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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC, November 17, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHARLES J. “CHUCK” FLEISCHMANN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

WEST VIRGINIA’S DRUG EPIDEMIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it has been nearly 4 weeks since President Obama visited my district in Charleston, West Virginia, to discuss the ongoing drug epidemic that is plaguing my State.

West Virginia has the highest overdose rate in the country, with 29 out of every 100,000 people each year dying from drug overdoses. This is an issue that affects all West Virginians.

We all know someone who has been addicted or has been directly affected by drug abuse. Drug addiction knows no boundaries. It affects the young and the old, the rich and the poor, the Black and the White. That is why we have to do everything we can to fight back.

We have to help coordinate efforts on the Federal, State, and local levels. One of the best ways to ensure that we have a cohesive strategy is to work with the HIDTA program, also known as the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area.

The HIDTA program was created by Congress to provide assistance to Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies operating in areas determined to be high drug-trafficking regions of the United States.

The purpose of the program is to reduce drug trafficking and illegal drug production in the United States by doing the following:

First, facilitating cooperation among Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies to share information and implement coordinated enforcement activities;

Second, enhancing law enforcement intelligence sharing;

Third, providing reliable law enforcement intelligence to law enforcement agencies needed to design effective enforcement strategies and operations;

Fourth, supporting coordinated law enforcement strategies which maximize use of available resources to reduce the supply of illegal drugs in designated areas and in the United States as a whole.

One of the counties in my district, Jefferson County, has recently applied to the HIDTA program. It is imperative that Jefferson County become a designated area.

On August 6, I sent a letter along with my colleagues in West Virginia, Congressman DAVID MCKINLEY and Congressman EVAN JENKINS, to Michael Botticelli, the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, urging him to make Jefferson County a HIDTA area. It is of the utmost importance to include Jefferson County as a Washington-Baltimore HIDTA-designated county to help combat the growing drug epidemic not only in our State, but also in our entire country.

Jefferson County is dangerously close to three major drug markets: Washington, D.C., which is 60 miles away, right here; Baltimore, which is 70 miles away, here; and Philadelphia, which is 171 miles away. Our Interstate Highway System directly links all three areas to Jefferson County, and a traveler can reach both D.C. and Baltimore in a little more than an hour, making it incredibly easy to bring drugs into our community.

There is also a large number of tourists that visit Jefferson County each year. It is estimated that around 4.3 million visitors come to Jefferson County annually to visit a number of tourist attractions, including the Harpers Ferry National Historical Park, eight historical homes of President George Washington’s family, Charles Town racetrack, Shepherd University, and many others. While Jefferson County greatly benefits from a large number of tourists, it is a growing concern that the ratio of police to visitors is growing too wide.

The most dramatic reason for Jefferson County to become a HIDTA is the high drug use statistics of the eastern panhandle of West Virginia. Cocaine use the past year is 16 percent above the national average, and nonmedical use of pain relievers is 15 percent above the national average. Illicit drug use other than marijuana in the past month is 27 percent above the national average.

It is time to act now before the situation in the eastern panhandle of West Virginia becomes grimmer. Jefferson County needs to be designated as a HIDTA county.
THE AFTERMATH OF TERRORIST ATTACKS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, we are all horrified by the barbarous attacks in Paris designed to slaughter innocent people and inspire terror. We stand with the French people and are all committed to redoubling our efforts to ensure we keep Americans safe and intensify our efforts to eradicate these evil, out in the open and apparent almost to be a different species.

It is important, however, that we think through clearly where we are, what we have done, and what makes sense going forward to protect Americans and redouble our efforts against this enemy. We must not jump to conclusions and do something before it is carefully planned and analyzed.

I was here in the aftermath of the horror of 9/11, the killing of innocent Americans in the Twin Towers and the Pentagon, and for the bravery of passengers on United Airlines flight 93, we might well have had our Capitol destroyed.

The Federal Government acted after 9/11, but it is not clear our actions were thought out the way they should. We assembled a clumsy behemoth, the Department of Homeland Security, the largest department we have created since 1947. In retrospect, it is not clear that it was the proper course of action.

Think about the excessive bureaucracy, charges of waste, fraud, and inefficiency in that department. Look at the clumsy response to Katrina.

The impulse to lash out led to the disastrous war in Iraq. The aftermath of that effort has done more to empower ISIS. It not only drew people to the movement, but we created a space where they can operate, grow, and lash out at us.

Now we hear what can only be described as crazy talk in the Republican Presidential primaries not just about sealing the borders, but having a religious test for refugees fleeing terror.

Remember, the 9/11 attackers did not sneak across the borders, but exploited weaknesses in our visa system. Even in Europe, it appears that most of the people involved with the attack did not sneak in, hidden with Syrian refugees. They were actually people already in Europe, radicalized and moving freely about.

It is appropriate to be concerned, angry, and determined to protect innocent people, to hunt down and elimi-
without equal in a world, a nation that does not fear or shy away from any challenge. It is our commitment to religious equality and the freedom to worship as we please that has made us a great nation. And this is no time to abandon that tradition.

Our bravery, the bravery of our military, and the bravery of our commitment to freedom and equality have shown for almost 250 years what American exceptionalism is truly all about. It is too late to lose sight of ourselves and say America is too weak, that America cannot handle 20,000 or 200,000 refugees fleeing for their lives. It is not the time for America to consider raising the white flag and say to those waving the black flag: “Yes, ISIS, you are right. We dislike and fear Muslims, and we do not care if you perish or not.”

A lot of us love this country too much to see it abandon core principles and values because religious extremists commit acts of terror designed precisely to terrorize us.

On Thursday, the Immigration Subcommittee will hold a hearing on refugees from Syria and the Middle East, as well it should, but you can already imagine what they will hear. Republicans will most likely raise fears that Muslim terrorists disguised as refugees would somehow pass exhaustive criminal background checks because they have been lying in wait in those camps overseas for years on the slim chance they could do damage to America. They will raise suspicions, instill fear of Muslims, maybe even fear of a President they have been saying is a Muslim, and it will probably be a pretty sad display.

Let us as legislators, leaders, and patriots rise above petty politics, rise above sectarian fears, and rise above the underlying layer of xenophobia that often surfaces in this country at moments throughout our century. And let us maintain America’s commitment to being a beacon of hope for those fleeing oppression, violence, and intolerance.

A haven for the religiously persecuted, whether they are Buddhists from Tibet, Christians from Iran, or pilgrims from Europe, is who we are. We are a nation that lives by the motto: “Out of many, one.” We will not run in fear from that motto today or any day. This is America.

CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL BOONDOGGLE

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

Mr. LAMAFLA. Mr. Speaker, as a Californian, I know full well that we are suffering from a record drought; but what we already know is that California officials pushing the State’s high-speed rail proposal won’t be deterred by skyrocketing costs, an absence of private investment, or the $55 million—and growing—funding gap. What we didn’t know was the extent of secrecy and mismanagement taxpayers would face at the hands of State officials pushing this project.

Just this month, we learned that in 2013 the project’s contractor projected that the first phase’s costs had risen 31 percent. This information was concealed by the High-Speed Rail Authority and only released 2 years later after pressure from Congress.

While the project’s secrecy is unacceptable, especially given that tax-payers are ultimately on the hook for this project, the fundamental issue here is that the entire project is a ruse—in literal terms, a train wreck—in that State officials knew this for some time and that those same officials hid this from the public.

In 2008, voters were promised an 800-mile system that would link Sacramento, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and San Diego, cost about $34 billion, and would require them to come up with two-thirds of the costs paid by the State through its taxpayers. The system was promised to travel from San Francisco to Los Angeles in under 2 hours and 40 minutes.

Fast forward to 2011 when the price had shot up to $60 billion, the plan was reduced to only L.A. to San Francisco, and the State was quick to grab billions of—unknown at the time—Federal stimulus that came along later, funding that could have been used for other critical needs like roads or water infrastructure that California needs so desperately, as well as now shifting cap-and-trade dollars recently created to try and prop up high-speed rail and its deficient budget dollars.

As a State senator at the time, the first bill I introduced was one that would require them to come up with the ultimate full plan of the cost of doing high-speed rail. Having not succeeded in getting that through a majority of the State, it was, my next legislation was to say, now that we know this is over $100 billion, let’s put this back on the ballot and in front of the voters, since the price has tripled and they were deceived at what it would cost at the time. That, too, met defeat, as those in the majority still wished to continue this boondoggle.

Today, the Governor claims the price has fallen to $68 billion for what would be an illegal system, based on what the voters approved Prop 1A. However, the estimate ignores the costs of tunneling through the Tehachapi Mountains, ignores cost spikes in the initial construction segment, and ignores the rising costs of lands acquisition due to people having to fight because they are being taken from them, their farms, and their small businesses paved over by this project.

The promises made in 2008 ranged from low ticket prices to questionable job figures, including the fact that they were claiming there would be a million new jobs from high-speed rail. When we pinned them down in committee a little bit later, they said, well, that would mean a million job-years. That number has since been pared down. All these have been proven false. In fact, these claims are so misleading that a State court has forbidden the legislature from writing ballot measures as options.

Earlier this week, I sent out a survey to residents in my weekly e-newsletter to constituents in California’s First District, my own district, asking them to share their thoughts on high-speed rail as it is now. I listed a number of suggested actions we could take on high-speed rail, from leaving it as is to defunding it, and asked which best represents our constituents’ position on the project now.

Of the nearly 1,600 answers we received, their views are pretty clear. Nearly half of them said they thought funding for high-speed rail should be redirected to invest in water storage and water infrastructure to help our State right now in this drought.

About 20 percent thought the State should defund it and require High-Speed Rail Authority officials to testify why the figures were concealed. Approximately 18 percent thought California’s high-speed rail should undergo a Federal investigation in response to these allegations, given that the project involves the use of Federal funds. A scant 7 percent thought we should keep going forward with high-speed rail and believed the current price tag is a worthwhile investment of public funds. Lastly, 4 percent supported investing in high-speed rail, provided the project stayed within the old constraints, the old prices—the ones they saw on the ballot. So, at best, you see 11 percent that might support high-speed rail and 4 percent that might under the old price, which is nowhere near what was projected.

People don’t like this project, don’t trust those advocating for it, and they deserve better than to see their own tax dollars used to lie to them. No new defunding it, and asked which best represents our constituents’ position on the project now. it is time we start prioritizing funding for projects that actually address real problems facing California, such as the current drought. It is time to apply common sense to this situation. We have a State whose economy depends on a sound water supply, yet in the midst of a historic drought, we are still churning this high-speed rail boondoggle.

Rather than throwing billions of dollars away, let’s get to what people demand and will help our economy and the people of California.
information? Often, the answer is the 24-hour news cycle, often filled by talking heads and sensationalism; or, to social media and message boards, where anyone can post anything—credible or completely misinformed.

The public is no longer being informed by the likes of Walter Cronkite and Edward Murrow, and it is making our public debate increasingly partisan, polarized, and misinformed.

What few realize or like to admit is that there is an easy way Congress can help elevate the debate and educate our constituents with neutral, unbiased, nonpartisan information from the Congressional Research Service, or CRS.

For over 100 years, CRS has served as Congress’ publicly funded think tank. Because they serve policymakers on both sides of the aisle, CRS researchers produce exemplary work that is accurate, nonpartisan, and easy to understand.

Despite the fact that CRS receives over $100 million from taxpayers each year, its reports are not made available to the public. Instead, constituents must request individual reports through a congressional office. This has led to several undesirable consequences.

Well-connected lobbyists have the easiest access to these reports, unlike the average American. Second, while nonprofits make some reports available online, there is no guarantee that they will remain available and up-to-date. And most outrageously, a small industry has sprung up reselling these reports for exorbitant fees. In other words, businesses are making a profit by selling publicly funded work, work that ultimately belongs to the people.

Keeping these reports in the hands of Congress and beltway insiders is selfish and indefensible. I understand that allowing the public to access these reports will not answer all the questions constituents have about the work that happens on Capitol Hill, but it underscores the broader need for increased transparency in Congress and government.

Public trust in government has reached historic lows, causing too many Americans to simply give up on Washington and the mission of government. The best way to rebuild the public’s trust and promote a more efficient and effective government is by further increasing transparency through increased accountability.

It is time to recognize that educators, students, media, and everyday citizens deserve access to CRS reports and that this access gives our constituents vital information about the issues, policies, and budgets we are debating. This resolution gives the public tools to cut through the misinformation they face, gives them access to something they are already paying for, and empowers the American people to hold Congress accountable for the decisions we make.

The steps toward a more open and transparent government may seem modest to some, but, in reality, they have a large impact. It is the government that serves the people. The mission of government matters, and if we are truly here to serve the people, then we owe it to them to operate in an open and transparent manner.

Let’s give the public the information we are basing our decisions on. I urge my colleagues to stand up for transparency and accountability by supporting H. Res. 34. Information is power, and that is exactly what the American people deserve.

NATURAL GAS EXPANSION IN CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of the efforts of the Susquehanna Economic Development Association’s Council of Governments, otherwise known as SEDA–COG, in working to expand the availability of natural gas in areas across central Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, natural gas is not only produced right here in the United States of America, but it is also economical and versatile, with uses that range from home heating to cooking and drying clothes.

While Pennsylvania sits on one of the largest natural gas reserves in the Nation, many areas of the State are unserved or underserved by natural gas providers. Converting to natural gas can lead to big savings for consumers who currently rely on other home heating fuels such as propane and oil.

To help address this issue, SEDA–COG’s $160,000 pilot project will provide natural gas to these areas in order to attract manufacturers and to give homeowners the option to connect. To do that, this organization has joined with gas suppliers such as UGI Utilities and Columbia Gas of Pennsylvania, starting with at least three projects in central Pennsylvania that will expand natural gas access to hundreds of potential customers.

In addition, the project will focus on the sustainability of delivering natural gas through “virtual pipelines,” where compressed gas would be delivered by a truck to be used by large commercial businesses located nearby.

If successful, SEDA–COG officials say that they could expand this model to fuel users connected by a small pipeline network, including residential areas such as housing developments.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the innovative spirit of SEDA–COG and its partners, and I look forward to learning more about how these projects could benefit other areas of Pennsylvania.

RESTORATION TUESDAY

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

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today is Restoration Tuesday. I rise today to support voting rights for all Americans.

I am proud to stand alongside Members who support the restoration of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 recently and to launch the #restorethevote legislative strategy. This national effort will help mobilize support for H.R. 2607, the Voting Rights Act of 2015, a bill that I sponsored with Representatives JUDY CHU and LINDA SÁNCHEZ to restore critical Federal oversight to jurisdictions who have a recent history of voter suppression.

Since elections are held on Tuesdays, every Tuesday that Congress is in session, like today, we will declare it to be Restoration Tuesday. So today I am speaking on the floor of the House of Representatives on the need to restore the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Our call for restoring the VRA is urgent, Mr. Speaker. As our colleague JOHN LEWIS so eloquently says, there is no other work more important in this or any Congress than protecting the full access of all Americans to the democratic process. If we do not act, the 2016 election will be the first Presidential election in 50 years without the protections offered to millions of voters by the Voting Rights Act of 1965. We must act now.

I therefore urge all of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle, my Republican and my Democratic colleagues, to...
join me on Tuesdays and speak in support of the Voting Rights Act and to sign onto the Voting Rights Restoration and Advancement Act of 2015, which restores key components of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Ultimately, this bill, H.R. 2687, will restore the fundamental elements of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The bill will provide more protection to more people in more States. It is about broadening, expanding, advancing the Voting Rights Act.

Nothing is more American than voting. So every Tuesday Congress is in session we will be wearing the #restorerelevevote pin. The red, white, and blue pin is a symbol of our unwavering commitment to restoring the voices of the excluded, ending discriminatory practices, and providing transparency in the voting process.

Fifty years ago, in 1965, President Lyndon Johnson signed the Voting Rights Act into law. His voice and his words still resonate today. The vote, he said, is the most powerful instrument ever devised by man for breaking down injustice.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was pivotal in preventing voter discrimination and presenting it from occurring across the United States. The act gave millions of African Americans a voice, a voice that has been heard throughout our Nation for nearly 50 years.

Now the Voting Rights Advancement Act will expand that not just to African American voters, but to all voters. That is exactly what we should be about. We should be about expanding voting rights opportunities so that all Americans are protected.

As a daughter of Selma, Alabama, I am painfully aware that the injustices suffered on the Edmund Pettus Bridge 50 years ago have not been fully vindicated. As States across the country are passing laws to restrict access to the ballot box, we are ever mindful that old battles have indeed become new again.

The recent decision by the State of Alabama, for example, to close 31 DMV offices in majority Black counties in spite of Alabama’s photo ID law is just one example of a modern-day barrier to voting.

The Supreme Court issued Congress a challenge in the Shelby decision. It didn’t say that pre-clearance was unconstitutional. Rather, it said: Congress must step up with a modern-day formula to address modern-day barriers to voting.

Well, this example in Alabama of 31 DMV offices closing when indeed the State requires a photo ID and a driver’s license is the most popular form of ID is only one example of where we see these counties that were discriminated against by this recent law in Alabama were the very counties where foot soldiers and activists like Jimmie Lee Jackson and Jonathan Daniels died for the opportunity and the right for others to vote. If Federal pre-clearance provisions were still in effect, these DMV closings would not have occurred.

To restrict the ability of any American to vote is an assault on all Americans’ equal participation in our electoral process. No one benefits when American voices are silenced at the polls.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud certain States like the States of California and Oregon, two States that are now automatically registering citizens who request a driver’s license to actually vote.

So, Mr. Speaker, on this Restoration Tuesday, I am asking all of my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 2687, the Voting Rights Advancement Act, and I am asking all Americans to join us in our efforts for #restorerelevote and #restorationtuesday.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT
A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Neiman, one of his secretaries.

HANFORD LAND TRANSFER
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the opening of the Manhattan Project National Historical Park, a significant part of which is in my Congressional District in the State of Washington.

Decades of successful cleanup efforts at the Hanford nuclear site have come to fruition with the dedication of the historic B Reactor as a part of this national park. The B Reactor was the world’s first full-scale plutonium production reactor, providing the atomic bomb for both World War II and the cold war.

The new park will highlight the sacrifices and the contributions of thousands of workers who built the facility and the scientists whose groundbreaking research played a critical role in the Manhattan Project.

More than 50,000 visitors have toured the site since 2009, and the park will attract thousands more to learn about our region’s history. The park will provide future generations with a unique educational experience.

I applaud the efforts of the community who has worked for years to make this national park a reality. I will continue to support the opening of additional sites for public access in order to preserve and tell the story of Hanford.

NOHEMI GONZALEZ AND THE ATTACKS ON PARIS
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the people of France and the people of the United States have shared a common bond of liberty and equality for over 200 years. In the face of the recent terrorist attacks in Paris, that bond brings us now even closer in unity and in solidarity.

We stand with the French people as they mourn. We stand with the families of those who were killed, like Nohemi Gonzalez, a young California State University, Long Beach, student studying abroad in Paris.

We also stand with our Cal State, Long Beach, family in mourning. Nohemi’s death is a very personal loss for each and every one of us. It tears at the very bonds of fraternity that embrace every member of our Cal State, Long Beach, family and the Long Beach community.

Nohemi was a daughter, a friend, and a mentor. Just 23 years of age, she was a vibrant student and what those who knew her have called “a shining star.”

Nohemi committed herself to learning. She traveled across the globe to explore her talents, her creativity, and the world. Now all that seems broken.

Yes, we grieve for Nohemi. But we also grieve for all the victims in Paris. We grieve for their families, their loved ones, and all those who were there. We grieve for each and every one of them.

Today we are all part of the human family. As a family, we mourn Nohemi Gonzalez, our shining star. But in our mourning, let us remember something very, very important.

This was not an attack on Paris, though Paris was the target. This was not an attack on the French people, though the French people were the target. This was an attack on what unites us, our shared humanity and our shared values of liberty.

In that humanity, in those values, we will find the strength to stand strong in the face of senseless violence because, in the end, humanity that unites us is what frightens those who would do us harm.

ISLAMIC EXTREMISM ATTACK
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, America and her allies are under attack by Islamic extremism. The despicable act of terrorism the world witnessed over the weekend in Paris serves as a stark reminder that the threat posed by ISIS knows no borders.

French officials have indicated that at least one of the Paris attackers linked to ISIS was admitted into Europe as a refugee from Syria. Nevertheless, the administration has made it clear that, in spite of this, it will continue to seek to bring up to 10,000 Syrian refugees to America in the coming year.

Let us stand together in solidarity.

Be a voice of reason. Be a voice of courage. Be a voice of unity.

If you want to honor Nohemi Gonzalez, let us honor her memory by joining together, speaking for justice, and standing in unity as Americans.

Thank you.
attacker is within their midst, we must halt the flow of any refugees into the United States from Syria.

Mr. Speaker, in light of these attacks, now is not the time to open our borders to refugees from countries who wish to do our citizens harm. Congress stands ready to legislate or use the power of the purse should this administration refuse to change course on this misguided policy.

HONORING RETIRED U.S. ARMY MASTER SERGEANT JACK C. HARLAN, JR.

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor retired U.S. Army Master Sergeant Jack C. Harlan, who received the Military Order of the Purple Heart on Veterans Day last week in Peoria, Illinois.

I was privileged to pin the medal on the lapel of Master Sergeant Harlan’s dress blues in front of hundreds of spectators and veterans gathered at Peoria’s World War I and World War II memorial.

The veterans event, held annually to honor our servicemen and -women, this year brought a special opportunity to witness Master Sergeant Harlan receive his distinguished medal. It had been approved recently by John McHugh, our Secretary of the Army.

Master Sergeant Harlan has 18 years of service to our Nation, carrying out tours in Afghanistan and Iraq. While on deployment for Operation Iraqi Freedom in 2007, a vehicle carrying Master Sergeant Harlan and a small transition team on combat control was suddenly struck by an IED.

Harlan was knocked unconscious from the blast and suffered concussive injuries from the attack.

Mr. Speaker, Master Sergeant Jack Harlan is a son of central Illinois and has served our country with valor. He was recognized for his bravery during the battle known as Bloody Ridge in September 1942 when he took over a machine gun where his closest friend had lost his life. Hank then laid siege throughout the night firing at, in his words, “anything that moved.”

During this heroic post, Mr. Speaker, Hank was wounded three times, and he was eventually awarded the Purple Heart.

Hank would go on to see combat in three more locations near the Solomon Islands before being discharged as a gunnery sergeant in 1946.

Upon his return home from war, Hank worked with his father-in-law at H&H Auto Parts in Canton, Ohio, where he grew the business into two very successful locations. In 2002, Hank retired to Florida, first moving to Port Myers and then making his final home in St. Petersburg.

Mr. Speaker, Hank was a well-known and well-respected man who had an infectious love of baseball. He served his country with distinction, made a lasting impact on his community, and will be sorely missed by the lives he touched.

May God bless Hank, his family, and friends. And may God bless the country Hank so proudly fought for: the United States of America.

FAIRNESS TO VETERANS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT ACT OF 2015

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to H.R. 1694, which was debated by this House under the suspension of the rules yesterday.

H.R. 1694 purports to be about fairness to veterans. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing fair about pitting veteran-owned businesses against women- and minority-owned businesses for an already meager goal of 10 percent of Federal highway and transit construction contracts.

If the sponsor of H.R. 1694 really wanted to create a new veterans preference system at the Department of Transportation, he would have worked with Mr. Cummings and Ms. Norton when offered the opportunity to do so over a year ago. If my colleague really wanted to create a new veterans preference system, he would have cosponsored legislation to establish a specific and separate contracting goal for veteran-owned small businesses. It is the better alternative. H.R. 3997, legislation that would create a veteran-owned business enterprise program, is the better alternative.

The vets are and always will be the nation’s canary in the coal mine when it comes to who is suffering in our society. We know that unemployment rates for women and minority-owned businesses are higher than any other group.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. tulley), offered the following prayer:
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within their borders. Protect those who work furiously to meet the needs of those most impacted by these events, and bless those who mourn the loss of loved ones.

And finally, as all such serious matters press upon us, engender in us thankful heart for the blessings we have enjoyed and which we possess today.

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

Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

STOP THE FLOW OF SYRIAN REFUGEES

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, President Obama needs to stop immediately any flow of Syrian refugees into America. Top law enforcement officials have made it clear: We don’t know who these people are, and we don’t have the capability to vet them. With last Friday’s ISIS attacks in Paris that did include a Syrian refugee, this halt is imperative.

We cannot allow terrorism to slip through the cracks. That is why I am a cosponsor of H.R. 3314, a bill to stop the admission of refugees into the United States. We must do all we can to protect our homeland. Stopping these people from coming here is the right and commonsense thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, the President has a duty to protect America. If he doesn’t stop risking our security, then we in Congress must make him stop.

CONDOLENCES TO FRANCE

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to express my condolences and support to our allies in France after last week’s attacks on civilians in Paris, an act that is undeniably the work of cowards.

Our hearts go out to the victims and their families, but there is comfort in the knowledge that France will rebound, and we will continue to stand by their side. They are resilient. No act of terror can shake the resolve of the French people to live free, and nothing and no one will intimidate France from living prosperously.

I want the people of France to know the American people and this Congress stand in solidarity with you. I say this in full faith and confidence to the cowards who plot against innocent civilians and the principles of freedom. No act of terror will usurp the principles of liberty, equality, and brotherhood.

In addition to France, innocent lives were lost in Beirut and Nigeria. We cherish terrorism, violence, and killing all over the world. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and a proud American, I strongly believe we need to strengthen the international coalition in order to create a united front to combat terrorism so that serve to undermine peace and democracy.

GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM STRIKES PARIS

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague from Illinois. This is certainly a bipartisan issue.

On Friday, the world watched in horror as Paris endured multiple murder attacks by Islamist radicals. My thoughts and prayers go out to the citizens of France, the oldest ally of the American people.

I know it is certain that the French values of liberty, equality, and fraternity will never weaken in the face of terror. President Francois Hollande yesterday reminded the world that France is a country of freedom.

In the last month of the global war on terrorism, Daesh, or ISIS, has murdered 344 on a Russian jetliner, 41 have been murdered in Beirut, Lebanon, and 129 were murdered across Paris, with a direct threat to attack Washington and Rome. The President should change course to eliminate safe havens for Islamist radicals.

Terrorists are trying to break our will with acts of cruel cowardice, but they are mistaken. We will fight together to protect our values and to protect American families.

As co-chair of the French Caucus, and of French heritage, I especially appreciate our friendship with the citizens of France.

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

RECOGNIZING RON BROWN

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

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Ron Brown of Walnut Creek, California. After 15 years of service to Save Mount Diablo and over 40 years in the nonprofit sector, Ron has announced his retirement at the end of 2015.

Under his leadership, Save Mount Diablo grew from a modest staff of 3 to its current staff of 18 people. It has participated in land use advocacy, land purchase for inclusion in parks, and relationships building with local government and developers, all with the objective of preserving the ecosystem that supports the Mount Diablo region.

This has resulted in $25 million raised to preserve thousands of acres of land.

Ron now looks forward to dedicating his time to enjoying the land he has worked so hard to protect. He will soon spend many days fishing and camping with his grandchildren.

Community members from across the East Bay will be gathering this week to honor Ron and celebrate the contributions he has made.

Congratulations, Ron, on a remarkable and impactful career that has positively changed the landscape of the East Bay.

AMERICAN EDUCATION WEEK

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

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 94th annual American Education Week and give thanks to the teachers and staff who dedicate themselves to the success and advancement of our children.

Mr. Speaker, as the son and brother of a public schoolteacher, I am proud to cosponsor H. Res. 527, which supports the goals and ideals of American Education Week.

For our public schoolteachers, what they do each and every day is more than just a job. It is a dedication to improve the lives and nourish the minds of their students and to strengthen the communities in which they live and work.

American Education Week is just one small way we can recognize the service of our public schoolteachers. Teachers are a part of the building blocks of a healthy republic.

To our schoolteachers and staff, I rise today to thank you for all you do day in and day out.

HONORING NOHEMI GONZÁLEZ

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

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor the memory of a young, bright student who was taken from this world far too soon.

Nohemi González, a 23-year-old design student at California State University, Long Beach, was one of the many innocent victims who were tragically murdered in the Paris terrorist attacks on Friday, November 13, while she dined at a restaurant with three friends who were all students at California State University, Long Beach. She was in Paris for a semester abroad, studying at the Strate College of Design.

Nohemi grew up in my district, in Whittier, and graduated from Whittier High School. She was a first-generation Mexican American student who was passionate about design and life. Nohemi was a talented student, a star in the design department, and she inspired and touched the lives of many. In her own words, she was high-spirited, orderly, and self-driven. She had a bright future ahead of her.

I know it is not enough, and it will never be enough, but I hope that Nohemi’s family and friends can find some solace in the outpouring of love and support from our community. We grieve for and with you.

At this time, I would like to ask my colleagues to take a moment today to honor Nohemi, the 131 other victims, and those who are in critical condition still fighting for their lives.

REMEMBERING BRUCE DAYTON

(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, Minnesota lost a leader, a philanthropist, and a pillar in the community with the passing of Bruce Dayton this past week. Many will remember Bruce for his role in taking the family-owned Dayton’s Department Store public and turning it into Target, the major brand that we know today, but there were many more sides toBruce.

For one, Bruce was a long-time patron of the arts, donating more than $80 million and 2,000 works of art to the Minneapolis Institute of Art. I had the opportunity and privilege of serving as a trustee with Bruce at the Institute, where I saw his legacy of generosity. He also donated land to conservation efforts in our State. Bruce’s civic-mindedness and business visions are reasons why the Minneapolis Star Tribune said he helped “build a modern Minnesota.”

Mr. Speaker, the passing of Bruce Dayton is a loss for all of Minnesota, and I offer my condolences to Governor Dayton and everyone in the Dayton family.

SOLAR INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, since Congress passed the solar investment tax credit in 2005, solar installations have grown by 1,600 percent. Americans have invested $72 billion in solar, and 8,000 businesses in all 50 States have created 160,000 jobs in the solar industry.

Much of this economic success story is due to the investment tax credit, which is scheduled to expire at the end of the year. When the investment tax credit expires, the solar industry could see a 71 percent decline, needlessly costing the American economy 100,000 jobs.

This uncertainty is already affecting the market. Consumers need confidence in the tax policy before they decide whether to make an investment into the solar industry. I ask my colleagues to join me in urging the Ways and Means Committee to expeditiously prioritize a long-term extension of this critical, job-creating tax incentive.

TERRORIST ATTACKS IN PARIS

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the recent terrorist attacks in Paris are a stark reminder that we cannot risk the safety of our country. I am asking Pennsylvania Governor Wolf to suspend the Commonwealth’s participation in the President’s Syrian refugee resettlement initiative. The administration has not provided any details of a thorough screening plan to thwart ISIS infiltration.

Meanwhile, the Director of National Intelligence, the Director of the FBI, and the Secretary of Homeland Security have told Congress they cannot properly screen refugees coming from Syria and the surrounding regions for national security threats.

We have an obligation to protect Americans from those who seek to take advantage of our generosity at the expense of innocent lives.

The President and Governor are pushing to make America the home for tens of thousands of refugees. We have 50,000 homeless veterans within the USA and 1,500 in Pennsylvania. If we want to welcome someone home, let’s start instead with our homeless veterans.

SMALL BUSINESS STRATEGY

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

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Small Business Saturday. Small Business Saturday takes place every year the Saturday after Thanksgiving. This event is an opportunity for Americans to reinvest in our communities by supporting our local businesses. Small businesses are the lifeblood of our local economies and a key to unlocking the American Dream.

As a former small-business owner, I know the value that small businesses bring to our local communities. My family owned and operated the Nebraska Clothing Company in Omaha for generations. This experience taught me the importance of the entrepreneurial spirit to our economy and our communities.

Nebraska is the proud home of over 166,000 small businesses. Nearly half of all working Nebraskans are employed by local companies.

Beyond the facts and figures, small businesses are essential to the health of our communities. Local companies have local ties. They hire local employees, contribute to local charities, and provide a high level of personal service.

This holiday shopping season we have an opportunity to show our appreciation for small businesses. I encourage all Americans to get out and support their local businesses this holiday season.

REMEMBERING ABDUL-RAHMAN KASSIG AND THE NEED TO STAY VIGILANT AGAINST ISIS

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

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, since I have traveled to Syria and the surrounding regions for national security threats.

Violent extremism can’t be contained in far-off places. It is a cancer that will inevitably spread across the globe, dividing our societies, undermining our personal security, and sparing none from the true definition of terror.

One year ago yesterday violent extremism touched my home State of Indiana. Abdul-Rahman Kassig, a 26-year-old humanitarian aid worker from Indianapolis, was mercilessly killed by the ISIS coward known as Jihadi John.

Abdul-Rahman is exactly the type of person that ISIS is targeting in hopes of expanding their caliphate, an apocalyptic medical aid worker committed to treating the wounded and bringing some sense of relief to the 7.6 million displaced Syrians in Lebanon and Syria.

The Islamic State’s twisted ideology will not allow it to accept our efforts to bring an end to the war of life destroyed. That is why it is absolutely vital that the United States redouble our efforts to take the leadership role that the world
demands of us, develop a strategy that will not just degrade, but will ultimately destroy, the ISIS network. Abdul-Rahman and the victims of terror and their families deserve this, and the security of our Nation depends on it.

OUR NATION IS A NATION OF IMMIGRANTS

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

Mr. CARDENAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to praise our Nation, a Nation of hundreds of years of immigrants. Since the Mayflower landed full of pilgrims seeking religious liberty, we have been a land built by immigrants.

Today in this great country 5 million immigrant kids and their parents know no other country. They are working hard building our Nation, their Nation. They are our new Plymouth Rock. They are the foundation on which we will build the next generation of our country.

Now three Justices have decided to block that generation, but if our Nation stays true to itself, that won't last long.

One year after our President took action, I urged the Supreme Court to approve President Obama's immigration policy. If you want to work hard and help keep building this great Nation of ours, this Nation of immigrants, you are welcome.

FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and celebrate the extraordinary accomplishments of various student members of Arkansas' Future Farmers of America. As their Congressman and as a past State FFA president, I am very proud of their achievements.

During the 88th National FFA Convention, Hermitage High School students were announced as the winning team of the National FFA Livestock Evaluation Event.

Ms. Taylor McNeel, an agricultural business major at Southern Arkansas University, was also named the 2015-2016 National FFA president. I am very proud of their achievements.

Ms. Taylor McNeel, an agricultural business major at Southern Arkansas University, was also named the 2015-2016 National FFA president. As president, Ms. McNeel will travel more than 100,000 miles to further the FFA mission of advancing agricultural literacy and preparing future generations for the challenges of feeding a growing population.

I congratulate these Fourth District students and applaud their inspiring efforts to serve others and hold true to the best traditions of our national life.

SIKH AMERICAN AWARENESS AND APPRECIATION MONTH

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

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize November as Sikh American Awareness and Appreciation Month. This month we recognize the contributions of Sikhs Americans throughout our country who have given much to our Nation.

Since the turn of the 20th century, in California's San Joaquin Valley, the Sikh Americans have come, like immigrants from around the world, to have a better life for themselves and their families.

In addition to sharing their rich culture and values, they have made countless contributions to our economy. They are farmers, business owners, physicians, and are engaged in every walk of life in so many fields.

They bring distinctive pride to the many endeavors and have a very strong work ethic, like all immigrant families. Their commitment to faith, family, and hard work is part of their rich diversity that sets our country apart from others, because we welcome immigrants. After all, we are a land of immigrants.

As we strive to appreciate the contributions of all religions and cultures in our Nation, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating Sikh American Awareness and Appreciation Month.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF CARL BOYETT

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor the life of a beloved Modesto community leader. Carl Boyett passed at the age of 70 last week.

On July 16, 1945, Carl was born to Stanford and Carol Boyett. After graduating Downey High School, he was offered an appointment to the United States Coast Guard Academy.

He joined the United States Army in 1967, where he displayed the utmost bravery during the tour of duty in Vietnam. He served valiantly during the Tet Offensive and advanced to the rank of sergeant.

After returning to civilian life in 1976, Carl began working for his family company, Boyett Petroleum. In 2004, he became the CEO and provided masterful leadership and results-oriented vision to the company, which just celebrated its 75th anniversary.

Carl had a generous spirit, participating in numerous enterprises with evidence of lasting contributions to our community. He demonstrated time and again a desire to share his resources and talents with others, and throughout the course of his life, he was the recipient of numerous awards and honors.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring and recognizing my friend for his unwavering leadership, many accomplishments, and contributions on behalf of the Modesto community and the Nation.

God bless him always.

REMEMBERING TIM VALENTINE

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Tim Valentine, former Representative from North Carolina's Second District, who passed away last week.

Tim was a judicious, conscientious legislator who worked effectively on the Public Works and Transportation and the Science, Space, and Technology Committees. On that latter committee, he was my mentor. We frequently collaborated.

Members across the political spectrum valued Tim as a cooperative, congenial colleague, easy to work with, but not afraid to engage in vigorous debate or to take a courageous stand when the need arose.

Tim was known for his wit and good humor and his gift for friendship. He had a remarkable ability to defuse any tense situation with humor. He made me look forward to coming to the House floor each day, where he invariably would have a good story to tell or a quip to make that brightened the day, a quip that often cut to the heart of the matter we were dealing with.

Tim was a treasured friend and colleague. I am grateful for his life and work, personally, and also on behalf of the institution in which we served and the citizens on whose behalf he labored. Lisa and I attended a beautiful service in Tim's honor last Saturday. We extend our love and best wishes to his wife, Barbara, and the rest of his family.

WE MUST KEEP THE A–10 JETS FLYING

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

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, it was recently reported that over 100 ISIS oil tanker trucks were destroyed in Syria in an attempt to finally cut off the terrorist group's oil revenue. And what asset did we call on to efficiently and effectively get the job done? None other than the A–10 Warthog.

The mission took advantage of the A–10's unique and lethal capabilities. The pilots employed their powerful 30-millimeter guns and 500-pound bombs to obliterate the trucks.

Time and time again, we have seen the A–10's number called up to protect us. Twelve A–10s were recently deployed to Turkey to strike ISIS targets like these fuel trucks. A–10s are also deployed in Europe to deter Russian aggression and along the border with North Korea.

Despite the administration's persistent and flawed arguments for seeking to mothball this irreplaceable
asset, A-10s continue to demonstrate their value on the battlefield.

Now, when the world turns to us to destroy this dangerous and growing threat, we turn to the A-10. It proves again that, until we have a suitable replacement for this one-of-a-kind attack jet, we must keep it flying.

CONGRESS MUST FUND THE GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, like many Members, I was pleased that Congress last month passed a bipartisan budget agreement that avoids yet another manufactured political crisis from hanging over the heads of America’s hardworking families.

But Congress must still act to pass legislation to fund the government before March 27, especially now, with very real national security threats. Congress must take the politics as usual out of the question, pass a clean bill without poison pill riders, and fund our government.

When I go home, I hear from my constituents every day that they just want Congress to do their job. They say it is time for responsible, bipartisan governing. I couldn’t agree more.

I am ready—I know other Democrats are, and I know Republicans are as well—to work together and avoid a government shutdown. But, without action, that won’t happen.

Passing a budget and a funding bill that will keep the government open means we can work on the priorities of the American people, helping them send their kids to school, afford to buy a house, and, of course, protect national security.

We have to act together, and we have to do it soon.

WEAR RED WEDNESDAY TO BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

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

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is Wear Red Wednesday to Bring Back Our Girls, a day that I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering those affected by the ISIS-linked Boko Haram. Especially now, with Friday’s reprehensible terrorist attacks in Paris, our remembrance will be especially important.

As we lower our heads in somber prayer for the Parisian victims and raise our voices in disgust over ISIS’ horrifying acts, I hope that we will also remember the millions of people around the world who have had their lives destroyed by ISIS and its affiliates. This, of course, includes the 15,000 people ISIS-linked Boko Haram has murdered in the last 2 years.

We will continue to wear red every Wednesday until we free the Chibok girls from Boko Haram, and we will continue to tweet, tweet, tweet #bringbackourgirls, #joinerwilson.

Please continue to pray for the people of Paris and continue to pray for the victims of Africa.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1737, REFORMING CFPB INDIRECT AUTO FINANCING GUIDANCE ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 511, TRIBAL LABOR SOVEREIGNTY ACT OF 2015; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 526 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 526
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. 1737) to nullify certain guidance of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection and requirements for guidance issued by the Bureau with respect to indirect auto lending. 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 Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All bills shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report as 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 a motion to recommit, and may 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 shall be in order, and points of order against the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment of the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may be 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 to the Committee on Financial Services. No further points of order against consideration of the bill for amendment of the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may be adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution—
(a) the House shall be considered to have: (1) taken from the Speaker’s table the bill and report of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and (2) stricken all after the enacting clause of such bill and inserted in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 5, as passed by the House; and (3) passed the Senate bill as so amended;
and (b) it shall be in order for the chair of the Committee on Education and the Workforce or his designee to move that the House insist on its amendment to S. 1177 and request a conference with the Senate.

SEC. 4. In the engrossment of H.R. 3762, the Clerk shall strike title I and redesignate the subsequent titles accordingly.

Mr. COLE. 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 Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule for consideration of two important measures. First, the resolution provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 1737, the Reforming Consumer Financial Protection Bureau Indirect Auto Financing Guidance Act. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Education and Workforce Committee, makes in order three amendments submitted to the Rules Committee which were germane to the legislation, and provides for a motion to recommit.

In addition, the resolution provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 511, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act of 2015. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Education and Workforce Committee, and provides for a motion to recommit.

In addition, the rule facilitates a conference with the Senate on reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act by replacing the text of S. 1177 with the text of H.R. 5, as passed by the House, and provides for a motion by the chair of the Committee on Education and the Workforce to request a conference with the Senate.

Finally, the rule directs the Clerk to strike a provision from the reconciliation bill which was already enacted.
into law in the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015, facilitating consideration of the bill by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1737 passed out of the Financial Services Committee by a vote of 47-10. It nullifies a guidance put forward by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau which was specifically exempted from making in the first place. In addition to the CFPB’s disregard for its statutory limitation, the CFPB’s methodology is severely flawed. According to a study by Charles River Associates, the CFPB’s methodology overestimates minorities by up to 41 percent, leading many to question the reliability of these results.

In addition, and more importantly to me, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 511, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act of 2015. When Congress passed the National Labor Relations Act in 1935, it specifically recognized all governments were excluded. Subsequent regulations and case law further recognized this exemption applies to territories, possessions, the District of Columbia, and State-operated port authorities. From the 1970s until 2004, the NLRB recognized that tribes are exempt from the NLRA as sovereign governments. Unfortunately, in 2004, the NLRB decided to reverse 69 years of prior precedent and strip tribes of their ability of self-government.

In the twin terms in Congress, Chairman KLINE and I both worked to try and restore the sovereignty this board had stripped away. While unsuccessful at that time, I am happy we are now able to rectify this injustice.

H.R. 511, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act would unequivocally state that tribal governments are not subject to the National Labor Relations Act. I respect my friends who hold different opinions, but in this case, they are simply wrong. In the NLRB’s 2004 decision, they made an arbitrary distinction between commercial activity and government activity. If you are a tribe and it is commercial activity, they said the NLRB could regulate it. But that same standard is not applied to any other government exempted from the NLRA, regardless of whether it engages in commercial activities or not.

Their nature, as a government, precludes their regulation under the NLRA. Practically every county and city in this country has a golf course. Most States have a lottery. The National Park Service operates hotels. Virginia and other States sell alcohol. Many cities operate convention centers. All of these activities are not regulated under the NLRA. It should be the same with tribes.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that this rule sets up a process for us to go to conference on an ESEA reauthorization. The last time we considered an ESEA reauthorization was 13 years ago. It is far past time to reauthorize this critical program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule and the underlying legislation. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman’s yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, on January 5, 2011, newly elected Speaker John Boehner announced: “To my friends in the minority, I offer a commitment: openness, once a tradition of this institution but increasingly scarce in recent decades, will be the new standard . . . You will always have the right to a roll call vote in an open process that allows you to represent your constituents, to make your case, offer alternatives, and be heard.”

What we were promised was openness, for example, passed more closed rules in 1 week in October of 2013 than in an entire year under Democrat control. It is true the trend toward more closed rules has been growing over the past 20 years under the leadership of both political parties, but my Republican colleagues have taken the trend to new heights. The Republican Congress has, since the 2010 elections, passed more closed rules in 1 week in October of 2013 than in an entire year under Democrat control.

It is the work of the Rules Committee to report each rule that comes to the floor, and according to our statistics, in this session of Congress, the majority has chosen a closed rule more times than any other kind of rule. Under this regime, the majority has wasted taxpayer money on their obsession with taking health care away from millions of people and held more than 60 votes to repeal or dismantle ObamaCare. They have spent over $5 million of taxpayer money on their obsessions that come to the floor, and according to our statistics, in this session of Congress, the majority has chosen a closed rule more times than any other kind of rule.

Under this regime, the majority has wasted taxpayer money on their obsession with taking health care away from millions of people and held more than 60 votes to repeal or dismantle ObamaCare. They have spent over $5 million of taxpayer money on their obsessions that come to the floor, and according to our statistics, in this session of Congress, the majority has chosen a closed rule more times than any other kind of rule.

While Americans are riding over rutted roads, traveling over unsafe bridges, using crowded and outdated airports, and our schools are crumbling around our children, this majority insists on wasting millions of dollars and our time not on governance, but on purely political goals. These distractions keep true regular order nothing but a mirage. This is the work that we got under Speaker Boehner’s promise of openness.

As it turns out, Speaker RYAN promised the same openness for his tenure. On November 5, 2015, just after taking office, he said to a gaggle of reporters: “I want to have a process that is more open, more inclusive, more deliberative, more participatory, and that’s what we’re trying to do.” We have heard that before.

He even explained the importance of an open legislative process and said: “So that every citizen of this country, through their elected Representatives, has the opportunity to make a difference. That is the people’s House. This is the branch of government closest to the people.”

Will we get that openness? Today gives us very little reason for hope.

Let me remind us that while we may have a new hand wielding the gavel, no amount of good intentions can overcome the dynamics in the radical Republican Conference because it remains the same.

Mr. Speaker, for this body to function as the Founding Fathers intended, we need debate and we need openness. For our constituents to be heard and for our institutions to thrive, we need debate and we need openness. Democrats have always been willing to provide the votes to move the country forward on any bill that would come to the floor, and I would like to extend my well wishes to our new Speaker, PAUL RYAN, and express again our willingness to work together for the American people, because that is why we have been sent here.

Let me mention, if I may, that today, when we are concerned about bringing refugees and immigration, that we have been begging for two years for this House to take up an immigration bill, and the majority has refused to do so.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is not surprising I would differ from my good friend on whether or not we have an open process here. Frankly, I think we can all point to times in the past where each of us believe the other has been less than open. I recall, during the Democratic majority, we literally would bring appropriations bills to the floor with absolutely closed rules, something that violates the tradition of this House.

In terms of this legislation, I hope I am forgiven, but again, I find very little change from Benghazi and Planned Parenthood to this particular debate. I don’t think it has anything to do.
The legislation in front of us really deals with two bills: H.R. 1737, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau bill, actually seeks to simply restrain an agency from exercising authority that it is prohibited from exercising under the legislation, and all the amendments that were germane to that piece of legislation were indeed made in order.

H.R. 511, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act, frankly, is just simply: Does the NLRB have this jurisdiction or not? They didn't take a lot of amendments. It is just a straight question. Our assertion is, obviously, that it does not. It has claimed authority it should not have, and we are simply restoring that to tribal governments.

So I actually think the rule in question facilitates the debate, allows those who have different ideas to present them if they are relevant, and I think we will end up with a good result.

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

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

If we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 430, a bill to clean up the secret money in politics and give the American people the fair and transparent political system that they deserve.

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 gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), to discuss our proposal, the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the Rules Committee, who began the discussion here by pointing out that here we go again. We say there is new leadership in town on the Republican side, but it is the same old closed process: closed rule, limit democracy, don't allow and don't want the people's House to decide on important questions for the country. When you have a closed rule, you are starting to close down democracy; you are limiting the ability of this House to make decisions on behalf of all the American people.

So we have, as part of the previous question, if you defeat the previous question, a proposal to also improve transparency and openness in the full political process, because this is the people's House, and we would hope that it would do the people's business. But we also know that there are a lot of special interests out there that are spending millions and millions and millions of dollars trying to get their way and substitute their special interests for the public interests. They are spending millions of dollars to try to elect candidates who will do their bidding.

What this proposal does is just say we need to be transparent and open about who is spending all that money. People in those interests can continue to spend money to try and elect candidates, but don't do it secretly. Do it openly.

So what we are asking is for this House to take up what is called the Disclose Act. The Disclose Act simply says that voters have a right to know which special interests around the country are spending millions and millions of dollars to try to influence their voting decision, because we believe that sunlight and transparency helps build accountability and that accountability helps build a stronger democracy.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

So after the Citizens United decision, that terrible decision, what happened? Special interests were able to spend millions and millions of dollars at a time. They weren't constrained by any limits on their contributions or what they could make. So we got a lot more money, but we also got something else. We got essentially a political under-ground in spending. We had this system now where people try and channel their moneys in secret ways to hide themselves from the public.

So if we get to vote on the Disclose Act, we will see where we stand on the simple question of whether this body supports transparency, because, honestly, if you want to hide, you have got nothing to fear.

Right now we have these commercials out there. They say, "Paid for by Committee for a Better America," "Paid for by mom and apple pie," but the people who are paying for them don't want the voters to know who they are. They want it to be a closed process. We are asking that they disclose their identity.

In fact, in the Citizens United case, eight Justices said they were for more disclosure. And, in fact, recently, Justice Kennedy, who was one of the five in the 5-4 majority, said that the disclosure that he thought would work is not working. But they said the legislature can always act on this issue and improve the transparency and disclosure of the political process. Even Justice Scalia said that would be good for the political process.

We want to know who is spending all that money to try and influence decisions of the people's House. What is wrong with a little sunshine? What is wrong with transparency? Doesn't that improve accountability, and doesn't that strengthen our democracy?

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the gentlewoman.

I understand that we are going to continue to have these closed rules apparently that are not going to make this an open process here, but for good-government's sake, Mr. Speaker, let's at least allow the American people to know who is spending all that money to try to influence voting decisions and, ultimately, influence the kind of legislation that comes to the floor of this House, because we need to be focused on the people's business, not the business of secret special interests.

Let the sunshine in. Let's allow transparency. Let's defeat the previous question so that we can move forward on the Disclose Act and give the voters the right to know that they deserve.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged by the debate so far because my good friends on the other side said absolutely nothing about H.R. 1737 and H.R. 511, so I assume that they support these bipartisan pieces of legislation.

Just to reiterate, with all due respect to my friends, we are not here to talk about campaign finance reform, always a worthy subject of discussion. I remember a number of years bringing up campaign finance reform, trying to get rid of taxpayer subsidies for political conventions. We finally got that done and redirected that money to research for pediatric diseases but could never get it made in order when my friends were on the other side of the aisle, so I understand the frustrations. But again, we have got two important bills to consider, and I want to get back to the matter where we ought to focus our attention.

In H.R. 1737, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has literally gone beyond the mandate laid out in Dodd-Frank. So I must say I am mystified that I am up here defending a provision of Dodd-Frank, but in this case, it is actually the right thing to do. They have tried to extend their authority into auto lending, which is specifically prohibited under the statute, so we are trying to make that we can vote on the other side said absolutely nothing about H.R. 1737 and H.R. 511 does something that, frankly, this House can be very proud of. It recognizes and extends and restores tribal sovereignty in a very important area. That has actually been an area of bipartisan cooperation.

We want to work together in the Violence Against Women Act across party lines to extend tribal sovereignty with respect to domestic crime and domestic violence committed by non-Indians on Indian land against Indian citizens. Now we are trying in the House to once again restore tribal sovereignty to what it was before 2004 when the National Labor Relations Board, frankly,
acted outside of its authority and seized jurisdiction it simply doesn’t have under any statute ever passed by Congress.

I would invite my friends to focus on those two areas, hope they do, and certainly to work with them in a bipartisan manner to pass both of those bills.

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

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

In closing, it really is a shame that the only way we can talk about campaign finance is to put it in our previous question because it is never a subject for debate here. That really is a shame because we have terrible situations going on in campaign finance unaccounted for, which is something that we have never had before in this country. I would like to hear about it.

Mr. Speaker, this rule we are doing today strikes a provision of the reconciliation bill that the House passed last month in the latest futile Republican attempt to undermine the Affordable Care Act. This provision is unprecedented, is unacceptable, and we oppose it. The stricken provision eliminates an auto Enrollment requirement that employers who offer health insurance automatically enroll new employees in the health plan. The rule strikes this provision because it is never a subject for debate here. That really is a shame because we have terrible situations going on in campaign finance unaccounted for, which is something that we have never had before in this country. I would like to hear about it.

My Republican colleagues may describe this as a simple housekeeping measure, but no matter what is done, the bill will not become a serious piece of legislation.

The bill passed by the House would add 16 million people to the ranks of the uninsured, would increase health insurance premiums by up to 20 percent for millions of others, and would reduce women’s access to important health services by ending Medicaid funding to Planned Parenthood clinics.

The best piece of housekeeping that Congress could do on the reconciliation bill is to set it aside and put an end, once and for all, to this fantasy of repealing affordable health coverage for millions of Americans. Instead, let us focus on the policies that actually help American families, such as improving access to important health services by ending Medicaid funding to Planned Parenthood clinics.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that people paid some attention to this debate today. There is so much going on in the House that they might have missed it.

Let me just reiterate that this is the most closed Congress in history. At every turn, the majority has chosen to shut out debate and silence the will of Members. We have heard again this morning the minority party, our constituents, and the democratic process itself are ailing, Mr. Speaker, and we must do something about it.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” and defeat the previous question so that we can take up Mr. Van Hollen’s good measure here and try to clean up, as even the members of the Supreme Court who voted to give us Citizens United would like to see us make some changes. I want to recognize that what they did has been a complete failure. Somehow they had this awesome wonderland idea that everybody would just continue to put their name down on their contributions, and we have no way of knowing. The fact is, it’s not the case. We don’t even know what country a lot of the money is coming from.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” and defeat the previous question and also to vote “no” on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat mystified by the changes on the other side have offered. It has got a lot to do with campaign finance reform. Unfortunately, there is nothing in the legislation before us that deals with that.

I beg to differ in terms of whether or not the rules here are closed or inappropriate. Frankly, every amendment offered to H.R. 1737 that was germane was actually made in order; and, frankly, amendments on H.R. 511 simply aren’t necessary. It is a yes or no type of question. Either the NLRB has jurisdiction that we think it has claimed improperly over Indian tribes and labor matters or it does not, and we think that clarifies things considerably.

So again, we also are a little bit surprised to see what we do think is a housekeeping matter in terms of striking something out of the reconciliation bill objected to. I just remind my friends they voted overwhelmingly for the budget plan that included that measure. There is nothing untoward going on here. We are just trying to move forward legislation that we think is important and remove things that have already been enacted into law. So it is, indeed, as suggested, a housekeeping matter.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to encouraged all Members to support the rule. H.R. 1737 undoes a regulation that should never have been made in the first place. It restores a right, the right of self-governance, that should have never been taken away from tribal governments.

The material previously referred to by Ms. Slaughter is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 526 OFFERED BY MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. 5. 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. 430) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements for corporations, labor organizations, and other entities, 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. All points of order in the consideration of the bill are waived. At the conclusion of order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill. SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 430.

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 also to vote 'no' on the rule. A vote to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against or defeating the previous question is the 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 (VT, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the course of the debate.” 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 resolution and carries the resolution back into order 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 being refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the recognition.”

The Republican minority 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 (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 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 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 demand 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 proviso 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. COLE. 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 ayes had 245, nays 178, not voting 10; and the Yeas and Nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 529, if ordered, suspending the rules and passing H.R. 1694 and H.R. 3114.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 245, nays 178, not voting 10, as follows:

**YEA—245**

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Beschak
Blienderakis
Billings
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bluemel
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brennan
Bridenstone
Briggs (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Buchbloch
Buchanan
Byrne
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TN)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clayton
Cliff 

**NAYS—178**

Adams
Agular
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyah
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brody (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Casarson (IN)
Cartwright
Castle (FL)
Castle (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cuilliene
Clark (MA)
Clark (NY)
Clay
Clear
Clyburn
Cohen
Connelly
Cuongers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cowie
Currier
Dingell
Dugger
Douglas
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Espy
Farley
Farr
Fattah
Fernandez
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Galgelo
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Allen
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hastings
Higginbotham
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (NY)
Johnson (WV)
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (MI)
Kelly (PA)
King (OH)
King (NY)
King
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Lahood
LaMalfa
Lange
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudmilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lumms
MacArthur
Bermudez
Marinho
Master
McCarthy
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodger
McSally
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Milеноea
Milione
Mintor
Mink
Miner
Nunes
Noem
Palazzo
Palmer
Parks
Parcel
Pelosi
Pence
Perry
Peterson
Phelps
Phelps
Pinkston
Pickering
Pleuger
Poe
Polly
Poston
Powell
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Redd
Reed
Reifsnyder
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (OK)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stekel
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Eptown
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Webber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Western
Westmoreland
Whittfield
Williamson
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (LA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

---

Messrs. SQUIRES, VELA, and LARSON of Connecticut changed their votes from “yea” to “nay.”

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

Stated against:

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I was not present during rollcall No. 629 on November 17, 2015 due to an Energy and Commerce Committee hearing.

I would like to reflect that on rollcall No. 629 I would have voted for the **YEA**. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. 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 243, nays 181, not voting 9, as follows:

**YEA—243**

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Beschak
Blienderakis
Billings
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bluemel
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brennan
Buck
Byrne
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clayton
Cliff

---

**NAYS**

Adams
Anggraini
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishoup (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brody (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Castarson (IN)
Cartwright
Castle (FL)
Castle (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cuilliene
Clark (MA)
Clark (NY)
Clay
Clear
Clyburn
Cohen
Connelly
Cuongers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cowie
Currier
Dingell
Dugger
Douglas
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Eshoo
Espy
Farley
Farr
Fattah
Fernandez
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Galgelo
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Allen
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hastings
Higginbotham
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (NY)
Johnson (WV)
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (MI)
Kelly (PA)
King (OH)
King (NY)
King
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Lahood
LaMalfa
Lange
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudmilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lumms
MacArthur
Bermudez
Marinho
Master
McCarthy
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodger
McSally
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Milеноea
Milione
Mintor
Mink
Miner
Nunes
Noem
Palazzo
Palmer
Parks
Parcel
Pelosi
Pence
Perry
Peterson
Phelps
Phelps
Pinkston
Pickering
Pleuger
Poe
Polly
Poston
Powell
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Redd
Reed
Reifsnyder
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (OK)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Smith (MO)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stekel
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner
Eptown
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Webber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Western
Westmoreland
Whittfield
Williamson
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (LA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke
FAIRNESS TO VETERANS IN INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is whether the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1694) to amend MAP–21 to improve contracting opportunities for veteran-owned small business concerns and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is whether the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 286, nays 138, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 631]

YEAS—286

Yeas—286, nays 138, not voting 10, as follows:

[Table of Yeas and Nays]

NAYS—138

Nays—138, not voting 10, as follows:

[Table of Yeas and Nays]
the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) said. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROE of Tennessee). Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the Committee on Education and the Workforce is considering H.R. 511, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act of 2015. The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 511

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 “Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF EMPLOYER. Section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 152) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting “or any Indian tribe, or any enterprise or institution owned and operated by an Indian tribe and located on Indian lands, after “subsection thereof,”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:
The San Manuel decision has been upheld in every appeals court where it has been challenged, and it is based on legal precepts that have been upheld by appellate courts over 30 years. The appeals have also noted that the tribal casinos are commercial enterprises, not part of the Department of Education, serving predominantly non-tribal clients and hiring predominantly non-tribal members to operate.

By depriving these workers of the rights to organize and bargain collectively, this legislation ensures that low-paid service workers in tribal casinos will lose the opportunity to share in the fruits of the wealth that they are creating for the tribe, and depriving them of the opportunity to climb the ladder into the middle class.

The bill also sets up a double standard. As a member of the International Labor Organization, the United States is obligated, as a government, to respect and promote the rights outlined in the ILO Declaration of Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, including the freedom of association and effective recognition of the right to collectively bargain.”

The Democrats and Republicans have insisted that our trading partners abide by and enforce these basic labor rights, and Congress has repeatedly ratified these obligations in trade agreements. But today the House will vote on a bill that does just the opposite—when it comes to the freedom of association and the right to collectively bargain at tribal enterprises.

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR).

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, Federal rulemaking continues to hurt the people of Michigan’s Fourth Congressional District.

As we have already seen, Federal departments and agencies have proposed overreachng water rules that create uncertainty for Michigan farmers, energy rules that raise electric rates on hardworking families, and healthcare rules that disrupt patients’ coverage.

Now Federal rulemaking is interfering with the sovereignty of Native American tribes. The National Labor Relations Board has claimed jurisdiction over the commercial businesses on tribal lands, intruding on the self-governance of the Saginaw Chipewa in my district.

Now, if the Board were to do the same with a school, a park, or any other enterprise owned and operated by a State or local government, no Member of Congress would stand for it.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).
Mr. ELLISON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of my record in support of tribal sovereignty. I have been a member of the Native American Caucus since 2012. I supported the legislation fix to Carceri v. Salazar Supreme Court decision that overturned 75 years of Federal Indian policy.

I cosponsored the Non-Disparagement of Native American Persons or People in Trademark Registration Act, and I have actually stood out in the street calling for the Washington football team to change its name because of the ugliness of what that represents.

And, of course, I was proud, proud to be a sponsor and a supporter of the Violence Against Women Act, which authorized tribal governments to exercise special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction over any individual that commits domestic violence, dating violence, or sexual violence, and to protect men and women on the tribal areas.

In short, I am a person who is very proudly and affirmatively for tribal sovereignty and tribal rights.

However, the right to form and work in a labor organization and the right to have rights on your job is also a very important right, and I cannot see why we cannot fashion legislation which protects both tribal sovereignty and the right of labor.

This bill unfortunately takes rights away from some in order to purportedly give them to the other.

I urge my friends who are tempted to vote for this legislation to ask themselves what they are giving up and what they are getting.

We could fashion legislation to look out for tribes. We could work together. But, instead, what we are doing is simply using a wedge issue to try to divide two very important principles, labor rights and tribal rights.

I am going to vote against this. I hope that all Members do. I hope that people who believe in tribal rights and sovereignty know that this is not about not supporting sovereignty, because I support it. But I believe that this Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act is going to do something very damaging to all workers, including tribal members.

We should be supporting all people, including tribal members’ right to form unions, to be in a labor organization, which is their very best shot at getting into the middle class.

We know that union members earn $207 a week more than nonunion counterparts. That is why some business interests, not all, hate unions, because they just don’t want to have a fair economy. They want to hoard the wealth of the company for themselves.

Workers who are in the union are far more likely to have retirement benefits, paid sick leave, and other medical benefits. Workers who have organized at their casinos have turned low-wage service sector jobs into good-paying jobs with benefits. This legislation would take those jobs away.

Therefore, I must oppose it, and I urge all my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), my friend and colleague on the Education and the Workforce Committee and a veteran of this great Nation.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the good doctor from Tennessee. I want to thank my Republican colleagues, Mr. ROKITA especially, for bringing this important matter to a vote today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 511, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act.

In this House, we often speak about the importance of ensuring and protecting tribal sovereignty. This bill does just that. The measure treats tribal governments like we do any other government entity in this country by excluding them from the onerous coverage under the National Labor Relations Act.

In my district in San Diego and Riverside County, California, I represent 18 different tribes in Congress. That is more than anybody else in this House. They vary in size, tradition, and economic wealth, but they share one thing in common. They are all sovereign nations.

This sovereignty ensures that they have jurisdiction over their territory. And, together, the American people made a promise to these tribes that they can govern themselves on their own land. This should especially apply in areas that this bill seeks to address.

I think it is ludicrous that the National Labor Relations Board thinks that they have purview over American Indian tribes.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 511.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, we live in a land of opportunity, and certainly many of the people who are being discussed here today understand that, for a very long time, it was not fair and not equal, because that is what we are truly discussing today, having a level playing field.

This year is the 80th anniversary of the National Labor Relations Act, and today is a time to rise to the middle class as we know it here in America today. But time after time, on both sides of the aisle, we hear how the discrepancies between those who are on the lower end and the one-percenters is growing wider.

So why am I talking about this when we are talking about this tribal bill? Because that is what we are really talking about.

See, there is a mechanism in place already that addresses this issue. It is a three-part test that has worked very well not only with the NLRB, but in the courts it has been working very well.

So this is a bill that is looking for a problem, because the true test of what is going on here today is trying to take those rights of having a level playing field away from those who don’t have a voice. Well, we stand here today as that voice. My career was as an electrician who later had the opportunity to become a business agent. I have been to National Labor Relations Boards many, many times. I have lost some. I have won some. But one thing I can tell you is it was fairer than that is what we want to give those on tribal lands, a fair fight.

Just because they are tribal lands doesn’t mean that none of our laws, history, and traditions apply to them. In fact, just the opposite. That three-part test has stood the test of time and has given a fair shot.

So what we are really talking about today is those who have the most abusing those who have the least, not giving anyone an opportunity to have a voice in the workplace so that they can have the American Dream.

I would urge my colleagues to vote against this very unfair, misguided bill and to give those who need it most that chance. That is what we are elected to do. I urge my colleagues to vote against this.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his good work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation that I am proud to co-sponsor, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act of 2015.

It has long been a priority of this Congress to protect tribal sovereignty. These lands and their people should be free from bureaucratic intrusion, as they are sovereign nations.

However, the National Labor Relations Board has overstepped its authority to expand its jurisdiction over tribal lands, creating a cloud of uncertainty for tribal leaders.

This legislation allows tribes to operate as they should, free from the threat of intrusion from the National Labor Relations Board. Much like states’ rights, this legislation puts the power back in the hands of local tribal governments so they can make decisions in their best interest.

I will continue to work to ensure tribal sovereignty is not infringed upon.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member SCOTT.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose H.R. 511. One of the most important things...
we can do in this body is help the middle class to have every opportunity for their family.

While the economy has been rebounding, unfortunately, wages for the middle class have remained flat. Productivity is up. Profits are up. CEO pay is up. But most workers have remained flat. Now we have a bill before us that will make it harder for hundreds of thousands of workers by taking away National Labor Relations Act protections from them.

Now, the sponsors of this legislation say this bill is designed to protect sovereignty. While I strongly support tribal sovereignty, this bill is not about that.

There are a number of Federal laws that tribes are compelled to follow in addition to the National Labor Relations Act: the Occupational Safety and Health Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, the Family and Medical Leave Act, and the public accommodations of the Americans with Disabilities Act, just for starters.

This bill isn’t about meaningful sovereignty. It is about selective sovereignty because it only excludes labor rights, which makes this a labor bill, not a sovereignty bill.

It would even affect workers who already have collective bargaining agreements, stripping away the rights they have collectively fought for and have agreed to.

Many of the advocates for this bill are loudly credible on this. The U.S. Chamber and other organizations have never taken strong stances on tribal issues in the past, issues like spearfishing and mascot names in my home State of Wisconsin or funding to address the crumbling infrastructure of Bureau of Indian Affairs schools.

But suddenly they support sovereignty. Well, history says otherwise. If this bill is about sovereignty, exempt OSHA and ERISA and FMLA and ADA, for starters—that would be a sovereignty bill—or require the tribes at least to have their own labor relations boards, which they don’t have.

This bill only exempts labor protections for hundreds of thousands of workers, both tribal members and nonmembers. Those affected workers will be denied their fundamental rights under this bill, and that is what this is really about.

Mr. Speaker, if this body wants to help tribes, I am here to help. If you want to make it easier for Federal tribes to be recognized via the Carcieri fix, I am in.

If you want to provide more adequate funding for Indian Health Services and exempt them from future sequestration cuts, where do I sign up?

If you want to provide funding for the maintenance infrastructure as well as the educational needs for Bureau of Indian Affairs schools, I am with you.

If you want to address some of the Tax Code disparities that hinder tribes from encouraging economic development on their lands, especially renewable energy projects, let’s do that bill.

But we are not addressing the real pressing issues that affect tribes in our country. Instead, we are only going after workers’ rights in the veil of tribal sovereignty, and that is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in hearing testimony at our subcommittee hearing Indian tribes have labor boards at their particular reservation, so I just want to have that in for the RECORD.

Also, all we are asking for is to treat the Indian tribes exactly the same as local or State governments are treated. If they are sovereign, they are sovereign; if they are not, they are not.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McClintock).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, there is no need today to catalog the litany of promises made and broken by this government to the American Indians. The sum total of these broken promises amounted to the banishment of these, the first Americans, to the most desolate and undesirable lands in the Nation. We left them with one thing and one thing only. We left them sovereignty over their lands.

In the past half century, many of these tribes have created, from that sovereignty, great engines of prosperity which provide themselves and their posterity: and suddenly, our government’s disinterest in their welfare, its benign neglect of their affairs, has changed. Now that they are prosperous, our government has developed a canine appetite to intervene in their affairs.

For 70 years after the enactment of the National Labor Relations Act, the Federal Government recognized the internal independence of these tribal governments, and for their rightful members. It recognized that unless Congress specified otherwise, the Indian nations were free to conduct their own affairs on their sovereign lands and to organize their enterprises according to their own traditions, customs, conditions, and necessities—that is, until 2004, when the National Labor Relations Board decision in San Manuel Indian Bingo & Casino struck the appropriate balance between respecting tribal sovereignty and upholding labor rights. In its decision, the NLRB stated the National Labor Relations Act does not apply if it would undermine the “exclusive rights of self-governance in purely intramural matters or ‘abrogate Indian treaty rights.’” However, the NLRB clarified that labor law would apply if an entity is a purely commercial enterprise and employs or caters to individuals who are not tribal members. That is an appropriate test, whether we are talking about casinos or construction companies, hotels and resorts, or mines or power plants.

H.R. 51 would overturn the NLRB’s carefully crafted decision and could take away existing bargaining rights from hundreds of thousands of workers. We know that these workers—truly owned casinos have benefited from union membership. A UNITE HERE! union study of tribal casino workers in California documented higher wages, lower healthcare costs, and less worker reliance on public benefits like Medicaid to meet the needs of their families. Employers, too, gain when workers are more productive and turnover is reduced.

We have real-world examples of how unions have helped workers. Gary Navarro, a Pomo Nation member employed at Graton Casino & Resort, testified before the Education and the Workforce Committee that “I became active in my union because of unjust treatment of casino workers by the managers and how nothing could be done about even sexual harassment because of sovereignty. Exercising our right to organize turned out to be the only way to protect ourselves and our coworkers.”

Madeline, a worker at Foxwoods, was suspended because she was forced to clock out when she went to see a nurse for a work-related injury, which put
her over the casino’s attendance points system. Her union won her reinstatement and backpay. And the company provided a mandatory OSHA training program for management.

Jenny Langlois, at Foxwoods, benefited from a union contract that gave her the time she needed to receive treatment for breast cancer.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 511 would result in the loss of those gains, and, by eliminating NLRA rights, could deny them to many more workers in the future. By doing so, it would leave those workers without any avenue to bargain collectively, ensure fair compensation, or seek redress for workplace injuries.

Three out of four of the 600,000 workers employed in tribal casinos are not tribal members. They do not have full access to internal, tribal mechanisms for filing grievances or petitioning for changes in policy. And while some tribal governments have labor laws that apply to commercial operations, many don’t. And we cannot guarantee that those who have them will not change or eliminate them in the future. By eliminating NLRA rights, workers could have no place to turn to push for labor rights, to appeal unfair firings or discipline, or to take action against sexual harassment.

H.R. 511 would affect more than the gaming industry, including construction workers, miners, and hotel workers. That is why the International Longshoremen’s and Warehousemen’s Union has stated that it “would appear likely that an exclusion of certain workers from the NLRA and its mechanisms would give rise to a failure to ensure to these workers their fundamental freedom of association rights absent any assurances that there were tribal labor laws that provide the same rights to all workers.”

But there is no such requirement in H.R. 511. It would preempt NLRA coverage. But there are other Federal laws that apply to tribes, including the Occupational Safety and Health Act, title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Family and Medical Leave Act, and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act. Why should we single out the NLRA, the law that gives workers bargaining rights? Or will we be asked to eliminate those other important protections in the future?

Mr. Speaker, proponents of the bill argue that it is designed to provide equal treatment for tribal nations with State and local governments, but there are key distinctions.

First, we are talking here not about people who work directly for tribal governments but for workers in commercial enterprises. Most States and localities operate huge commercial entities that hire the majority of workers from outside of their jurisdictions.

Second, if State or local workers want to protect collective bargaining rights, they have the ability to participate in the political process and vote in elections. That is one reason that the vast majorities of State and local public employees have those rights. Non-tribal workers at tribal-operated commercial enterprises lack that ability. They don’t vote in tribal elections, and they have no direct ability to affect labor policies for tribal governments.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act of 2015. Minnesota is a proud home to seven Ojibwe reservations and four Dakota communities. We have a strong and deep Native American history and are proud of the work we have accomplished through centuries of working together for the communities that have contributed so much to our Nation’s history.

The intent of the National Labor Rights Act passed in 1935 was never to include tribal governments within its jurisdiction. It is unfortunate that some are seeking to take advantage of a once well-intentioned law, but it is now up to Congress to do the right thing and expressly clarify that tribal governments are exempt from the National Labor Relations Act.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, could you tell us how much time remains on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROE). The gentleman from Tennessee has 21 1/4 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also say to my friend from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), he and I are going to work hard on this legislation, but we disagree.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that if the National Labor Relations Act were at issue on this floor today, my belief is—I may be wrong—that many of the people who will vote for this bill would be for repealing the National Labor Relations Act. That is a fair place to be, I suppose, but that is essentially what we are talking about here.

I can’t think of anyone in this House who does not have strongly in the principle of protecting the sovereignty of American tribes and their governments. I know surely that is where I am. I presume all 434 of my colleagues are there. It is the least we can do, having treated the Native Americans so badly when we got here and thereafter.

We agree that when tribal governments are carrying out inherently governmental functions. It is the key for the courts; it ought to be the key for us—their sovereignty is fully, and should be, secure under current law. But this bill goes a lot further, than reinforcing that understanding.

Instead, this bill extends the current understanding of sovereignty not from what it is, but it is in an effort to undermine the rights for working men and women in this country, which is why, for all Americans, we cannot get a minimum wage bill on this floor, which is $7.25, which is now 7 years in being, and would be, if we paid the same in 1968 for the minimum wage, $10.68 today. It is the same principle, and what we would get it or for all Americans—not just Indian Americans—for all Americans, Native Americans, it undermines their rights, rights that every Member of this House also ought to support.

Democrats are proud to stand shoulder to shoulder with Native American tribal communities across this country, and we are going to continue working with them to fight for more investment in education. Hear me. We will not put our money where our mouth is. Native American housing, health care, education, along with continuing to protect their sovereignty in governing themselves according to their cultures and traditions.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, what we do not support is repealing away protections from American workers, Native and non-Native alike, who work in commercial enterprises owned by tribes. All of our people deserve the chance to earn a decent living, be safe at work, and reach for a better life. This bill is not a step in the right direction.

Courts have ruled that tribes must also comply with other laws. I want to adopt the comments of the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, what we do not support is repealing away protections from American workers, Native and non-Native alike, who work in commercial enterprises owned by tribes. All of our people deserve the chance to earn a decent living, be safe at work, and reach for a better life. This bill is not a step in the right direction.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it is taking away protections from Americans—not just Indian Americans—for all Americans, Native Americans, it undermines their rights, rights that every Member of this House also ought to support.

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

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Tennessee an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SPEARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SPEARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Tennessee an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SPEARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Tennessee an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it is taking away protections from Americans—not just Indian Americans—for all Americans, Native Americans, it undermines their rights, rights that every Member of this House also ought to support.

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

Mr. SPEARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SPEARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is taking away protections from Americans—not just Indian Americans—for all Americans, Native Americans, it undermines their rights, rights that every Member of this House also ought to support.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Tennessee an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it is taking away protections from Americans—not just Indian Americans—for all Americans, Native Americans, it undermines their rights, rights that every Member of this House also ought to support.

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

Mr. SPEARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is taking away protections from Americans—not just Indian Americans—for all Americans, Native Americans, it undermines their rights, rights that every Member of this House also ought to support.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Tennessee an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it is taking away protections from Americans—not just Indian Americans—for all Americans, Native Americans, it undermines their rights, rights that every Member of this House also ought to support.

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

Mr. SPEARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is taking away protections from Americans—not just Indian Americans—for all Americans, Native Americans, it undermines their rights, rights that every Member of this House also ought to support.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Tennessee an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it is taking away protections from Americans—not just Indian Americans—for all Americans, Native Americans, it undermines their rights, rights that every Member of this House also ought to support.

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

Mr. SPEARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is taking away protections from Americans—not just Indian Americans—for all Americans, Native Americans, it undermines their rights, rights that every Member of this House also ought to support.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Tennessee an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it is taking away protections from Americans—not just Indian Americans—for all Americans, Native Americans, it undermines their rights, rights that every Member of this House also ought to support.

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

Mr. SPEARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is taking away protections from Americans—not just Indian Americans—for all Americans, Native Americans, it undermines their rights, rights that every Member of this House also ought to support.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Tennessee an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it is taking away protections from Americans—not just Indian Americans—for all Americans, Native Americans, it undermines their rights, rights that every Member of this House also ought to support.

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

Mr. SPEARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is taking away protections from Americans—not just Indian Americans—for all Americans, Native Americans, it undermines their rights, rights that every Member of this House also ought to support.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Tennessee an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it is taking away protections from Americans—not just Indian Americans—for all Americans, Native Americans, it undermines their rights, rights that every Member of this House also ought to support.

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

Mr. SPEARMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is taking away protections from Americans—not just Indian Americans—for all Americans, Native Americans, it undermines their rights, rights that every Member of this House also ought to support.
of my comments; because that side does not support National Labor Relations Act rights.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Given that there is no logical distinction to explain why these other laws should apply to tribes but the NLRA should not, the only plausible explanation is that this legislation is a precursor of other legislation and says, once again, we do not support the rights of Americans to collectively bargain for pay, benefits, safety, and working conditions.

Mr. Speaker. I urge my colleagues to send a strong and unequivocal message—two messages: A, we support strongly the sovereignty of our tribes, but, secondly, we also support the decency and safety and pay of working Americans, tribes and non-tribes alike. I urge my colleagues to vote "no." Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just for clarification, Mr. Speaker, many other laws specifically exclude Indian tribes from the definition of employer, including title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act, and the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act. In contrast, statutes of general application, including the NLRA; Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act; Age Discrimination in Employment Act, ADEA; Fair Labor Standards Act; Family and Medical Leave Act; and Employee Retirement Income Security Act, ERISA, are silent in their application to Indian tribes. Federal courts have held that the statutes of general application—specifically, FLSA and ERISA—do apply. Otherwise, the conclusion is that sovereignty is to be given. And, truly, the conclusion is that sovereignty is not given to them; it is actually, it is not given to them; it is the purview of this Congress, not the rulemakers of the National Labor Relations Board meddling in their economic development affairs when they are trying to make life better for the people who live in their communities.

I urge my colleagues to support tribal sovereignty, support tribal governments, and vote "yes" on this important legislation.

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALPA).

Mr. LAMALPA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to be able to speak on this bill today.

While this administration has been eager to recognize tribes, too often it fails to also recognize their sovereign rights, imposing onerous Federal requirements on tribes' management of their own lands and livelihoods, which is very important in my own First District of California, home of many recognized tribes.

This measure rectifies a clear overreach yet again of this administration by rolling back National Labor Relations Board regulations that impose Federal labor laws on tribal businesses located on their own tribal land never intended under the NLRA.

Mr. Speaker, sovereign status doesn't mean that tribes may manage their own affairs only now and then, or only when the administration chooses. It means tribes have a right to self-government in every aspect of their affairs.

It is time that this House reaffirm its constitutional role, defined in article I, section 8, to recognize tribes, not this overreaching board. Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) and thank him for his service to this great Nation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

Really this whole matter and discussion is pretty simple: Article I, section 8, Congress shall have the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes"—explicit language in the Constitution that we all defend and that I have defended since I was 18.

It is the purview of this Congress, not the rulemakers of the National Labor Relations Board, to regulate commerce.

This Nation must continue to recognize the rights of Indian tribal sovereignty, and this Congress must uphold the Constitution and sovereign treaties with those tribes.

Those opposed to this bill, Mr. Speaker, say that it will take away the rights of workers. As a Representative from Oklahoma, whose Fifth District is more than 18 percent Native American, our largest minority, our constituents know that the actions of the rulemakers will take away the rights of sovereign tribes. Congress must reverse these rights with the passage of this bill.

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. Cramer).

Mr. Cramer. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker, self-reliance and self-government need to be more than liberal buzzwords if we are going to make a difference, if they are going to have any meaning at all. And I find some of the comments of the opposition to be a distressing thing. I am grateful, fortunately, they are similar to the comments that President Obama had this morning when he announced his opposition to this legislation, stating that he could not support the bill unless tribal governments adopted his view. In other words, they have to be identical to his views in order to have sovereignty. Well, this isn't sovereignty at all.

The President often likes to say that he honors and respects tribal sovereignty. In fact, I heard him say that he respects it as much as any President, right while standing in the powwow grounds in Cannon Ball, North Dakota, last summer.

Yet when presented with this opportunity—and it is not the only opportunity we presented, by the way—the Native American Energy Act and gas-gathering pipeline bills have done the same thing, trying to give sovereignty where sovereignty is to be given. And, actually, it is not given to them; it is held by them.

So I call on Congress and President Obama to respect the rights of tribes and pass this legislation into law.

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. Michelle Lujan Grisham).

Ms. Lujan Grisham. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act, which would clarify Federal law, restore parity for tribal governments, and protect tribal autonomy.

As you have heard today, tribes have a constitutional right to manage their own land, and regulate tribal enterprises according to their own cultural, traditions, and law. They have
the right to regulate labor relations with their employees as a result, and I expect tribal governments to view this legislation, in fact, as an opportunity to strengthen their own worker protections.

No worker, as you have also heard today, should be without a voice or an ability to petition their employer for stronger benefits or a better work environment. In fact, many tribes across the country and in New Mexico have developed labor ordinances that, in fact, protect these rights.

During negotiations of the 1999 tribal-State gaming compact, Indian tribes in California agreed to adopt the Model Tribal Labor Relations Ordinance in order to strengthen worker protections.

Although this bill does not prevent similar tribal efforts to protect workers, I am disappointed that it doesn’t do anything to promote stronger tribal labor practices.

Congress should provide tribes the resources they need to develop and implement labor laws and regulations at Native American enterprises. Employee protections and tribal autonomy are not opposing values, and I urges you to support this bill and to work for protecting workers’ rights.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read portions of a Statement of Administration Policy, issued by the Executive Office of the President:

“The administration is deeply committed to respecting tribal sovereignty and maintaining government-to-government relationships with Indian tribes as well as to protecting American workers and enforcing Federal labor laws. The administration cannot support H.R. 511, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act of 2015, as currently drafted, because it does not include the provisions as explained below.

The President’s commitment to tribal sovereignty has taken many forms—from establishing the White House Council on Native American Affairs, which is dedicated to protecting American workers. The Administration vigorously enforces Federal labor laws and has repeatedly emphasized the importance of strengthening workers’ rights to collective bargaining.

The Administration is encouraged by the efforts of some tribal governments to balance these important interests and find common ground when formulating compacts to operate casinos on tribal land under the Federal Indian Gaming Regulatory Act. In several of these compacts, tribes have agreed to establish their own labor relations policies. Though these compacts differ on minor details, what they have in common is that they generally protect tribal self-governance while also ensuring that most casino workers retain important and effective labor rights.

It is thus possible to protect both tribal sovereignty and workers’ rights, and the Administration supports approaches that accomplish that result. Therefore, the Administration can support a bill which recognizes tribal sovereignty in formulating labor relations law and exempts tribes from the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board only if the tribes adopt labor standards and procedures applicable to tribally owned and operated commercial enterprises reasonably equivalent to those in the National Labor Relations Act.”

Mr. Speaker, I include in the Record the Statement of Administration Policy.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY H.R. 511—TRIBAL LABOR SOVEREIGNTY ACT OF 2015


The Administration is deeply committed to respecting tribal sovereignty and maintaining government-to-government relationships with Indian tribes as well as to protecting American workers and enforcing Federal labor laws. The administration cannot support H.R. 511, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act of 2015, as currently drafted, because it does not include the provisions as explained below.

At the same time, the President is firmly dedicated to protecting American workers. The Administration vigorously enforces Federal labor laws and has repeatedly emphasized the importance of strengthening workers’ rights to collective bargaining.

The Administration supports approaches that accomplish that result. Therefore, the Administration can support a bill which recognizes tribal sovereignty in formulating labor relations law and exempts tribes from the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board only if the tribes adopt labor standards and procedures applicable to tribally owned and operated commercial enterprises reasonably equivalent to those in the National Labor Relations Act. Amended legislation would also need to include an authorization for the Administration to support the development and implementation of tribal labor laws and regulations.

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Ms. Moore).

Ms. MOORE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 511.

Congress originally passed the National Labor Relations Act in 1935. Congress exempted Federal, State, and local governments from the definition of employer. What we have seen since then, Mr. Speaker, is that local units of government have allowed labor unions to grow and the development of the middle class because labor unions have been in place. Nowhere in the NLRA are Indian tribes mentioned. For nearly 60 years, the NLRB treated tribes as local units of government and the Board declined to apply the NLRA over tribal activities in Indian Country. However, in
Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

Mr. POCAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a number of things we have not heard on the other side of the aisle. I have heard a lot about sovereignty, but we have asked explicitly about other areas, one being OSHA. We have asked explicitly about the ADA. We have asked explicitly about the ADA. Why aren’t those in here if this is a sovereignty bill and not just an antilabor bill?

In fact, on the Education and the Workforce Committee, I don’t think a month goes by, Mr. Speaker, that we don’t have a hearing that attacks the National Labor Relations Board and their actions or some other labor-related activity. It happens as often as you can imagine.

This is the debate being told is really about sovereignty, but we don’t really engage in a debate about sovereignty. Where we have a problem is on the labor front and what it would mean to working people—to the hundreds of thousands of people, 700,000 people-plus—who would lose their rights if this were to be passed.

One of the things that was said that is simply not correct is that a number of tribes have their own labor practices, including a labor employment law in Indian Country—in a book from 2011 that is specifically about labor law and tribes—of the 567 federally recognized tribes, “few tribes have implemented labor ordinances, rather than right-to-work provisions to govern labor organizations and collective bargaining.”

In fact, when you look at specific tribes, what has been passed, all too often, unfortunately, are things like right to work, which takes away the ability to have that collective bargaining right.

If we are going to have this debate about sovereignty, let’s talk about sovereignty, let’s talk about the funding for the Bureau of Indian Affairs’ schools, let’s talk about lifting some of those tax laws that make it harder for them to invest in renewable energy. Let’s talk about those laws and not just the other issues that affect the tribes.

I have a tribe in my district, as we have many tribes in Wisconsin, and I have had a good, long relationship in my time in the legislature with those tribes. I have fought on behalf of the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians. I have fought on behalf of making sure that they have spearfishing rights in the State of Wisconsin.

The U.S. Chamber and all of those other groups would never there. The U.S. Chamber is opposed because they think they have the ability to go after workers’ rights. This bill is only here because you want to go after workers’ rights. Let’s just be honest about it.

If you want to have a debate on sovereignty, talk about the many issues we have brought up, because that is not what this bill is about. I support tribal sovereignty. I also support the many people who work in these facilities. We have to ensure that they still have the protection of the act.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. Speaker, certainly what we are after here today are the rights of Native Americans, whose rights have been trampled on by this country. We have had treaty after treaty that we have ignored. Maybe we can finally, with this piece of legislation, get one right here.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), my very good friend and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary Education. Mr. ROKITA. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on the committee and in helping bring the bill to the point it is today. Mr. Speaker, this bill is not a new product. It has been around for about 10 years. But it hasn’t gone as far as it has gone today. That is a compliment to all of the proponents of the bill, to Members like KRISTI NOEM, who has talked earlier and who had this bill in the past, and Chairman JOHN KLINE, who has carried it in the past, and all the way back to J.D. Hayworth. We thank them all for getting us here. I, for one, am a Member who has picked up this product and has run with it to help get it here.

I have been to 13 tribal communities this year alone, understanding what the problems are with this activist Department of Labor and National Labor Relations Board. That is why this bill is so popular, and in my talking with nearly every Member of this body, that is why so many Members have supported it. I expect and would ask for a strong vote today for sovereignty, for parity.

Mr. Speaker, the history is this: The National Labor Relations Act was silent as to tribal communities in terms of being regulated as an employer. State governments and local governments were specifically exempted from the act.

Then, because of an error in a court decision as well as an activist Department of Labor, we are in this position where the jurisdiction of tribal communities under the act has now been invented.

This bill corrects that and says in no uncertain terms—and very explicitly in just three pages—that tribal communities are to be exempted from the act if they are to be sovereign. All we are asking for is parity with State and local governments.

Let me give you an example. Let’s say you have a municipally owned and operated golf course in your community—or if it were a State government, a state university, or a State government, owned by the State—and that municipality didn’t want to have union activities and it wrote its own set of rules for its employees. That would be fine under the act.

By not allowing the very same right or luxury to a tribal government, we are treating them unlike other State and local governments. That is why in this context they are not sovereign. That is why this bill is needed.

The gentleman from Wisconsin who just spoke reminds us that there are agencies in this bill that aren’t covered. I would say to him: What a great idea for tribal labor sovereignty, act two.

But the logic that just because every agency isn’t covered under what is only meant to cover the NLRA somehow negates the good that this bill does—the right answer that comes with a yes vote—is ridiculous. Just because it doesn’t do everything doesn’t mean you can’t do anything.

So I would say to the Members of this body, on that fact alone, you should vote yes.

It is also true that many tribal communities have unions, that many tribal communities have rules that guide their labor and employees, and those who want to oppose this bill, in my estimation, Mr. Speaker, simply want to insert their judgments, their biases, for their preferred rule or for their preferred union in place of duly elected majority, of a tribal government.

So I would say to those opponents: What makes you smarter than the people who elect the tribal government?
What makes you better and your judgment superior to those who have been duly elected by the members of a tribal nation? The fact of the matter is the arguments that have been made by the opponents do not apply to what is right here. The question is—Are tribal communities sovereign or are they not? Should they at least be in parity with State and local governments or should they not?

I would ask Mr. Speaker, to every Member here and remind everybody—Republican, Democrat—that this is a bipartisan bill. We just had two Democratic Members speak in favor of this bill.

If you want to do what is right—if you believe in the sovereignty of tribal communities, if you believe they should at least have the same parity, judgment, and authority as State and local governments do—then you should vote “yes” on H.R. 511. I urge all Members to do that, Republican and Democrat.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman prepared to close?

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Yes. I am prepared to close.

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

We have heard about the fact that the National Labor Relations Act is silent. That is true. But in terms of laws of general application, they are applied to tribal workers precisely in the same manner and the courts applied that test. That test is a half a century old. The activist NLRB that ruled in 2004 was during the George W. Bush administration. So we don’t know how activist they could be interpreted.

There are a lot of laws that we have found and have discussed that apply to tribes, like the Fair Labor Standards Act, OSHA, ERISA. They have to withhold taxes. They have to pay their employer share of Social Security and Medicare, and on and on. The criminal laws go on and on as well as laws of general application.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from a letter from the International Labour Office, which is basically talking about the international labor obligations we have. They write:

“Given the concerns that you have raised, it would be critically important that, at the very least, a complete legal and comparative review be undertaken to support assurances that all rights, mechanisms and remedies for the full protection of internationally recognized freedom of association and collective bargaining rights are available to all workers on all tribal lands. In the absence of such assurances, it would appear likely that an exclusion of certain workers from the protection of the NLRA would deny protection under the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) of a large number of workers employed by tribal-owned and tribal-operated enterprises located on tribal territory and ask for the informal opinion of the Office as to whether such an exclusion of workers employed on tribal lands would be in conformity with the principles of freedom of Association which are at the core of the ILO Constitution and the ILO’s Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. In conformity with the regular procedure concerning requests for an informal opinion from the International Labour Office in respect of drafting legislation and its possible impact on international labour standards and principles, the views set out below should in no way be considered as prejudging any comments or observations that might be made by the ILO supervisory bodies within the framework of their examination of the application of ratified international labor standards or principles on freedom of association. Your links to committee reports of the congressional majority and minority and other background information have enabled the proponents of the legislative sponsors to ensure that the views set out below should in no way be considered as prejudging any comments or observations that might be made by the ILO supervisory bodies within the framework of their examination of the application of ratified international labor standards or principles on freedom of association.

Given the concerns that you have raised, it would be critically important that, at the very least, a complete legal and comparative review be undertaken to support assurances that all rights, mechanisms and remedies for the full protection of internationally recognized freedom of association and collective bargaining rights are available to all workers on all tribal lands. In the absence of such assurances, it would appear likely that an exclusion of certain workers from the protection of the NLRA would deny protection under the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) of a large number of workers employed by tribal-owned and tribal-operated enterprises located on tribal territory and ask for the informal opinion of the Office as to whether such an exclusion of workers employed on tribal lands would be in conformity with the principles of freedom of Association which are at the core of the ILO Constitution and the ILO’s Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. In conformity with the regular procedure concerning requests for an informal opinion from the International Labour Office in respect of drafting legislation and its possible impact on international labour standards and principles, the views set out below should in no way be considered as prejudging any comments or observations that might be made by the ILO supervisory bodies within the framework of their examination of the application of ratified international labor standards or principles on freedom of association. Your links to committee reports of the congressional majority and minority and other background information have enabled the proponents of the legislative sponsors to ensure that the views set out below should in no way be considered as prejudging any comments or observations that might be made by the ILO supervisory bodies within the framework of their examination of the application of ratified international labor standards or principles on freedom of association. Your links to committee reports of the congressional majority and minority and other background information have enabled the proponents of the legislative sponsors to ensure that the views set out below should in no way be considered as prejudging any comments or observations that might be made by the ILO supervisory bodies within the framework of their examination of the application of ratified international labor standards or principles on freedom of association. Your links to committee reports of the congressional majority and minority and other background information have enabled the proponents of the legislative sponsors to ensure that the views set out below should in no way be considered as prejudging any comments or observations that might be made by the ILO supervisory bodies within the framework of their examination of the application of ratified international labor standards or principles on freedom of association. Your links to committee reports of the congressional majority and minority and other background information have enabled the proponents of the legislative sponsors to ensure that the views set out below should in no way be considered as prejudging any comments or observations that might be made by the ILO supervisory bodies within the framework of their examination of the application of ratified international labor standards or principles on freedom of association.

In accordance with ILO principles and rights at work, the views set out below should in no way be considered as prejudging any comments or observations that might be made by the ILO supervisory bodies within the framework of their examination of the application of ratified international labor standards or principles on freedom of association. Your links to committee reports of the congressional majority and minority and other background information have enabled the proponents of the legislative sponsors to ensure that the views set out below should in no way be considered as prejudging any comments or observations that might be made by the ILO supervisory bodies within the framework of their examination of the application of ratified international labor standards or principles on freedom of association. Your links to committee reports of the congressional majority and minority and other background information have enabled the proponents of the legislative sponsors to ensure that the views set out below should in no way be considered as prejudging any comments or observations that might be made by the ILO supervisory bodies within the framework of their examination of the application of ratified international labor standards or principles on freedom of association.
thousands of workers employed by tribal cas-
inosa alone. Tribal casinos have created over
628,000 jobs. This legislation does not only apply
to casinos. It could impact dozens of other
businesses including power plants, mining
operations, and hotels.

UAW deeply believes in tribal sovereignty
and has a strong record in supporting civil
rights and employee rights throughout our
history. This legislation, however, is misleading. It is an attack
on fundamental collective bargaining rights and
would strip workers in commercial enter-
prises of their right to enter into collective
bargaining agreements through the
NLRB. Supporters of the bill argue that
the bill creates parity for the tribes with state
government employees who are not
covered under the NLRA. However, there
are some significant differences.

For starters, non-tribal members cannot
petition a tribe for labor legislation, while
workers employed by a state or local govern-
ment have a voice with their elected leaders.
This is an important difference since 75 per-
cent of Native American gaming employees
are not tribal members. In addition, tribes
are exempt from employment laws (Title VII
of the Civil Rights Act) that apply to state
and local employees. Finally, priva-
tor contractors work extensively on behalf of
state and local governments and they
therefore have to comply with the NLRA.
In summary, the parity argument does not hold
up under scrutiny.

Tribal casinos have a significant and grow-
ing presence throughout our country. In 2013,
448 tribal enterprises made $2.6 billion
in revenues. Seventy-five percent of the
workforce is non-tribal members. In fact, at
Foxwoods, the UAW represents the workers
who are not tribal members (other casinos),
well over 95 percent of employees and patrons
are not tribal members. These employees are
working for a tribal enterprise which is sim-
ply a business organization competing with
non-tribal businesses.

Having a union and a legally binding contract
has made a real difference in the lives of
UAW members who work as dealers and
assistant floor supervisors. Hundreds of
dealers have been promoted to benefited and
supervisory positions because of provisions in
the contract that maintain minimum per-
centages of full-time, part-time and super-
visory positions. Work rules, wages, and ben-
efits are protected because of the company’s
commitment to collectively bargain. H.R. 511
would put all of these hard fought gains in jeopardy.
Under the terms of this bill, when a labor
contest is certified, the employer could
terminate the bargaining relationship with
the union without legal consequence under
the NLRA, because the employer’s obligation
to bargain could be eliminated.

H.R. 511 seeks to overturn a decision by the
National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) in
San Manuel Indian Bingo and Casino, 314
NLRB No. 138 (2004). In that decision, the
Board concluded that applying the NLRA
would not interfere with the tribe’s auton-
omous and the effects of the NLRA would not
‘‘extend beyond the tribe’s business enter-
prise and regulate intramural matters.’’ The
ruling does not apply in instances where its
applicability would interfere with internal gov-
ernance, since non-tribal members are
exempt from employment laws (Title VII
of the Civil Rights Act, the Employee Retirement In-
come Security Act, and Title III of the
Americans with Disabilities Act. Indeed,
courts have denied attempts to gain exemp-
tions on numerous occasions ruling commer-
cial tribal enterprises should not be excluded
from such laws. Tribes and protections
should not be treated differently.

Proponents assert that they are seeking
the same exemption as state and local gov-
ernments. However, this is wrong. The
NLRKRA only exempts actual government employees
and not private sector employees performing
contractual work for tribal enterprises. Also, a
substantial majority of workers at these
tribal enterprises are not Indian or tribe members,
and thus have no ability to influence tribal
sovereignty. Federal law therefore does not
impact the CRA.

At a time of growing wealth inequality and
shrinking middle class, the last thing Con-
gress should do is deprive workers of their le-
gally enforceable right to form unions and
bargain collectively. We urge you to oppose
H.R. 511.

Sincerely,

Josh Nassar,
Legislative Director.

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD
OF TEAMSTERS,
Washington, D.C.

To Congress:

Dear Representative:
The International Brotherhood of Teamsters urges you to oppose
H.R. 511, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act (H.R. 511). This legislation
would prohibit tribal workers from seeking to organize and bargain
collectively, including Teamsters, who are employed by at tribally
owned and operated enterprises on Indian lands broadly defined from
the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA).

If H.R. 511 were to become law, hundreds of
thousands of workers at these enterprises,
including Teamsters, would be stripped of
their right to organize and collective bargaining. It would deprive
both tribal members and non-member employees of the right to form
unions and to bargain collectively for better wages, hours,
and working conditions. We should be work-
ing to expand the rights and ability of work-
ers to earn a decent living for themselves
and their families and to secure a safe and
healthy workplace.

While tribal casinos have been the focus of
discussion, this legislation affects not just
casino workers. Since the 1980’s tribes have
expanded business interests beyond casinos.
They now operate many different revenue
producing commercial enterprises—construc-
tion companies, mining operations, power
plants, golf courses, water parks and ski resorts,
to name a few.

In 2004, the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) (in San Manuel)
ruled that tribal enterprises should have NLRA pro-
tections. Shortly after the San Manuel deci-
sion, legislation, in the form of amendments,
was twice offered to block the NLRB from
enforcing the San Manuel decision. These
amendments were rejected. Since then, the
NLRB has proceeded in a measured fashion
asserting jurisdiction on a case-by-case basis.

The NLRB will not assert jurisdiction
where it would interfere with internal gov-
ernance matters or treaty rights. Otherwise,
the NLRB will protect workers’ rights at trib-
ally owned enterprises. The NLRB has taken
a careful approach to balancing tribal sovereignty interests with Fed-
eral law.

It should be noted that other important
federal laws that protect workers apply to
Indian businesses, such as the Occupational Safety and Health Act, the
Fair Labor Standards Act, the Employee Retirement In-
come Security Act, and Title III of the
Americans with Disabilities Act. Indeed,
courts have denied attempts to gain exemp-
tions on numerous occasions ruling commer-
cial tribal enterprises should not be excluded
from such laws.

One of your jobs as a representative
is to support workers employed by
casinos alone. Tribal casinos have created over
628,000 jobs. This legislation does not only apply
to casinos. It could impact dozens of other
businesses including power plants, mining
operations, and hotels.

UAW deeply believes in tribal sovereignty
and has a strong record in supporting civil
gen. We urge you to oppose H.R. 511.

Sincerely,

Anthony M. Perrone,
International President.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR
AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL OR-
GANIZATIONS,

Washington, DC, November 16, 2015.

Dear Representative: The AFL-CIO urges you to oppose the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act (H.R. 511), which would deny protection under the NLRA to a large number of workers who are employed by tribal-owned and -operated enterprises lo-
cated on Indian lands. This legislation, if passed, would impact 600,000 tribal casino workers, the vast majority of whom are not Native Amer-
icans. In recent years, there has been a sub-
stantial increase in gaming, and it would be impacted by this legislation—not only ca-
sinos, but mining operations, power plants,
The AFL–CIO does support the principle of sovereignty for tribal governments, but does not believe this principle should be used to deny workers their collective bargaining rights and freedom of association. While the AFL–CIO continues to support the concept of tribal sovereignty and self-governance, it is in no position to repudiate fundamental human rights that belong to every worker in every nation. Workers cannot be denied any legally enforceable right to form unions and bargain collectively in instances where they are working for a tribal enterprise which is simply a commercial operation competing with non-tribal businesses.

This view has been confirmed by the International Labor Organization (ILO), an agency of the United Nations. In its report on the question about whether excluding workers employed on tribal lands from the NLRA would “extend beyond the tribe’s business enterprise and regulate intramural matters.” However, the test articulated in San Manuel provides for a careful balancing of the tribal sovereignty interests with the Federal protection of the self-organization and ‘organizing’ rights of workers. In the Board’s view, the NLRA will apply if it would “abrogate Indian treaty rights.” The Board in San Manuel also considered other factors, including that the casino in question was a mixed operation competing with non-tribal businesses, and that its customers were primarily non-Native American.

In San Manuel, the Board concluded that applying the NLRA would not interfere with the tribe’s autonomy, and the effects of the NLRA would not “extend beyond the tribe’s business enterprise and regulate intramural matters.” However, the test articulated in San Manuel provides for a careful balancing of the tribal sovereignty interests with the Federal protection of the self-organization and ‘organizing’ rights of workers. In the Board’s view, the NLRA will apply if it would “abrogate Indian treaty rights.” The Board in San Manuel also considered other factors, including that the casino in question was a mixed operation competing with non-tribal businesses, and that its customers were primarily non-Native American.

The AFL–CIO does support the principle of sovereignty for tribal governments, but does not believe this principle should be used to deny workers their collective bargaining rights and freedom of association. While the AFL–CIO continues to support the concept of tribal sovereignty and self-governance, it is in no position to repudiate fundamental human rights that belong to every worker in every nation. Workers cannot be denied any legally enforceable right to form unions and bargain collectively in instances where they are working for a tribal enterprise which is simply a commercial operation competing with non-tribal businesses.

This view has been confirmed by the International Labor Organization (ILO), an agency of the United Nations. In its report on the question about whether excluding workers employed on tribal lands from the NLRA would “extend beyond the tribe’s business enterprise and regulate intramural matters.” However, the test articulated in San Manuel provides for a careful balancing of the tribal sovereignty interests with the Federal protection of the self-organization and ‘organizing’ rights of workers. In the Board’s view, the NLRA will apply if it would “abrogate Indian treaty rights.” The Board in San Manuel also considered other factors, including that the casino in question was a mixed operation competing with non-tribal businesses, and that its customers were primarily non-Native American. Workers cannot be denied any legally enforceable right to form unions and bargain collectively in instances where they are working for a tribal enterprise which is simply a commercial operation competing with non-tribal businesses.

This view has been confirmed by the International Labor Organization (ILO), an agency of the United Nations. In its report on the question about whether excluding workers employed on tribal lands from the NLRA would “extend beyond the tribe’s business enterprise and regulate intramural matters.” However, the test articulated in San Manuel provides for a careful balancing of the tribal sovereignty interests with the Federal protection of the self-organization and ‘organizing’ rights of workers. In the Board’s view, the NLRA will apply if it would “abrogate Indian treaty rights.” The Board in San Manuel also considered other factors, including that the casino in question was a mixed operation competing with non-tribal businesses, and that its customers were primarily non-Native American.

The AFL–CIO does support the principle of sovereignty for tribal governments, but does not believe this principle should be used to deny workers their collective bargaining rights and freedom of association. While the AFL–CIO continues to support the concept of tribal sovereignty and self-governance, it is in no position to repudiate fundamental human rights that belong to every worker in every nation. Workers cannot be denied any legally enforceable right to form unions and bargain collectively in instances where they are working for a tribal enterprise which is simply a commercial operation competing with non-tribal businesses.

This view has been confirmed by the International Labor Organization (ILO), an agency of the United Nations. In its report on the question about whether excluding workers employed on tribal lands from the NLRA would “extend beyond the tribe’s business enterprise and regulate intramural matters.” However, the test articulated in San Manuel provides for a careful balancing of the tribal sovereignty interests with the Federal protection of the self-organization and ‘organizing’ rights of workers. In the Board’s view, the NLRA will apply if it would “abrogate Indian treaty rights.” The Board in San Manuel also considered other factors, including that the casino in question was a mixed operation competing with non-tribal businesses, and that its customers were primarily non-Native American. Workers cannot be denied any legally enforceable right to form unions and bargain collectively in instances where they are working for a tribal enterprise which is simply a commercial operation competing with non-tribal businesses.

This view has been confirmed by the International Labor Organization (ILO), an agency of the United Nations. In its report on the question about whether excluding workers employed on tribal lands from the NLRA would “extend beyond the tribe’s business enterprise and regulate intramural matters.” However, the test articulated in San Manuel provides for a careful balancing of the tribal sovereignty interests with the Federal protection of the self-organization and ‘organizing’ rights of workers. In the Board’s view, the NLRA will apply if it would “abrogate Indian treaty rights.” The Board in San Manuel also considered other factors, including that the casino in question was a mixed operation competing with non-tribal businesses, and that its customers were primarily non-Native American. Workers cannot be denied any legally enforceable right to form unions and bargain collectively in instances where they are working for a tribal enterprise which is simply a commercial operation competing with non-tribal businesses.
Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Mr. SCOTT. He is a dedicated Representative for additional information. I urge my colleagues to support this long overdue bill.

The Speaker pro tempore. The question is on the motion. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act and friend of our Native American tribes.

The Speaker pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 526, the question is on the passage of the bill. The question was taken; and the bill was ordered engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time. The Speaker pro tempore. The question is the on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Speaker pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 526, I offer a motion. The Speaker pro tempore. The motion is the on the motion. The Clerk will report the motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Kline moves that the House insist on its amendment to S. 1177 and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act to ensure that any enterprise or institution owned and operated by an Indian tribe would be treated with parity by any state or local government.

This legislation is necessary to reverse a 2004 National Labor Relations Board's ruling which increased the jurisdiction of the NLRA to cover tribal operations. H.R. 511 promotes tribal sovereignty and allows the tribal government to make decisions that are the best for their people, and it will ensure the Federal Government honors and respects the sovereignty of the tribal nations.

As a proud original cosponsor of the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act and friend of our Native American tribes. Today, we have made to Native Americans that is unique to its status, fulfilling just such governmental functions (providing free health care services solely to tribal members.)." Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation, 341 NLRB 139 (2004).

The Speaker pro tempore. The question is on the motion. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 1177, STUDENT SUCCESS ACT

Mr. KLINE, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 526, I offer a motion. The Speaker pro tempore. The motion is the on the motion. The Clerk will report the motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Kline moves that the House insist on its amendment to S. 1177 and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The Speaker pro tempore. The question is the on the motion. The Speaker pro tempore. The motion is the on the motion. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE).
The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conference on S. 1177:

Mr. Kline, Ms. Foxx, Messrs. Roe of Tennessee, Thompson of Pennsylvania, Guthrie, Rokita, Messer, Grothman, Russell, Curbelo of Florida, Scott of Virginia, Mrs. Davis of California, Ms. Fudge, Mr. Polis, Ms. Wilson of Florida, Ms. Bonamici, and Ms. Clark of Massachusetts.

There was no objection.

TRIBAL LABOR SOVEREIGNTY ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 511) to clarify the rights of Indians and Indian tribes on Indian lands under the National Labor Relations Act, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. GOSWAMI. Pursuant to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 249, nays 177, not voting 7, as follows:

(No Roll No. 633

YEAS—249

Noem Newhouse Noordeweer

Neubauer Newhouse Noordeweer

Nolte Nugent Nunan

Norris Olsen Palazzo

Palmer Palmer Pearson Perry

Petersen Pletinger Pitts

Poliquin Pompeyo Ponce

Price, Tom Pomroy

Poliquin Pompeyo Ponce

Price, Tom Pomroy

Poliquin Pompeyo Ponce

Price, Tom Pomroy

Pollak Pouliot Powell

Poliquin Pompeyo

Pomroy Ponce

Poliquin Pompeyo

Pomroy Ponce

Poliquin Pompeyo

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce

Pomroy Ponce
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whereas the attacks on the Bataclan concert hall in Paris, the Petit Cambodge restaurant, Le Belle Equipe bar, and on the Avenue de la Republique in the 10th district, represent the largest terrorist attacks in Europe since the Madrid, Spain, train bombings of 2004;

whereas American student Nohemi Gonzalez, 23, of El Monte, California, is among the innocent lives lost in these terrorist attacks, with several Americans injured;

whereas French first responders and law enforcement are heroically and heroically, in one instance blocking entrance of a suicide bomber to the Stade de France, doubtlessly saving dozens of lives;

whereas seven terrorists were killed, most in suicide bombings and one in a shoot-out with police, and French intelligence and law enforcement are still pursuing those possibly connected to the attacks;

whereas French President Francois Hollande vowed that “we will fight, and we will be ruthless”;

whereas NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg stated that the Alliance would stand with France and remain “strong and united” against terrorism;

whereas President Barack Obama stated, “Once again we’ve seen an outrageous attempt to terrorize innocent civilians. This attack is not just on Paris . . . this is an attack on all of humanity and the universal values that we share. We stand prepared and ready to provide whatever assistance that the Government and the people of France need to respond.”;

whereas the so-called “Islamic State of Iraq and Syria” (ISIS) claimed responsibility for this attack;

whereas the precise coordination of these attacks at multiple sites across Paris, along with the recent downing of a Russian airplane in Egypt, and the double suicide bombing in a shopping district in Beirut—brutal attacks, with several Americans injured;

whereas the continued and enhanced coordination of law enforcement and intelligence efforts amongst European countries is critical to inhibiting the movement and support for ISIS-affiliated terrorist cells;

whereas intelligence cooperation, law enforcement engagement, and information sharing on emerging threats and identified Islamist extremists greatly improves security for the people of the United States, Europe, and our allies around the world;

whereas the loss of innocent lives in Paris strengthens our resolve to defeat ISIS and its terrorist affiliates which pose a growing threat to international peace and stability;

whereas France has been our indispensable ally in our joint coalition efforts to defeat ISIS;

whereas France has long been an ally and friend to the United States since the birth of our Nation, throughout the major conflicts of the 20th century, and has provided significant assistance to key United States strategic priorities such as combating terrorism in northern Africa; and

whereas we stand in solidarity with our French allies in their time of national mourning, ready to provide assistance in bringing to justice all those involved with the planning and execution of these attacks, as well as identifying and thwarting any planning to undertake similar assaults in the future, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representa- (1) condemns in the strongest terms the terrorist attacks in Paris, France, on November 13, 2015, that resulted in the loss of at least 129 innocent lives and the severe wounding of many hundreds; (2) expresses its condolences to the families and friends of those individuals who were killed in the attacks and expresses its sympathies to those individuals who have been injured; (3) supports the Government of France in its efforts to bring to justice all those involved with the planning and execution of these terrorist attacks; (4) remains concerned regarding the flow of foreign fighters to and from the Middle East and North Africa and the threat posed by these fighters upon their return to their local communities; and (5) expresses its readiness to assist the Government and people of France to respond to the growing terrorist threat posed by the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) and its terrorist affiliates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENRAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this resolution. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 524, condemning the series of terrorist attacks in France carried out by Islamist extremists last week.

It was just after 9 p.m. on Friday, November 13, when a night of terror fell over Paris, France. That is when ISIS launched three waves of terrorist attacks on the French capital, killing at least 130 people and wounding more than 350 others. At least one American, Nohemi Gonzalez of El Monte, California, was killed in the attacks, while several more were injured.

The first wave involved three suicide bombers at the Stade de France, where thousands, including the French President, were watching a soccer game between France and Germany.

The second wave involved shooting at several restaurants, bars, and cafes in the 10th and 11th districts of Paris. A suicide bomber blew himself up on a nearby street.

And the third wave involved a mass shooting at the Bataclan music hall, where an American rock band was playing music. The attackers took theater attendees hostage and started to systematically shoot members of the audience. They detonated suicide vests as the police launched an assault on the theater. This is where most of the killing that night took place.

In claiming responsibility for the attacks, ISIS called them “the first storm.” The Paris attacks came a day after ISIS carried out a double suicide bombing in Beirut, Lebanon, and 2 weeks after ISIS claimed responsibility for downing a Russian passenger jet in Egypt’s Sinai Peninsula.

Indeed, U.S. officials, including the CIA Director, have warned that these attacks demonstrate a commitment by ISIS to conduct attacks outside of Syria and Iraq, reaching further and further from their home base. And yesterday, ISIS released a video threatening attacks here on Washington, D.C., which U.S. counterterrorism officials are taking seriously.

Mr. Speaker, there are no words we can say today that will comfort the families and friends of the 129 people murdered in these terrorist attacks. The victims included Parisians from every walk of life. And there are no words strong enough to condemn these terrorists and their radical ideology. ISIS is waging war on anyone who disagrees with their violent world view. And, frankly, they view everyone else as apostates to be killed.

Alarming, their fighting force continues to grow, thanks in part to a steady stream of foreign recruits. More than 30,000 fighters have made it to Syria and Iraq from more than 100 countries, and it is estimated that more than 4,500 hold Western passports, with more than 250 Americans among them. This “terrorist diaspora” is a plane-ride from Europe—and even from the United States.

This resolution is on the House record as condemning in the strongest terms possible the Paris attacks and extends the sympathy of every American to those affected by this tragedy. It reaffirms our support for France, America’s sister republic and oldest ally.

This is a time to not just express sorrow for those killed but also a time to show resolve in this fight.

Our intelligence-sharing with allies, as strong as it is, needs to get sharper: border checks will need to be improved; online recruitment of terrorists need to be checked; and coalition efforts to destroy ISIS will need to be stepped up. I urge all Members to support this resolution.

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

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

This resolution is the support of this measure. First of all, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of Chairman ROYCE. I think that all of us share the horror of what happened in Paris just a few short days ago.

Terrorism, Mr. Speaker, want to make their enemies live their lives in fear and retreat from the freedom which underpins our society. But I...
think the fanatics responsible for this attack underestimate the French people.

Across the centuries, Paris and France have seen far worse: a bloody revolution, the darkest days of two World Wars, a Nazi occupation that marched columns of German troops beneath the Arc de Triomphe and down the Champs-Élysées. And all the while, the Republic emerged even stronger and more committed to the values of liberty, equality, and fraternity—values that we cherish and that bind the U.S. and France together.

The people of France will endure and the City of Light will shine even brighter. Last week’s attacks were an atrocity, but they won’t break the spirit of the French people. And as France grieves and moves forward, the United States will be standing shoulder to shoulder alongside our oldest ally in friendship and solidarity.

But, let’s be clear: friendship and solidarity is what is needed in the wake of these attacks. What is needed is clarity, resolve, and action.

Clearly, ISIS is an enemy that must be defeated. So we need to ramp up our information sharing and intelligence efforts with our allies and partners to figure out how ISIS orchestrated this plot and to prevent future attacks.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), chairman of the House Intelligence Committee.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank the chairman, Chairman ROYCE, and Ranking Member ENGEL for the great leadership they are providing at this moment in our history when we need that type of leadership the most.

What we are witnessing is an attack on Western civilization. Radical Islamic terrorists are seeking to terrorize the West into a retreat.

We fought and defeated an evil ideology that would have implanted an atheist dictatorship on the world not that long ago. We defeated this evil force, Communism, just as we defeated the Nazism and Japanese militarism before that.

Today, the West again is confronted with an evil force that would threaten the world. Again, America must stand tall, and we must provide the leadership to save mankind from this evil threat. We will defeat radical Islamic terrorism. We are Americans. We will lead the way.

We say to the people of France at this moment of suffering: Lafayette, we are with you.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), who is the ranking member of the House Intelligence Committee.

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as co-chair of the House’s France Caucus, I rise to speak today with a heavy heart. The barbaric attacks by ISIL-affiliated extremists in Paris on Friday evening were a savage attempt to shake the foundations of the civilized world.

The victims, their families, and their loved ones are in our thoughts and our hearts, and we send them our deepest condolences in this enormously difficult time.

The indiscriminate brutality of last Friday’s rampage has shocked the conscience of people around the world. But let us be clear, the forces of ISIL cannot finish the City of Light, and we will not reap the panic and fear that they are attempting to sow.

The United States stands with France today, as we have done for more than two centuries, as a partner, a friend, and an ally. We will confront this evil together and, in the names of all of those who have suffered so mercilessly at the hands of ISIL, we will defeat it. Violence, intolerance, and repression are no match for liberty, equality, and fraternity—liberte, egalite, and fraternite.

I stand today in solidarity with the people of France and the people of all nations who would choose freedom over tyranny.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTANZ).

Mr. LATTANZ. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as co-chairman of the Congressional French Caucus, I too extend heartfelt condolences and prayers to the victims of the tragic terrorist attack in Paris, to their families, Parisians, and the entire nation of France as we mourn the loss of innocent life.

We are unified in our dedication to the protection and preservation of liberty and committed to ensuring those who have perpetrated these attacks are brought to justice. ISIS poses a clear and present danger to the United States and to our allies across the world. They are a threat to all those who promote freedom. Our survival is inextricably linked.

The United States and our allies, including those in NATO, must stand together with great resolve to defeat this threat and ensure the security of freedom-loving people across the world.

I urge passage of this resolution.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a very well-respected member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with the chairman and ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee to condemn the November 13 attacks in Paris.

This is a time of mourning for many families who have lost their loved ones. Let’s pause for a moment to reflect on those lives that were cut short and honor their memory with a solemn promise to bring to justice those responsible for this senseless violence.

The violent extremists who carried out those attacks have sowed a great nation and an ally of the United States.

From the American Revolution to the liberation of Paris, our two countries have established a special bond forged in the darkest hours of our shared history. The full measure of our creation is, in part, owed to the people of France, and we must come to their aid in this difficult time.

I am doing so, not out of fear, but out of confidence: confident that we have the means to maintain the safety and security of free societies in which we live, and confident that those societies are worth preserving. It is in this manner that a liberated Paris will endure.

I support this legislation.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER).

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, our prayers go out to the families whose loved ones were murdered or wounded in the pointless acts of violence carried out in Paris on November 14.

These were attacks on innocent people by Islamic terrorists, recruited, trained, equipped, and directed by a degraded group of people known as ISIS. These are our enemies. They may be difficult to know, but not impossible to defeat, and we will defeat them.

I commend the French President for calling this what it is: an act of war. This is, indeed, a war declared on Western civilization—in fact, all of civilization by Islamic terrorists who are so consumed with pure evil that they believe that the slaughter of innocence is the path to paradise.
We will never give up in this war. France is the oldest ally of the United States. In fact, a portrait of the Marquis de Lafayette, whose assistance was integral to the birth of our Nation, hangs in this very Chamber. If France is at war, the United States must be at war as well.

In the strongest terms, I condemn Islamic terrorism around the world, and I pledge solidarity and commitment to our French brothers and sisters.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from California. I think many of us will come to the floor and emphasize that we stand with both Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ENGEL for this very strong statement of commitment by the people of the United States to stand with the people of France.

My heart cried and my soul was distressed as the video began to unfold and the most heinous acts of attacking innocent persons, persons who had gone to a stadium to be with friends and relatives; maybe fathers with young sons; maybe families with two or three or four soccer players, the brothers and sisters, as was noted by one of the soccer players whose sister was lost, who had come to see him play; maybe as the beautiful young woman from California experiencing her dreams, a beautiful designer—I pay tribute to her courage and inspiration—who just was enjoying the ambience and culture of France in the beautiful outdoor cafes that many travel to France just to experience. She lost her life, a beautiful flower, someone who was going to be a young lady who would obtain her dreams. They didn’t care about that. All they cared about was the vile violence of killing.

I am very much in solidarity, as we move forward, to not allow and tolerate ISIS/ISIL continuing their violent ways. I want peace, Mr. Speaker. All of us want peace. But ISIL must be eliminated, and we must do things differently here in this country.

We have been vigilant. We have changed our ways since 9/11. We do “see something, say something.” But I believe as we proceed, we must act not out of fear, but of rational thought. We must be vigilant. We must be on the radar station of young people; and the efforts of the administration, countering violent terrorism, extremism, has been an effective tool of meeting Muslim communities all over America, letting them know that if they see something, they can say something.

We must address the question of vulnerabilities in places like airports and large venues, not be shameful about enhancing security, but recognizing that our values of democracy and freedom and access are very important. I think we can do that. We did it after 9/11 with the USA PATRIOT Act, and we have continued to do it.

It is our heritage to be free and to have a democratic process. It is our heritage to our friends who first established these tenets of democracy that we followed here in the United States.

So, to the people of France, we know that you will act, but we ask you to remember the wonderful leadership that you have given of democracy and freedom and the tenets of liberty. We know that liberty and freedom are not free, but it is important to be able to acknowledge these horrible and outrageous acts.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 524, and I call upon America to be vigilant, diligent, but not to act in fear.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in sorrow and outrage but in strong support of H. Res. 524, a bipartisan resolution that condemns “in the strongest terms the terrorist attacks in Paris, France, on November 13, 2015, that resulted in the loss of at least 129 lives.”

The first two decades of the new millennium will forever be known for barbaric attacks on innocent civilian populations by terrorists on a scale not seen since the end of World War II.

If the succeeding decades are to redeem the first two, then the civilized world must act in concert, with one accord and one resolve, to defeat the terrorists who refuse to make peace with the modern world and instead make war on people who wish only to remain free and enjoy the blessings of liberty.

Mr. Speaker, we stand in unyielding solidarity with the people of France, which like the United States is one of the most welcoming nations in the world.

Right now, our prayers are with the victims and their families at this terrible time.

Mr. Speaker, for centuries Paris has been known to the world as the City of Light. The title is richly deserved because Paris has been a world leader in the march of human progress in the arts, culture, science, democratic theory and governance, and in embrace the challenges and opportunities of the modern world.

Those who think that they can terrorize the people of France or the values that they cherish underestimat a nation that has faced and prevailed against far more sinister and lethal adversities.

And they will again, but they will not confront these adversaries alone.

They will be joined by the United States and the other countries of the civilized world. The French are justly proud of their national motto, “Liberté, égalité, fraternité,” (liberty, equality, fraternity) and no act of terrorism by cowardly perpetrators will succeed in leading them to renounce their heritage of freedom and justice.

It is a heritage that we here in the United States share.

And that is why the civilized world must and will rededicate itself to combating and defeating radicalism.

And as has been done many times throughout the long and special relationship between the United States and France, we will face and overcome threats to our way of life together.

We will not bow and will never break; we will not falter or fail.

We will respond. We will endure. We will overcome.

The terrorist attacks in Paris on Friday were horrific acts on innocent civilians perpetrated by depraved individuals who misuse the peaceful religion of Islam for their own misguided purposes.

Their horrible and heinous acts are their responsibility, and theirs alone, and for which there is no measure that they alone will be held accountable.

We will never forget what happened on Friday, November 13, 2015, which will be forever known in France and throughout the civilized world as “Black Friday.” And we will always remember the many innocent lives cut short by the outrageous and heinous acts of terrorism that shocked and rocked the people of Paris last Friday and earned the lasting enmity of peaceful and freedom loving people around the world.

I ask a moment of silence for the victims killed and injured in the terrorist attacks last Friday in Paris.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Mississippi (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H. Res. 524. Like all Americans, I was shocked and saddened by the terrorist attacks in Paris, France. As Americans, we must stand united with the people of France in their grief.

The stories of innocent civilians being slaughtered on the streets of Paris serve as stark reminders that we must do everything in our power to prevent this type of attack from occurring in the United States.

Investigations have revealed that one of the terrorists entered Europe with migrants fleeing the Syrian civil war. In light of these reports, it is essential that we pause the process of refugees coming into the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the attacks in Paris show the danger of open border policies. The United States must not allow any refugees into our country without exhaustive security screenings.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER).

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my prayers and deepest sympathies to the people of Paris.

As Americans, we share in the shock, the horror, and the tremendous sense of loss you now feel following the ruthless, unprovoked terrorist attack against your great country. We stand with you against ISIS in defense of our shared values of freedom, liberty, and equality under the law.

Mr. Speaker, the world needs America to lead with clarity and resolve in the fight against terror. Contrary to the President’s assertion that ISIS is
Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for bringing this resolution to the floor. It is sad that we bring this resolution to the floor, and it is sad that too often we see the results of terrorism around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support—as I think all Members will—of this resolution expressing Congress' solidarity with the people of Paris and all of France after Friday's terror attacks.

Americans know that Paris is the "City of Light."

On Friday evening, 129 very bright and vibrant lights were suddenly extinguished, leaving a dark void in the heart of that city and in the hearts of millions across France, America, and the world. Our flag on this Capitol stands at half-staff in memory of those 129 souls.

As we mourn them, pray for their families, and offer our aid, the world will wonder with a firm resolve to deny the perpetrators a chance to instill in us that which they seek: fear.

These attacks were carried out by individuals who follow a hopeless ideology, who look with awe to a twisted past, and who are blind to a better future the rest of us can envision. Without a belief in tomorrow, there is only fear and the acts of cowardice it inspires.

But the French Republic and the American Revolution began neither born in fear nor do we live in fear. We were born in hope and in courage. We were born looking forward. Both our nations were founded upon the same ideals of liberty, democracy, and individual rights espoused by Rousseau and Jefferson, Montesquieu and Paine. The Marquis de Lafayette is the only substantial painting—other than the Father of our Nation, George Washington—to be pictured in this hall of democracy by a Frenchman. And it was the French with the liaison of Marquis de Lafayette as France stood with us for freedom, for equality, and, yes, for fraternity, brotherhood between us and them.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, across the hall, as I think all Members will, in the midst of a major traffic circle in Paris, on the river from the Eiffel Tower, in the midst of what historians in the future call ISIS or Daesh, they will surely be using only the past tense. It is why the people of France and America and all who cherish the freedom to think, to speak, to worship, and to strive for a better tomorrow must stand together, as we have before, and shine the bright light of our values and our principles into the darkness we confront.

We are all French today—nous sommes francois. It will not be quick. It will not be easy. But we will test our idea, we will test our will. But with Lafayette watching over us in this House, with George Washington standing guard over the City of Paris, and with Lady Liberty holding her torch high, surely France and America and all those who cherish liberty and justice throughout the world will continue to cast a light of hope, strength, and freedom upon our world.

May God bless our French brothers and sisters. We send them our sympathy and we pledge them our resolve.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.
States and by our original ally, France, in our own effort to achieve the dream of that freedom. It is that freedom that is under assault.

The unfortunate reality, Mr. Speaker, is that these attacks in Paris are indicative of a resurgent terrorism that is continuing to build.

I mentioned that there were some 30,000 fighters. Those fighters, my friends, came from all over the world. They came from across the globe on a virtual caliphate called the Internet in order to join Islamic State and in order to join what they call their caliphate. The intent of their caliphate is to put an end to the freedom that is enjoyed by those that they consider apostates, the freedom enjoyed by civilization itself.

The great sorrow that we express here today on this floor is over the fact that, of those young people murdered and maimed in this attack, the vast majority of them were under 30 years of age. They had their whole lives ahead of them when they were targeted, civilians targeted for this kind of mayhem.

Mr. Speaker, the resolve we show with our brothers and sisters in France is a resolve that freedom will be the rallying cry. Civilization will be the test. Freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and freedom of assembly under democracy are the rights of civilized people. Those who bring barbarism and attack the institutions and attack civilians targeted for this kind of mayhem.

We reaffirm our support for France, and we reaffirm our support for the French Government and the words and the actions that they have taken in the wake of this attack.

Yes, here in this Chamber we have Lafayette’s portrait. At the end of that War for Independence—and this is why his portrait is here—he said to us, “Humanity has now won its battle. Liberty has a country.” And after we achieved our freedom, France went on to achieve their freedom.

But now liberty is under assault. That is why today we bring this resolution to the floor of this House, to say that America must continue to stand shoulder to shoulder with the French in their fight against tyranny, in their fight against this terror, and in the hope that this will give an example to the rest of the world in standing up to ISIS and to make certain that our basic liberties are protected around this world.

I am going to quote David Petraeus, who recently gave us these remarks. He said that Syria is a geopolitical Chernobyl. He said, “Like a nuclear disaster, the fallout from the meltdown of Syria threatens to be with us for decades, and the longer it is permitted to continue, the more severe the damage will be.”

We have had this relationship tested many times. France has had its relationship with us tested many times. Tonight we stand together with France in our commitment to see this through and to make certain that ISIS is not merely contained, but to make certain that ISIS is ultimately destroyed.

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

Ms. SINEMA, Mr. Speaker, we come together to honor the victims of the horrific terrorist attacks in Paris and to condemn these barbaric acts.

These attacks claimed the lives of 129 innocent people and wounded more than 350 others. Our hearts ache for the victims and their families.

Today, our resolve to punish the perpetrators and destroy the Islamic State and other terrorists is only stronger.

We stand in solidarity with the French people. Together we will defeat terrorism around the world and here in the U.S.

The Islamic State is one of the world’s most violent and dangerous terrorist groups. To keep our country safe, we must be one step ahead of them, cutting off their funding and stopping their efforts.

As a member of the Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing, I offered an amendment, accepted as part of the National Defense Authorization Act, to direct the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury, to shut down ISIL’s oil revenues and report on resources needed for these efforts.

I also included language in the Intelligence Authorization Act directing the Intelligence Community to dedicate the necessary resources to defeat the Islamic State’s revenue mechanisms.

The attacks in Paris underscore the urgency with which we must pursue the defeat of ISIL. These murders foment violence, destabilize the Middle East, and present a clear threat to the United States and our allies.

I will continue to work with my colleagues on both sides to destroy ISIL and strengthen the safety and security of Arizona families.

We stand with the people of France. We stand with all decent peoples around the world who respect and cherish life.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The recess having expired, the House stood in recess.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL) at 5 o’clock and 21 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1210, PORTFOLIO LENDING AND MORTGAGE ACCESS ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3189, FED OVERSIGHT REFORM AND MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM NOVEMBER 20, 2015, THROUGH NOVEMBER 27, 2015

Mr. STIVERS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-341) on the resolution (H. Res. 529) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1210) to amend the Truth in Lending Act to provide a safe harbor from certain requirements related to qualified mortgages for residential mortgage loans held on an originating depository institution’s portfolio, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3189) to amend the Federal Reserve Act to establish requirements for policy rules and blackout periods of the Federal Open Market Committee; establish requirements for certain activities of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and to amend title 31, United States Code, to reform the manner in which the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is audited, and for other purposes; and providing for proceedings during the period from November 20, 2015, through November 27, 2015, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

2015 NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-79)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Agriculture, Committee on Appropriations, Committee on Education and the Workforce, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Committee on Financial Services, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Committee on Homeland Security, Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Natural Resources, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, Committee on Ways and Means, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the 2015 National Drug Control Strategy, my Administration’s 21st century approach to drug policy that works to reduce illicit drug use and its consequences in the United States. This evidence-based plan, which balances public health and public safety efforts to prevent, treat,
and provide recovery from the disease of addiction, seeks to build a healthier, safer, and more prosperous country.

Since the release of my Administration's inaugural National Drug Control Strategy in 2010, we have seen significant progress in addressing challenges we face along the entire spectrum of drug policy—including prevention, early intervention, treatment, recovery support, criminal justice reform, law enforcement, and international cooperation. However, we still face serious drug-related challenges. Illicit drug use is a public health issue that jeopardizes not only our well-being, but also the progress we have made in strengthening our economy—contributing to addiction, disease, lower student academic performance, crime, unemployment, and lost productivity.

Therefore, we continue to pursue a drug policy that is effective, compassionate, and just. We are working to erase the stigma of addiction, ensuring treatment and a path to recovery for those with substance use disorders. We continue to research the health risks of drug use to encourage healthy behaviors, particularly among young people. We are reforming our criminal justice system, providing alternatives to incarceration for non-violent, substance-involved offenders, improving re-entry programs, and addressing unfair sentencing disparities. We continue to devote significant law enforcement resources to reduce the supply of drugs via sea, air, and land interdiction, and law enforcement operations and investigations. We also continue to partner with our international allies, helping them address transnational organized crime, while addressing substance use disorders and other public health issues.

I thank the Congress for its continued support of our efforts. I look forward to joining with them and all our local, State, tribal, national and international partners to advance this important undertaking.

Barack Obama.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 17, 2015.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule 1, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.
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AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia) at 10 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CONFEREES ON H.R. 22, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION REAUTHORIZATION AND REFORM ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following additional conferees on H.R. 22: From the Committee on Armed Services, for consideration of section 1101 of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. THORNBERY, ROGERS of Alabama, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of sections 1109, 1201, 1202, 3003, Division B, sections 31101, 31201, and Division F of the House amendment and sections 11001, 11006, 11013, 21003, 21004, subtitles B and D of title XXXIV, sections 51101 and 51201 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. UPTON, MULLIN, and PAL-LOME.

From the Committee on Financial Services, for consideration of section 32202 and Division G of the House amendment and sections 52203 and 52205 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. HENSARLING, NEUGABER, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of sections 1313, 21009, and 43001 of the House amendment and sections 32502 and 35437 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. GOODLATTE, MARINO, and Ms. LOFGREN.

From the Committee on Natural Resources, for consideration of sections 1114–16, 1120, 1301, 1302, 1304, 1305, 1307, 1308, 1310–13, 1316, 1317, 10001, and 10002 of the House amendment and sections 11024–27, 11101–13, 11116–18, 15006, 31103–05, and 73103 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, LAHODY, and GRJALVA.

From the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for consideration of sections 5106, 5223, 5205, 5206, 61003, and 61004 of the House amendment and sections 12004, 21019, 31203, 32401, 32508, 32606, 33203, 33311, and 33312 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. INGAURADO, HURT of Texas, and CONNOLLY.

From the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for consideration of sections 3008, 3015, 4003, and title VI of the House amendment and sections 11001, 12001, 12002, 12004, 12102, 21009, 21017, subtitle B of title XXXI, sections 35105 and 72003 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Ms. EDWARDS.

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of sections 31101, 31201, and 31203 of the House amendment, and sections 51101, 52101, 52103, 52103–05, 52108, 62001, and 74001 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. BRADY of Texas, REICHERT, and LEVIN.

There was no objection. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the additional conferees.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of attending a family funeral.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1356. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate.

There was no objection. Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 18, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3481. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's Semiannual Report for the period ending September 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); Public Law 95-452, Sec. 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3482. A letter from the Director, Office of Financial Management, United States Capital Police, transmitting the Statement of Disbursements for the United States Capitol Police for the period April 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 191(a); Public Law 108-55, Sec. 1005; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.


3484. A letter from the Deputy Under Secretary for Management and Chief Financial
REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STIVERS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 329. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1210) to amend the Truth in Lending Act to provide a safe harbor from certain requirements related to qualified mortgages for residential mortgage loans held on an originating depository institution’s portfolio, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3189) to establish requirements for policy rules and blackout periods of the Federal Open Market Committee, to establish requirements for certain activities of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and to amend title 31, United States Code, to reform the critical and declining status; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself and Mr. DESALVADORI):
H.R. 4028. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that refugees may not be resettled in any State where the governor of the State has taken any action, formally or informally, disapproving of the resettlement of refugees in that State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWAB (for himself and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):
H.R. 4029. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to participant votes on the suspension of benefits under multiemployer plans in critical and declining status; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALAZZO:
H.R. 4030. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that refugees may not be resettled in any State where the governor of the State has taken any action, formally or informally, disapproving of the resettlement of refugees in that State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE:
H.R. 4031. A bill to prohibit obligation of Federal funds for admission of refugees from Syria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Duncan of South Carolina, Mr. Loudermilk, Mr. Westerman, Mr. Smith of Texas, Mr. Farentino, Mr. Lamb, Mr. Babin, Mr. Weber of Texas, Mr. Collins of Georgia, Mr. Conaway, and Mr. Massie):
H.R. 4032. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for a limitation on the resettlement of refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:
H.R. 4033. A bill to temporarily suspend the admission of refugees from Syria and Iraq into the United States and to give States the authority to reject admission of refugees into its territory from that land; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLEMING:
H.R. 4034. A bill to require fencing along and operational control of the southwest border, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FLEMING:
H.R. 4035. A bill to prohibit consumers by prohibiting the Environmental Protection Agency from promulgating as final certain energy-related rules that are estimated to cost more than $100,000,000 and will cause significant adverse effects to the economy; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FLEMING:
H.R. 4036. A bill to prohibit any regulation regarding carbon dioxide or other greenhouse gas emissions reduction in the United States until Congress implements similar reductions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FLEMING:
H.R. 4037. A bill to prohibit the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from proposing, finalizing, implementing, or enforcing any prohibition or restriction under the Clean Air Act with respect to the emission of methane from the oil and natural gas source category; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. McCaul (for himself and Mr. HUDSON):
H.R. 4038. A bill to require that supplemental certifications and background investigations be completed prior to the admission of certain aliens as refugees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself, Ms. Judy Chu of California, Ms. Kelly of Illinois, Mrs. Lawrence, Mr. Payne, Mr. Takai, and Ms. Velázquez):
H.R. 4039. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a small business start-up tax credit for veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. Edwards, Mr. McDermott, Mr. Pascrell, and Mr. Wolfe):
H.R. 4040. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and extend certain tax incentives relating to energy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:
H.R. 4041. A bill to provide grants for high-quality prekindergarten programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. CLARK of New York:
H.R. 4043. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve the financial aid process for homeless children and youths and foster care children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CLAWSON of Florida:
H.R. 4044. A bill to prohibit obligation of Federal funds for admission of refugees from certain countries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Mr. Elder)
H.R. 4045. A bill to establish USAccounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself, Mr. Ryan of Wisconsin, Mr. Polan, Mr. Kind, Ms. Moore, Mr. Sensenbrenner, Mr. Grothman, and Mr. Reid):
H.R. 4046. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 220 East Oak Street, Glenwood City, Wisconsin, as the Second L. Ellen Ainsworth Memorial Post Office; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Ms. Ros-Lehtinen, Mr. Gonzalez, Mr. Cole):
H.R. 4047. A bill to amend chapter 329 of title 49, United States Code, to ensure that new vehicles enable fuel competition so as to reduce Federal dependency on foreign oil; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.
By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. FLEMING):

H.R. 4048. A bill to suspend the admission and resettlement of any seeking refugee status because of the conflict in Syria until adequate protocols are established to protect the national security of the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 4060. A bill to provide for the identification of certain dangerous railroad locations, and for the safety of passenger operations at such locations; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. LOVE (for herself, Mr. NEURBEI R, and Mr. HUZENGA of Michigan):

H.R. 4049. A bill to amend the Bank Hold ing Company Act of 1956 to exempt certain non-financial companies and smaller banking entities from the application of the Volcker Rule; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 4060. A bill to provide for the identification of certain dangerous railroad locations, and for the safety of passenger operations at such locations; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. J. AL GORE of Texas, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MENES, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 4052. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prioritize the treatment of veterans with traumatic brain injuries through the National Health Service Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 4054. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make grants for repair and remodeling of community centers, clinics, and hospitals that serve veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. TUCKER):

H.R. 4054. A bill to revise the 90-10 rule under the Higher Education Act of 1965 to count veterans' education benefits under such rule and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Ms. BASS, Ms. LEE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. HUSS of Michigan, Mr. HUIKSKAMP of Oregon, Mr. LEWANDOWSKI of Minnesota, Mr. Luetkemeyer, Mr. Bishop of Georgia, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SHERES, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mrs. WASHINGTON, Ms. CLAIRE of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RUSSELL, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. BLUM, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. HAIN, Mr. BLIRIKAS, Mr. LANZIKIN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H. Res. 530. A resolution expressing support for the goals of “National Adoption Day” and “National Adoption Month” by promoting national awareness of adoption and the children awaiting families, celebrating children and families involved in adoption, and encouraging the people of the United States to secure safety, permanency, and well-being for all children by Congress on Education and the Workforce.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 4023. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3, and Article I, section 8, clause 18.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 4024. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 4025. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

“Congress shall have Power . . . To establish uniform Rules of Naturalization . . . “

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 4026. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which states “The Congress shall have Power to establish uniform Rules of Naturalization . . .”

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 4027. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

“Congress shall have Power . . . To establish uniform Rules of Naturalization . . . “

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 4028. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DELBENE:

H.R. 4029. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

“Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce . . . “

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 4028. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JOYCE:

H.R. 4030. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power * * * to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.R. 4031. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Sec. 8, Clause 4 and Article I Sec. 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.R. 4031. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4: “Congress shall have Power To . . . establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization . . . “

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 4032. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 18

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 4033. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution. “The Congress shall have Power . . . To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization . . . “

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 4034. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which states “The Congress shall have Power to establish uniform Rules of Naturalization . . .”

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 4037. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which states “The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce among the several States.”

By Mr. McCaul:

H.R. 4038. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. HERNANDEZ of California:

H.R. 4039. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

“The Constitution of the United States provides clear authority for Congress to pass legislation regarding income taxes. Article I of the Constitution provides that “Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes . . . “ (Section 8, Clause 1).

By Mr. CARDENAS:

H.R. 4041. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitution of the United States provides clear authority for Congress to pass legislation regarding income taxes. Article I of the Constitution provides that “Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes . . . “ (Section 8, Clause 1).

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 4042. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
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.

The United States Constitution, Art. 1, Sec. 8, Clause 18

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:
H.R. 4046.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, U.S Constitution
By Mr. CLAWSON of Florida:
H.R. 4046.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:
H.R. 4055.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18
The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:
H.R. 4054.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:
H.R. 4054.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

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.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 78: Mr. Kildee.
H.R. 167: Mr. Pallone.
H.R. 317: Mr. Sanford.
H.R. 540: Mr. Posey.
H.R. 546: Mr. Takai, Mr. Gosar, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 592: Mr. Kennedy and Mr. LoBiondo.
H.R. 604: Mr. Sessions.
H.R. 605: Mr. Barletta.
H.R. 646: Mr. Lamborn and Mr. Courtney.
H.R. 654: Mr. Poe of Texas.
H.R. 711: Ms. Jackson Lee and Mr. Vela.
H.R. 771: Mr. Rohrabacher.
H.R. 814: Mr. Barletta, Mr. MacArthur, and Mr. Neugebauer.
H.R. 845: Mr. Tipton.
H.R. 878: Mr. Babin and Mr. Mullen.
H.R. 921: Mr. LaHood and Mr. Kinzinger of Illinois.
H.R. 985: Mr. Rokita, Mr. Lucas, Mr. Ashford, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 1019: Mr. Hastings.
H.R. 1093: Mr. Rothfus.
H.R. 1173: Mr. Capuano.
H.R. 1306: Mr. Hudson.
H.R. 1247: Ms. Adams.
H.R. 1248: Mr. Smith of Missouri.
H.R. 1255: Mr. Van Hollen.
H.R. 1258: Mr. Philippi.
H.R. 1238: Ms. Roybal Allard, Ms. Wilson of Florida, Mr. Loehsack, Mr. Lowenthal, and Mr. Sherman.
H.R. 1292: Mr. Cramer and Ms. Judy Chu of California.
H.R. 1310: Mrs. Lawrence.
H.R. 1346: Mr. Cummings.
H.R. 1401: Ms. Stefanik, Mr. Salmon, Mr. Crenshaw, and Mr. Wilson of South Carolina.
H.R. 1427: Mr. Swalwell of California, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Vargas, Ms. Franken of Florida, Mr. Fattah, Mr. Cicilline, Mr. Schiffer, and Ms. Kaptur.
H.R. 1492: Mr. Lee.
H.R. 1567: Mr. Huffman, Mr. Hanna, and Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York.
H.R. 1694: Mr. Cafero of Georgia.
H.R. 1695: Mr. Woodall, Mr. Graves of Missouri and Mr. Fincher.
H.R. 1670: Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania, Mr. DeSaulnier, Mr. Nungesser, Mr. Young of Iowa, Ms. Jackson Lee, Mr. Davis of Illinois, Mr. Duckworth, Mr. LoBorarcz, Mr. Rouzer, and Mr. Buc.

H.R. 1779: Ms. Duckworth.
H.R. 1786: Mrs. Wagner, Mr. Hunter, and Mr. Knight.
H.R. 1789: Mrs. Lumms.
H.R. 1805: Mr. Newhouse.
H.R. 1816: Mr. Walberg and Mr. Katko.
H.R. 1929: Mr. Young of Iowa.
H.R. 1941: Mr. Webster of Florida and Mr. Crawford.
H.R. 2016: Mr. DeSaulnier, Mr. Gutiérrez, and Mr. Cummings.
H.R. 2017: Ms. Jenkins of Kansas and Mr. Young of Iowa.
H.R. 2125: Mr. Nadler.
H.R. 2154: Mr. Israel.
H.R. 2342: Mr. Bishop of Georgia.
H.R. 2366: Mr. Lamborn.
H.R. 2403: Mr. Payne, Mrs. Beaty, and Mr. Polis.
H.R. 2434: Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2515: Mr. Curhelo of Florida and Mr. Blumenauer.
H.R. 2536: Mr. Rouzer.
H.R. 2536: Mr. Jolly.
H.R. 2538: Mr. LaMalfa.
H.R. 2657: Mr. Thompson of California, Mr. LaHood, and Mr. Crow.
H.R. 2698: Mrs. Kirkpatrick and Mr. Gravely.
H.R. 2759: Mr. DeSaulnier.
H.R. 2817: Mr. Quigley and Ms. Granger.
H.R. 2847: Mr. Rangel, Mr. Nolan, Mr. Mc District, Ms. Beatty, and Ms. DelBene.
H.R. 2849: Mr. DeSaulnier.
H.R. 2856: Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois.
H.R. 2874: Mr. Young of Iowa, Mr. Gosar, Mr. Babin, and Mr. Kildee.
H.R. 2963: Mr. Welch and Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2965: Mr. Rothfus.
H.R. 3110: Mr. King of Kentucky, Mr. Barr, Mr. Boustany, and Mr. Quigley.
H.R. 3119: Mr. Trott and Ms. Kuster.
H.R. 3316: Mr. Scalise, Mr. Loudermilk, Mr. Beye, Mr. Sanford, Mr. Gowdy, Mr. Williams, Mr. Graves of Georgia, Mr. Carter of Georgia, Mr. Boustany, Mr. Lance, Mr. Lamborn, Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania, Mr. Millie of Florida, and Mr. Floridians.
H.R. 3116: Mr. Caruso of Indiana, Ms. Tsonga, Mr. Trahan, Ms. Lee, Mr. Murphy of Pennsylvania, Mr. Crowley, Mr. Van Hollen, Mr. Vargas, Mr. Engel, Mr. Huffman, and Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York.
H.R. 3326: Mr. Lucas, Ms. Brownley of California, Mr. LoBiondo, and Mr. Welch.
H.R. 3339: Mr. Reid, Mr. Blumenauer, Ms. DeLauro, and Mrs. Hartzler.
H.R. 3340: Mr. Poe of Texas.
H.R. 3375: Mr. Larson of Washington.
H.R. 3397: Mr. Barr, Mr. Guthrie, and Mr. Huizenga of Michigan.
H.R. 3406: Mr. Delgado.
H.R. 3423: Ms. Duckworth and Ms. McSally.
H.R. 3451: Mr. Blumenauer.
H.R. 3471: Mr. Marchant.
H.R. 3513: Mr. Garamendi, Ms. Slaughter, Mr. Jeffries and Ms. Kaptur.
H.R. 3516: Mr. Brynk, Mr. Young of Alaska, and Mr. Fleischmann.
H.R. 3537: Mr. Allen.
H.R. 3541: Mr. Serrano.
H.R. 3573: Mr. Harper, Mr. Neugebauer, Mr. Smith of Nebraska, Mr. Weber of Texas, Mr. Ross, Mr. Young of Iowa, Mr. Abraham, Mr. Gosar, Mr. Crenshaw, Mr. Schweikerdt, Mr. Bilirakis, Mr. Kinzinger of Illinois, Mr. Kelly of Mississippi, Mr. Graves of Georgia, Mr. Sanford, Mr. Ratcliffe, Mrs. Constock, Mr. Gutiérrez, Mr. Lance, Mr. Walker, Mr. Russell, Mr. Miller of Florida, Mr. Lamborn, Mr. Wittman, Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania, Mr. Fitzpatrick, Mr. Carter of Texas, Mr. Collins of New York, Mr. Young of Indiana, Mr. Shuster, Mr. Marchant and Mr. Clawson of Florida.
H.R. 3591: Mr. Pascrell and Mr. LoBiondo.
H.R. 3663: Mr. Loback.
H.R. 3683: Mr. Ross and Mrs. Capps.
H.R. 3706: Mr. Sessions and Mr. Carson of Indiana.
H.R. 3711: Mr. Gallego.
H.R. 3724: Mr. Cuellar, Mr. Palazzo, Mr. Mullen, and Mr. Smith of Missouri.
H.R. 3730: Mr. Mulvaney.
H.R. 3733: Mr. Ted Lieu of California.
H.R. 3756: Mr. McKeon, Mr. Lowenthal, Mr. Hardy, Ms. Ros-Lehtinen, Mr. Desaulnier, and Mr. Costa.
H.R. 3790: Mr. Connolly, Ms. Schakowsky, Mr. Pocan, and Mr. Gutierrez.
H.R. 3765: Mr. Babin and Mr. Byrne.
H.R. 3793: Mrs. Davis of California, Mr. Quigley, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Takano, and Mrs. Watson Coleman.
H.R. 3799: Mr. Grottman, Mr. Miller of Florida, and Mr. Carter of Georgia.
H.R. 3802: Mr. Palazzo, Mr. Byrne, and Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois.
H.R. 3863: Ms. Jenkins of Kansas and Mr. Hensarling.
H.R. 3834: Mr. Grijalva and Mr. Carson of Indiana.
H.R. 3845: Mr. Blum, Mr. Newhouse, and Mr. LaHood.
H.R. 3860: Mr. Barletta.
H.R. 3865: Mr. Luettkenmeyer.
H.R. 3869: Mr. Messer.
H.R. 3870: Mr. Rangel, Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania, Mr. Jones, and Ms. Bordallo.
H.R. 3886: Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois and Mr. Hanna.
H.R. 3892: Mr. King of Iowa and Mr. Palazzo.
H.R. 3914: Mr. Miller of Florida.
H.R. 3919: Mr. Lewis.
H.R. 3949: Mr. Griffith, Mr. Carter of Georgia, Ms. Jenkins of Kansas, Mr. Biliakus, Mr. Hudson, Mr. Bishop of Georgia, Mr. Grayson, Mr. Mooney of West Virginia, and Mr. Abramam.
H.R. 3956: Mr. Valadao.
H.R. 3977: Mr. Huffman.
H.R. 3986: Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois.
H.R. 3991: Ms. Speier and Mr. Honda.
H.R. 3997: Mr. Nadler, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Mrs. Napolitano, Ms. Jackson Lee, Ms. Edwards, Mrs. Watson Coleman, Mr. Crowley, Mr. DeFazio, Mrs. Kirkpatrick, Mr. Carson of Indiana, Ms. Blauhut, Mr. Clay, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, Ms. Eddie Bernice Johnson of Texas, Mr. Ruppersberger, Mr. Tonko, Mr. Bishop of Georgia, Mr. Kildee, Mr. Deutch, Mrs. Davis of California, Mr. Murpuy of Florida, Mr. Ashford, Mr. Capuano, Mr. Castelo of Texas, Mrs. Lowey, Mr. Cartwright, Mr. Carney and Ms. McCollum.
H.R. 4000: Mr. Bilirakis, Mr. Long and Mr. Farenthold.
H.R. 4003: Mr. Trott and Mr. Forbes.
H.J. Res. 22: Mr. Gutiérrez.
H.J. Res. 33: Mrs. Black, Mrs. Ellmers of North Carolina and Mrs. Roy.
H.J. Res. 71: Mrs. Lummis, Mr. Hulskamp, Mr. Tipton, Mr. Bost, Mr. Bucshon, Mr. Rohrabacher, Mr. Chaffetz, Mr. Barletta and Mr. Rogers of Kentucky.
H.J. Res. 72: Mrs. Lummis, Mr. Hulskamp, Mr. Tipton, Mr. Bost, Mr. Bucshon, Mr. Rohrabacher, Mr. Chaffetz, Mr. Barletta and Mr. Rogers of Kentucky.
H. Res. 28: Mr. Valadao.
H. Res. 32: Ms. Jackson Lee, Mr. Pascrell, Mr. Fischer and Mr. Fitzpatrick.
H. Res. 394: Mr. Pascrell.
H. Res. 416: Mr. Palazzo and Mr. LoBiondo.
H. Res. 432: Mr. Takano and Mr. Foster.
H. Res. 485: Mr. Kinzinger of Illinois.
H. Res. 513: Mr. Huffman.
H. Res. 520: Mrs. Beaty and Mr. Jeffries.
H. Res. 524: Mr. Bost, Mr. Donovan, Mr. Sherman, Mr. Weber of Texas, Mr. Bera, Mr. Rohrabacher, Mr. Salomon, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Duncan of South Carolina, Mr. Lowenthal, Mr. Wilson of South Carolina, Mr. Connolly, Ms. Ros-Lehtinen, Mr. Cicilline, Mr. Madows, Mr. Sires, Mr. McCaul, Mr. Deutch, Mr. Clawson of Florida, Mr. Yoho, Mr. Brendan F. Boyle of Pennsylvania, Mr. Trott, Ms. Bass, Ms. Meng, Mr. Ribble, Mr. Issa, Mr. Marino, Mr. Keating, Mr. Meeks, Ms. Gabbard, Mr. Desjardins, and Mr. Grayson.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative Denny Heck (WA) or a designee, to H.R. 3189, the Fed Oversight Reform and Modernization Act of 2015, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 3770: Mr. Veasey.