermott	8/17	8/19	Nepal		508.22		(*)				508.22
Hon. Dina Titus	8/17	8/19	Nepal		508.22		(*)				508.22
Hon. Susan Davis	8/17	8/19	Nepal		508.22		(*)				508.22
Justin Wein	8/17	8/19	Nepal		508.22		(*)				508.22
Sean Brady	8/17	8/19	Nepal		508.22		(*)				508.22
Hon. Vern Buchanan	8/19	8/21	Kosovo		406.00		(*)				406.00
Hon. David Price	8/19	8/21	Kosovo		326.00		(*)				326.00
Hon. Adrian Smith	8/19	8/21	Kosovo		406.00		(*)				406.00
Hon. Jim McDermott	8/19	8/20	Kosovo		163.00		(*)				163.00
Hon. Dina Titus	8/19	8/21	Kosovo		406.00		(*)				406.00
Hon. Susan Davis	8/19	8/21	Kosovo		406.00		(*)				406.00
Justin Wein	8/19	8/21	Kosovo		326.00		(*)				326.00
Sean Brady	8/19	8/21	Kosovo		326.00		(*)				326.00
Committee total					13,805.69						13,805.69

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. VERN BUCHANAN, Sept. 20, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 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. Frank Lucas	8/31	9/1	Switzerland	749.30	785.42		9,263.35				10,048.77
Hon. Frank Lucas	9/1	9/4	France	887.58	995.04						995.04
Hon. Eddie Bernice Johnson	8/31	9/1	Switzerland	749.30	785.42		14,351.75				15,137.17
Hon. Eddie Bernice Johnson	9/1	9/4	France	887.58	995.04						995.04
Tom Hammond	8/31	9/1	Switzerland	749.30	785.42		2,987.45				3,772.87
Tom Hammond	9/1	9/4	France	817.58	916.57						916.57
Adam Rosenberg	8/31	9/1	Switzerland	749.30	785.42		2,987.45				3,772.87
Adam Rosenberg	9/1	9/4	France	817.58	916.57						916.57
Committee total					6,964.90		29,590				36,554.90

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. LAMAR SMITH, Chairman, Oct. 1, 2015.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3107. A letter from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Fee Increases for Overtime Services [Docket No.: APHIS-2009-0047] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3108. A letter from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Golden Nematode; Removal of Regulated Areas in Orleans, Nassau, and Suffolk Counties, New York [Docket No.: APHIS-2015-0040] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3109. A letter from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Tomato Plantlets in Approved Growing Media From Mexico [Docket No.: APHIS-2014-0099] (RIN:

0579-AE06) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3110. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Greene County, PA, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2015-0001] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8401] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3111. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Reportable Events and Certain Other Notification Requirements (RIN: 1212-AB06) received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3112. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121,

Sec. 251; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3113. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Multiemployer Plans; Electronic Filing Requirements (RIN: 1212-AB28) received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3114. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report entitled "The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran", the twenty-third in a series of reports required by Sec. 1245(d)(4)(A) of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2012; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3115. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Mica-Based Pearlescent Pigments [Docket No.: FDA-2015-C-1154] received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3116. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to the Minor New Source Review (NSR) State Implementation Plan (SIP) for Portable Facilities [EPA-R06-OAR-2010-0283; FRL-9935-04-Region 6] received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3117. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Alabama; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2013-0185; FRL-9935-21-Region 4] received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3118. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Butanedioic Acid, 2-Methylene-, Homopolymer, Sodium Salt; Inert Ingredient Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0395; FRL-9933-74] received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3119. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Rhode Island; Sulfur Content of Fuels [EPA-R01-OAR-2014-0605; A-1-FRL-9935-31-Region 1] received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3120. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Promulgation of State Implementation Plan Revisions; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Ozone, 2008 Lead, and 2010 NO₂ National Ambient Air Quality Standards; North Dakota [EPA-R08-OAR-2012-0974; FRL-9935-15-Region 8] received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3121. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Dimethyl sulfoxide; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0630; FRL-9934-17] received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3122. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Kentucky Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead NAAQS [EPA-R04-OAR-2014-0443; FRL-9935-19-Region 4] received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3123. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Kentucky: New Sources in or Impacting Nonattainment Areas [EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0384; FRL-9935-22-Region 4] received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3124. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Georgia Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0696; FRL-9935-24-Region 4] received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3125. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Maine; General Permit Regulations for Non-metallic Mineral Processing Plants and Concrete Batch Plants [EPA-R01-OAR-2015-0527; A-1-FRL-9935-33-Region 1] received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3126. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Trans-1,3,3,3-tetrafluoroprop-1-ene; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0043; FRL-9934-74] received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3127. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Cellulose Carboxymethyl Ether, Potassium Salt; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0482; FRL-9934-45] received October 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3128. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; MI; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2008 Ozone, 2010 NO₂, 2010 SO₂, and 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS [EPA-R05-OAR-2014-0657; FRL-9935-18-Region 5] received October 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3129. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Infrastructure for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R06-OAR-2014-0205; FRL-9935-44-Region 6] received October 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3130. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Oregon: Lane Regional Air Protection Agency Open Burning Rules and Oregon Department of Environmental Quality Enforcement Procedures [EPA-R10-OAR-2014-0562; FRL-9935-48-Region 10] received October 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3131. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Governmentwide Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards [FRL-9926-01-OARM] (RIN: 2030-AA99) received October 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121,

Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3132. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Greenhouse Gas Reporting Rule: 2015 Revisions and Confidentiality Determinations for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems [EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0831; FRL-9935-50-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS37) received October 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3133. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — NESHAP for Brick and Structural Clay Products Manufacturing; and NESHAP for Clay Ceramics Manufacturing [EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0290 and EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0291; FRL-9933-13-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AP69) received October 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3134. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report certifying that the export of the listed item to the People's Republic of China is not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry, pursuant to Sec. 1512 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for FY 1999 (Pub. L. 105-261), as amended by Sec. 146 of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for FY 1999 (Pub. L. 105-277), and the President's September 29, 2009 delegation of authority [74 Fed. Reg. 50,913 (Oct. 2, 2009)]; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3135. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities that was declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, as required by Sec. 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and Sec. 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3136. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to South Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014, as required by Sec. 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and Sec. 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3137. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, as required by Sec. 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and Sec. 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3138. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule and technical amendment — Ocean Dumping: Expansion of an Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site Offshore of Jacksonville, Florida [EPA-R04-OW-2014-0372; FRL-9934-57-Region 4] received October 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3139. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards for the Steam Electric

Power Generating Point Source Category [EPA-HQ-OW-2009-0819; FRL-9930-48-OW] (RIN: 2040-AF14) received October 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3140. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Women-Owned Small Business Federal Contract Program (RIN: 3245-AG72) received October 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Small Business.

3141. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a letter respectfully urging Congress to take action as soon as possible and raise the debt limit well before Treasury exhausts its extraordinary measures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3142. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's Annual Report on Continuing Disability Reviews for FY 2013, pursuant to Sec. 221(i) of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3143. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Commerce, transmitting draft legislation to implement the Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fisheries Resources in the North Pacific Ocean, to implement the Convention on the Conservation and Management of High Seas Fishery Resources in the South Pacific Ocean, and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MOORE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. LEE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. MOULTON):

H.R. 3708. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to provide for an increase in the discretionary spending limit for fiscal year 2016, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POLIQUIN (for himself and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK):

H.R. 3709. A bill to make permanent the pilot program administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs regarding enhanced contract care authority for the health care needs of veterans located in highly rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LAMALFA (for himself, Mr. COSTA, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. ROUZER, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, and Mr. YOHO):

H.R. 3710. A bill to amend the Plant Protection Act with respect to authorized uses of methyl bromide, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 3711. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Interior to conduct a special resource study of Chicano Park, located in San Diego, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HONDA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 3712. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to mental health services under the Medicare program; 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 Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. TROTT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 3713. A bill to reform sentencing laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOST (for himself, Ms. MENG, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 3714. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to allow the Small Business Administration to establish size standards for small agricultural enterprises using the same process for establishing size standards for small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 3715. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to permit interments, funerals, memorial services, and ceremonies of deceased veterans at national cemeteries and State cemeteries receiving grants from the Department of Veterans Affairs during certain weekends if requested for religious reasons; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUCSHON (for himself, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD):

H.R. 3716. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require States to provide to the Secretary of Health and Human Services certain information with respect to provider terminations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 3717. A bill to provide for the establishment of a grant program to support United States-Israel cooperation for neuroscience-related research and related technological innovation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROSKAM (for himself and Mr. CARNEY):

H.R. 3718. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to curb waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare and Medicaid programs; 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 Mr. GUINTA (for himself and Ms. KUSTER):

H.R. 3719. A bill to provide for the comprehensive approach to eradication of the heroin epidemic, to develop the best practices in law enforcement and prescription medication prescribing practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. TSONGAS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. TONKO, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mrs. TORRES):

H.R. 3720. A bill to encourage water efficiency; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, Armed Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 3721. A bill to expand the use of open textbooks in order to achieve savings for students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. McCAUL, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. CURBELO of Florida):

H.R. 3722. A bill to strengthen our mental health system and improve public safety; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, Veterans' Affairs, Appropriations, and 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 Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 3723. A bill to provide for media coverage of Federal appellate court proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself and Mr. ROSKAM):

H.R. 3724. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service from rehiring any employee of the Internal Revenue Service who was involuntarily separated from service for misconduct; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 3725. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to guarantee principal and interest payments on bonds issued by the government of the U.S. territory of Puerto Rico, including its public corporations and instrumentalities, on the condition that the government of the territory demonstrates meaningful improvement in the management of its public finances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 3726. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to authorize States to issue special permits to allow the operation of vehicles of up to 95,000 pounds on Interstate System highways for the hauling of livestock; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico):

H.R. 3727. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide protections for consumers against excessive, unjustified, or unfairly discriminatory increases in premium rates; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 3728. A bill to amend the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 to modify the requirement to impose sanctions with respect to the provision of specialized financial messaging services to the Central Bank of Iran and other sanctioned Iranian financial institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. DUFFY):

H.R. 3729. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit certain research on human fetal tissue obtained pursuant to an abortion; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 3730. A bill to authorize unused visas numbers made available under section 101(a)(15)(E)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to be made available to nationals of Ireland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.J. Res. 69. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEFazio (for himself, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SCHRAEDER, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H. Con. Res. 85. Concurrent resolution condemning the senseless murder and wounding of 18 people, sons, daughters, fathers, mothers, uncles, aunts, cousins, students, and teachers, in Roseburg, Oregon on October 1, 2015; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. PELOSI):

H. Res. 467. A resolution establishing the Select Committee on Gun Violence Prevention; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. ESTY, Mr. COSTA, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 468. A resolution expressing support for designation of October 8, 2015, as "National Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BISHOP of Michigan (for himself, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. DONOVAN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. BYRNE):

H. Res. 469. A resolution urging North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) member countries to meet or exceed the two percent

gross domestic product commitment to spending on defense; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself and Mr. JOYCE):

H. Res. 470. A resolution congratulating the National Institute of Nursing Research on the occasion of its 30th Anniversary; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. KILMER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MENG, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. PETERS, Ms. LEE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. BASS):

H. Res. 471. A resolution recognizing Filipino American History Month and celebrating the history and culture of Filipino Americans and their immense contributions to the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. POLIS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KEATING, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. FARR, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. TAKAI):

H. Res. 472. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of October 11, 2015, through October 17, 2015, as "Earth Science Week"; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 473. A resolution expressing support for the designation of June as National Gun Violence Awareness Month and calling on Congress to address gun violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 3708.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. POLIQUIN:

H.R. 3709.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 ". . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for car-

rying 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. LAMALFA:

H.R. 3710.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 3711.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 2 of Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution, which states: The Congress shall have the 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 any particular State.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 3712.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H.R. 3713.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 3714.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the ability to enact legislation necessary and proper to effectuate its purposes in taxing and spending.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 3715.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States—The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BUCSHON:

H.R. 3716.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 3717.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I Section 8 Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which states the United States Congress shall have power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes".

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 3718.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 states The Congress shall have Power To provide . . . for the . . . general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. GUINTA:

H.R. 3719.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VII, Claus XVIII: 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

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3720.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

Article I; Section 8; Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 3721.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

General Welfare: Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 3722.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution."

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 3723.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 3724.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 3725.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution; to borrow money on the credit of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution; to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution such powers, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution; and to make rules and regulations respecting the U.S. territories, as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 3726.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes;

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 3727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 3728.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1. Section 8.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 3729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 3730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.J. Res. 69.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, the Taxing and Spending Clause: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . ."

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

- H.R. 10: Mr. MEADOWS.
- H.R. 167: Mr. WHITFIELD.
- H.R. 288: Mr. JOLLY.
- H.R. 304: Ms. BONAMICI.
- H.R. 546: Mr. ROHRBACHER.
- H.R. 592: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
- H.R. 602: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. DENT.
- H.R. 674: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
- H.R. 771: Mrs. NOEM.
- H.R. 775: Mr. DENT.
- H.R. 776: Mr. VALADAO.
- H.R. 793: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
- H.R. 845: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
- H.R. 855: Mr. LONG.
- H.R. 870: Ms. DELAURO.
- H.R. 953: Mr. YARMUTH.
- H.R. 969: Mrs. TORRES, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.
- H.R. 985: Mrs. NOEM and Mr. SIRES.
- H.R. 1142: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
- H.R. 1149: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
- H.R. 1188: Ms. PINGREE.
- H.R. 1197: Mr. BERA, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. CRENSHAW.
- H.R. 1217: Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BASS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GRJALVA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. RUIZ,

Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

- H.R. 1233: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
- H.R. 1258: Mr. FATTAH.
- H.R. 1388: Mr. PEARCE.
- H.R. 1401: Ms. BORDALLO.
- H.R. 1427: Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. BASS, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
- H.R. 1453: Mr. VARGAS and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
- H.R. 1516: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
- H.R. 1550: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
- H.R. 1559: Mr. PERRY.
- H.R. 1603: Mr. CárDENAS.
- H.R. 1608: Mr. TURNER, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.
- H.R. 1627: Mr. PIERLUISI and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
- H.R. 1671: Mr. POMPEO.
- H.R. 1686: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 1786: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. O'ROURKE.
- H.R. 1853: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
- H.R. 1854: Mr. CHABOT.
- H.R. 1877: Mr. YARMUTH.
- H.R. 1986: Mr. YOHO.
- H.R. 2017: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. VALADAO.
- H.R. 2077: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
- H.R. 2217: Ms. MOORE.
- H.R. 2237: Mr. JONES.
- H.R. 2248: Mr. ENGEL.
- H.R. 2266: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mr. VEASEY.
- H.R. 2293: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. HANNA.
- H.R. 2322: Mr. NADLER.
- H.R. 2366: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
- H.R. 2368: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
- H.R. 2450: Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 2477: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. WALBERG, and Ms. DUCKWORTH.
- H.R. 2493: Mr. FOSTER.
- H.R. 2494: Mr. HANNA.
- H.R. 2513: Mr. VALADAO.
- H.R. 2597: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
- H.R. 2646: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. ROYCE.
- H.R. 2657: Mr. TROTT.
- H.R. 2667: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
- H.R. 2698: Mrs. NOEM and Mr. GIBBS.
- H.R. 2710: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Mr. PALAZZO.
- H.R. 2713: Mr. FATTAH.
- H.R. 2716: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
- H.R. 2730: Mr. HASTINGS.
- H.R. 2732: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
- H.R. 2759: Mr. POCAN.
- H.R. 2808: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
- H.R. 2855: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 2863: Mr. DESANTIS.
- H.R. 2880: Mr. HONDA, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. CONNOLLY.
- H.R. 2894: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
- H.R. 2896: Mr. BUCK.
- H.R. 2903: Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. ROSS.
- H.R. 2923: Mr. BOUSTANY.
- H.R. 2994: Mr. MOULTON.
- H.R. 3024: Mr. NUNES.
- H.R. 3033: Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. MESSER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
- H.R. 3036: Mr. REED.
- H.R. 3151: Mr. FORBES.
- H.R. 3221: Mr. HONDA.
- H.R. 3222: Mr. WOMACK.
- H.R. 3225: Mr. THORNBERY.
- H.R. 3229: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. REED, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
- H.R. 3299: Mr. HUNTER.
- H.R. 3314: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
- H.R. 3351: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. CUMMINGS.
- H.R. 3364: Mr. POCAN.
- H.R. 3366: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 3381: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 3384: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 3418: Mr. HIGGINS and Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 3423: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 3463: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 3468: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 3471: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 3473: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
H.R. 3480: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 3488: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BUCK, and Ms. STEFANK.
H.R. 3513: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 3518: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 3532: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 3559: Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 3573: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 3580: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 3628: Mr. LOUDERMILK.
H.R. 3634: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 3640: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 3652: Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 3664: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 3666: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. LONG, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 3696: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3707: Ms. NORTON, and Ms. MOORE.
H. Con. Res. 75: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H. Res. 112: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H. Res. 203: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H. Res. 289: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H. Res. 348: Mr. DONOVAN, and Mr. DESANTIS.
H. Res. 354: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H. Res. 416: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H. Res. 419: Mr. DEUTCH.
H. Res. 429: Mr. HONDA.
H. Res. 440: Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H. Res. 445: Ms. ADAMS.
H. Res. 456: Ms. FUDGE.