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

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

## RECOGNIZING LYNNEL RUCKERT

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 0915

## CONGRATULATIONS TO THE SEATTLE SEAHAWKS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

S.J. RES. 22

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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