



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 3, 2016

No. 35

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: God of mercy, thank You for giving us another day. Give us the resolve to bring an end to hunger in our world.

Quicken our spirits so that we will know the blessings of living together in unity and peace. We all have our personal aspirations and ideas of what is best. Grant that we might know the satisfaction of sharing our common concerns and experience the joy of mutual accomplishment.

Bless the Members of the people's House with success in bringing fruition to all efforts to work toward common solutions to the issues facing our Nation, solutions which often seem so distant.

During the days of the coming week, may the American people be able to communicate their hopes for the efforts of their Congressmen and -women. May they understand as well that a unified Nation is equally the work of each of us where we live.

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

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. WELCH 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 five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

KLAMATH DAM REMOVAL SECRET MEETINGS

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, a government for, by, and of the people cannot hold its most basic deliberations in secret. I am not talking about matters of national security, but basic, everyday government deliberations.

Yet the Department of the Interior, the State of California, and the State of Oregon are meeting with select groups in private in places like Portland, Sacramento, and even proposed San Francisco, to make public policy decisions affecting my district in the north end of California and south Or-

egon without public or legislative input. In order to be invited to join these meetings, individuals are required to sign confidentiality agreements and agree to a predetermined outcome.

The issues involving the Klamath River water and possible removal of the hydroelectric dams are indeed of concern to the public. The decisions regarding whether these dams should be removed and what water and environmental policy should govern the region are fundamentally a public policy decision. The deliberations should be made in public and free for all to be involved, yet long-distance locations an hour or a full day's drive away don't make that possible, especially when they are held in secret.

These secret meetings have been happening for years, and they are wrong. The agencies of the government are meeting in secret to create a 501(c)(3) dam removal entity called the Klamath River Renewal Corporation. This new corporation will be the recipient of taxpayer and utility rate dollars.

These meetings need to be held in public where the people can meet and hear what they are planning to do.

TRUTH IN LABELING

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

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, this is pure Vermont maple syrup made at a family farm, Maverick Farm, by friends and neighbors Arthur and Anne Berndt. People love it. Sugar makers from Maine to Michigan, it is a labor of love and real additional income in small farm economies.

Big companies have figured that out. They know that consumers love maple syrup. But instead of buying maple syrup from those farmers, they provide fake labels to mislead consumers.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H1119

These are some of the biggest companies in the world.

Take a look at some of these companies and the products that they claim have maple in them. Quaker, Kellogg's, Hood, Bakery on Main. They say they have maple, but there is not a trace of maple in it. The ingredients include rice syrup, artificial flavor, caramel color, gelatin, molasses. That is not maple syrup.

We who represent farmers producing maple syrup are writing the FDA telling them to have truth in labeling. Let's have real syrup, not fake labels.

VERA HOUSE WHITE RIBBON CAMPAIGN

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

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about an important issue that faces our society: domestic violence and sexual abuse. Violence against women is a worldwide but underexamined problem. Sadly, we are still far from a world where women are free from the threat of harassment, battering, and sexual assault.

Consider some of these statistics: according to the FBI, a woman is battered every 15 seconds; 2 to 4 million American women are abused each year; up to 50 percent of homeless women and children in this country are fleeing domestic violence.

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

In an effort to raise awareness and put an end to domestic violence and sexual abuse, the Vera House in Syracuse will be kicking off the White Ribbon Campaign. This campaign is one of the largest efforts in the world to prevent and end domestic violence and sexual assault. The campaign will begin Friday, March 4, and run through March 31.

During this month, thousands of my constituents in central New York will be wearing a white ribbon or white wristband to raise awareness about domestic violence and sexual abuse. Wearing the white ribbon demonstrates a personal pledge to never commit, condone, or remain silent about violence against women or children.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in this effort.

CONGRATULATING RIVERSIDE CITY COLLEGE ON THEIR CEN- TENNIAL

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 100th anniversary of Riverside City College, one of the oldest and most respected community colleges in California. Since 1916, RCC has provided thousands of students with an

engaging and affordable educational experience that prepares them for successful careers.

The college boasts of many great alumni who have gone on to lead remarkable lives, but the one I admire most is my father. He attended RCC to build up credits for a degree in business administration, and with that degree he was able to earn a good-paying job that secured my family's place in the middle class.

I was honored to serve on RCC's board of trustees for 22 years, and I take pride in what the school continues to do for thousands of students every year.

Congratulations to Riverside City College on your centennial. Thank you for the incredible impact you have had on our community.

SPECIAL OLYMPICS STATE FLOOR HOCKEY TOURNAMENT

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of the 10th anniversary of the Pennsylvania State Floor Hockey Tournament at Bald Eagle High School, located in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District. This Special Olympics tournament is scheduled for this Saturday and Sunday.

Each year more than 300 Special Olympians and more than 100 coaches from across Pennsylvania compete in this event, which includes teams from a large number of the Commonwealth's counties.

I congratulate the athletes participating in this week's tournament in advance for their hard work and perseverance, rising above the challenges to excel in athletics. I look forward to seeing them in person at Bald Eagle High School this weekend.

I also commend Special Olympics of Pennsylvania for its work in planning this annual event.

Mr. Speaker, the Thompson family has a special connection to these games. My younger son, Kale, who is now a music teacher, was the first student director when the floor hockey tournament moved to the Bald Eagle Area site.

Along with the annual floor hockey tournament, Special Olympics holds its summer games each year at Penn State University in State College. This is a great organization which helps so many people across Pennsylvania and our Nation.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF ISABELLA GREENWAY

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

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as part of Women's History Month to recognize and celebrate the

life of Isabella Greenway, the first female Member of Congress from Arizona.

Congresswoman Greenway was a trailblazer, social activist, and dedicated public servant. She worked tirelessly to serve the people of Arizona and the Nation through the Great Depression and many years after.

Congresswoman Greenway was particularly committed to ensuring that those who served the Nation in World War I were taken care of after they returned home. Following the war, she opened Arizona Hut, a furniture manufacturer focused on employing disabled veterans and their families.

During her time in Congress, she was known for her willingness to fight for the rights of veterans, including acting as a vocal defender of veterans' pensions and introducing legislation to expand the VA in Arizona.

Congresswoman Greenway was an inspiration for women in our State and throughout our country. She refused to be limited or defined by her gender, instead devoting her life to serving and protecting the most vulnerable members of our society.

I hope my colleagues will join with me in honoring the lasting legacy of Isabella Greenway.

TEXAS LAWMAN—OFFICER DAVID HOFER

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, he was a son, a brother, and a soon-to-be groom. David Hofer's life was ripped from this world on March 1, 2 days ago, leaving behind his family and his fiancée.

Officer Hofer was 29. He was from Fort Worth, Texas. He was shot and coldly murdered after a gunfire exchange with an outlaw in a nearby park. The criminal who gunned him down was a 22-year-old drug addict who had been released from prison that very day.

Officer Hofer served with the Euless, Texas, Police Department. He had been serving there for 2 years. He had previously served with the NYPD for 5 years. He dedicated his life to protecting the rest of us.

Mr. Speaker, hundreds of blue lights from patrol cars lit the way as Officer Hofer's body was transported from the hospital.

Mr. Speaker, this is the 16th police officer killed this year. In fact, two officers now have been murdered in 2 days.

Mr. Speaker, we must always honor and respect and mourn the life of such valiant men and women. The thin blue line stands strong in the face of evildoers that live among us.

The men and women who wear the badge are America's best—men such as Officer David Hofer. They sacrifice their lives to keep the homefront safe

from the dregs of society, misfits, and bandits who wish to do the rest of us harm.

Back the blue, Mr. Speaker. Back the blue.

And that is just the way it is.

IT IS TIME TO ACT ON IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to give a little history about the efforts of the Democratic Party to secure our Southern border.

We had an immigration bill last session. In that bill that passed the Senate with bipartisan support—not only every Democrat, but also many Republicans, like JOHN MCCAIN and MARCO RUBIO—we had \$40 billion to secure our Southern border. Talk about a secure wall—security, making sure that illegal products and illegal people do not cross across that border—we had that.

Thanks to the Republicans' failure to take action in this body, the House of Representatives, and simply pass the Senate bill, there is still no security on the Southern border. There are people, illegal drugs, and illegal products sneaking across every day because this body hasn't acted.

Now, it is pie in the sky to think that some other country is going to pay for a wall to protect America. It isn't going to happen.

What we did is we actually had fines for people who were here illegally. So people who are here illegally were actually the very ones who contributed money back into our coffers to help secure our Southern border, not to mention the additional economic benefit and taxes that they would pay going forward.

It is time to act on immigration and secure our border.

□ 0915

TRIBUTE TO COACH JIM BELDEN

(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, I rise today to honor a beloved member of the Hamilton County, Indiana, community, Jim Belden.

Jim was a dedicated public servant and a devoted husband, father, and grandfather. Sadly, he passed away after a battle with cancer. He will be dearly missed by the Hoosier community, but what a legacy he left.

Jim left his mark as a family man, a teacher, a U.S. Navy veteran, and a 23-year member of the Hamilton County Council, but he is best known for being one of the best football coaches in Indiana, an Indiana Football Hall of Fame coach. I am the daughter of a high school football coach as well.

For more than 30 years, Jim coached and mentored young men in Westfield, Noblesville, and Carmel High Schools. He led Carmel High School to four State championship titles and is the 12th winningest coach in Indiana State history.

I attended his memorial service just last weekend. There were hundreds of players there. I heard from those whose lives had been touched. There were those he coached who were now not quite so young, because he coached in the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s, and the 2000s.

I also heard from the students he taught, the assistant coaches, the faculty he worked with, the community he served, and, most importantly, his family, who loved him so dearly.

I offer my deepest condolences to his family, especially his wife Bev. They had just celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary. We all mourn his loss and cherish his memory. What a legacy lives on in Jim Belden.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4557, BLOCKING REGULATORY INTERFERENCE FROM CLOSING KILNS ACT OF 2016, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MARCH 4, 2016, THROUGH MARCH 11, 2016

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 635 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 635

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4557) to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants for brick and structural clay products or for clay ceramics manufacturing before requiring compliance with such rule. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommend.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from March 4, 2016, through March 11, 2016—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLY of Mississippi). The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 635 provides for consideration of H.R. 4557, the Blocking Regulatory Interference from Closing Kilns Act of 2016. The resolution provides for a closed rule. No amendments are made in order, as none were filed with the Rules Committee. Additionally, the rule also provides for standard adjournment authority.

H.R. 4557 is an important piece of legislation. It is a bipartisan bill that addresses an unfortunate recurring theme: overreach by the EPA that takes jobs away from hardworking Americans.

Last September the EPA finalized the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Brick and Structural Clay Products and Clay Ceramics, commonly known as Brick MACT. Only in the Federal Government would we string that many words together and think it makes sense.

In that rule, the EPA set stringent standards for brick industry emissions of mercury and nonmercury pollutants as well as health-based standards for acid gases.

EPA previously promulgated Brick MACT standards in 2003. That rule was vacated by a Federal court in 2007, but, by that time, many brick manufacturers had already spent millions of dollars in irreversible compliance costs.

Now, let's be clear. Those aren't just costs that are borne by those businesses. Those get passed along to the American consumers, raising the price of brick to each and every one of us.

The brick industry faces again the uncertainty of having to spend millions of dollars to comply with revised Brick MACT while the fate of the rule makes its way through the court system.

Mr. Speaker, the brick industry employs thousands of Americans at more than 70 brick plant and supporting facilities nationwide. These facilities are located in 38 States. Alabama, my home State, is one of the top five States for brick manufacturing capacity and faces some of the largest job losses.

Unlike other industries targeted by EPA's overreach, the brick industry is dominated by small, family-owned businesses that have been struggling in our current economy.

EPA estimates industry-wide annual compliance in Brick MACT will cost

\$25 million annually. The industry estimates that the costs may be as much as \$100 million per year. For a facility with two kilns, which is the industry average, costs are estimated to be \$4.4 million.

Remember, those costs get passed along to us consumers in the cost of bricks. These costs will likely cause many of these small facilities to shut their doors and are, of course, over and above the millions of dollars already spent by the industry to comply with the earlier rule that was vacated by the D.C. Circuit.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4557 ensures that the brick industry will not again have to make millions of dollars in expenditures before Brick MACT works its way through the courts.

H.R. 4557 would implement a legislative stay to Brick MACT and block the rule until all related court challenges have been resolved by the Federal courts.

Opponents of this bill argue that a legislative stay is unnecessary because the brick industry can request a judicial stay in Federal court; however, as an attorney, I can tell you that the standard to receive such a stay is incredibly high and such stays are rarely granted.

The recent case of Michigan v. EPA provides a great example of why this legislation is necessary. In that case, the Supreme Court found the EPA's Utility MACT rule to be legally flawed and remanded the case; however, by that time, utility companies had already been forced to spend billions of dollars to comply with Utility MACT. Remember, that gets passed along to the consumers in our utility bills.

EPA Acting Administrator Janet McCabe stated that, although EPA lost, the Supreme Court's decision was of limited practical effect because the majority of power plants were already in compliance or well on their way to compliance. Thus, the EPA was, in practicality, able to evade any meaningful judicial review, which makes a mockery of this process.

The EPA should not get to do the same again to the brick industry while Brick MACT makes its way through the court system. Thousands of American jobs should not be put at risk due to a rule which has already been vacated once. Again, the consumers of America should not be penalized for the same reason.

I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 635 and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. The Blocking Regulatory Interference from Closing Kilns Act—certainly, a mouthful to say—is yet another of the endless list of attempts by this body—and it will not become law—to block implementation of an administrative rule or regulation that some people

don't like, rather than tackling the issues that this country cares about and that I hear from voters back home when I have townhall meetings or I am at the grocery store.

I hear about fixing our broken immigration system and securing our border. I hear about balancing the budget deficit. I hear about making sure that Medicare and Social Security are solvent and there for the next generation. I hear about making sure we create jobs, that housing is affordable, and that our roads and bridges are safe so traffic can flow safely and quickly.

Yet, here we are again, spending an entire legislative day debating a bill that won't become law, which you will certainly hear about over the next couple of hours, regarding a series of regulations around brick kilns.

Once again the Republicans are approaching a complex rulemaking process with a knee-jerk reaction in a non-transparent process with a closed rule, not even allowing a debate for a single amendment.

Not only is this bill not transparent and not necessary, in this particular case, it sets a bad precedent because the courts already have the authority to issue a stay of compliance on a final rule.

As we saw through the recent delay of the Clean Power Plan, our judicial and legislative systems are separate for a reason.

Let the courts do their work and let us do ours. Let us not preempt the courts from their normal process. Our judicial and legislative systems are separate. Individuals, organizations, and companies have plenty of recourse and options through the court system to address this matter.

The floor of the House is not the place to be requesting a stay. If there was something done that was illegal or wrong, the place to request a stay is the courtroom.

But time and time again legislation like this has come to this floor, disposing of the judicial process and shortcutting the justice system that we have to delay a rule until all legal challenges are completed, which effectively means that frivolous lawsuits can jam up the rule indefinitely and forever.

Over the past 45 years, it is proven that clean air regulations are important to protect the public health and consistent with growing a strong economy.

Of course, I understand the pressure requirements placed on brick and clay ceramic makers. They have legitimate reasons to provide input to question or contest the rule.

The judicial avenue is and will be available to them. That is the appropriate venue to request a stay, not the floor of the House of Representatives.

There are several brick and clay companies in my State of Colorado, such as the Summit Brick & Tile Company in Pueblo, Colorado. I know these companies updated and changed their industry after the 2004 rule.

But, unfortunately, like so many rules under the administration of George Bush, the rule is written so poorly that it was vacated by the courts in 2007, which means there is no rule under the authority of the Clean Air Act, which this Congress has made the law of the land, that sets standards for eliminating air pollution in this industry. Not only is that unacceptable, but, of course, it needs to be rectified urgently.

There is nothing special about brick kilns. Like anything else, of course, they affect air quality. I have a picture of what we are talking about here.

Of course, like any other economic activity that creates issues regarding air quality, we need a nuanced and thoughtful rule that ensures that the economic activity continues, subject to maintaining the public health.

In fact, the EPA has a responsibility under section 112 of the Clean Air Act to control pollution from stationary sources of pollution, like brick kilns.

Let me repeat that. The EPA was actually required by Congress to implement a rule that covers this industry because, according to the judiciary, President Bush enacted the rule incorrectly.

If Congress wants to get at the underlying statutes, let's have that debate. Let's talk about what the EPA should and shouldn't do.

I believe that we should close down loopholes that exempt fracking from regulation under the Clean Air Act. We have a series of bills that would do that—the BREATHE Act and the FRESHER Act—to ensure that the small site exemption does not occur, does not exist with regard to fracking activities that, in the aggregate, can have a considerable impact on air quality.

We have seen areas of our State and our neighboring State of Wyoming have worse air quality than downtown Los Angeles because of the extraction and fracking-related activity, which is largely exempt from the clean air law.

That is the debate I would be happy to have. Let's debate the appropriate jurisdiction of the EPA. If there is something we got wrong in that with regard to brick kilns and their authority or responsibility, that is the place to have the debate.

□ 0930

It is not to give an indefinite stay to simply implement what is the law of the land and the will of Congress, which is the EPA's responsibility.

Congress has told the EPA, through the Clean Air Act, that they have the responsibility under section 112 to control pollution from stationary sources of pollution. They tried to do it under President Bush. It was tossed out by the courts because it was improperly constructed, and they are doing their job.

Yet, Congress is trying to use something that is normally a judicial procedure, a stay, to get around the very

mandate that Congress gave the Environmental Protection Agency. So it is simply the wrong way to go about it.

Brick and clay plants, if left unregulated, which is why they are covered under the Clean Air Act, can be major sources of toxic air pollutants, like hydrogen fluoride, hydrogen chloride, and hazardous metal, heavy metal pollutants that can endanger people with everything from asthma to cancer.

Now, I don't know about you, but I would rather have my children running around a playground of a town where plants that put out hazardous pollutants are regulated in a thoughtful and responsible way, which is what this rule attempts to do.

That is why opponents of this legislation include the Center for Biological Diversity, League of Conservation Voters, League of Women Voters, National Resource Development Council, the Sierra Club, and the Union of Concerned Scientists.

All of these experts understand that, for 15 years, Congress has expected air pollution from these facilities to be covered by the Clean Air Act standards, and that delaying the process further is irresponsible, prevents the EPA from doing their mandate that Congress has given them, sets a dangerous public health precedent, and will endanger lives of American citizens.

Not only is this a treacherous pattern but, again, it is a waste of time. This bill won't become law. It came out of committee on a party-line vote. The majority knows that, even in the off chance that the Senate were to consider this legislation, which I highly doubt, the President would veto the bill.

It was indicated in the Statement of Administration Policy that I will include in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, which reads, in part, H.R. 4557 would create "an incentive for parties to litigate this rulemaking and the related corrections notice for as long as possible in order to delay air pollution reductions."

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
H.R. 4557—BLOCKING REGULATORY INTERFERENCE FROM CLOSING KILNS ACT OF 2016—REP. BILL JOHNSON, R-OH, AND SEVEN CO-SPONSORS

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 4557, which could extend indefinitely deadlines for the brick and structural clay industry to limit mercury and other hazardous air pollution. Specifically, H.R. 4557 would extend compliance deadlines for the Brick and Structural Clay National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants until all litigation on the final rule is complete, thereby creating an incentive for parties to litigate the rulemaking and the related corrections notice for as long as possible in order to delay air pollution reductions. In the meantime, H.R. 4557 would undermine the public health protections of the Clean Air Act (CAA) by allowing further emissions of approximately 30 tons per month of toxic air pollution from brick and clay products production facilities. These toxic emissions include mercury, gases, and other hazardous metals which are associated with a variety of acute and chronic health effects, including cancers.

The CAA required the Environmental Protection Agency to finalize pollution standards for toxic air pollution from all industrial sectors by 2000. Since then, sources in many other sectors have been complying with standards that limit their emissions of cancer-causing toxic air pollutants. The subject rule reflects CAA requirements while providing flexible compliance options and the maximum time allowed by law for compliance. It also makes distinctions between requirements for small and large kilns in order to reduce the impacts on small businesses.

Since its enactment in 1970, and subsequent amendment in 1977 and 1990—each time with strong bipartisan support—the CAA has improved the Nation's air quality and protected public health. Over that same period of time, the economy has grown over 200 percent while emissions of key pollutants have decreased nearly 70 percent. Forty-five years of clean air regulation have shown that a strong economy and strong environmental and public health protection go hand-in-hand.

Because H.R. 4557 threatens the health of Americans by allowing more toxic air pollution, if the President were presented with H.R. 4557, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mr. POLIS. Again, so long as even there are the most frivolous lawsuits and anybody could continually file a lawsuit, and so long as any one of them is pending, the rule does not take effect. It is indefinitely stayed.

So, yet again, we are debating something on the floor going nowhere. We are not debating improving our roads and bridges. We are not debating securing our southern border. We are not debating balancing our Federal budget deficit. We are not debating making America more competitive and bringing jobs from overseas and China back home here and creating a growing middle class. Instead, we are wasting time on legislation that won't become law, that shouldn't even become law because it is the inappropriate role of this body.

There are so many things that we could be talking about even within the energy realm and the EPA realm that would be productive discussions. I will give you an example.

I have had the opportunity in hearings in the Natural Resources Committee to bring up a bipartisan bill that I have with Mr. GOSAR twice this week, and this is the third time. It is a bill that would create jobs and create renewable energy. It is called the Public Lands Renewable Energy Development Act.

Why don't we have a rule on that bill or bring it up on suspension?

Mr. GOSAR and my bill would incentivize renewable energy development by streamlining the permitting process on public lands for renewable energy projects.

Isn't that something we can come together about, making sure that we can find a way to expedite siting for renewable energy products on public land, creating jobs and creating clean energy?

Or we could be discussing the need for a permanent reauthorization of the

Land and Water Conservation Fund, something that just last week was offered as a bipartisan amendment by myself and Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. SANFORD of South Carolina.

But, of course, that amendment was not given an hour of debate, 2 hours of debate, like this. We have the rule, we have the bill. The entire legislative day is discussing a stay on brick kilns. It should be in a courtroom, not in the U.S. House.

We weren't even given 10 minutes. We weren't even given 1 minute to discuss that bipartisan amendment from Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. SANFORD and myself.

Look, the list goes on and on of what we could be doing. It has been said that politics is the art of the possible.

When the American people look at our proceedings on the floor and what the Republican majority is doing with Congress, is it any wonder that the approval rating of Congress is 8 percent?

The people look at Congress and say, look, you are spending an entire day debating a stay on kiln rules. First of all, why are you talking about it? It should be in a courtroom.

Second of all, aren't there critical national priorities that you need to be debating right now to create jobs, make America more competitive overseas, improve our schools, make college more affordable, balance our deficit, fix our broken immigration system, improve our roads and bridges, make America more competitive and grow the middle class? Aren't there?

That is what 92 percent of the American people are crying out. There is still time for this Congress to listen. I hope that we begin.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for his important work on this issue, and also the gentleman from Ohio.

I rise today in support of H.R. 4557, the BRICK Act. This legislation delays an unnecessary EPA rule that imposes overly strict emission standards on American brick kilns.

Manufacturers shouldn't have to deal with the hassles of an overzealous regulator in the first place, but they should at least get to have their day in court fighting this unreasonable regulation before incurring millions of dollars of expense to comply.

Since 2003, brick manufacturers have reduced emissions from kilns by 95 percent. However, EPA decided to impose another Washington mandate on small businesses, which they may not even be able to meet.

Shuttering U.S. brick factories will lead to higher costs for American consumers, making it even more expensive to open a business or raise a family.

Additionally, manufacturers will shed good-paying jobs in places like Malvern, Arkansas. And, once again,

our manufacturing needs will move offshore to a place that pollutes much worse than we do here.

Not only is the EPA out of touch with reality on this issue, they exhibit no common sense when they regulate jobs away from America and send them to countries that pay sub-par wages and have sub-par pollution control technology. They have a lose-lose proposition.

Mr. Speaker, this is the same EPA that negligently released millions of gallons of toxic mine water into the Animas River, tried to cover up and minimize their actions, refused to take responsibility, and resisted being held accountable.

If anyone needs more regulation, it is this out-of-control Federal agency, not hard-working Americans.

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of our environment and economy, I urge the House to pass the BRICK Act to keep the air cleaner and to save good-paying jobs here at home.

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

I want to talk a little bit more about when we say this bill will never become law what exactly we mean and I mean when I indicate that.

There have been an enormous number of bills that have passed the House of Representatives. As an example, repealing the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, taking health care away from tens of millions of Americans—that has passed this House in one form or another 64 times. So 64 times the House of Representatives has voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act. That is clearly what people who have been elected to the House have decided to do.

The House of Representatives alone, however, doesn't get to make the law. We have the United States Senate and we have a President. The United States Senate usually requires, as a procedural matter, 60 votes to move legislation forward. And of course, even after a bill in the same form passes the House and the Senate, for it to become law, the President needs to sign it. If the President vetoes it, it immediately comes back and will require two-thirds to override the veto.

So what we are talking about with this bill around kilns, like this one here, we are talking about a bill that probably will pass the House. I expect that that is what we are spending a whole day on. I don't think the Republicans would want to spend a whole day on it if it was going to fail. So let's assume it passes.

I have heard no indication whatsoever that the Senate is going to take this up in any way, shape, or form. In the unlikely event that the Senate takes it up, they have the challenge of getting 60 votes.

The bill had no bipartisan support in committee. It is hard to see how they would get enough Democratic support in the Senate to get the 60 votes to pass the bill. Even if they somehow did,

President Obama and the administration is, of course, against providing a stay against their own rule that they promulgated. Therefore, we are spending an entire day doing nothing, talking about brick kilns, fiddling while Rome burns.

The American people are upset, Mr. Speaker. The American people want this Congress to tackle the issues that affect them and their family around their kitchen table: rising rents and mortgage prices; maybe the mom or the dad or the kids lost their job and need to get back to work; making sure that they have a way to commute to work every day, and that our roads and bridges are strong, and they spend a minimal amount of time in traffic so they can spend more time with their family or at work earning money; balancing our budget deficit to secure a strong financial future for our country; making sure that Medicare and Social Security are there and safe, not only for today's retirees, but for the next generation and the next generation of American retirees; securing our southern border and replacing our broken and nonsensical and costly immigration system with one that works for America to make us more competitive, generate more revenues, unites families, and reflects our values as a Nation of immigrants.

We could be doing any of those things. We could be debating any of those things. No one says they are easy. It starts with time to debate here on the floor of the House. What a great way to spend a day, a Thursday.

By the way, Speaker RYAN and the Republicans don't even have us working Friday, tomorrow. They are sending us all home on Thursday, after spending a day debating brick kilns. We are not even debating anything tomorrow, Friday, or Monday or Tuesday or Wednesday or Thursday or Friday of next week.

I mean, look, the American people would love this kind of job which the Republican majority has given themselves with the congressional calendar where we have worked 3½ days this week, get Friday off, all of next week off, and spend a whole day debating brick kilns, rather than the issues that the American people care about.

That is what is going on here. That is why Congress has such a low approval rating.

Well, look, let's begin by debating the issues that people care about. They are hard. I get that. Fixing our broken immigration system, balancing our budget deficit, securing Medicare and Social Security, are not easy issues.

But why don't we spend a day doing that, today, all day, having ideas from both sides of the aisle, having Members speak about their plans to make America better and stronger, rather than debating a court procedure, a stay on brick kilns, all day, and then rewarding ourselves with a day off tomorrow.

Job well done, Congress. We did a court procedure on brick kilns as our

work product and, for that, we deserve a week and a half off.

That is the job that Congress has defined for itself, and it is why the American people are so outraged.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that would require the Republicans to stop their partisan games and hold hearings on the budget proposal, the President's budget.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, if we pass this previous question motion that I am making, we can actually begin the important discussion of how we can bring our budget into balance and restore fiscal responsibility.

Let's have hearings on the President's budget proposal. Let's talk about the tradeoffs around investments and savings. Let's have those meaningful discussions, rather than to spend an entire day on brick kilns, and then giving ourselves a week and a half off.

We can still salvage this Congress for the American people. We can restore trust in the integrity and the desire of the American Government to do good and tackle the big issues we face. I am confident we can.

That can begin by passing my previous question motion and getting to debate about the budget and balancing our budget and the tradeoffs and investments in our future, rather than debating kilns and giving ourselves a week and a half off.

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

□ 0945

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

I was very interested to hear my colleague talk about what makes the American people frustrated and angry right now. I have just come through a primary campaign for my seat in Alabama. I spent a lot of time with the citizens of the United States in my district. They are indeed frustrated and angry, and let me tell you why. They are frustrated and angry because we have a government in the Federal sphere that is out of control, and it is taking away their jobs.

This regulation will take away jobs from people in Alabama. It will take away jobs from people in 38 States. That is what makes them angry: a Federal Government that cares so little about them that they would put out a regulation like this that kills jobs, that raises the price of bricks on those of us who buy them to build our homes, and the Federal Government thinks that is necessary. But we have to do this today because we have a Federal Government that doesn't understand that its role is not to do that.

So let's get back to what this really means. This is not a partisan issue. Two of the sponsors of this bill are from the other party. My colleague from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) is a sponsor of this bill and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) is a sponsor of this bill because they understand it is going to hurt their constituents. It is going to hurt the average working person in this country.

My colleagues on the other side don't get that, and because they don't get that, there is no job too small for them, in their minds, to kill. There is no business too small for them to put out of business. There is no amount of money that they are going to increase what we consumers have to pay that is too much for them. They would kill every job, and they would hold back every consumer's ability to get a home at a decent price to get some little, small, almost nothing benefit.

There were no amendments offered as part of this debate today because none were offered in committee and none were offered to the Rules Committee. So this is not a closed debate because we are trying to close off amendments. There aren't any amendments.

Now, I heard a lot about a judicial stay. I said this in my initial remarks: saying that there is a "possibility" for a judicial stay says nothing about the practicality of it. I addressed that in my opening remarks. Let me just tell you, as a practical way, it is almost impossible to get this stay. Yet, when they got a stay several years ago, it was so late in the game that the brick industry had to go ahead and make all the changes, which cost jobs and increased the price of bricks for the rest of us.

Here is the truth. My colleague said that there is an obligation to have a rule here. There is already a rule on particulate matter, and most of the benefits in the rule that has been proposed here are to particulate matter. It is already regulated.

And, oh, by the way, when that prior regulation that was turned back by the Supreme Court was put out there and the industry had to go ahead and comply with it, they had already reduced emissions by over 90 percent.

So what we are talking about in this regulation is another effort to get at some small, little, almost imperceptible benefit at the cost of hundreds, if not thousands, of American jobs. I am astonished that this administration is so insensitive to that. The people of America are angry and frustrated because of that.

Now, I know that we are going to be having debates about some of the issues that my colleague talked about, and I am looking forward to those debates. But to the people who work in the industry, this is an important issue. It may not be important to other people in this House, but it is important to people that work for these brick businesses. It is important to me as a consumer looking at what it is going to cost me for buying new bricks.

So I would hope that there would be greater sensitivity from this administration for my colleagues in this House to people who are being hurt by this rule, and I hope that we will all take this very seriously as the important issue that it is.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to, first of all, congratulate the gentleman from Alabama. He had a recent election and triumphed, and, of course, we will be excited to continue to serve with him.

When we run, it is difficult. We have our ear to the ground, and we hear people. The gentleman mentioned that people were angry back home. I think there are a lot of people in my district that are angry, too. But again, I want to ask the gentleman: Is what they were angry about this brick kiln rule, or were they angry about the failure of Congress to secure our borders and the failure of Congress to balance our budget, all those things? I want to ask whether what you heard about in that anger was about brick kilns, or was it about other issues.

I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, they are angry about a Federal Government that is overreaching and hurting them. That is what they are angry about.

Mr. POLIS. Did anybody who was angry bring up brick kilns as something they were angry about?

I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, they brought up the EPA over and over again. I hear about the EPA everywhere I go.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, as I indicated, it would be an appropriate discussion for us to talk about the statutory obligations of EPA. We might have differing opinions. I think they should have the authority, we should remove the small site exemption, and they should look at emissions from the fracking industry and the extraction. But that is a valid discussion to have.

Instead of that, we are saying you are doing what we told you to do, but we want to grant a stay. So Congress, under the EPA in section 112, directed the EPA under the Clean Air Act to promulgate these regulations. President George Bush did so. They were tossed out, and now there is a new set of regulations going forward to implement what Congress wanted the EPA to do.

Now, if the gentleman from Alabama doesn't want the EPA to do that, let's have that discussion about EPA's authority. I am happy to do it. I have ideas. Maybe there are some areas the EPA shouldn't have that mandate authority. There are other areas, like making sure we look at emissions from fracking where we need enhanced authority because there is something

called the small site exemption in the Clean Air Act, where, even though each particular fracking pad has a very small contribution to air quality, when you start having thousands of them in a limited area—which we do—it starts looking a lot less like a couple automobiles and a lot more like a large industrial factory. So they shouldn't be exempt just by nature of being small, because when you have a lot of small things, it equals not only one big thing, it equals 10 big things and 100 big things.

We have over 40,000 active wells in the greater Weld-Larimer County area alone, and there is an enormous impact on our air quality, which is exempt under the small site exemption.

So again, section 112 directs the EPA to promulgate these rules. If we want to open up the mandate that Congress has given the EPA, let's have that discussion.

As an individual legislator, I might trade you this brick kiln authority if we can close the small site exemption. I would say, fine; my constituents care more about closing that small site exemption than they do if there are two brick kilns in our entire State. So I think, in general, my constituents and Coloradans care more about making sure our air quality is good and protected with regard to the emissions from the fracking activity than from the two brick kilns. So I would be open to that as a legislative compromise. That is how legislation is made. But we are not allowed to have that debate.

The gentleman mentioned, oh, no amendments were brought forward. Guess what? We did a motion in the Rules Committee—I am sure the gentleman from Alabama remembers—yes, yesterday to do an open rule on this. If that had passed—and it failed on a partisan vote. Not a single Republican voted to allow an open rule on this bill. If that had succeeded, if that had passed, that open rule the Democrats wanted, we could then introduce amendments like the ones that I mentioned to talk about the authority of the EPA or other issues that we have to improve the statutory requirements in charge of the EPA. Right on the floor, we would have the opportunity to do that. Instead, we have an entire day on brick kilns without even being allowed to introduce amendments that affect our clean air and water in any way, shape, or form. I think we can do better.

The gentleman also asked what the impact of the brick kilns on this is. The EPA estimates that the brick and clay rule would reduce national air toxins by approximately 375 tons in 2018. Again, that is what Congress has told the EPA to do under the Clean Air Act.

If Congress wants the EPA to do something different, let's have that discussion, section 112, other sections of the Clean Air Act, of the mandate that Congress has given the EPA. Let's not use a court procedure, a stay, that

won't become law to short-circuit something that Congress has told the EPA to do. It is positively schizophrenic for Congress to require an agency to do something and then say we are not going to allow you to do what we told you to do.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, if I heard the gentleman correctly, he wants an open rule. Let me restate: we had no amendments offered at the committee of jurisdiction and no amendments offered before the Rules Committee, so that would fly in the face of our desire here to have regular order. What he has proposed is not regular order. He is proposing chaos, and I don't think the American people want us to be in chaos around here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), a great conservative leader.

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time to speak on the rule.

Our process for a bill to get to the floor is it has to go through the Rules Committee. This was a very, very important bill. It was interesting in the debate, listening to the sides, because there is an argument by constituents of having clean bills: one bill, one issue, simply understood, vote on it, instead of this horse trading that sometimes gets proposed: you give me this for my giving you that. I can tell you one thing, I know in my district they really don't like this. They want us to be accountable for a bill.

I also get frustrated with how easy it is to throw away jobs: I only have blank kilns in my State. Those are good-paying jobs for families, and they are important to the fabric of those communities. Just to say, "Look, I have only got two. I don't really worry about them. Let's trade them off" is really troublesome, and I am sorry we fall into that type of debate.

This is really part of a bigger debate in that the courts have already done this with the Clean Power Plan, the climate change bill. The debate is, "Okay. EPA, you can do the regulation. Do the regulation." What the EPA likes to do is do the regulation; and they play this game: "We know it is not legal, so we will impose the regulation. We know it is not legal. We are going to force industry to comply," and then when the courts say it is not legal, they have already gone too far, and the jobs have been lost.

That is factual. That is what happened in 2003. That is what happened when the EPA promulgated the MACT rules in 2003. The rules were vacated by the Federal court in 2007—vacated—which means you can't do it. But the industry already was forced to do it, either to spend millions and millions of dollars, or they had to close.

So fast-forward. Where are we today?

The courts have done this on the Clean Power Plan, the big climate change rule. What the Court just said for the first time, the Supreme Court said: No, we are not going to force the States to implement the Clean Power Plan until it is litigated in the courts. They put a stay on everyone and said: Don't do anything. Let's have the legislative-judicial debate and fight.

That is what this bill does. Let's just have the litigation on the legality of this new rule. If it comes up that it is legal, then the industry is going to have to comply. But if it comes out that it is not legal, guess what. We are going to save jobs. We are going to save communities, and we are going to save the family income for two kilns in a State or maybe more, depending upon the brick-producing capability of individual States.

So I am down here just to thank the Rules Committee for bringing this bill to the floor.

I look forward to the debate. It is much more than brick kilns. It is about when can the EPA force a company to do something. We would hope they could only do it after it has been ruled legal by the courts if someone challenges a rule, and that is what this does.

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

□ 1000

There is a way that our process works around here. If a rule is illegal, it will be tossed out by the courts. George Bush's attempt to implement the Clean Air Act, section 112, around brick kilns was tossed out.

What this bill does is says that, so long as there is a court challenge, there is some sort of presumption that the rule be tossed out and, therefore, an indefinite stay.

Now, there can be challenges all the time. The minute one fails, another one can be launched. No bones about it. This would indefinitely prevent this rule from ever taking effect with regard to brick kilns.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, I haven't heard from a single constituent on this issue. Like the gentleman from Alabama, my constituents are angry. They are angry at Congress and worried about the direction of the country.

They want Congress to replace our broken immigration system with one that works and secure our southern border. They want Congress to return to fiscal responsibility and balance our budget. They want to make sure that college is affordable for the next generation. They want to make sure they have good jobs here at home.

They want to make sure that we encourage companies to locate and grow here in America rather than take tax advantages for relocating overseas or inverting their headquarters to occur overseas, as occurs with today's Tax Code. Those are some of the many issues that my constituents want me to talk about here.

I just had a townhall meeting last week in Fort Collins, Colorado, the biggest city in my district. About 100 people came. Not a single person was angry about brick kilns.

But, yes, there was a lot of anger there about some of the issues I indicated: people frustrated with why Congress refuses to act on making college more affordable, why Congress has refused to act in making sure that Medicare and Social Security are there for the next generation, and why Congress doesn't put our country on the course of fiscal responsibility and reduce our debt-to-GDP ratio.

But, instead, we are debating a bill that won't become law without allowing amendments here on the floor. That is what a closed rule means. If it was an open rule, I would be able to offer my amendment to close the small site exemption with regard to fracking, but I can't.

We are debating a bill that won't become law, attacking a rule that is merely implementing what Congress has told not just this President, but any President, to do. George Bush tried. Obama tried.

It is because Congress, under the Clean Air Act, tells the executive: You have to do this under section 112. And then, when they do it, there is the issue that went through the courts.

That is appropriate. That is their role. But when they implement what Congress has told them to do, we are saying: No. There is an indefinite stay.

That is what this bill would do.

I know, Mr. Speaker, regardless of what they think about any of the policies or rules put out by this administration or any administration, it is not the place of Congress to issue stays on rules. It is the role of the courts.

The Constitution established three branches in our government for a reason under our Constitution. It is the courts' job, not Congress' job, to interfere with the legal process.

It is not Congress' job to take that responsibility away from the judicial branch, especially with a bill that would actually encourage more frivolous litigation by rewarding frivolous litigation and endless appeals when we already have too much of that in our court system.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" to defeat the previous question, which, if we succeed on that vote, we can immediately get to hold hearings on the President's budget proposals.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule as well, again, a closed rule, not allowing amendments here on the floor of the House.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The American people are sick and tired of a Federal Government that is out of control. I can't imagine the Founders of this country in that constitutional convention in Philadelphia in 1787 saying: Now, let's think about a

government agency established under our Constitution that is going to regulate bricks.

No wonder the American people look at the Federal Government and say: Have you lost your mind? What are you doing?

These other issues that my colleague talked about are important. But we have to stop here in this Congress to deal with another out-of-control Federal agency—and the EPA is one of the most out-of-control Federal agencies—to protect the American people and, yes, to protect their jobs, to protect the consumers of America from unreasonable increases in the cost of things like bricks because another agency has done something to them.

Yes, I think the American people are sick and tired of that, and I do think it is the role of this Congress to do something about it.

The EPA would have no power except for the fact that this Congress has delegated its own legislative power to the EPA. Indeed, it is our role to not only provide oversight to that power but, on particular occasions, to take it back.

Frankly, in my judgment, we don't take it back enough. If we took it back more, we would be protecting the American people more and their jobs and the cost of things that they buy every day.

I understood what my colleague just said. I heard it. But once again I don't think he is thinking about those people who work for these brick companies and I don't think he is thinking about the consumers of America, who are ready for the Congress to do its job to protect them. This is one way that we can do that.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 635 and the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 635 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 4. Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 624) Directing the Committee on the Budget to hold a public hearing on the President's fiscal year 2017 budget request with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget as a witness. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 624.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and

a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIBBLE). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered, and suspending the rules and passing S. 1826, if ordered. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 174, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 106]

YEAS—233

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

NAYS—174

Adams	Ashford	Bera
Aguilar	Becerra	Beyer

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

NOT VOTING—26

Allen Griffith
Bass Harris
Beatty Herrera Beutler
Cárdenas Hinojosa
Costa McCaul
Engel Meeks
Franks (AZ) Moore
Graves (LA) Mulvaney
Green, Gene Napolitano

□ 1026

Mrs. DINGELL, Messrs. WELCH and COOPER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

Stated for:

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 106, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 173, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 107]

AYES—235

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)

NOES—173

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici

Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsock
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNeerney
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree

NOT VOTING—25

Betty
Bishop (UT)
Black
Cárdenas
Costa
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hinojosa
Love
McCaul
McDermott
Moore
Mulvaney
Napolitano
Pascrell
Perry
Pitts
Roybal-Allard
Sanchez, Loretta
Smith (WA)
Wagner
Westmoreland
Zinke

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1033

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 107, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 107, I was detained and missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

LIEUTENANT COLONEL JAMES “MAGGIE” MEGELLAS POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1826) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 99 West 2nd Street in Fond du

Lac, Wisconsin, as the Lieutenant Colonel James “Maggie” Megellas Post Office, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. WOMACK. 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 406, nays 1, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 108]

YEAS—406

Abraham	Collins (GA)	Fudge
Adams	Collins (NY)	Gabbard
Aderholt	Comstock	Gallego
Aguilar	Conaway	Garamendi
Allen	Connolly	Garrett
Amash	Conyers	Gibbs
Amodei	Cook	Gibson
Ashford	Cooper	Gohmert
Babin	Costello (PA)	Goodlatte
Barletta	Courtney	Gosar
Barr	Cramer	Gowdy
Barton	Crawford	Graham
Bass	Crenshaw	Granger
Becerra	Crowley	Graves (GA)
Benishek	Cuellar	Graves (LA)
Bera	Culberson	Graves (MO)
Beyer	Cummings	Grayson
Billirakis	Curbelo (FL)	Green, Al
Bishop (GA)	Davis (CA)	Griffith
Bishop (MI)	Davis, Danny	Grijalva
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Rodney	Grothman
Black	DeFazio	Guinta
Blackburn	DeGette	Guthrie
Blum	Delaney	Gutiérrez
Bonomaci	DeLauro	Hahn
Bost	DelBene	Hanna
Boustany	Denham	Hardy
Boyle, Brendan F.	Dent	Harper
Brady (PA)	DeSantis	Harris
Brady (TX)	DeSaulnier	Hartzler
Brat	DesJarlais	Hastings
Bridenstine	Deutch	Heck (NV)
Brooks (AL)	Diaz-Balart	Heck (WA)
Brooks (IN)	Dingell	Hensarling
Brown (FL)	Doggett	Hice, Jody B.
Brownley (CA)	Dold	Higgins
Buchanan	Donovan	Hill
Buck	Doyle, Michael F.	Himes
Bucshon	Duckworth	Holding
Burgess	Duffy	Honda
Bustos	Duncan (SC)	Hoyer
Butterfield	Duncan (TN)	Hudson
Calvert	Edwards	Huelskamp
Capps	Ellison	Huffman
Capuano	Ellmers (NC)	Huizenga (MI)
Carney	Emmer (MN)	Hultgren
Carson (IN)	Engel	Hunter
Carter (GA)	Eshoo	Hurd (TX)
Carter (TX)	Esty	Hurt (VA)
Cartwright	Farenthold	Israel
Castor (FL)	Farr	Issa
Castro (TX)	Fattah	Jackson Lee
Chabot	Fincher	Jeffries
Chaffetz	Fitzpatrick	Jenkins (KS)
Chu, Judy	Fleischmann	Jenkins (WV)
Cicilline	Fleming	Johnson (GA)
Clark (MA)	Flores	Johnson (OH)
Clarke (NY)	Forbes	Johnson, E. B.
Clawson (FL)	Fortenberry	Johnson, Sam
Clay	Foster	Jolly
Cleaver	Foxo	Jones
Clyburn	Frankel (FL)	Jordan
Coffman	Franks (AZ)	Joyce
Cohen	Frelinghuysen	Kaptur
		Katko

Keating	Mooney (WV)
Kelly (IL)	Moulton
Kelly (MS)	Mullin
Kelly (PA)	Murphy (FL)
Kennedy	Murphy (PA)
Kildee	Nadler
Kilmer	Neal
Kind	Neugebauer
King (IA)	Newhouse
King (NY)	Noem
Kinzinger (IL)	Nolan
Kirkpatrick	Norcross
Kline	Nugent
Knight	Nunes
Kuster	O'Rourke
Labrador	Olson
LaHood	Palazzo
LaMalfa	Pallone
Lamborn	Palmer
Lance	Paulsen
Langevin	Payne
Larsen (WA)	Pearce
Larson (CT)	Pelosi
Latta	Pittenger
Lawrence	Perlmutter
Lee	Perry
Levin	Peters
Lewis	Peterson
Lieu, Ted	Pingree
Lipinski	Pittenger
LoBiondo	Pocan
Loebsack	Poe (TX)
Loftgren	Poliquin
Long	Polis
Loudermilk	Pompeo
Love	Posey
Lowenthal	Price (NC)
Lowe	Price, Tom
Lucas	Rangel
Luetkemeyer	Ratcliffe
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Reed
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Reichert
Lummis	Renacci
Lynch	Ribble
MacArthur	Rice (NY)
Maloney, Carolyn	Rice (SC)
Maloney, Sean	Richmond
Marchant	Rigell
Marino	Roby
Massie	Rogers (AL)
Matsui	Rogers (KY)
McCarthy	Rohrabacher
McClintock	Rooney (FL)
McCollum	Ros-Lehtinen
McGovern	Roskam
McHenry	Ross
McKinley	Rothfus
McMorris	Rouzer
Rodgers	Royce
McNeerney	Ruiz
McSally	Ruppersberger
Meadows	Rush
Meehan	Russell
Meeks	Ryan (OH)
Meng	Salmon
Messer	Sánchez, Linda T.
Mica	Sanford
Miller (FL)	Sarbanes
Miller (MI)	Scalise
Moolenaar	Schakowsky
	Schiff
	Schrader
	Schweikert

NAYS—1

Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—26

Beatty	McCaul	Rokita
Blumenauer	McDermott	Roybal-Allard
Byrne	Moore	Sanchez, Loretta
Cárdenas	Mulvaney	Smith (WA)
Cole	Napolitano	Wagner
Costa	Pascrell	Welch
Green, Gene	Pitts	Westmoreland
Herrera Beutler	Quigley	Zinke
Hinojosa	Roe (TN)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1039

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and not present for rollcall vote No. 108. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on final passage of S. 1826, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 99 West 2nd Street in Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, as the Lieutenant Colonel James “Maggie” Megellas Post Office.

BLOCKING REGULATORY INTERFERENCE FROM CLOSING KILNS ACT OF 2016

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 635, I call up the bill (H.R. 4557) to allow for judicial review of any final rule addressing national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants for brick and structural clay products or for clay ceramics manufacturing before requiring compliance with such rule, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 635, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4557

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 “Blocking Regulatory Interference from Closing Kilns Act of 2016”.

SEC. 2. EXTENDING COMPLIANCE DATES (PENDING JUDICIAL REVIEW) OF RULES ADDRESSING NATIONAL EMISSION STANDARDS FOR HAZARDOUS AIR POLLUTANTS FOR BRICK AND STRUCTURAL CLAY PRODUCTS MANUFACTURING OR CLAY CERAMICS MANUFACTURING.

(a) EXTENSION OF COMPLIANCE DATES.—

(1) EXTENSION.—Each compliance date of any final rule described in subsection (b) is deemed to be extended by the time period equal to the time period described in subsection (c).

(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “compliance date” means, with respect to any requirement of a final rule described in subsection (b), the date by which any State, local, or tribal government or other person is first required to comply.

(b) FINAL RULES DESCRIBED.—A final rule described in this subsection is any final rule to address national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants (NESHAP) for brick and structural clay products manufacturing or clay ceramics manufacturing under section 112 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412), including—

(1) the final rule entitled “NESHAP for Brick and Structural Clay Products Manufacturing; and NESHAP for Clay Ceramics Manufacturing” published at 80 Fed. Reg. 65469 (October 26, 2015);

(2) the final rule entitled “NESHAP for Brick and Structural Clay Products Manufacturing; and NESHAP for Clay Ceramics Manufacturing; Correction” published at 80 Fed. Reg. 75817 (December 4, 2015); and

(3) any final rule that succeeds or amends the rule described in paragraph (1) or (2).

(c) PERIOD DESCRIBED.—The time period described in this subsection is the period of days that—

(1) begins on the date that is 60 days after the day on which notice of promulgation of a final rule described in subsection (b) appears in the Federal Register; and

(2) ends on the date on which judgment becomes final, and no longer subject to further appeal or review, in all actions (including actions that are filed pursuant to section 307 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7607))—

(A) that are filed during the 60 days described in paragraph (1); and

(B) that seek review of any aspect of such rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WHITFIELD. 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 H.R. 4557.

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

There was no objection.

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

Today, we have the important opportunity to protect the American brick manufacturing industry and the ceramic kiln industry and its 7,000 employees from a costly regulation that has yet to survive a judicial scrutiny.

At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), one of the original sponsors of this bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I certainly appreciate the opportunity to speak on this bill.

I rise today in support of H.R. 4557, the Blocking Regulatory Interference from Closing Kilns Act, or the BRICK Act. This legislation is important to preserving the viability of brick manufacturing facilities all across the country.

Simply put, the BRICK Act pauses the EPA's 2015 National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants until court challenges of the rule are resolved. I am very concerned that brick manufacturers in my district, as well as those in the districts of my colleagues, may be required to spend hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of dollars to satisfy an EPA requirement similar to the EPA's 2003 rule, a rule, it should be noted, that was vacated by the Federal courts.

□ 1045

For example, Cherokee Brick & Tile from Macon, Georgia, spent over \$1.5 million to install controls in order to comply with the EPA's invalidated 2003 rule.

Cherokee is a small, family-owned business, and as my colleagues with

small businesses in their districts can attest, \$1.5 million is a very substantial sum that can cut heavily into a bottom line. This rule impacts more than just Cherokee Brick & Tile in my State, but also General Shale and Pine Hall Brick, among others.

A basic material for home building and construction, bricks are more than just a figurative cornerstone in the United States construction industry. Passing this legislation would guarantee the EPA would wait until its 2015 emission standards are reviewed by the courts before implementing the rule and before manufacturers across the country are needlessly required to spend millions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 4557, the BRICK Act.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4557 is an unnecessary bill that would set a terrible precedent.

As the Statement of Administration Policy, which outlines the justification for President Obama's veto threat, states:

"H.R. 4557 would undermine the public health protections of the Clean Air Act by allowing further emissions of approximately 30 tons per month of toxic air pollution from brick and clay products production facilities. These toxic emissions include mercury, gases, and other hazardous metals which are associated with a variety of acute and chronic health effects, including cancers."

Mr. Speaker, the statement from President Obama goes on to say:

"Because H.R. 4557 threatens the health of Americans by allowing more toxic air pollution, if the President were presented with H.R. 4557, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill."

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4557 is the wrong remedy at the wrong time. Mr. Speaker, this bill is premature.

While I understand that the industry feels that it has been penalized for complying with the 2003 rule, that is not sufficient reason in itself to set up a unique process that incentivizes all parties that object to this rule to file endless challenges to the rulemaking.

The Brick and Clay Maximum Achievable Control Technology, or MACT, regulations that are the subject of this legislation are the subject of ongoing legal actions by industry and by public health communities across this Nation.

The courts already have the ability to grant a stay on this rule, yet for some reason the industry has not yet made that request to the court. But there are a number of pending cases filed by the industry on this very rule.

This week, Mr. Speaker, it was reported that the industry petitioned the court to put four suits on hold until the EPA decides whether to grant their requests to reconsider the regulations.

The pending decision by the court and by the EPA indicate that there is

no need for H.R. 4557, as there are ample remedies available under the Clean Air Act to address concerns about this rule. Additionally, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4557 does not actually address the merits or the faults with the Brick and Clay MACT rules.

Instead, what this bill does is takes these rules and this rulemaking outside of the process in the Clean Air Act that allows the EPA to issue final rules with deadlines for their implementation, without waiting for the conclusion of all the appeals and all the reviews.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would also delay any subsequent rule issued that is similar in scope and similar in objective until any legal challenges to it were completed as well. In other words, Mr. Speaker, this bill allows an opportunity for endless lawsuits on this very issue.

I fear, Mr. Speaker, that if H.R. 4557 were to become law, we would end up in a situation where we would never, ever control air polluting emissions from these facilities, no matter how cost-effective or how necessary that rule might be. Mr. Speaker, this is a policy that we must reject.

As the Statement of Administration Policy also noted, if rules cannot go forward until all legal actions are complete, there is a strong incentive to use frivolous legal challenges to prevent any rules from being implemented.

Under that scenario, we never would have achieved the improvements in air quality and in public health that have been accomplished under the Clean Air Act. We know, Mr. Speaker, that the Clean Air Act has delivered many cost-effective health benefits to the American people over the years.

It has been demonstrated many times that we do not have to make a choice between healthy air and jobs in this Nation. We can have both.

We cannot agree, Mr. Speaker, to setting this precedent and establishing a process that will delay important public health protections and encourage, at the same time, frivolous legal challenges to our clean air rules.

The brick, clay, and tile industries would be better served by pursuing the options available to them right now under the Clean Air Act.

For all of these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I must urge all of my colleagues to oppose this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) for introducing this important bill. This is an industry that has been hard hit by the recession. It has lost 45 percent of its jobs. There are 70 of these plants around the country, and they employ 7,000 people.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the BRICK Act would simply allow for the consideration and completion of any judicial review regarding the

EPA's 2015 National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for the brick, clay, and tile industries before requiring compliance.

So why is this important? Because this rule needlessly jeopardizes good-paying jobs all across America, as the chart right here next to me clearly demonstrates.

And for what reason? Why are they jeopardizing these jobs? The EPA itself concedes in the rule: "We do not expect that the combined emissions . . . would result in substantial cumulative health and environmental impacts."

Instead, the real health impacts due to this rule will be felt by the workers who lose their jobs, their health benefits, and even the education and training opportunities offered by their employers.

The brick industry primarily consists of small, family-owned businesses. They are often located in small communities that depend on the plant for good-paying jobs.

To comply with the EPA's requirement, these small businesses will be forced to borrow millions of dollars to pay for the required control technology. Many brick companies are already struggling to find the capital for plant modernization. I can't imagine how difficult it will be for these companies to secure the needed investments to pay for new control equipment, equipment that provides zero return on investment.

And let's not forget that the brick industry has already been through this before. The EPA finalized a similar rule in 2003 that required brick companies to spend millions of dollars on control equipment. A few years later, a Federal court vacated that rule.

Unfortunately, the brick industry couldn't roll back the clock and recover the investments they had made. Worse yet, the EPA's new emission rules use the reductions achieved by the vacated rule as the baseline for further reduction requirements, so the industry essentially got no credit for the hard work that they had already done.

This history further underscores why this legislation is so important. It also baffles me when I hear some of my colleagues say the BRICK Act is not needed because parties can already seek a judicial stay.

However, the EPA has effectively indicated, in a statement for the RECORD submitted to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, that they would oppose any requests to stay the rule.

Further, while the EPA's Clean Power Plan was recently stayed, the parties were only able to obtain relief by going to the U.S. Supreme Court. Here, the EPA's rule threatens the very existence of small brick and tile companies. These companies do not have unlimited resources to litigate against the Federal Government, and their jobs should not be put at risk due to a rule which has been vacated once already and has yet to be reviewed by the courts.

Mr. Speaker, the brick industry is part of our American culture. It has helped build some of the most iconic buildings, cities, and towns in existence in our country today. We must make certain our regulations and laws preserve this industry, not destroy it. The BRICK Act will do that.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers right now.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

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

I rise in favor of this very important, I think, legislation sponsored by my colleague from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON). I want to thank him for his leadership on this bill because it is a very pro-growth jobs bill. I think it is very important that we pass this.

I happen to be the chairman of the House Committee on Small Business, and our Nation's brick industry is primarily made up of small, family-owned businesses that employ thousands of workers. In Ohio alone, brick companies directly employ more than 700 workers and ensure the livelihoods of thousands of other workers.

□ 1100

Brick is used to construct, as we all know, residential homes and has been used to build some of our country's most iconic landmarks, such as Independence Hall, the birthplace of this great Nation.

With the severe downturn in construction during the Great Recession, the brick industry suffered significantly and still has not fully recovered. The industry is operating at about 50 percent of its capacity and suffered a 45 percent job loss from 2005 to 2012.

Now, small brick manufacturers are facing a costly new EPA regulation that may make it impossible for them to keep their doors open. That means those jobs would go away.

Compliance will require many companies to remove and replace costly air pollution control equipment with new devices that may not be able to meet the new, stringent emissions standards.

It is estimated to cost \$4.4 million to retrofit two kilns—the average number of kilns in a facility—with the new pollution control equipment. While the regulation is being challenged in Federal court, it just makes common sense to delay the compliance deadlines until that matter is resolved.

As chairman of the Small Business Committee, I urge my colleagues to stand up for small brick manufacturers and support this bill. This is a jobs bill.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) for his leadership in moving this bill forward.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois). The gen-

tleman from Illinois has 21½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky has 22½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the BRICK Act.

I agree with my colleagues that the brick, clay, and tile industries are in a tough position. The Bush administration issued final brick and clay emission standards—or Brick and Clay MACT standards—in 2003, 3 years after they were supposed to be completed.

Unfortunately, the rule was flawed and, when challenged, the court vacated those standards as unlawful. As a result, the EPA Administrator was able to redo the brick and clay rule.

I am sympathetic to the fact that the brick, clay, and tile industries have been facing some real challenges since 2007, when the housing market began to decline, but some proponents of this bill will have you believe that all of the challenges are a result of the improvements the industry must make to meet the 2015 Brick and Clay MACT rule. What they refuse to acknowledge are the real health benefits that will come with the reduction of several major air pollutants.

I understand the industry stakeholders' reluctance to make further investments in pollution control technology to comply with this rule, given their previous experience with the 2003 rule, but the Clean Air Act provides a number of remedies that are available to them.

The courts are the proper venue for resolving issues with the Brick and Clay MACT. To date, industry groups have filed lawsuits on the merits of the rule, but none of the interested parties have actually asked the court to stay the rule's compliance dates.

The industry can also ask EPA to reconsider the rule, which I understand has already happened. In fact, earlier this week industry groups asked the D.C. Circuit Court to postpone consideration of their pending lawsuits until EPA makes a decision on whether to reconsider the rule. Neither of those remedies require action by Congress, but a legislative quick fix is the only remedy the proponents of this bill appear to care about.

H.R. 4557 does not resolve the ongoing issues with this rule. In fact, it is far more likely to create a drawn-out rulemaking process fueled by an endless stream of court challenges. That wouldn't resolve any of the industry's problems with the Brick and Clay MACT rule.

The bill also sets, in my opinion, a terrible precedent by delaying all of the rule's compliance requirements until all legal actions are complete.

If this remedy sounds familiar, that is because it is. The majority included a similar provision in a bill we considered earlier in this Congress: H.R. 2042,

the Ratepayer Protection Act. I opposed that bill, and I oppose this one for the same reasons.

If we had included a litigation delay policy in the Clean Air Act, we would never have achieved the improvements in air quality and public health that we now enjoy.

The Clean Air Act provides ample opportunities for industry and the public to influence the development and implementation of regulations. These tools should be used in this case.

Finally, I do not support legislation to resolve the issues being raised by the bill's supporters. These issues can and should be resolved by the courts.

So I urge my colleagues to reject this attempt to get around the courts. I ask that they vote "no" on H.R. 4557.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL), one of the original cosponsors of this legislation.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to voice my support for H.R. 4557, the BRICK Act.

I want to tell a story about a small company in my hometown of Selma, Alabama. Henry Brick Company has been a family-owned business since 1945, providing jobs and economic support to the Black Belt of Alabama.

In 2003, the EPA passed a rule requiring Henry Brick Company, along with all other brick and structural clay manufacturers, to reduce their air pollutant emissions.

In order to meet these new regulations by 2006, Henry Brick Company of Selma, Alabama, spent \$1.5 million to come into compliance with the rule. This was a major financial burden for this small company, but Henry Brick Company is a good corporate citizen and understands the importance of protecting our environment.

However, 1 year after they spent \$1.5 million, the courts vacated the EPA's 2003 regulation. So the EPA went back to the drawing board to create a new rule, but they did not give these brick companies credit for emission reductions achieved under the previous rule.

On the contrary, in their new rule, the EPA actually used the emission reductions achieved under the vacated rule as a baseline for further reduction requirements.

Now, Henry Brick Company faces a new brick and clay manufacturing rule with even stricter emissions requirements and must come into compliance by December 2018.

This time the small company may have to spend up to \$8 million to comply with the new emissions standards, leaving Henry Brick Company one step closer to being forced to close their doors.

I am supportive, Mr. Speaker, of reducing emissions, and I am also in favor of protecting our environment. But this must be done in an economically viable way. It is simply unfair for regulators to continue to move the goalposts on small brick manufacturers like Henry Brick Company.

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. That is why I support this legislation to delay the enforcement of the new EPA rule until all of the legal challenges have been concluded.

This is a necessary and commonsense bill. I ask my colleagues to vote "yes" on final passage.

I want to thank Representative JOHNSON of Ohio and all of those that are working hard to make sure that small brick companies, like Henry Brick Company of Selma, Alabama, do not have to close its doors.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4557, the BRICK Act.

Once again American businesses find themselves facing millions of dollars in compliance costs due to burdensome EPA regulations.

It is estimated that the EPA's Brick MACT rule may cost the brick and ceramics industry up to \$100 million per year, with the cost of compliance for the average facility at approximately \$4.4 million.

In addition, the industry will not be able to meet the requirement deadlines imposed by the rule, which is currently being challenged in Federal court.

The EPA's first attempt at a Brick MACT rule was judicially vacated, but not before the industry spent millions in compliance measures ultimately found to be invalid.

Small brick and ceramics businesses have been the hardest hit by the first rule, and if this situation repeats itself, many of these businesses will be forced to close their doors for good.

H.R. 4557 would provide much-needed regulatory relief to brick and ceramic businesses by stating that no additional compliance measures shall be mandated by the EPA until judicial review of the rule is completed.

I encourage my colleagues to support this bill, which will protect a vital industry and its thousands of jobs from potentially devastating regulatory uncertainty.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the Blocking Regulatory Interference from Closing Kilns Act, or the BRICK Act.

Rules handed down by the EPA have real-world consequences on businesses and our economy. You have heard the backstory today regarding the 2015 Brick MACT standards and the impact it will have on the brick manufacturing industry.

In my district, Columbus Brick Company, a fifth-generation, family-owned small business, will be forced to spend millions of dollars in compliance costs

and significantly downsize or go out of business and tell 85 dedicated employees to find a new job. What is even more disappointing is that Columbus Brick has been forced to navigate this decision before.

The EPA promulgated Brick MACT standards in 2003, and then the rule was vacated by a Federal court in 2007, but not until a significant monetary investment had been made by Columbus Brick in an attempt to be in compliance. That is why it is imperative that we pass the BRICK Act today.

Companies like Columbus Brick aren't asking for zero regulation, but they are asking to be regulated fairly, to have a seat at the table in determining new rules, and some certainty when it comes to making future business decisions.

The American people deserve better. They deserve a government that can ensure citizens have clean air to breathe without eliminating essential industries.

That is why I urge you to support the BRICK Act. Let's wait until judicial review is complete so our businesses aren't forced to make unnecessary, costly decisions with minimal or unknown environmental benefits.

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

Mr. Speaker, I don't know why we are even here debating this issue, which is an important issue, but not a prevailing issue. This is an issue that concerns one industry.

It is a concern that is already under consideration by the courts and by the administration. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is a problem that is more appropriately addressed by those branches of government than by this Congress.

There are many other issues that this Congress has before it that it is our job to address. Yet, Mr. Speaker, we are not spending ample time on those things that are closely tied to the economic benefits and jobs for all Americans.

Our water infrastructure, Mr. Speaker, is in dire need of repair and maintenance. We spend little to no time on our water infrastructure and the problems associated with it.

We have Superfund sites and brownfield sites that need to be cleaned up and put to productive use. No time, no energy, no congressional resources are used to address these vital issues.

Our States need support for modernizing and hardening the electricity grid. We are AWOL on these issues.

And still, Mr. Speaker, many Americans are underemployed, unemployed, and underpaid for the work that they are doing.

□ 1115

Where is the time allocation, the resource allocation? Where are our efforts on behalf of these people?

All of these things, Mr. Speaker, particularly and especially the infrastructure issue, must be addressed by the Congress. There is no other place that

can address these issues as appropriately, as effectively, as efficiently, except this Congress. And these issues, these infrastructure issues affect every industry, every State, every American in our Nation.

So, Mr. Speaker, let us use this body's time and efforts on the critical issues that are of great importance to the American people. Mr. Speaker, our time could be better served if we would just address some of these prevailing issues of the day.

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

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

I will conclude my remarks over on this side. I was listening to the debate on the rule about this bill, and some people did make the comment that this was not a particularly important issue.

I might say to the 7,000 people employed in this industry, to the owners of the companies, this is very important because some of them may very well lose their business, may very well lose their jobs.

So we have two goals with this legislation. One is simply to say this regulation coming out of EPA needs to be considered by the courts before these companies are required to invest significant sums of money.

In fact, the industry itself has said that the average plant has two kilns, and a plant with two kilns would have to spend roughly \$4 million to meet the requirements of this regulation.

Now, remember, in 2003, EPA came out with a regulation for this industry and, by 2006, the industry had to comply. They did comply and they reduced emissions of the regulated substance by 96 percent.

We see a pattern developing at EPA. They know full well that this President would veto any legislation that changes in any way anything coming out of EPA, so the only avenue left to the regulated parties is to file a lawsuit.

So just as the brick industry filed a lawsuit in 2003 on that extreme regulation, they had to comply by 2006; and then the Court, in 2007, after they had already complied, ruled that the regulation was illegal, but the money had already been spent.

Now, the money has already been spent, 96 percent reduction has occurred, and now the EPA is coming back with a new regulation.

So these people involved, they have no avenue. I mean, they are talking to EPA, pleading with EPA, and EPA, as usual, is not responsive.

So all this legislation does is say, we are not trying to reverse the regulation, change the regulation. We are simply saying, let the Court decide.

And guess what?

A pattern is also developing over at EPA because they are losing these court cases.

Now, on the Clean Energy Plan, which was one of the most extreme reg-

ulations ever to come from EPA, 3 days before Judge Scalia died, the Supreme Court issued a stay on the Clean Energy Plan, saying that you cannot implement this plan until the judicial remedies have been exhausted.

Then, even under Utility MACT, that also went to the Supreme Court, and the Court said, well, you didn't consider certain costs; we are remanding this. But most of the industries have already spent the money, met the requirements, and some of them have closed as well.

So the question becomes, are we going to let an EPA adopting extreme rules under this administration make all the decisions?

Or will the Congress of the United States try to stand up and pass some legislation, not reversing, not changing, but simply saying, since lawsuits have been filed, let's give the Court the opportunity to determine if the regulation is legal or not legal?

So that is all we are doing here.

I want to thank those who introduced this legislation, both the Democrats and Republicans. And I would urge our colleagues to pass this legislation, to simply provide some commonsense balance, and let the courts make a decision before we require the companies to spend all this money and, in many cases, lay off employees and, in some cases, even close the business.

So I would urge the passage of H.R. 4557.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I voted against H.R. 4557, the Blocking Regulatory Interference from Closing Kilns Act of 2016, yet another bill in a series of Republican attempts to block EPA's ability to effectively regulate pollution in a way that protects our health and the environment.

H.R. 4557 would delay the enactment of an important rule limiting mercury and other hazardous pollution from clay and brick products production facilities. I was disappointed to see it pass the House, but I know that President Obama and Democrats in the Senate will ensure that this misguided bill does not become law this year.

The Clean Air Act requires the EPA to establish standards for pollution from all industrial sectors, and many other sectors are already complying to improve air quality. There is no reason to further delay this rule, and no reason for this legislation.

I am hopeful that House Republicans will drop its obsession with pro-pollution bills and allow us to get to work on a budget and bills that will improve the lives of Oregonians.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity today to help many struggling small businesses and the jobs they support by voting yes on H.R. 4557, the BRICK Act.

How did we get here? Last October, the EPA finalized an extremely stringent new rule for the brick making industry. Most of the companies that find themselves threatened by this rule are small businesses—many are family-owned—and the industry is still dealing with the effects of the recession and the weak recovery that continues to suppress demand for bricks and other building materials. Few, if any, brick makers can easily afford the esti-

mated \$4.4 million dollars it will take to bring a typical facility into compliance and the industry is currently challenging the rule in federal court.

The BRICK Act simply extends the compliance deadlines for the rule until after judicial review is complete. This commonsense step would prevent brick makers from having to initiate costly and potentially irreversible compliance steps—and in some cases shut their doors entirely and lay off workers—over a rule whose legality is still in question.

This is far from a hypothetical concern. EPA's last set of Brick standards in 2003 were vacated by a federal court in 2007, but by that time the industry had already been forced to spend millions on compliance. None of us want to see that happen again. It's a matter of fairness. It's a matter of commonsense.

For the sake of brick makers and their thousands of employees across the country, including nearly 2,000 in Michigan I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the BRICK Act.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 635, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of the bill will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 163, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

YEAS—238

Abraham	Cole	Flores
Aderholt	Collins (GA)	Forbes
Allen	Collins (NY)	Fortenberry
Amash	Comstock	Fox
Amodei	Conaway	Franks (AZ)
Ashford	Cook	Frelinghuysen
Babin	Cooper	Gibbs
Barletta	Costello (PA)	Gibson
Bilirakis	Cramer	Gohmert
Bishop (GA)	Crawford	Goodlatte
Bishop (MI)	Crenshaw	Gosar
Bishop (UT)	Cuellar	Gowdy
Black	Culberson	Granger
Blackburn	Curbelo (FL)	Graves (LA)
Blum	Davis, Rodney	Graves (MO)
Bost	Denham	Griffith
Boustany	Dent	Grothman
Brady (TX)	DeSantis	Guinta
Brat	DesJarlais	Guthrie
Bridenstine	Diaz-Balart	Hanna
Brooks (AL)	Dold	Hardy
Brooks (IN)	Donovan	Harper
Buchanan	Duffy	Harris
Buck	Duncan (SC)	Hartzler
Bucshon	Duncan (TN)	Heck (NV)
Byrne	Ellmers (NC)	Hice, Jody B.
Calvert	Emmer (MN)	Hill
Carter (GA)	Farenthold	Holding
Carter (TX)	Fincher	Hudson
Chaffetz	Fitzpatrick	Huelskamp
Clawson (FL)	Fleischmann	Huizenga (MI)
Coffman	Fleming	Hultgren

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

Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
MacArthur
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise

Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres

Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 217, noes 154, answered “present” 1, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]
AYES—217

Abraham	Garrett	Palmer
Adams	Goodlatte	Pelosi
Allen	Gowdy	Perlmutter
Ashford	Graham	Pingree
Barletta	Griffith	Pocan
Barr	Guthrie	Polis
Becerra	Hahn	Posey
Beyer	Hardy	Price (NC)
Bilirakis	Harper	Ratcliffe
Bishop (GA)	Harris	Ribble
Bishop (MI)	Hartzler	Roby
Bishop (UT)	Hastings	Rogers (KY)
Black	Heck (WA)	Rohrabacher
Blackburn	Himes	Rooney (FL)
Bonamici	Huffman	Ross
Boustany	Hultgren	Rothfus
Brady (TX)	Issa	Royce
Brat	Jeffries	Ruiz
Bridenstine	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Brooks (AL)	Johnson, E. B.	Russell
Brooks (IN)	Johnson, Sam	Salmon
Brown (FL)	Jolly	Sanford
Buchanan	Kaptur	Scalise
Bustos	Katko	Schiff
Butterfield	Kelly (IL)	Schrader
Calvert	Kelly (MS)	Schweikert
Capps	Kelly (PA)	Scott (VA)
Carson (IN)	Kennedy	Scott, Austin
Carter (TX)	Kildee	Scott, David
Castro (TX)	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Kline	Serrano
Chu, Judy	Kuster	Sessions
Cicilline	Labrador	Sewell (AL)
Cicilline	LaHood	Sherman
Clark (MA)	LaMalfa	Shimkus
Clay	Lamborn	Shuster
Cleaver	Latta	Sinema
Cole	Lipinski	Slaughter
Collins (NY)	Lofgren	Smith (NE)
Comstock	Long	Smith (NJ)
Cooper	Loudermilk	Smith (TX)
Cramer	Lowenthal	Stefanik
Crenshaw	Lucas	Stewart
Cuellar	Luetkemeyer	Stutzman
Culberson	Lujan Grisham	Takai
Davis (CA)	(NM)	Takano
Davis, Danny	DeGette	Thornberry
DeGette	DeLauro	Titus
DeLauro	DelBene	Torres
DelBene	Dent	Tsongas
Dent	DeSaulnier	Upton
DesJarlais	DesJarlais	Van Hollen
Deutch	Marino	Wagner
Diaz-Balart	Massie	Walden
Dingell	McCarthy	Walorski
Doggett	McClintock	Walters, Mimi
Donovan	McCollum	Walz
Doyle, Michael	McHenry	Wasserman
F.	McMorris	Schultz
Duckworth	Rodgers	Webster (FL)
Duncan (SC)	McNerney	Welch
Emmer (MN)	Meadows	Wenstrup
Engel	Meeks	Whitfield
Eshoo	Meng	Williams
Esty	Moolenaar	Wilson (FL)
Fitzpatrick	Mooney (WV)	Wilson (SC)
Fleischmann	Moulton	Wittman
Fortenberry	Mullin	Womack
Foster	Murphy (FL)	Yarmuth
Frankel (FL)	Nadler	Young (IA)
Franks (AZ)	Neugebauer	Young (IN)
Frelinghuysen	Newhouse	Zeldin
Gabbard	Noem	Zinke
Gallego	Nunes	
Garamendi	O'Rourke	
	Olson	

NOT VOTING—32

Barr
Barton
Beatty
Benishke
Burgess
Cárdenas
Chabot
Cleaver
Costa
Edwards
Garrett

Graves (GA)
Green, Gene
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hinojosa
Hoyer
Kirkpatrick
McCaul
Moore
Mulvaney
Napolitano

Pascrell
Price, Tom
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Sanchez, Loretta
Scott, David
Smith (WA)
Speier
Thompson (PA)
Westmoreland

□ 1140

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Messrs. MARCHANT and ZELDIN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 109, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 109, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent on Thursday, March 3, 2016. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following ways:

Vote “no” on rollcall No. 106—Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4557.

Vote “no” on rollcall No. 107—H. Res. 635—Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4557—Blocking Regulatory Interference from Closing Kilns (BRICK) Act of 2016.

Vote “yes” on rollcall No. 108—S. 1826—To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 99 West 2nd Street in Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, as the Lieutenant Colonel James “Maggie” Megellas Post Office.

Vote “no” on rollcall No. 109—Passage of H.R. 4557—Blocking Regulatory Interference from Closing Kilns (BRICK) Act of 2016.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for votes due to official business outside of Washington, D.C.

If I were present, I would vote in the following manner on the following votes:

(1) Previous Question—“yes.”

(2) Adoption of the Rule—“yes.”

(3) S. 1826—To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 99 West 2nd Street in Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, as the Lieutenant Colonel James “Maggie” Megellas Post Office—“yes.”

(4) H.R. 4557, Blocking Regulatory Interference from Closing Kilns Act—“yes.”

THE JOURNAL

The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

NAYS—163

Adams
Aguilar
Bass
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Cappert
Capuano
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Ellison

Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey

Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter

NOES—154

Aderholt	Graves (GA)	Norcross
Aguilar	Graves (LA)	Nugent
Amash	Graves (MO)	Pallone
Babin	Grayson	Paulsen
Barton	Green, Al	Pearce
Bass	Guinta	Perry
Bera	Gutiérrez	Peters
Blum	Heck (NV)	Peterson
Bost	Hice, Jody B.	Poe (TX)
Brady (PA)	Hill	Poliquin
Brownley (CA)	Holding	Price, Tom
Buck	Honda	Reichert
Bucshon	Huizenga (MI)	Renacci
Burgess	Hurd (TX)	Rice (SC)
Capuano	Israel	Rigell
Carney	Jackson Lee	Roe (TN)
Carter (GA)	Jenkins (KS)	Rogers (AL)
Cartwright	Jenkins (WV)	Rokita
Castor (FL)	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Chaffetz	Jones	Rouzer
Clarke (NY)	Jordan	Rush
Clawson (FL)	Joyce	Ryan (OH)
Clyburn	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Coffman	Kind	Schakowsky
Cohen	Kinzinger (IL)	Smith (MO)
Conaway	Knight	Speier
Connolly	Lance	Stivers
Conyers	Langevin	Swalwell (CA)
Costello (PA)	Larson (CT)	Thompson (CA)
Crowley	Lawrence	Thompson (MS)
Cummings	Lee	Thompson (PA)
Curbelo (FL)	Levin	Tiberi
Davis, Rodney	Lewis	Tipton
DeFazio	Lieu, Ted	Turner
Delaney	LoBiondo	Valadao
Denham	Love	Vargas
DeSantis	Lowey	Veasey
Dold	Lynch	Vela
Duffy	MacArthur	Velázquez
Ellison	Maloney, Sean	Visclosky
Ellmers (NC)	Marchant	Walberg
Farenthold	Matsui	Walker
Farr	McDermott	Waters, Maxine
Fattah	McGovern	Watson Coleman
Fincher	McKinley	Weber (TX)
Fleming	McSally	Westerman
Flores	Meehan	Woodall
Forbes	Messer	Yoder
Foxx	Miller (FL)	Yoho
Fudge	Murphy (PA)	Young (AK)
Gibson	Neal	
Gosar	Noelan	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tonko

NOT VOTING—61

Amodiei	Hanna	Palazzo
Beatty	Hensarling	Pascrell
Benishkek	Herrera Beutler	Payne
Blumenauer	Higgins	Pittenger
Boyle, Brendan	Hinojosa	Pitts
F.	Hoyer	Pompeo
Byrne	Hudson	Quigley
Cárdenas	Huelskamp	Rangel
Collins (GA)	Hunter	Reed
Cook	Hurt (VA)	Rice (NY)
Costa	Keating	Richmond
Courtney	King (IA)	Roskam
Crawford	Kirkpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Duncan (TN)	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez, Linda
Edwards	Loeb sack	T.
Gibbs	McCaul	Sanchez, Loretta
Gohmert	Mica	Simpson
Granger	Miller (MI)	Sires
Green, Gene	Moore	Smith (WA)
Grijalva	Mulvaney	Trott
Grothman	Napolitano	Westmoreland

□ 1148

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present in the House Chamber for certain rollcall votes on February 26th and the week of February 29 through March 3, 2016.

Had I been present on those dates, I would have voted "yea" for rollcalls 100, 102, 103, 104, 105, 108, and 110 and "nay" on rollcalls 101, 106, 107, and 109.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on Thursday, March 3, 2016, due to important events being held today in our district in Houston and Harris County, Texas.

If I had been able to vote, I would have voted as follows:

On the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4557, the Blocking Regulatory Interference from Losing Kilns Act, I would have voted "no."

On H. Res. 635, the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4557, I would have voted "no."

On S. 1826, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 99 West 2nd Street in Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, as the Lieutenant Colonel James "Maggie" Megellas Post Office, I would have voted "yea."

On passage of H.R. 4557, the Blocking Regulatory Interference from Losing Kilns Act of 2016, I would have voted "no."

On the Journal Vote, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I was absent due to illness and was not present for roll call votes on Thursday, March 3, 2016. Had I been present, I would have voted in this manner:

Rollcall Vote No. 106—Ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 635—the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4557—Blocking Regulatory Interference from Closing Kilns Act of 2016—"no."

Rollcall Vote No. 107—Adoption of H. Res. 635—the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4557—Blocking Regulatory Interference from Closing Kilns Act of 2016—"no."

Rollcall Vote No. 108—S. 1826 To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 99 West 2nd Street in Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, as the Lieutenant Colonel James "Maggie" Megellas Post Office—"yes."

Rollcall Vote No. 109—Passage of H.R. 4557—Blocking Regulatory Interference from Closing Kilns Act of 2016—"yes."

Rollcall Vote No. 110—Journal—"yes."

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 29; Tuesday, March 1; Wednesday, March 2; and Thursday, March 3, 2016, I was on medical leave while recovering from hip replacement surgery and unable to be present for recorded votes. Had I been present, I would have voted:

"Yes" on rollcall vote No. 102 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4238).

"Yes" on rollcall vote No. 103 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 136).

"Yes" on rollcall vote No. 104 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 3735).

"Yes" on rollcall vote No. 105 (on passage of H.R. 3716).

"No" on rollcall vote No. 106 (on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 635).

"No" on rollcall vote No. 107 (on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 635).

"Yes" on rollcall vote No. 108 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 1826).

"No" on rollcall vote No. 109 (on passage of H.R. 4557).

"Yes" on rollcall vote No. 110 (on approving the journal).

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, MARCH 3, 2016, TO MONDAY, MARCH 7, 2016

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 4 p.m. on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Michigan). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

BLOCKING REGULATORY INTERFERENCE FROM CLOSING KILNS ACT

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, the President has a history of legislating through government agencies, and his flavor of the week continues to be the EPA.

Using faceless EPA bureaucrats, this administration issues new rules and regulations daily, passing them out like candy. Not only are they costly and time-consuming, these rules affect the heart of America's prosperity and economic growth: our small businesses.

I rise today in support of legislation that works to block the overreaching hand of this administration and protects Americans and American businesses from more burdensome regulations.

The BRICK Act delays a harmful EPA rule from being implemented until all judicial review has been completed. To me, this legislation is plain common sense.

Congress needs to stand up to this administration, which continues to legislate outside its jurisdiction, and increasingly, the courts confirm my claims. The legislative process begins and ends with Congress. I commend my colleagues today for passing the BRICK Act to prove we will stand up to Washington agencies that overstep their boundaries.

NO BUDGET, NO PAY

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I ran for Congress on the idea of no budget, no pay. If Congress can't do its job and pass a budget, they don't deserve a paycheck. No hardworking American gets paid for not doing their job. So why should we?

Just a few months ago we passed a bipartisan 2-year budget agreement that moved us away from the harmful sequester. Now many of my colleagues

on the other side of the aisle are threatening to go back on that agreement and keep us from having a budget at all. That is what gridlock looks like, and that is what people hate about Congress.

What are we going to do to fix it? Come in to work 10 days in the entire month of March. Maybe if we came to work, we could debate and pass a budget and spending bills that will spur economic growth and create high-quality jobs.

But, instead, we have 2 months on the calendar this year where we don't come to work at all, even once. A 5-day workweek is expected from most Americans. Why should Congress be any different?

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate March as Women's History Month. As this month is also Red Cross Month, I want to recognize one woman in particular: Clara Barton.

Ms. Barton was a nurse during the Civil War and a teacher before founding the American Red Cross in 1881. She then served as the organization's first president. Her compassion and accomplishments are truly inspiring, and her work has literally helped millions.

Unfortunately, in our society today, women make up less than 5 percent of CEOs and are equally underrepresented in other areas. As a father of two daughters, ensuring that young women can achieve anything that they set their mind to is personal for me.

In the 10th Congressional District, we run a Young Women's Leadership Academy. This program is designed to help young women develop the leadership skills necessary to overcome any and all challenges thrown their way.

This unique program gives young women the opportunity to learn from other inspiring female leaders, such as our own colleague, Congresswoman ELISE STEFANIK, the youngest woman ever elected to the United States Congress.

I encourage all of my colleagues to start similar programs in their district so that we can all do our part to help inspire young women to become leaders in their chosen fields.

Of course, this is just a small part of the solution. As we celebrate the inspiring achievements of women this month, we must rededicate ourselves to doing more to tear down barriers and ensure gender equality in our country.

HONORING EDWARD CHOW, JR.

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

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the service of Cap-

tain Edward Chow, Jr., a decorated Army veteran who was awarded the Bronze Star for his selfless service in the Vietnam war.

True to his character, Ed's service to our great Nation did not end after the war. Out of uniform, Ed has continued serving his fellow Americans, dedicating his life to supporting fellow vets.

Ed's illustrious public service career culminated in leading the State of Maryland's Department of Veterans Affairs. Under Secretary Chow's leadership, the Department enhanced claims processing and improved the quality of its veterans' homes.

As Ed's friend, I witnessed his dedication and passion for helping the men and women who defended our country. Ed never hesitated to help whenever I called him on behalf of a veteran needing assistance.

I, like so many others, thank Ed for his admirable career of military and public service and want him to know his legacy will endure.

M&M'S 75TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 75th anniversary of an iconic American candy first made in the great State of New Jersey.

On March 3, 1941, in Newark, New Jersey, Mars began producing M&Ms as military rations for those serving in World War II. Over the 75 years since their founding, M&Ms grew to become an internationally recognized brand and a symbol of American innovation and quality.

To this day, Mars continues to produce M&Ms in my district in Hackettstown, New Jersey. New Jersey is also home to Mars Global Chocolate headquarters, and they operate four facilities in a State employing over 1,700 associates.

Mars has remained active in New Jersey communities over the years, and I applaud their philanthropic endeavors and their commitment to our local towns. No doubt New Jersey is a sweeter place because of M&Ms.

On behalf of the Fifth District of New Jersey, I am pleased to have the opportunity to recognize this extraordinary anniversary for M&Ms.

HONORING JAMES V. KIMSEY

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, America and the world lost an indefatigable champion, a distinguished gentleman, and a charismatic friend with the death of James V. Kimsey this past Tuesday.

Jim was larger than life. Everything Jim touched has become part of the history and culture of our community. From Bullfeathers to AOL, from his

home above the Potomac to the orphanages in Vietnam, from the Kennedy Center to the International Commission on Missing Persons, Jim Kimsey has been a transformational leader.

Despite his too-short life, Jim's résumé is long and deep: founder and CEO of AOL, chairman of Refugees International, Library of Congress Trust Fund Board, Executive Committee of the National Symphony Orchestra, Kennedy Center Board of Trustees, West Point Board of Visitors, an Army tour in the Dominican Republic and two in Vietnam, the Army Ranger Hall of Fame, and so much more.

But for Jim's myriad of friends, he was so much more than a list of achievements. He was visionary, strategic, generous, mischievous, and always had a smile on his face.

Who else could be tossed out of Gonzaga College High School 2 months before graduation, graduate from our archrival St. John's College High School, and still be a generous and loyal Gonzaga friend for decades to come?

Jim's funeral will be this Saturday at the Cathedral of St. Matthew the Apostle in Washington, D.C.

We will all miss you for a long time.

□ 1200

WHEN WEAKNESS IS PROVOCATIVE

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this week, the House Select Investigative Panel on Infant Lives began hearings to look into Planned Parenthood's harvesting and trafficking of human body parts, which was revealed in a series of undercover videos last year. These were videos that even Democrat Presidential frontrunner Hillary Clinton, in her words, "obviously found disturbing."

Since the release of the videos last year, some have rushed to defend the organization, and Planned Parenthood and its allies have been in full damage control mode. Among the more bizarre defenses has been that the videos were heavily edited, as if the statements made by Planned Parenthood officials and a worker who harvested body parts really aren't what they appear to be.

I do not serve on this select committee, but if I did, I would really want to take a hard look at that defense. The term "heavily edited" suggests that important, qualifying context may have been omitted in these videos;

but I struggle, Mr. Speaker, with trying to understand any context that would soften the language in these tapes.

For example, in what context is this okay?

“We have been very good at getting heart, lung, liver, because we know that, so I am not going to crush that part.”

What about: “A lot of people want intact hearts these days,” or “always as many intact livers as possible”?

Do the defenders of Planned Parenthood think that they are talking about chicken hearts or livers at a butcher shop as opposed to baby body parts?

Just in what context does this sound right?

“Yesterday was the first time she said people wanted lungs.”

How about: “Some people want lower extremities, too”—that would be legs. “I don’t know what they’re doing with it. I guess they want the muscle”?

Again, Mr. Speaker, what is the situation in which these statements would not shock a sensitive conscience?

What about this line? When is this an acceptable statement?

“Using a ‘less crunchy’ technique to get more whole specimens.”

In that phrase, the context is you have a Planned Parenthood official who is talking about a “less crunchy” type of abortion, which begs the obvious question: What does that even mean?

Can anyone who defends Planned Parenthood give me the context in which this sounds good?

“I know I’ve seen livers; I’ve seen stomachs; I’ve seen plenty of neural tissue. Usually you can see the whole brain, usually, come out.”

What about: “I don’t think it would be as war torn” when discussing what fetal remains look like during a second trimester abortion? What would that sentence sound like in an unedited video?

At one point in a video, a clinic worker brings in another fetal body, saying, “And another boy.” A boy. In another context, you might hear “and another boy” if a mom is giving birth to twin sons, but that is obviously not the context of these videos.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, can someone please tell me the context in which this dialogue does not mean what it says?

“This is a really good fetus, and it looks like we can procure a lot from it . . . we’re going to procure brain.” Further: “So she gave me the scissors and she told me I have to cut down the middle of the face; and I can’t even, like, describe, like, what that feels like. And I remember picking it up and finishing going through the rest of the face and just picking up the brain and putting it in a container . . . and I’m just sitting there, like, what did I just do?”

What is the context in which these words might not be what they seem?

I can think of one: perhaps if you had a screenwriter who was talking about a new horror film she was writing.

But this is no horror film, Mr. Speaker. These words are direct quotes from a technician who is engaged in a real-world practice that is appalling, barbaric, and indefensible—the harvesting of fetal body parts for money.

It is not easy to come to the floor of the House to speak these words. I would prefer not to. It is uncomfortable to listen to these words, and many people would prefer not to hear them. If that is the case, Mr. Speaker—if I don’t like talking about this and if people don’t like hearing about it—why, for goodness sake, are we allowing hard-working taxpayers’ dollars to go to the organization that is responsible for them?

We are a better nation than what is revealed in these videos. There are 13,000 other health clinics that are capable of providing health care for women, clinics which do not perform abortions. It is past time that the \$500 million in Federal dollars that Planned Parenthood receives every year be redirected to those clinics.

I thank the gentleman from Texas.

WHEN WEAKNESS IS PROVOCATIVE

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank Mr. ROTHFUS, my friend from Pennsylvania. He is exactly right. We have so many people across this Nation who understand the tragedy of taking a child’s life before it is fully born.

Mr. Speaker, I know there are some people, like our friend Donald Trump, who say Planned Parenthood has done a lot more good; but the trouble is, so often, Planned Parenthood takes money from the Federal Government and then just refers the women out. Of course, that has been perpetuated by this administration in its making it sound like Planned Parenthood does mammograms and other things that they don’t do. They refer people to other people.

Why not have that money not get held up at Planned Parenthood? Why not have that money go directly to the thousands of healthcare providers that actually provide the care that the women are seeking and not have it go to Planned Parenthood so that they can get money from the government and then keep their abortion business going?

That also leads right into this article today from the National Review, Jim Geraghty, regarding ObamaCare. Headline: “Deductibles Increased in 41 States under ObamaCare.”

It reads:

Freedom Partners unveils a new ‘Deductibles Tracker’ showing how much deductibles have increased, on average, in each State. I know this will shock you, but most people are finding their deductibles are going up and, in some cases, way up.

Their analysis shows deductibles have increased in 41 States under ObamaCare—in some States, like Mississippi, by over \$1,000. Seventeen States, representing over half of total exchange enrollment, are seeing double-digit spikes. The largest increases were in Mississippi, which went up 39 percent; Washington State went up 31 percent; South Carolina went up 26 percent; Louisiana went

up 24 percent; Florida went up 23 percent; Minnesota and Vermont went up 22 percent; Arizona went up 21 percent; North Carolina went up 20 percent.

Mr. Speaker, what makes it so incredibly difficult is knowing there are Federal dollars that are being used for abortion and being used for purposes that are against the religious beliefs of so many Americans. When we think that the whole object we were told for having ObamaCare and passing it against the will of the majority of the American people was so that we could make sure everybody had insurance, now it appears that there has not been much change in the net number of people covered under insurance.

Oh, yes, it is true. There are some people who were paying for their insurance who no longer have it—they can’t afford it anymore. It is true that we have some people who were not paying for it who are having it provided now, but it really appears to have been more a transfer of working people’s money to people who were not working.

It appears that we have been moving into a socialist agenda for some time, and that goes back to what President Obama said when he first ran, telling “Joe the Plumber” that he wanted it to be about spreading the wealth around. The pilgrims found out that, at least in this world, if you try to share and share alike—the Early New Testament tried it, and it didn’t work—and if you start allowing people who are not working to have the same benefits as those who work, you will have more and more people who are not working.

I hear from so many of my constituents—I know I hear from others of my friends here in Congress—that constituents are hurting. Their insurance is costing more, and like this article points out, the deductibles have gone higher. Ask one of my staff, who is not making very much.

If you make \$30,000 and if you have a deductible of \$6,000 as a healthy young person, what that basically means is that every dime you are paying into health care is not going to help your health care whatsoever. You are paying for the new IRS agents, the new navigators, and the new government union workers who will never spray Bactine on anybody’s cut, who will never put a Band-Aid on. They will just keep adding forms, adding requirements, taking more time away from the true healthcare providers and more money away from the true healthcare providers for bureaucrats.

I know, back when I was an exchange student in the Soviet Union and when I went and toured some of the most up-to-date facilities in what was the Soviet Union at the time, I thanked God that I lived in America. I thanked God that we had such incredible health care and that I didn’t have to rely on what appeared to have been 30- or 40-year-old antiquated healthcare methods and equipment for my health care.

Even living in the small town of Mount Pleasant, as I did, I knew we

had a lot better healthcare facilities in my hometown where I was growing up than they did in one of the largest cities—well, the largest city in Ukraine—Kiev, where I toured facilities. I toured a medical school and I couldn't believe how far behind our medical schools that they were.

It is what happens when you continue moving towards socialized health care. I know Mr. Trump, initially, wanted the government to provide everybody's health care, but apparently in his being informed that conservatives don't like that, he is now saying no, that that is not where he is going.

We know that President Obama, back before he was President, was caught on video saying that we want to go to single payer—in other words, socialized medicine—where the government is in charge of everybody's health care.

I know I have got conservative friends who say, LOUIE, we don't have to worry. We don't have to fight ObamaCare, because socialized medicine always fails. They are wrong. Socialism always fails. As Margaret Thatcher said, eventually, you run out of other people's money.

You incentivize not working and penalize working, and that is what we are doing here in America now. We are moving in that direction, toward socialism. The only time true capitalism, true free liberty, entrepreneurship in the marketplace fails is when it starts moving into socialist tendencies and adopting socialist ways. Then that can spell doom for capitalism, those who want to have a dictatorial Federal national government. That is where they want to see things go.

□ 1215

But it is ironic that when a free market society struggles, it is when they start incorporating socialist tendencies and rewarding improper conduct or nonworking. Then you have a lot more people not working.

You incentivize people not to hire. You penalize people for hiring. You penalize people for hiring more than 50 people, like ObamaCare does.

I have talked to people that still say that they could hire more, but they are not going to because of ObamaCare.

That means there are people walking around today going from business to business, looking for a job that will not find that business that will hire them because of ObamaCare.

When you have young people with 5-, 6-, \$7,000 deductible health insurance, they are paying for the bureaucracy. They are not paying for health care.

Apparently, some religious beliefs dictate against birth control. Mine doesn't, my Christian beliefs. But I absolutely respect the religious beliefs of those who are against it. They should not have to pay for people to violate their religious beliefs.

That used to be the way this country grew and was blessed by God. But as we turn further and further away from

what was a blessing to America, then the world hurts. I have seen it in Africa, the Middle East, Asia, South America.

When we are not strong—as I have said numerous times, quoting a South African gentleman: When you get weak, we suffer. Please tell people in Washington to quit getting weaker. We suffer when you are weaker.

These kind of programs, ObamaCare, make us weaker. When we provide the resources, the ability for the largest supporter of terrorism in the world to have over \$100 billion, which they say some of it is for sure going to be spent on more terrorism, that is the kind of activity that will not be blessed. That is the kind of activity that brings a nation's demise.

So health care is costing more. Deductibles are going up. People are paying more for higher deductibles, less coverage. Yes. There are some who, because of the government subsidies, are saying: Well, mine's a little less than it was before. But the people that are working are paying more, and it is devastating.

Mr. Speaker, it is critical that those of us who have a voice in this city make our voices heard for those in our districts. You can't be listening to the talking heads in this town and think you have heard from America.

I mean, look at Politico. Last week they said I had a close race. Tuesday, with one opponent spending tremendously more than I did, two opponents, I won with 82 percent. So that is what Politico calls a close race.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I didn't win with 82 percent because of my looks and certainly not because of the way I sound.

It is because I make my voice heard for the huge majority of people in east Texas with all the common sense they have got. That is what I am hearing from them.

They are outraged that we have allowed ObamaCare to last as long as it has. They are suffering. They are outraged that this administration has turned on our friend, Israel, and seeing that Iran is rewarded for their massive misconduct, as they have continued to be the largest supporter of terrorism in the world, with this administration as an accomplice, as an enabler. There are consequences to nations and governments that enable crime and misconduct and terrorism and abuse.

For those who believe in the Bible, it was Hosea. God was explaining why he was about to come down on the children of Israel. I love the rather loose translation when he says that it is because they have selected leaders who were not my choice.

So people around the country can say all they want: Well, this President is not my President. This Governor is not my Governor. This person is not my elected representative.

I don't agree with them. But everyone in the country will suffer the consequences of poor choices as leaders.

That is the way self-government works.

Now, I have been reporting, Mr. Speaker, from this very podium for years about the misuse and abuse and providing our security by Homeland Security.

I am very grateful to Judicial Watch. In their lawsuit against Homeland Security, they have been able to obtain records that verify what some of us have known to be true because of whistleblowers providing us information. While some, whether CNN and other places, belittle what we have said, we knew what we were talking about, but we couldn't give the sources.

Judicial Watch. This headline says: "Homeland Security Records Reveal Officials Ordered Terrorist Watch List Scrubbed."

It says: "Judicial Watch announced today that it obtained 183 pages of documents from the Department of Homeland Security revealing that the Obama administration scrubbed the law enforcement agency's 'Terrorist Screening Database' in order to protect what it considered the civil rights of suspected Islamic terrorist groups. The documents appear to confirm charges that Obama administration changes created a massive 'hands off' list. Removed data from the terrorist watch list could have helped prevent the San Bernardino terrorist attack."

Mr. Speaker, I would also submit that we have seen the email—I believe Senator GRASSLEY requested more information about it.

To my knowledge, we have not seen additional explanations or information about the email about a person's terrorist ties, indication that he was a radical Islamist. The email response was: Oh, this guy's on the Secretary of Homeland Security's hands-off list.

We have read stories about the White House allowing at least one or more individuals with terrorist ties to come to the White House. There are consequences for ignoring the law, ignoring the lawbreakers, and not protecting our homeland.

The article says:

"The new documents were produced in response to a Judicial Watch February 2015 Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) lawsuit filed back on February 13, 2015."

It should be noted, I mean, that that is over a year ago. The Freedom of Information Act request should have been answered promptly, but this administration is too caught up in trying to cover up their own tracks.

That is why we haven't even gotten the Attorney General to provide Members of Congress the documents showing support for terrorism, the boxes of documents that were provided to people who were convicted of supporting terrorism.

The Justice Department provided it to them. I have asked repeatedly, and the most I have gotten is reference to a few Web sites.

They covered up their own wrongdoing. They have covered up ties to terrorism. They have covered up for

people who have supported terrorism. And there are consequences for that. You learn more when you leave this town, Washington, D.C.

But when you have people in Africa, Egypt, Jordan, UAE, India, and Afghanistan telling you that your administration in America is supporting violence by not standing up against radical Islam and when you hear that from Muslim leaders who recognize the failures of this administration, then you know that the whole world is seeing what is going on and it is only here that people have become so blind.

I know there are people in the Republican establishment that just cannot believe that a man like Trump, who has spent his whole life taking one position, could be leading so big in different contests.

And, yes, my friend TED CRUZ is doing quite well. It is nice to see somebody that has been consistently doing well. But around the world they see what is going on.

The Republican establishment doesn't seem to understand. People are furious. They are furious about ObamaCare. They are furious that we turned on our friend, Israel. They are furious that we have enabled Iran to continue their terrorist ways.

All of this at the same time—of course, this was—Donald Trump's big issue that shot him to the top is border security.

This article from today from KRWG News, "Border Crime Taking A Toll On Residents In Southwest New Mexico, Arizona," says: "Residents of New Mexico's Bootheel and parts of southern Arizona say human smuggling and drug trafficking is taking its toll on the region.

"The Deming Headlight reports that residents are scheduled Thursday to express their concerns to Federal officials during a meeting at the Animas Community Center in Animas, New Mexico.

"Judy Keeler, a longtime resident of the rural border region, says her home was recently burglarized and it's not an unusual episode for other residents.

"Residents have said State Highway 80 has become a favorite for Mexican cartel drug runners who manage to navigate out of the Peloncillo Mountains along the Arizona-New Mexico border. They want an even more increased presence from the U.S. Border Patrol."

Apparently, they are not going to get it.

We still hear people say there is no way to secure our entire border, but this brings back a recollection in history.

One of my least favorite Presidents, Woodrow Wilson, secured the border after Pancho Villa had some of his thugs come across the border and kill American families. Americans back then with good sense said: We can't have that.

They spurred the President on until he sent tens of thousands of what we

call National Guard troops now, and they secured the border. Nobody came across our border that we did not want to come across. He did it back in the early 1900s, and we can't do it now.

Well, the truth is, Mr. Speaker, we could do it now, but you have to have an administration with the will to provide for the common defense of the American people.

Instead, we have enabled a massive amount of crime across the border regions that is spilling into other areas of the country. Drugs are spreading around the country.

We have heard, also, from the FBI Director himself. There are ISIS cells, and there are ISIS investigations in every State in the Union. So when are they going to be triggered?

We know that, when they are triggered with reports like we have just read here, the administration has continued to cleanse our Homeland Security records to purge training material for the FBI, for Intelligence, for Homeland Security so they don't actually learn exactly what radical Islam is. They don't actually learn the verses in the Koran that are relied upon by radical Islamists.

When we do finally have a Muslim leader like President Sissi in Egypt, who stands up in front of a room of Muslim imams and demands that they take back their region from the radical Islamists, this administration chooses to try to punish him and not help him, like this administration did, and wanted to do more for the Muslim Brotherhood.

□ 1230

I am tired of hearing from foreign Muslim leaders their question: Why is your country still helping the Muslim Brotherhood? Don't they know? Don't you know? The Muslim Brotherhood has been at war with you since 1979, and you keep helping them.

Well, that is the way you lose a country. You lose it. We have got our choice. Fiscal irresponsibility, which is immoral. Instead of doing like all preceding generations in this country, which have always had as their theme, "we want to make our country better for our children than we had it," now we have gone through a couple of generations who have said: You know what? Forget the future generations. We want future generations' money spent on us now.

Fifty years ago, seventy-five years ago, one hundred years ago, even when cars were first invented, you would not have seen a bumper sticker like is not uncommon today, retired persons say, "We are spending our children's inheritance." You wouldn't see that because they wanted to make the country better than they had it.

Mr. Speaker, I know you personally, and you and I and our colleagues, we talk about it. We have talked about it today—heated conference—because we want a better country even than we have had with more opportunity, more

freedoms, as we see freedom slipping away.

Adam Kredo has a story here:

"The flow of illegal immigrant children into the United States is expected to rise to record-breaking numbers in 2016 as deportations decrease, according to leading members of the Senate's Judiciary Committee.

"At least 20,455 unaccompanied minors have been caught during fiscal year 2016 along the U.S.-Mexico border as of last month, according to Committee Chairman Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY, who warned that if this trend continues, the number of illegal minors could eclipse a massive 2014 surge that strained the resources of the Department of Homeland Security and prompted investigations into the Obama administration's handling of the issue."

Now, one of many problems is you have people that are coming to America because there are more opportunities here, which begs the question: Why are there more opportunities here than there are in their home country?

When you analyze the situation, what you find is the reason they don't have businesses booming in their home country is because of graft or corruption or a corrupt government or a dictatorship because, as the old saying goes, "capital is a coward."

Money to capitalize or invest always goes to where it feels safest—that is why it is "capital is a coward"—and it is not very safe in countries where the government is corrupt, the rule of law is not applied across the board, and the laws are not enforced across the board.

One of the great ironies in the world right now is that people are leaving countries where there is violence and the rule of law is not enforced. They are coming to America where, for most of our history, we have done a better job than most any country ever in enforcing the law across the board.

Once here illegally, those same people are saying: Now that we are here, we want you not to enforce the law across the board. We want you to ignore your law on immigration and law on becoming citizens. Ignore it.

If we do that, it will make us like the corrupt countries they came from and make us a land of no opportunity, where people will have to go to some other country where they enforce the law.

I have had even Members of Congress say: Well, if it all goes bad, we will all pack up and head to Australia. But I was talking to some people from Australia this year, and I mentioned that to them, and they didn't laugh. They looked very somber.

They said: You know, if something happens to the United States, you are not going to be coming to Australia, because China will take us over like that. If the United States is not standing strong, they said, our country, Australia, will be gone. China would grab us up in a heartbeat.

It is important that America stand strong. You can't stand strong when

you are financially bankrupt. You can't stand strong when you are morally bankrupt. We seem to have our choice of ways we could meet our demise.

Our military is being degraded under this administration, the Navy going back to its size back in—was it?—the early 1900s before World War I. Weakness is provocative. I haven't heard anybody else notice. Maybe there is no correlation; maybe there is.

It seems historically, from my study of history, that when a nation's enemy sees that nation's biggest friend pulling away and not being as good a friend, then that enemy is provoked to attack. But it was in May of 2010 when this administration sided with Israel's enemies in demanding that Israel disclose all their weapons systems, including any potential nukes. I was shocked by that. The United States had never sided with all of Israel's enemies like that before.

I thought about the Bible story of King Hezekiah when the Babylonian leaders had come to visit and schmoozed with him, and Isaiah asked him: What have you done with the Babylonian leaders? Of course, this is a Texas paraphrased version, but he bragged about: I have taken them and shown them all of our treasure. The most literal translation from the Hebrew says: And I showed them all the defenses we have in our arsenal, our armory.

Isaiah explained: You are going to lose the country.

You don't show your enemy—you don't even show your friends—all of your defenses, and yet we were demanding that of Israel. Within 48 hours, Israel's enemies launched a flotilla to go challenge the lawful blockade of the Gaza Strip. All that Israel was doing was trying to prevent more rockets from going in because the rockets were being launched at them every day—totally legal. They were trying to defend themselves against rocket attacks and created a terrible situation at the blockade.

But as America continues to help fund Iran's desire to support terrorism, and as this administration has turned its back on nations like Nigeria, Ethiopia, Kenya, I hear from leaders in those countries where they say: You know, all we wanted was a little help against our enemy.

Of course, in Nigeria, having been there and having met with so many of the parents of girls who were kidnapped by Boko Haram, radical Islamists, we then hear that our administration here says: Oh, yeah, we will give you some help, but you have got to change your religious beliefs. You have got to change your laws so it supports same-sex marriage and you fund abortion, and then we will give you more help.

The President in Kenya basically said at a news conference, in effect: You take care of your country. You are not going to come tell us what our religious beliefs and laws should be.

As a Nigerian Catholic bishop stated: Our religious beliefs are not for sale—not to President Obama, not to anybody.

But there are consequences in world history when one nation tries to destroy the religious beliefs of another country—their closely, firmly held religious beliefs. There are consequences when a nation forgets to say: Thank You, God, for all of our blessings. Thank You, God, for protecting us. Thank You for allowing us to live in the greatest country, a country in which there is more opportunity, more assets per person than anywhere in the world.

This is the one country where the number one health problem for our Nation's poor is obesity. It is a terrible problem that we need to deal with. But where in history do you have a country where the nation's poor have, as their number one health problem, obesity?

This Nation has been blessed beyond anything that people could have ever dreamed when this Nation was founded. But the Founders did see one thing. They saw the threat of giving more and more power to a Federal Government.

I was fortunate to call Justice Scalia a friend. A group of seniors from my hometown of Tyler, Texas, from my church, Green Acres Baptist, came up to Washington, D.C. They said: Hey, you are supposed to be friends with Justice Scalia. We would love to meet him. That is one thing we really want to do in Washington.

So I called over, and Justice Scalia, bless his heart, he said: Sure, come on over.

So they arranged it. We had the meeting. He walks in. They are all seated there, the seniors from my church, and Justice Scalia could be very talkative. I treasure meals with him, exchanging jokes and stories. It made you feel good about the world. He walks in and leans up against the table at the front: So, you want to meet me. What is your question? What questions have you got?

It kind of took them by surprise. One said: Do you think we are the freest Nation in history because of our Bill of Rights?

Justice Scalia, in his inimitable style, said: Oh, gosh, no. No. The Soviet Union had a better Bill of Rights than we did.

I had forgotten. I made an A on a paper in college that I did about the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the Soviet Union. Yeah, they were promised all kinds of rights, but the government was given the power to erode all of the rights that were said to be protected.

He said: No. The reason that we are the freest country in history is because our Founders did not trust government, and so they wanted to make it as hard as possible to pass laws. See, the Founders thought that gridlock was a blessing, gridlock was a great thing, because it meant that, as people anticipated passing laws, it would be tough

because many laws regulate what you can and can't do.

The more laws you pass, just as this administration has shown the American people, as it has set all-time records for the most pages of regulations—there are over 79,000 new pages of regulations every year. How can anybody make a living with that kind of regulation coming out year after year, certainly for the last 7? Incredible.

The Founders knew that. They wanted to make it hard for any governmental agency, any government bureaucracy to create laws that took away freedom because they had some libertarian tendencies.

Justice Scalia, said: So they wanted it hard to pass laws, so what do they do? They create a legislature with two Houses, and certainly that was part of the compromise. But in England, the House of Lords is not particularly powerful, but they wanted both houses with the power to stop what the other one was doing. They wanted it very difficult in one house to pass a law.

I think they would cringe if they saw all the bills that are just passed with unanimous consent or on suspension that we do more and more and more, because they wanted it tough to pass laws.

I have friends say: You guys should be in session more often.

I say: You don't know what you are asking for, because every day we are in session, we pass some new bill, we pass some new law.

□ 1245

Many of those laws take away freedoms of Americans. The Founders knew that. That is why, Justice Scalia said, they created two Houses. If one House got a law through it, the other one could stop it cold. But that wasn't enough to protect our freedom.

We want an executive, but not one like a prime minister. The prime minister is elected by the legislature. We don't want that. We want it tough.

We want independence. So we are going to have a chief executive, a President, that is elected totally separate from the legislature.

Even if the House and Senate finally agree on something, we will give him the power to just say: No. I am not going to let it happen.

But that is not enough. We want more gridlock. So let's create a judicial branch, as they did in Article III, that could turn around and say: No. The House, Senate, and the President may have agreed, but we don't agree.

It is not consistent with the Constitution. Justice Scalia said that is why we are the freest Nation in history: because our Founders did not trust government.

So, Mr. Speaker, it concerns me when I see voters begin to think that our hope is going to arrive on Air Force One. One of my greatest thrills was becoming friends with Chuck Colson.

As Chuck Colson said: Our hope will not arrive on Air Force One.

The old saying, the axiom, is true: democracy ensures a people are governed no better than they deserve.

If you want a good President, you have got to be a good country. An immoral country is not going to elect a great leader. They are going to elect an immoral leader.

When you see Christians who believe that the only way to the saving grace of Jesus is to ask for forgiveness and, as the Bible says, believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and you will be saved, it is amazing to see Christian leaders saying they are going to put their faith in a guy that says he has never had to ask for forgiveness. But that was modified later to: Well, I don't think God's concerned with trivial things like that.

If I were God, I wouldn't be. But thank God I am not God. He seems to care about every individual. If you believe the Bible, that is what it says.

And then, if there is not enough bad news, this comes from KPNX today: "Attorney General Report: Possible smuggling trail between the Middle East and Arizona border."

We have talked about that before. Long before, the Attorney General indicated that there appeared to be a trail between the Middle East and the Arizona border.

We have this story this week from Stephen Dinan from The Washington Times: "Top border chief to agents who object to Obama amnesty: 'Look for another job.'"

There you are, Mr. Speaker. When the head of the border agency says they are not going to enforce the laws that exist, then one of two things, either that is what the country deserves because it has become immoral and lawless or the country rises up and says: We will never have another administration like this. As long as we are alive, we are going to make sure we have an administration that enforces the law, no matter who it is.

Apparently, since people govern no better than they deserve, we now find out that Hillary's highly paid IT guru at the State Department had no actual national security experience.

So, apparently, we elected an administration that ensured people were governed no better than they deserve and, apparently, they felt like we didn't deserve a State Department with national security experience.

Is it any wonder—I thank God—that there have been more Benghazis under that kind of attitude? One was too many.

We see yesterday that the Justice Department grants immunity to the staffer who set up the Clinton email server. I have been a prosecutor. I have been a judge. I have been a chief justice. When someone grants immunity, they are closing in on a prosecution. That is the intent.

You don't grant immunity to someone and someone doesn't normally seek immunity unless they are concerned that they may have violated the law. They seek immunity because they violated the law.

Immunity is granted when, with the prosecution, the investigators—in this case, the FBI—feel that laws are being violated. So we are going to grant immunity to this person so that we can get the person further up.

But I still maintain that, as long as Hillary Clinton does not condemn or expose the Obama administration to any of the truth about what went on in Benghazi and about the hands-off list of terrorists and homeland security, I do not see her getting indicted. It is a good insurance policy.

Another article from the New York Times: "As Campaign Unfolds, So Do Inquiries Into Hillary Clinton's Emails."

So many voters don't seem to care. Why? Because people are governed no better than they deserve. If they are more concerned about themselves than their children, they are going to get what they deserve.

Well, we had Mitt Romney come out today just before we voted condemning Donald Trump as phony and a fraud. Everybody knows that people across this country are furious with the establishment.

So if that idea was Donald Trump's—to get Mitt Romney to come out and condemn him—it was a brilliant plan. Because that is like asking Marv Levy to tell you how to win the Super Bowl, after he lost four of them.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, this country is in grave danger. I was all over the 12 counties that I represent. This country has so many great citizens. They deserve better than what they are getting.

I hope and pray the majority in the country will wake up and see the dangers to our own national defense, to our own national security, from government intrusions into our private lives, from drugs that are coming in through Mexico, and from terrorists that are coming into this country. The FBI Director himself says we have got them in every State.

We are in big trouble. It is time the American people woke up and said, as our parents did: We don't care what has happened before. We are going to make sure this country is left in better shape, with more opportunity, than we had growing up.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to have to hurry. The clock is ticking.

I yield back the balance of my time.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS AS CONGRESSIONAL ADVISORS ON TRADE POLICY AND NEGOTIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 161(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2211), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Members on the part of the House as Congressional Advisors on Trade Policy and Negotiations:

Mr. BRADY, Texas

Mr. REICHERT, Washington
Mr. NUNES, California

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of illness.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

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

S. 1596. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2082 Stringtown Road in Grove City, Ohio, as the "Specialist Joseph W. Riley Post Office Building".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 7, 2016, at 4 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

451. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Base Year Emission Inventories for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2014-0664; FRL-9943-33-Region 5] received March 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

452. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Regional Haze Glatfelter BART SIP Revision [EPA-R05-OAR-2014-0362; FRL-9943-29-Region 5] received March 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

453. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Wisconsin; Base Year Emission Inventories for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2014-0860; FRL-9943-31-Region 5] received March 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

454. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Disapproval; Georgia; Disapproval of Automatic Rescission Clause [EPA-R04-OAR-2010-0816; FRL-9943-35-Region 4] received March 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

455. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Alpha-[2,4,6-Tris(1-(phenyl)ethyl)phenyl]-Omega-hydroxy poly(oxyethylene) poly(oxypropylene) copolymer; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0485; FRL-9942-48] received March 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4556. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Arizona Air Plan Revisions; Phoenix, Arizona; Second 10-Year Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan [EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0645; FRL-9942-17-Region 9] received March 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4557. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fluensulfone; Pesticide Tolerance for Emergency Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0475; FRL-9942-10] received March 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4558. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Pendimethalin; Tolerance Actions; Corrections [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0194; EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0397; FRL-9942-24] received March 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4559. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Penoxsulam; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0879; FRL-9940-36] received March 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4560. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Rulemaking to Affirm Interim Amendments to Dates in Federal Implementation Plans Addressing Interstate Transport of Ozone and Fine Particulate Matter [EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0491; FRL-9943-36-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS40) received March 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4561. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Zoxamide; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0922; FRL-9942-18] received March 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4562. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Expanding Consumers' Video Navigation Choices [MB Docket No.: 16-42]; Commercial Availability of Navigation Devices [CS Docket No.: 97-80] received March 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4563. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Expansion of Online Public File Obligations to Cable and Satellite TV Operators and Broadcast and Satellite Radio Licensees [MB Docket No.: 14-127] received March 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added

by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4564. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Automotive Fuel Ratings, Certification and Posting (RIN: 3084-AB39) received March 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4565. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final NUREG — Chapter 11, Radioactive Waste Management [SRPs: 11.1; 11.2; 11.3; 11.4; 11.5] received March 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4566. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final NUREG — Probabilistic Risk Assessment and Severe Accident Evaluation for New Reactors [SRP Section 19.0] received March 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4567. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final NUREG — Chapter 11, Radioactive Waste Management [SRPs: BTP 11-3; BTP 11-5; BTP 11-6] received March 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4568. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(d) Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1; (86 Stat. 619); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4569. A letter from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's calendar year 2015 annual report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); Public Law 94-409, Sec. 3(a); (90 Stat. 1241); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4570. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition filed on behalf of workers who were employed at Battelle Laboratories at the King Avenue site in Columbus, Ohio, to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 7384q(c)(2); Public Law 106-398, Sec. 1 (as amended by Public Law 108-375, Sec. 3166(b)(1)); (118 Stat. 2188); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4571. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Regulated Navigation Area; Reporting Requirements for Barges Loaded with Certain Dangerous Cargoes, Inland Rivers, Eighth Coast Guard District; Expiration of Stay (Suspension) and Administrative Changes [Docket No.: USCG-2013-0760] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received February 29, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4572. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Pleasure Beach Bridge, Bridgeport, CT [Docket No.: USCG-2015-1088] (RIN: 1625-AA00) re-

ceived February 29, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4573. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's notice of enforcement of regulation — Safety Zone; Circle Line Sightseeing Fireworks, Liberty Island, Upper New York Bay, Manhattan, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2015-1048] received February 29, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4574. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Navy UNDET, Apra Outer Harbor, GU [Docket No.: USCG-2015-1096] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 29, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4575. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River and Illinois River, MO and IL [Docket No.: USCG-2015-1121] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received February 29, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4576. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Regulated Navigation Area, Kill Van Kull and Newark Bay; Bayonne, NJ, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0002] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received February 29, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4577. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Lamorinda Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2015-0007; T.D. TTB-133; Ref. Notice No.: 151] (RIN: 1513-AC17) received March 2, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4578. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Regulations Governing Organization of the Joint Board for the Enrollment of Actuaries [TD 9749] (RIN: 1545-BM81) received February 26, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Education and the Workforce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 4677. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to

provide death benefits for campus police officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. YOHO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. SALMON):

H.R. 4678. A bill to prohibit modification, abrogation, abandonment, or other related actions with respect to United States jurisdiction and control over United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, without congressional action; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DENT (for himself and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 4679. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to eliminate straight-party voting from any voting system used for Federal elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 4680. A bill to prepare the National Park Service for its Centennial in 2016 and for a second century of promoting and protecting the natural, historic, and cultural resources of our National Parks for the enjoyment of present and future generations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 4681. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide greater support to students with dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 4682. A bill to repeal debt collection amendments made by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself, Mr. WALZ, Mr. ZELDIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. JONES, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. GALLEGUO):

H.R. 4683. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for a review of the characterization or terms of discharge from the Armed Forces of individuals with mental health disorders alleged to affect terms of discharge; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself, Mr. KILMER, and Miss RICE of New York):

H.R. 4684. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish mental health care to certain former members of the Armed Forces who are not otherwise eligible to receive such care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H.R. 4685. A bill to take certain Federal lands located in Tulare County, California, into trust for the benefit of the Tule River Indian Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself and Mr. NEWHOUSE):

H.R. 4686. A bill to amend Public Law 103-434 to authorize Phase III of the Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project for the purposes of improving water management in the Yakima River basin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MULLIN (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL):

H.R. 4687. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that temporary em-

ployees of the Department of Defense may compete for vacant permanent positions under internal merit promotion procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. AMODEI (for himself, Mr. HARDY, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Ms. TITUS):

H.R. 4688. A bill to promote conservation, improve public land, and provide for sensible development in Douglas County, Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 4689. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts with administrative contractors for the processing of claims for hospital care and medical services furnished in non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. LOESACK, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 4690. A bill to revitalize Army arsenals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 4691. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require local educational agencies to implement a policy on allergy bullying in schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 4692. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, in relation to requiring adrenoleukodystrophy screening of newborns; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 4693. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a refundable and advanceable tax credit for individuals with young children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 4694. A bill to amend the Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992 to define environmental intervention blood lead level, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DOLD, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. MACARTHUR):

H.R. 4695. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to improve the quality, health outcomes, and value of maternity care under the Medicaid and CHIP programs by developing maternity care quality measures and supporting maternity care quality collaboratives; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 4696. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for

homeowners association assessments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ESTY (for herself, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KNIGHT):

H.R. 4697. A bill to provide for increased Federal oversight of prescription opioid treatment and assistance to States in reducing opioid addiction, diversion, and deaths; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KEATING, Mr. DONOVAN, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 4698. A bill to enhance aviation by requiring airport security assessments and a security coordination enhancement plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 4699. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for parent savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. NUNES, Mr. JONES, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 4700. A bill to award a Congressional gold medal to the 5307th Composite Unit (Provisional), commonly known as "Merrill's Marauders", in recognition of their bravery and outstanding service in the jungles of Burma during World War II; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KUSTER (for herself, Mr. LANCE, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. HARPER):

H.R. 4701. A bill to encourage States to require the installation of residential carbon monoxide detectors in homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANCE (for himself and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 4702. A bill to direct the Director of the Government Publishing Office to provide members of the public with Internet access to Congressional Research Service reports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 4703. A bill to eliminate the authority of the executive branch to further restrict intra-family firearm transfers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 4704. A bill to increase accountability with respect to Department of Energy carbon capture, utilization, and sequestration projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 4705. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a nonrefundable

credit for the purchase of emergency position-indicating radio beacons and personal locator beacons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 4706. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income certain interest and money market fund dividend income payments to charity and to modify the requirements relating to the reporting of such payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. ADERHOLT):

H.R. 4707. A bill to provide housing opportunities for individuals living with HIV or AIDS, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California):

H.R. 4708. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a nonrefundable credit for working family caregivers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 4709. A bill to amend the CAN-SPAM Act of 2003 to require commercial email messages to include an option allowing recipients to unsubscribe from any such future emails; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 4710. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to eliminate premium subsidies for crop insurance for tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. FARR, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. CAPP, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 4711. A bill to make funds available for Dungeness crab and rock crab emergency disaster assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 4712. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to provide for an option under the Secure Mail Initiative under which a person to whom a document is sent under that initiative may require that the United States Postal Service obtain a signature from that person in order to deliver the document, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 4713. A bill to amend the market name of genetically altered salmon in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 4714. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure Medicare coverage of certain costs associated with FDA-approved clinical trials; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LOUDERMILK (for himself, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. GOWDY, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr.

BRAT, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. MCCLELLIN-TOCK, Mr. BARTON, and Mr. RIBBLE):

H.J. Res. 85. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring that the Federal budget be balanced; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BRAT, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GRIF-FITH, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H. Con. Res. 123. Concurrent resolution recognizing the George C. Marshall Museum and George C. Marshall Research Library in Lexington, Virginia, as the National George C. Marshall Museum and Library; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H. Res. 636. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding Burma's 2015 elections; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DELANEY (for himself, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. POLIS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. LEE, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. ESTY, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HIMES, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BEYER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. CAPP, Mr. LEVIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. NEAL, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SCHKOWSKY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. FOSTER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. MENG, Mr. NOLAN, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H. Res. 637. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should establish a national goal of more than 50 percent clean and carbon free electricity by 2030 for the purposes of avoiding the worst impacts of climate change, growing our economy, increasing our shared prosperity, improving public health, and preserving our national security; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

175. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 121, to memorialize the Congress of the United States to address freeze emergencies and their consequences by enacting legislation to define freeze emergencies as major disasters eligible for federal disaster relief and emergency assistance; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. CAPUANO:

H.R. 4677.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause I; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 4678.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 and Article IV, section 3 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 4679.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 4680.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3
Article I, Section 8

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

H.R. 4681.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18, Section 8, Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

H.R. 4682.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18, Section 8, Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 4683.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution (Clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 4684.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H.R. 4685.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 4686.

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. MULLIN:

H.R. 4687.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clauses 1, 12, 13, and 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 4688.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2: The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 4689.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 4690.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 4691.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 (relating to the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.)

By Ms. CLARKE of New York:

H.R. 4692.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 4693.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and the Sixteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 4694.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3 and Clause 18.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 4695.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 4696.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 4697.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution, "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 4698.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 4699.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution: The Congress shall have the Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 4700.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 of the Constitution

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 4701.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 4702.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec 8, Clause 18, of the United States Constitution Which states: Congress shall have power . . . to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying in execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any other department or officer thereof.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 4703.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. constitution. Specifically Clause 3 which gives Congress the authority to Regulate Commerce.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 4704.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 4705.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 4706.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 4707.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States, the general welfare clause.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 4708.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 4709.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H.R. 4710.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 4711.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 4712.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 4713.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana:

H.R. 4714.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to "provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. LOUDERMILK:

H.J. Res. 85.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution, which grants Congress the power to propose amendments to the Constitution when two-thirds of both chambers shall deem it necessary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 27: Mr. SANFORD.

H.R. 169: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

H.R. 239: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 267: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 288: Mr. MICA.

H.R. 297: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. KAPTUR.

- H.R. 314: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 448: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 491: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 546: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 605: Mr. ROHRBACHER and Mr. LAN-
GEVIN.
H.R. 654: Mr. DUFFY.
H.R. 662: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 664: Mr. NEAL, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS,
Mr. FATTAH, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of
Texas, and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 815: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
H.R. 865: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 1151: Mr. HARRIS.
H.R. 1185: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr.
COLLINS of New York, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr.
WALBERG, Ms. PINGREE, and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 1220: Mr. KNIGHT, Ms. FRANKEL of
Florida, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 1260: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 1342: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1399: Mr. FORBES and Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 1457: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 1523: Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 1567: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 1717: Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. ZELDIN, and
Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 2124: Mr. TAKAI, Mr. LANCE, Mrs.
DAVIS of California, and Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 2400: Mr. BLUM.
H.R. 2404: Mr. BOUSTANY.
H.R. 2411: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2430: Ms. BONAMICI and Ms.
VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 2434: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Mr.
MARCHANT.
H.R. 2460: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 2737: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 2773: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 2799: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 2800: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 2811: Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 2849: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2939: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 3092: Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 3119: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and
Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 3179: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3185: Ms. ADAMS and Ms. GRAHAM.
H.R. 3222: Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 3235: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 3268: Mr. KIND and Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 3299: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. OLSON, and
Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 3326: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 3514: Mr. COHEN, Mr. SARBANES, and
Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 3580: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 3860: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 3862: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 3917: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr.
THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3929: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr.
DEFazio, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. WELCH, Mr.
ABRAHAM, Mr. BRAT, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MCCAUL,
Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. BEYER,
Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia,
Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KELLY of
Pennsylvania, and Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 3970: Mr. WELCH and Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 3985: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 4027: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 4095: Mr. GRAYSON.
H.R. 4167: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. CRAMER,
and Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 4209: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. HECK of
Washington.
H.R. 4219: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 4229: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 4293: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BARLETTA, and
Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 4352: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. VALADAO, and
Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 4371: Mr. LABRADOR.
H.R. 4376: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COHEN, Mr.
MCDERMOTT, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois,
Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. ADAMS, Ms.
MOORE, Mr. POLIS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN,
Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsyl-
vania, Ms. PINGREE, and Ms. WILSON of Flor-
ida.
H.R. 4386: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. BLU-
MENAUER.
H.R. 4420: Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 4430: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 4442: Mr. ASHFORD.
H.R. 4474: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mrs.
LUMMIS.
H.R. 4479: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 4480: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 4491: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 4500: Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 4522: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 4524: Mr. ASHFORD and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 4526: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 4570: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of
New York.
H.R. 4592: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of
New York, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. TIBERI, Ms.
ESTY, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. KELLY of Penn-
sylvania.
H.R. 4599: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 4600: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 4614: Mr. WOMACK.
H.R. 4622: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. KELLY of Mis-
sissippi, and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 4625: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 4633: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 4641: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 4653: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 4654: Mr. CICILLINE and Ms. CLARKE of
New York.
H.R. 4657: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H. Con. Res. 89: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr.
YOUNG of Indiana.
H. Res. 33: Ms. MENG.
H. Res. 393: Mr. BEYER and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H. Res. 451: Mr. PALAZZO and Mr. WEBER of
Texas.
H. Res. 501: Ms. PINGREE and Ms. LOFGREN.
H. Res. 552: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of
New York.
H. Res. 591: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROGERS of Ala-
bama, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. HANNA, and Mr.
TONKO.