



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2015

No. 169

## House of Representatives

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

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
November 17, 2015.

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

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

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

### WEST VIRGINIA'S DRUG EPIDEMIC

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Second, enhancing law enforcement intelligence sharing;

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

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

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

On August 6, I sent a letter along with my colleagues in West Virginia, Congressman DAVID MCKINLEY and Congressman EVAN JENKINS, to Michael

Botticelli, the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, urging him to make Jefferson County a HIDTA area. It is of the utmost importance to include Jefferson County as a Washington-Baltimore HIDTA-designated county to help combat the growing drug epidemic not only in our State, but also in our entire country.

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

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

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

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

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.

H8245

### THE AFTERMATH OF TERRORIST ATTACKS

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

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

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

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

The Federal Government acted after 9/11, but it is not clear our actions were thought out the way they should. We assembled a clumsy behemoth, the Department of Homeland Security, the largest department we have created since 1947. In retrospect, it is not clear that was the wisest course of action. Think about the excessive bureaucracy, charges of waste, fraud, and inefficiency in that department. Look at the clumsy response to Katrina.

We passed the PATRIOT Act instead of the bipartisan legislation produced by the Committee on the Judiciary. Look at the vast, sprawling, shadowy intelligence network, so large nobody actually knows precisely how big it is. Remember, the failure of 9/11 to stop the attack was not for lack of intelligence. It was a failure to be able to use the knowledge we have. There is a danger at times of drowning in data.

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

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

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

It is appropriate to be concerned, angry, and determined to protect innocent people, to hunt down and elimi-

nate these horrific threats. I just hope that we learn from our past mistakes about impulse and overreach that may not produce its intended results but, instead, may leave us with more problems and vulnerability.

Remember how a college dropout was able to expose vast amounts of sensitive American data. Edward Snowden had been a private contractor who had worked for the government just a few months.

Working in a highly charged political environment does not tend to bring out the best in Congress. We need to be careful about getting this right, that we have the support of the American people, and that Congress in a really frustrating time in American politics takes the time and energy to craft effective action. Let's try and get on the same page rather than a rapid response, which history shows is not necessarily the right response.

Decidedly, turning our back on Syrian refugees is un-American, unpatriotic, and morally weak. Turning our back on an entire population due to broad-brush characterizations of those who practice a certain faith goes against our core values as a country. I think America is better than that.

Seeking compassion for Syrian refugees can be done securely. The facts make that clear. A failure to do so would put us on the wrong side of history. It would be one of those mistakes we make under pressure and would only make us less safe rather than more.

### REFORMING CFPB INDIRECT AUTO FINANCING GUIDANCE ACT

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

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1737, the Reforming CFPB Indirect Auto Financing Guidance Act.

Businesses across West Virginia's Third District are already facing hardships from the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's rules. Those businesses that make, sell, finance, or service motor vehicles in my State are especially worried about the CFPB's 2013 rulemaking affecting their industry.

The 2013 rule could raise credit costs and push consumers out of the marketplace entirely. It should be consumers, not government bureaucrats, deciding what works best for them.

This bill would rescind that flawed rule and replace it with commonsense guidance for transactions related to indirect auto financing. The bill would give consumers, especially those with low and moderate incomes, a chance to receive the best financing options available for them to purchase a new auto vehicle.

I fully support passage of this bill and hope we can continue to work in a bipartisan fashion to reform CFPB rulemaking.

### REACTING TO THE TERRORIST ATTACKS

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, we are shocked, horrified, and deeply saddened by the news coming from Paris. As a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I know there is much to fear, both for our allies and for us.

But in light of the attacks on our ally France last Friday, I urge my colleagues to keep a cool head and not to react exactly the way that ISIS and other terrorists hope we do, with fear, with chaos, and with lashing out. But, sadly, that is what we have already seen Republican Governors, elected leaders, candidates, and media figures do.

I have been here long enough to know a thing or two about opportunism. Maybe it is too much to resist when you are one of 15 candidates for President of the United States. Politicians, pundits, and celebrities will be tempted to say whatever they can to get the news cameras pointed at them.

The Governor of Illinois, my home State, could not resist saying our State was closed to Syrians fleeing the terror of ISIS and the Assad regime. The Governor of Louisiana, the son of immigrants, running for President of the United States, a nation of immigrants, said "no" to refugees. The Governors of a dozen other States did so, too. A Senator whose parents came as refugees from Cuba fleeing there has said "no," too.

This is despicable and cowardly and precisely the kind of reaction ISIS wanted. ISIS could not have written a better script. The free people of the world are turning their backs on people seeking safety and freedom. When we sent Jews back to Germany and when we sent Japanese to internment camps, we regretted it, and we will regret this as well.

We have had candidates actually say that refugees seeking safety in the strongest nation in the world must first pass a test to prove they are from an acceptable religion. In the United States of America they said this. In the 21st century. An acceptable religion in America.

Now, of course, the Governors of Illinois, Texas, and Louisiana, and most of the other States that are scared of ISIS, are Republican. Because it is a Federal matter, they are overstepping their powers with executive orders because they cannot actually stop refugees from resettling in their States, and they know it. How sad.

□ 1015

Instead, they have instructed State agencies not to assist people fleeing terror. We are a better country than that.

No matter how scared Republican leaders become, we must not abandon our commitment to being a nation

without equal in a world, a nation that does not fear or shy away from any challenge. It is our commitment to religious equality and the freedom to worship as we please that has made us a great nation. And this is no time to abandon that tradition.

Our bravery, the bravery of our military, and the bravery of our commitment to freedom and equality have shown for almost 250 years what American exceptionalism is truly all about.

It is not the time to lose sight of ourselves and say America is too weak, that America cannot handle 20,000 or 200,000 refugees fleeing for their lives. It is not the time for America to consider raising the white flag and say to those waving the black flag: "Yes, ISIS, you are right. We dislike and fear Muslims, and we do not care if you perish or not."

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

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

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

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

#### CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL BOONDOGGLE

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, as a Californian, I know full well that we are suffering from a record drought; but what we already know is that California officials pushing the State's high-speed rail proposal won't be deterred by skyrocketing costs, an absence of private investment, or the \$55

million—and growing—funding gap. What we didn't know was the extent of secrecy and mismanagement taxpayers would face at the hands of State officials pushing this project.

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

While the lack of transparency is unacceptable, especially given that taxpayers are ultimately on the hook for this project, the fundamental issue here is that the entire project is a ruse—in literal terms, a train wreck—in that State officials knew this for some time and that those same officials hid this from the public.

In 2008, voters were promised an 800-mile system that would link Sacramento, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and San Diego, cost about \$34 billion, and would have less than one-third of the costs paid by the State through its taxpayers. The system was promised to travel from San Francisco to Los Angeles in under 2 hours and 40 minutes.

Fast forward to 2011 when the price had shot up from \$34 billion to \$100 billion, the plan was reduced to only L.A. to San Francisco, and the State was quick to grab billions of—unknown at the time—Federal stimulus that came along later, funding that could have been used for critical needs like roads or water infrastructure that California needs so desperately, as well as now shifting cap-and-trade dollars recently created to try and prop up high-speed rail and its deficient budget dollars.

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

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

The promises made in 2008 ranged from low ticket prices to questionable job figures, including the fact that they were claiming there would be a million new jobs from high-speed rail. When we pinned them down in committee a little bit later, they said, well,

that would mean a million job-years. That number has since been pared down. All these have been proven false. In fact, these claims are so misleading that a State court has forbidden the legislature from writing ballot measure descriptions.

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

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

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

People don't like this project, don't trust those advocating for it, and they deserve better than to see their own tax dollars used to lie to them. No new Federal dollars will come from here to help this project be propped up anymore.

It is time we start prioritizing funding for projects that actually address real problems facing California, such as the current drought. It is time to apply common sense to this situation. We have a State whose economy depends on a sound water supply, yet in the midst of a historic drought, we are still chasing this high-speed rail boondoggle.

Rather than throwing billions of dollars away, let's get to what people demand and will help our economy and the people of California.

#### CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, when the average American wants to learn about a policy, where do they turn for

information? Often, the answer is the 24-hour news cycle, often filled by talking heads and sensationalism; or, to social media and message boards, where anyone can post anything—credible or completely misinformed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

It is time to recognize that educators, students, media, and everyday citizens deserve access to CRS reports and that this access gives our constituents vital information about the issues, policies, and budgets we are debating here in Congress.

That is why Congressman LANCE and I introduced H. Res. 34, which directs the Clerk of the House of Representatives to maintain a centralized public database for nonconfidential CRS reports. This resolution gives the public tools to cut through the misinformation they face, gives them access to

something they are already paying for, and empowers the American people to hold Congress accountable for the decisions we make.

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

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

#### NATURAL GAS EXPANSION IN CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### 130TH ANNIVERSARY OF DUBOIS BUSINESS COLLEGE

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 130th anniversary of the DuBois Business College, which has several campuses located in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District.

The college was founded in 1885 by a local businessman who recognized a need for skilled businessowners, operators, and employees. The school's original location was once known as the largest building in America devoted exclusively to commercial education.

□ 1030

In the many years since, DuBois Business College has expanded not just to a new location in DuBois, but also to include branch campus locations in Oil City, Philipsburg, and Huntingdon.

Today the college has a student body of more than 400 and offers a variety of associate's degree and diploma programs, all of which can be completed in less than 2 years. This provides a quick transition for students into the workforce.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to welcome administrators and students from DuBois Business College to Capitol Hill today. I look forward to congratulating them in person, and I wish them well in their continued success.

#### RESTORATION TUESDAY

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

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

I was proud to stand alongside Members who support the restoration of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 recently and to launch the #restorethevote legislative strategy. This national effort will help mobilize support for H.R. 2867, the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2015, a bill that I sponsored with Representatives JUDY CHU and LINDA SÁNCHEZ to restore critical Federal oversight to jurisdictions who have a recent history of voter suppression.

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

Our call for restoring the VRA is urgent, Mr. Speaker. As our colleague JOHN LEWIS so eloquently says, there is no other work more important in this or any Congress than protecting the full access of all Americans to the democratic process.

If we do not act, the 2016 election will be the first Presidential election in 50 years without the protections offered to millions of voters by the Voting Rights Act of 1965. We must act now.

I therefore urge all of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle, my Republican and my Democratic colleagues, to

join me on Tuesdays and speak in support of the Voting Rights Act and to sign onto the Voting Rights Restoration and Advancement Act of 2015, which restores key components of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Ultimately, this bill, H.R. 2657, will restore key components of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The bill will provide more protection to more people in more States. It is about broadening, expanding, advancing the Voting Rights Act.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Well, this example in Alabama of 31 DMV offices closing when indeed the State requires a photo ID and a driver's license is the most popular form of ID is one example.

These counties that were discriminated against by this recent law in Alabama were the very counties where foot soldiers and activists like Jimmie Lee Jackson and Jonathan Daniels died for the opportunity and the right for others to vote. If Federal pre-clearance provisions were still in effect, these DMV closings would not have occurred.

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

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

So, Mr. Speaker, on this Restoration Tuesday, I am asking all of my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 2867, the Voting Rights Advancement Act, and I am asking all Americans to join us in our efforts for #restorethevote and #restorationtuesday.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

#### HANFORD LAND TRANSFER

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### NOHEMI GONZALEZ AND THE ATTACKS ON PARIS

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the people of France and the people of the United States have shared a common

bond of liberty and equality for over 200 years. In the face of the recent terrorist attacks in Paris, that bond brings us now even closer in unity and in solidarity.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### ISLAMIC EXTREMISM ATTACK

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

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

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

The President's refugee proposal places the interests of other nations ahead of the safety and security of the American people. Because we are unable to verify whether the next

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1045

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

Mr. Speaker, Master Sergeant Jack Harlan is a son of central Illinois and has served our country with valor. He has since been honorably discharged from the United States Army and has returned home to help serve his fellow veterans. We honor him with this Purple Heart.

**CELEBRATING THE LIFE AND HONORING  
THE MEMORY OF GUNNERY  
SERGEANT HENRY "HANK"  
GREEN**

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

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life and honor the memory of Gunnery Sergeant Henry "Hank" Green. Hank passed away on November 5 at the age of 95.

Mr. Speaker, Hank was one of the first marines to land on Guadalcanal as a member of the First Marine Raider Battalion known as Edson's Raiders. He was recognized for his bravery dur-

ing the battle known as Bloody Ridge in September 1942 when he took over a machine gun where his closest friend had lost his life. Hank then laid siege throughout the night firing at, in his words, "anything that moved."

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

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

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

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

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

**FAIRNESS TO VETERANS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT  
ACT OF 2015**

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

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

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

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

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has done neither. Instead, he chose to put forth legislation that threatens to inflict irreparable harm on the entire Disadvantaged Business Enterprise program by opening it up to additional legal challenges and undermining its core purpose. The DBE program was created by Congress to combat dis-

crimination against minority- and women-owned small businesses. It is and must remain narrowly tailored to serve a compelling governmental interest in order to withstand the Supreme Court's test of strict scrutiny.

While I support the sponsor's stated goal of helping veterans and, more specifically, helping veteran-owned businesses compete for Federal highway and transit construction contracts, I reject the notion that the best way to do so is by undermining the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise program.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a zero-sum game. We do not need to pit these two constituencies—both of whom continue to suffer through disproportionately high unemployment rates—against each other. We can and should help both veteran and disadvantaged businesses succeed.

That is why I joined Representatives CUMMINGS, NORTON, BROWN, and BUSTOS in sponsoring H.R. 3997, legislation that would create a new veteran-owned business enterprise program at the Department of Transportation that is wholly separate and apart from the existing DBE program. It is the better and more direct way of helping veteran-owned businesses compete for Department of Transportation contracts, and it does so without harming the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 1694.

**RECESS**

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 50 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

**AFTER RECESS**

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

**PRAYER**

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Compassionate God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As the Members of the people's House regather, we ask that they be endowed by Your spirit with wisdom and purpose to address the issues facing our Nation. There is great disagreement about what we are called to in these days, when perhaps the greatest need is a sense of unified focus. Help them to leave behind rancorous accusation so that the dangers that threaten us all can be responsibly addressed together.

We ask Your blessing upon the people of France, Lebanon, Nigeria, and so many other nations coping with the horrific aftermath of terrorist attacks

within their borders. Protect those who work furiously to meet the needs of those most impacted by these events, and bless those who mourn the loss of loved ones.

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

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

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

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

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

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

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

#### STOP THE FLOW OF SYRIAN REFUGEES

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

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

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

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

#### CONDOLENCES TO FRANCE

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

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

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

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

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

#### GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM STRIKES PARIS

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

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

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

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

In the last month of the global war on terrorism, Daesh, or ISIL, has murdered 244 on a Russian jetliner, 41 have been murdered in Beirut, Lebanon, and now 129 were murdered across Paris, with a direct threat to attack Washington and Rome. The President should change course to eliminate safe havens for Islamist radicals.

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

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

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President, by his actions, never forget September the 11th in the

global war on terrorism. France is the latest direct target in the global war on terrorism.

#### RECOGNIZING RON BROWN

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

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

Under his leadership, Save Mount Diablo grew from a modest staff of 3 to its current staff of 18 people. It has participated in land use advocacy, land purchase for inclusion in parks, and relationship building with local government and developers, all with the objective of preserving the ecosystem that supports the Mount Diablo region. This has resulted in \$25 million raised to preserve thousands of acres of land.

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

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

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

#### AMERICAN EDUCATION WEEK

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### HONORING NOHEMI GONZALEZ

(Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission

to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

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

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

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

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

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

#### REMEMBERING BRUCE DAYTON

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

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

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

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

#### SOLAR INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

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

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

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

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

#### TERRORIST ATTACKS IN PARIS

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the recent terrorist attacks in Paris are a stark reminder that we cannot risk the safety of our country.

I am asking Pennsylvania Governor Wolf to suspend the Commonwealth's participation in the President's Syrian refugee resettlement initiative. The administration has not provided any details of a thorough screening plan to thwart ISIS infiltration.

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

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

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

□ 1215

#### SMALL BUSINESS STRATEGY

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

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Small Business Saturday. Small Business Saturday

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

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

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

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

This holiday shopping season we have an opportunity to show our appreciation for small businesses. I encourage all Americans to get out and support Small Business Saturday on November 28.

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

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

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on Friday the world again was shocked and stunned when eight gunmen wreaked havoc on Paris, the City of Lights. The day before a pair of suicide bombings struck Beirut, and today we learned that the Russian passenger plane carrying 224 innocent people that crashed last month was blown up using a homemade explosive device.

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

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

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

The Islamic State's twisted ideology will not allow it to cease until our entire way of life is destroyed. That is why it is absolutely vital that the United States redouble our efforts to take the leadership role that the world



demands of us, develop a strategy that will not just degrade, but will ultimately destroy, the ISIS network. Abdul-Rahman and the victims of terror and their families deserve this, and the security of our Nation depends on it.

#### OUR NATION IS A NATION OF IMMIGRANTS

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

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

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

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

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

#### FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA

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

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

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

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

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

#### SIKH AMERICAN AWARENESS AND APPRECIATION MONTH

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

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

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

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

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

#### HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF CARL BOYETT

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

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

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

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

After returning to civilian life in 1970, Carl began working for his family company, Boyett Petroleum. In 2004, he became the CEO and provided masterful leadership and results-oriented vision to the company, which just celebrated its 75th anniversary.

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

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring and recognizing my friend for his unwavering leadership, many accom-

plishments, and contributions on behalf of the Modesto community and the Nation.

God bless him always.

#### REMEMBERING TIM VALENTINE

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

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

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

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

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

Tim was a treasured friend and colleague. I am grateful for his life and work, personally, and also on behalf of the institution in which we served and the citizens on whose behalf he labored.

Lisa and I attended a beautiful service in Tim's honor last Saturday. We extend our love and best wishes to his wife, Barbara, and the rest of his family.

#### WE MUST KEEP THE A-10 JETS FLYING

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

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

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

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

Despite the administration's persistent and flawed arguments for seeking to mothball this irreplaceable

asset, A-10s continue to demonstrate their value on the battlefield.

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

#### CONGRESS MUST FUND THE GOVERNMENT

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

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

But Congress must still act to pass legislation to fund the government before December 11. Especially now, with very real national security threats, Congress must take the politics as usual out of the question, pass a clean bill without poison pill riders, and fund our government.

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

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

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

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

#### WEAR RED WEDNESDAY TO BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

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

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

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

We will continue to wear red every Wednesday until we free the Chibok girls from Boko Haram, and we will

continue to tweet, tweet, tweet #bringbackourgirls, #joinrepwilson.

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

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

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 526

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1737) to nullify certain guidance of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection and to provide requirements for guidance issued by the Bureau with respect to indirect auto lending. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 511) to clarify the rights of Indians and Indian tribes on Indian lands under the National Labor Relations Act. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further 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 Education and the Workforce; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution—  
(a) the House shall be considered to have: (1) taken from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1177) to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that every child achieves; (2) stricken all after the enacting clause of such bill and inserted in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 5, as passed by the House; and (3) passed the Senate bill as so amended; and

(b) it shall be in order for the chair of the Committee on Education and the Workforce or his designee to move that the House insist on its amendment to S. 1177 and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

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

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my friend, 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. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

Finally, the rule directs the Clerk to strike a provision from the reconciliation bill which was already enacted

into law in the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015, facilitating consideration of the bill by the Senate.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding me the time.

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

What we were promised was openness, but what we got was absolutely the opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the breaking of a record, perhaps the worst kind of record: this has officially become the most closed session of Congress in American history. We are living it now.

Today marks the 45th closed rule in this session of Congress, and with each new closed rule that the majority approves, we will break the record anew. Under a closed rule, no amendments are allowed on the House floor, which limits debate and silences half of the American people who are represented by the minority of the House.

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

It is the work of the Rules Committee to report each rule that comes to the floor, and according to our statistics, in this session of Congress, the majority has chosen a closed rule more times than any other kind of rule.

Under this regime, the majority has wasted taxpayer money on their obsession with taking health care away from millions of people and held more than 60 votes to repeal or dismantle ObamaCare. They have spent over \$5 million of taxpayer money on a duplicative, politicized Benghazi special committee even after nine other House and Senate committees and one State Department committee had found nothing nefarious nor illegal. Benghazi was, yes, a tragedy, but it was not a conspiracy. To continue with their wasteful, politicized special committees, they created a special committee to investigate Planned Parenthood, even after grilling the president of Planned Parenthood, Cecile Richards, for 5 hours in a hearing and the chairman later declared that no law had been broken.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is what you get here for your taxpayer dollars.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, for this body to function as the Founding Fathers intended, we need debate and we need openness. For our constituents to be heard and for our institutions to thrive, we need debate and we need openness.

Democrats have always been willing to provide the votes to move the country forward on any bill that would come to the floor, and I would like to extend my well wishes to our new Speaker, PAUL RYAN, and express again our willingness to work together for the American people, because that is why we have been sent here.

Let me mention, if I may, that today, when we are concerned about bringing refugees and immigration, that we have been begging for 2 years or more for this House to take up an immigration bill, and the majority has refused to do so.

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

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

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

In terms of this legislation, I hope I am forgiven, but again, I find very little relevance of discussions of Benghazi and Planned Parenthood to this particular debate. I don't think it has anything to do.

The legislation in front of us really deals with two bills: H.R. 1737, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau bill, actually seeks to simply restrain an agency from exercising authority that it is prohibited from exercising under the legislation, and all the amendments that were germane to that piece of legislation were indeed made in order.

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

□ 1245

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), to discuss our proposal, the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

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

So we have, as part of the previous question, if you defeat the previous question, a proposal to also improve transparency and openness in the full political process, because this is the people's House, and we would hope that it would do the people's business. But we also know that there are a lot of special interests out there that are

spending millions and millions and millions of dollars trying to get their way and substitute their special interests for the public interests. They are spending millions of dollars to try to elect candidates who will do their bidding.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

improve accountability, and doesn't that strengthen our democracy?

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

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank the gentlewoman.

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

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

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

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

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

In H.R. 1737, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau has literally gone beyond the mandate laid out in Dodd-Frank. So I must say I am mystified that I am up here defending a provision of Dodd-Frank, but in this case, it is actually the right thing to do. They have tried to extend their authority into auto lending, which is specifically prohibited under the statute, so we are trying to make that crystal clear.

H.R. 511 does something that, frankly, this House can be very proud of. It recognizes and extends and restores tribal sovereignty in a very important area. That has actually been an area of bipartisan cooperation.

We worked together in the Violence Against Women Act across party lines to extend tribal sovereignty with respect to domestic crime and domestic violence committed by non-Indians on Indian land against Indian citizens. Now we are trying in the labor area to once again restore tribal sovereignty to what it was before 2004 when the National Labor Relations Board, frankly,

acted outside of its authority and seized jurisdiction it simply doesn't have under any statute ever passed by Congress.

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

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

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

In closing, it really is a shame that the only way we can talk about campaign finance is to put it in our previous question because it is never a subject for debate here. That really is a shame because we have terrible situations going on in campaign finance unaccounted for, which is something that we have never had before in this country, certainly since the Watergate issue, where we cleaned up campaign finance considerably and did well with it. But now all that is gone and anything goes.

Mr. Speaker, this rule we are doing today strikes a provision of the reconciliation bill that the House passed last month in the latest futile Republican attempt to undermine the Affordable Care Act. This provision is unprecedented, is unacceptable, and we oppose it. The stricken provision eliminates an auto enroll requirement that employers who offer health insurance automatically enroll new employees in the health plan. The rule strikes this provision from the reconciliation bill because it became law as part of last month's bipartisan budget agreement.

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

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

The best piece of housekeeping that Congress could do on the reconciliation bill is to set it aside and put an end, once and for all, to this fantasy of repealing affordable health coverage for millions of Americans. Instead, let us focus on the policies that actually help American families, such as improving access to education and to good-paying jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that people paid some attention to this debate today. There is so much going on in the House that one wonders if we have.

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

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and to defeat the previous question so that we can take up Mr. VAN HOLLEN's good measure here and try to clean up, as even the members of the Supreme Court who voted to give us Citizens United would like to see us make some change there because they recognize that what they did has been a complete failure. Somehow they had this awesome wonderland idea that everybody would just continue to put their name down on their contributions, and we have certainly found that that is not the case. We don't even know what country a lot of the money is coming from.

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to encourage all Members to support the rule. H.R. 1737 undoes a regulation that should never have been made in the first place, and H.R. 511 restores a right, the right of self-governance, that should have never been taken away from tribal governments.

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

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

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

SEC. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 430) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for additional disclosure requirements

for corporations, labor organizations, and other entities, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 430.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and 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. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 House Resolution 526, if ordered, suspending the rules and passing H.R. 1694 and H.R. 3114.

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

[Roll No. 629]

YEAS—245

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

Issa	Miller (FL)	Schweikert
Jenkins (KS)	Miller (MI)	Scott, Austin
Jenkins (WV)	Moolenaar	Sensenbrenner
Johnson (OH)	Mooney (WV)	Sessions
Johnson, Sam	Mullin	Shimkus
Jolly	Mulvaney	Shuster
Jones	Murphy (PA)	Simpson
Jordan	Neugebauer	Smith (MO)
Joyce	Newhouse	Smith (NE)
Katko	Noem	Smith (NJ)
Kelly (MS)	Nugent	Smith (TX)
Kelly (PA)	Nunes	Stefanik
King (IA)	Olson	Stewart
King (NY)	Palazzo	Stivers
Kinzinger (IL)	Palmer	Stutzman
Kirkpatrick	Paulsen	Thompson (PA)
Kline	Pearce	Thornberry
Knight	Perry	Tiberi
Labrador	Pittenger	Tipton
LaHood	Pitts	Trott
LaMalfa	Poe (TX)	Turner
Lamborn	Poliquin	Upton
Lance	Pompeo	Valadao
Latta	Posey	Wagner
LoBiondo	Price, Tom	Walberg
Long	Ratcliffe	Walden
Loudermilk	Reed	Walker
Love	Reichert	Walorski
Lucas	Renacci	Walters, Mimi
Luetkemeyer	Ribble	Weber (TX)
Lummis	Rice (SC)	Webster (FL)
MacArthur	Rigell	Wenstrup
Marchant	Roby	Westerman
Marino	Roe (TN)	Westmoreland
Massie	Rogers (AL)	Whitfield
McCarthy	Rogers (KY)	Williams
McCaul	Rohrabacher	Wilson (SC)
McClintock	Rokita	Wittman
McHenry	Roskam	Womack
McKinley	Ross	Woodall
McMorris	Rothfus	Yoder
Rodgers	Rouzer	Yoho
McSally	Royce	Young (AK)
Meadows	Russell	Young (IA)
Meehan	Salmon	Young (IN)
Messer	Sanford	Zeldin
Mica	Scalise	Zinke

NAYS—178

Adams	Dingell	Lieu, Ted
Aguilar	Doggett	Lipinski
Ashford	Doyle, Michael	Loebsack
Bass	F.	Lofgren
Beatty	Duckworth	Lowenthal
Becerra	Edwards	Lowey
Bera	Ellison	Lujan Grisham
Beyer	Engel	(NM)
Bishop (GA)	Esty	Lujan, Ben Ray
Blumenauer	Farr	(NM)
Bonamici	Fattah	Lynch
Boyle, Brendan	Foster	Maloney,
F.	Frankel (FL)	Carolyn
Brady (PA)	Fudge	Maloney, Sean
Brown (FL)	Galleo	Matsui
Brownley (CA)	Garamendi	McCollum
Bustos	Graham	McDermott
Butterfield	Grayson	McGovern
Capps	Green, Al	McNerney
Capuano	Green, Gene	Meeks
Cardenas	Grijalva	Meng
Carney	Gutierrez	Moulton
Carson (IN)	Hahn	Murphy (FL)
Cartwright	Hastings	Nadler
Castor (FL)	Heck (WA)	Napolitano
Castro (TX)	Higgins	Neal
Chu, Judy	Himes	Nolan
Cicilline	Honda	Norcross
Clark (MA)	Hoyer	O'Rourke
Clarke (NY)	Huffman	Pallone
Clay	Israel	Pascarell
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Pelosi
Clyburn	Jeffries	Perlmutter
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Peters
Connolly	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson
Conyers	Kaptur	Pingree
Cooper	Keating	Pocan
Costa	Kelly (IL)	Polis
Courtney	Kennedy	Price (NC)
Crowley	Kildee	Quigley
Cuellar	Kilmer	Rangel
Cummings	Kind	Rice (NY)
Davis (CA)	Kuster	Richmond
Davis, Danny	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz
DeLaney	Larson (CT)	Rush
DeLauro	Lawrence	Ryan (OH)
DeBene	Lee	Sanchez, Linda
DeSaulnier	Levin	T.
Deutch	Lewis	Sanchez, Loretta

Sarbanes	Smith (WA)	Vela
Schakowsky	Speier	Velázquez
Schiff	Swalwell (CA)	Visclosky
Schrader	Takano	Walz
Scott (VA)	Thompson (CA)	Wasserman
Scott, David	Thompson (MS)	Schultz
Serrano	Tonko	Waters, Maxine
Sewell (AL)	Torres	Watson Coleman
Sherman	Tsongas	Welch
Sinema	Van Hollen	Wilson (FL)
Sires	Vargas	Yarmuth
Slaughter	Veasey	

NOT VOTING—10

DeFazio	Payne	Takai
Eshoo	Rooney (FL)	Titus
Hinojosa	Ros-Lehtinen	
Moore	Ruppersberger	

□ 1329

Messrs. SIRES, VELA, and LARSON of Connecticut changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

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

I would like to reflect that on rollcall No. 629, I would have voted "no."

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 181, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 630]

YEAS—243

Abraham	Cramer	Grothman
Aderholt	Crawford	Guinta
Allen	Crenshaw	Guthrie
Amodei	Culberson	Hanna
Babin	Curbelo (FL)	Hardy
Barletta	Davis, Rodney	Harper
Barr	Denham	Harris
Barton	Dent	Hartzler
Benishek	DeSantis	Heck (NV)
Bilirakis	DesJarlais	Hensarling
Bishop (MI)	Diaz-Balart	Herrera Beutler
Bishop (UT)	Dold	Hice, Jody B.
Black	Donovan	Hill
Blackburn	Duffy	Holding
Blum	Duncan (SC)	Hudson
Bost	Duncan (TN)	Huelskamp
Boustany	Ellmers (NC)	Huizenga (MI)
Brady (TX)	Emmer (MN)	Hultgren
Brat	Farenthold	Hunter
Bridenstine	Fincher	Hurd (TX)
Brooks (AL)	Fitzpatrick	Hurt (VA)
Brooks (IN)	Fleischmann	Issa
Buchanan	Fleming	Jenkins (KS)
Buck	Flores	Jenkins (WV)
Bucshon	Forbes	Johnson (OH)
Burgess	Fortenberry	Johnson, Sam
Byrne	Fox	Jolly
Calvert	Franks (AZ)	Jones
Carter (GA)	Frelinghuysen	Jordan
Carter (TX)	Garrett	Joyce
Chabot	Gibbs	Katko
Chaffetz	Gibson	Kelly (MS)
Clawson (FL)	Gohmert	Kelly (PA)
Coffman	Goodlatte	King (IA)
Cole	Gosar	King (NY)
Collins (GA)	Gowdy	Kinzinger (IL)
Collins (NY)	Granger	Kline
Comstock	Graves (GA)	Knight
Conaway	Graves (LA)	Labrador
Cook	Graves (MO)	LaHood
Costello (PA)	Griffith	LaMalfa

Lamborn Paulsen  
 Lance Pearce  
 Latta Perry  
 LoBiondo Pittenger  
 Long Pitts  
 Loudermilk Poe (TX)  
 Love Poliquin  
 Lucas Pompeo  
 Luetkemeyer Posey  
 Lummis Price, Tom  
 MacArthur Ratcliffe  
 Marchant Reed  
 Marino Reichert  
 Massie Renacci  
 McCarthy Ribble  
 McCaul Rice (SC)  
 McClintock Rigell  
 McHenry Roby  
 McKinley Roe (TN)  
 McMorris Rogers (AL)  
 Rodgers Rogers (KY)  
 McSally Rohrabacher  
 Meadows Rokita  
 Meehan Rooney (FL)  
 Messer Roskam  
 Mica Ross  
 Miller (FL) Rothfus  
 Miller (MI) Rouzer  
 Moolenaar Royce  
 Mooney (WV) Russell  
 Mullin Salmon  
 Mulvaney Sanford  
 Murphy (PA) Scalise  
 Neugebauer Schweikert  
 Newhouse Scott, Austin  
 Noem Sensenbrenner  
 Nugent Sessions  
 Nunes Shimkus  
 Olson Shuster  
 Palazzo Simpson  
 Palmer Smith (MO)

Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Stefanik  
 Stewart  
 Stivers  
 Stutzman  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiberi  
 Tipton  
 Tipton  
 Trott  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Valadao  
 Wagner  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walker  
 Walorski  
 Walters, Mimi  
 Weber (TX)  
 Webster (FL)  
 Wenstrup  
 Westerman  
 Westmoreland  
 Whitfield  
 Williams  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Yoder  
 Yoho  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (IA)  
 Young (IN)  
 Zeldin  
 Zinke

Takano  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Tonko  
 Torres  
 Tsongas  
 Van Hollen  
 Vargas  
 Veasey  
 Vela  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walz  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters, Maxine  
 Watson Coleman  
 Welch  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Yarmuth

Hahn  
 Hanna  
 Hardy  
 Harper  
 Harris  
 Hartzler  
 Heck (NV)  
 Heck (WA)  
 Hensarling  
 Herrera Beutler  
 Hice, Jody B.  
 Hill  
 Holding  
 Hudson  
 Huelskamp  
 Huizenga (MI)  
 Hultgren  
 Hunter  
 Hurd (TX)  
 Hurt (VA)  
 Issa  
 Jenkins (KS)  
 Jenkins (WV)  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jolly  
 Jones  
 Jordan  
 Joyce  
 Katko  
 Keating  
 Kelly (MS)  
 Kelly (PA)  
 Kennedy  
 Kilmer  
 Kind  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Kinzinger (IL)  
 Kirkpatrick  
 Kline  
 Knight  
 Kuster  
 Labrador  
 LaHood  
 LaMalfa  
 Lamborn  
 Lance  
 Langevin  
 Latta  
 Lipinski  
 LoBiondo  
 Loeb sack  
 Long  
 Loudermilk  
 Love  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Lujan Grisham  
 (NM)  
 Lummis  
 Lynch

MacArthur  
 Maloney, Sean  
 Marchant  
 Marino  
 Massie  
 McCarthy  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McHenry  
 McKinley  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 McSally  
 Meadows  
 Meehan  
 Messer  
 Mica  
 Miller (FL)  
 Miller (MI)  
 Moolenaar  
 Mooney (WV)  
 Moulton  
 Mullin  
 Mulvaney  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Neal  
 Neugebauer  
 Newhouse  
 Noem  
 Nolan  
 Norcross  
 Nugent  
 Nunes  
 Olson  
 Palazz  
 Palmer  
 Pascrell  
 Paulsen  
 Pearce  
 Perry  
 Peters  
 Peterson  
 Pittenger  
 Pitts  
 Poe (TX)  
 Poliquin  
 Pompeo  
 Posey  
 Price, Tom  
 Ratcliffe  
 Reed  
 Reichert  
 Renacci  
 Ribble  
 Rice (SC)  
 Rigell  
 Roby  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Rokita

Rooney (FL)  
 Roskam  
 Ross  
 Rothfus  
 Rouzer  
 Royce  
 Ruiz  
 Russell  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Salmon  
 Scalise  
 Schrader  
 Schweikert  
 Scott, Austin  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Sessions  
 Shimkus  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Sinema  
 Smith (MO)  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Stefanik  
 Stewart  
 Stivers  
 Stutzman  
 Thornberry  
 Tiberi  
 Tipton  
 Trott  
 Turner  
 Tsongas  
 Upton  
 Valadao  
 Wagner  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walker  
 Walorski  
 Walters, Mimi  
 Webster (FL)  
 Wenstrup  
 Westerman  
 Westmoreland  
 Whitfield  
 Williams  
 Wittman  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Yoder  
 Yoho  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (IA)  
 Young (IN)  
 Zeldin  
 Zinke

NOT VOTING—9

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

□ 1337

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 629 and 630, had I been present, I would have voted “no” and “no.”

FAIRNESS TO VETERANS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1694) to amend MAP-21 to improve contracting opportunities for veteran-owned small business concerns, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.  
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 285, nays 138, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 631]

YEAS—285

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

Abraham  
 Aderholt  
 Aguilar  
 Allen  
 Amodei  
 Ashford  
 Babin  
 Barletta  
 Barr  
 Benishek  
 Bera  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop (MI)  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Black  
 Blackburn  
 Blum  
 Bost  
 Boustany  
 Sarbanes  
 F.  
 Brady (TX)  
 Brat  
 Bridenstine  
 Brooks (AL)  
 Brooks (IN)  
 Brownley (CA)  
 Buchanan  
 Buck  
 Buschson  
 Burgess  
 Byrne  
 Calvert  
 Carter (GA)

NAYS—138

Adams  
 Amash  
 Bass  
 Beatty  
 Becerra  
 Beyer  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Blumenauer  
 Bonamici  
 Brady (PA)  
 Brown (FL)  
 Bustos  
 Butterfield  
 Capps  
 Capuano  
 Cárdenas  
 Carney  
 Carson (IN)  
 Cartwright  
 Castor (FL)  
 Castro (TX)  
 Chu, Judy  
 Clark (MA)  
 Clarke (NY)  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Cohen  
 Conyers  
 Courtney  
 Crowley  
 Cuellar  
 Cummings  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis, Danny  
 DeGette  
 DeLauro

Carter (TX)  
 Chabot  
 Chaffetz  
 Cicilline  
 Clawson (FL)  
 Coffman  
 Cole  
 Collins (GA)  
 Collins (NY)  
 Comstock  
 Conaway  
 Connolly  
 Cook  
 Cooper  
 Costa  
 Costello (PA)  
 Courtney  
 Cramer  
 Crawford  
 Crenshaw  
 Cuellar  
 Culberson  
 Curbelo (FL)  
 Davis, Rodney  
 Delaney  
 DelBene  
 Denham  
 Dent  
 DeSantis  
 DesJarlais  
 Dold  
 Donovan  
 Duffy  
 Duncan (SC)

DeSaulnier  
 Deutch  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Doyle, Michael F.  
 Duckworth  
 Edwards  
 Ellison  
 Eshoo  
 Esty  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Foster  
 Frankel (FL)  
 Fudge  
 Gallego  
 Grayson  
 Green, Al  
 Grijalva  
 Gutiérrez  
 Hastings  
 Higgs  
 Himes  
 Honda  
 Hoyer  
 Huffman  
 Cohen  
 Jackson Lee  
 Jeffries  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Kaptur  
 Kelly (IL)  
 Kildee

Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Lawrence  
 Lee  
 Levin  
 Lewis  
 Lieu, Ted  
 Lofgren  
 Lowenthal  
 Lowey  
 Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)  
 Maloney,  
 Carolyn  
 Matsui  
 McCollum  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McNeerney  
 Meeks  
 Meng  
 Moore  
 Murphy (FL)  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 O'Rourke  
 Pallone  
 Pelosi  
 Perlmutter  
 Pingree  
 Pocan  
 Polis  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Rangel

Rice (NY)	Serrano	Van Hollen	Collins (NY)	Herrera Beutler	Meeks	Slaughter	Tsongas	Webster (FL)
Richmond	Sewell (AL)	Vargas	Comstock	Hice, Jody B.	Meng	Smith (MO)	Turner	Welch
Roybal-Allard	Sherman	Veasey	Conaway	Higgins	Messer	Smith (NE)	Upton	Westrup
Rush	Sires	Velázquez	Connolly	Hill	Mica	Smith (NJ)	Valadao	Westerman
Sánchez, Linda	Slaughter	Visclosky	Conyers	Himes	Miller (FL)	Smith (TX)	Van Hollen	Westmoreland
T.	Smith (WA)	Wasserman	Cook	Holding	Miller (MI)	Smith (WA)	Vargas	Whitfield
Sanchez, Loretta	Speier	Schultz	Cooper	Honda	Moolenaar	Speier	Veasey	Williams
Sanford	Swalwell (CA)	Waters, Maxine	Costa	Hoyer	Mooney (WV)	Stefanik	Vela	Wilson (FL)
Sarbanes	Takano	Watson Coleman	Costello (PA)	Hudson	Moore	Stewart	Velázquez	Wilson (SC)
Schakowsky	Thompson (CA)	Welch	Courtney	Huelskamp	Moulton	Stivers	Visclosky	Wittman
Schiff	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (FL)	Cramer	Huffman	Mullin	Stutzman	Wagner	Womack
Scott (VA)	Tonko	Yarmuth	Crawford	Huizenga (MI)	Mulvaney	Swalwell (CA)	Walberg	Woodall
Scott, David	Torres		Crenshaw	Hultgren	Murphy (FL)	Takano	Walden	Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—10

Barton	Payne	Thompson (PA)
DeFazio	Ros-Lehtinen	Titus
Diaz-Balart	Ruppersberger	
Hinojosa	Takai	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1343

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.

## PROVIDING FUNDS TO THE ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS TO ASSIST WITH CURATION AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3114) to provide funds to the Army Corps of Engineers to hire veterans and members of the Armed Forces to assist the Corps with curation and historic preservation activities, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 3, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 632]

YEAS—422

Abraham	Blumenauer	Capuano
Adams	Bonamici	Cárdenas
Aderholt	Bost	Carney
Aguilar	Boustany	Carson (IN)
Allen	Boyle, Brendan	Carter (GA)
Amodel	F.	Carter (TX)
Ashford	Brady (PA)	Cartwright
Babin	Brady (TX)	Castor (FL)
Barletta	Brat	Castro (TX)
Barr	Bridenstine	Chabot
Barton	Brooks (AL)	Chaffetz
Beatty	Brooks (IN)	Chu, Judy
Becerra	Brown (FL)	Cicilline
Benishek	Brownley (CA)	Clark (MA)
Bera	Buchanan	Clarke (NY)
Beyer	Buck	Clawson (FL)
Bilirakis	Bucshon	Clay
Bishop (GA)	Burgess	Cleaver
Bishop (MI)	Bustos	Clyburn
Bishop (UT)	Butterfield	Coffman
Black	Byrne	Cohen
Blackburn	Calvert	Cole
Blum	Capps	Collins (GA)

Collins (NY)	Herrera Beutler	Meeks	Slaughter	Tsongas	Webster (FL)
Comstock	Hice, Jody B.	Meng	Smith (MO)	Turner	Welch
Conaway	Higgins	Messer	Smith (NE)	Upton	Westrup
Connolly	Hill	Mica	Smith (NJ)	Valadao	Westerman
Conyers	Himes	Miller (FL)	Smith (TX)	Van Hollen	Westmoreland
Cook	Holding	Miller (MI)	Smith (WA)	Vargas	Whitfield
Cooper	Honda	Moolenaar	Speier	Veasey	Williams
Costa	Hoyer	Mooney (WV)	Stefanik	Vela	Wilson (FL)
Courtney	Hudson	Moore	Stewart	Velázquez	Wilson (SC)
Cramer	Huelskamp	Moulton	Stivers	Visclosky	Wittman
Crawford	Huffman	Mullin	Stutzman	Wagner	Womack
Crenshaw	Huizenga (MI)	Mulvaney	Swalwell (CA)	Walberg	Woodall
Crowley	Hultgren	Murphy (FL)	Takano	Walden	Yarmuth
Cuellar	Hunter	Murphy (PA)	Thompson (CA)	Walker	Yoder
Culberson	Hurd (TX)	Nadler	Thompson (MS)	Walorski	Yoho
Cummings	Hurt (VA)	Napolitano	Thompson (PA)	Walters, Mimi	Young (AK)
Curbelo (FL)	Israel	Neal	Thornberry	Walz	Young (IA)
Davis (CA)	Issa	Neugebauer	Tiberi	Wasserman	Young (IN)
Davis, Danny	Jackson Lee	Newhouse	Tipton	Schultz	Zeldin
Davis, Rodney	Jeffries	Noem	Tonko	Waters, Maxine	Zinke
DeGette	Jenkins (KS)	Nolan	Torres	Watson Coleman	
Delaney	Jenkins (WV)	Norcross	Trott	Weber (TX)	
DeLauro	Johnson (GA)	Nugent			
DelBene	Johnson (OH)	Nunes			
Denham	Johnson, E. B.	O'Rourke	Amash	Loudermilk	Sanford
Dent	Johnson, Sam	Olson			
DeSantis	Jolly	Palazzo			
DeSaulnier	Jones	Pallone	Bass	Payne	Takai
DesJarlais	Jordan	Palmer	DeFazio	Ros-Lehtinen	Titus
Deutch	Joyce	Pascrell	Hinojosa	Ruppersberger	
Diaz-Balart	Kaptur	Paulsen			
Dingell	Katko	Pearce			
Doggett	Keating	Pelosi			
Dold	Kelly (IL)	Perlmutter			
Donovan	Kelly (MS)	Perry			
Doyle, Michael	Kelly (PA)	Peters			
F.	Kennedy	Peterson			
Duckworth	Kildee	Pingree			
Duffy	Kilmer	Pittenger			
Duncan (SC)	Kind	Pitts			
Duncan (TN)	King (IA)	Pocan			
Edwards	King (NY)	Poe (TX)			
Ellison	Kinziger (IL)	Poliquin			
Ellmers (NC)	Kirkpatrick	Polis			
Emmer (MN)	Kline	Pompeo			
Engel	Knight	Posey			
Eshoo	Kuster	Price (NC)			
Esty	Labrador	Price, Tom			
Farenthold	LaHood	Quigley			
Farr	LaMalfa	Rangel			
Fattah	Lamborn	Ratcliffe			
Fincher	Lance	Reed			
Fitzpatrick	Langevin	Reichert			
Fleischmann	Larsen (WA)	Renacci			
Fleming	Larson (CT)	Ribble			
Flores	Latta	Rice (NY)			
Forbes	Lawrence	Rice (SC)			
Fortenberry	Lee	Richmond			
Foster	Levin	Rigell			
Fox	Lewis	Roby			
Frankel (FL)	Lieu, Ted	Roe (TN)			
Franks (AZ)	Lipinski	Rogers (AL)			
Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo	Rogers (KY)			
Fudge	Loebsock	Rohrabacher			
Gabbard	Lofgren	Rokita			
Gallego	Long	Rooney (FL)			
Garamendi	Love	Roskam			
Garrett	Lowenthal	Ross			
Gibbs	Lowe	Rothfus			
Gibson	Lucas	Rouzer			
Gohmert	Luetkemeyer	Roybal-Allard			
Goodlatte	Lujan Grisham	Royce			
Gosar	(NM)	Ruiz			
Gowdy	Luján, Ben Ray	Rush			
Graham	(NM)	Russell			
Granger	Lummi	Ryan (OH)			
Graves (GA)	Lynch	Salmon			
Graves (LA)	MacArthur	Sánchez, Linda			
Graves (MO)	Maloney	T.			
Grayson	Carolyn	Sanchez, Loretta			
Green, Al	Maloney, Sean	Sarbanes			
Green, Gene	Marchant	Scalise			
Griffith	Marino	Schakowsky			
Grijalva	Massie	Schiff			
Grothman	Matsui	Schrader			
Guinta	McCarthy	Schweikert			
Guthrie	McCaul	Scott (VA)			
Gutiérrez	McClintock	Scott, Austin			
Hahn	McCollum	Scott, David			
Hanna	McDermott	Sensenbrenner			
Hardy	McGovern	Serrano			
Harper	McHenry	Sessions			
Harris	McKinley	Sewell (AL)			
Hartzer	McMorris	Sherman			
Hastings	Rodgers	Shimkus			
Heck (NV)	McNerney	Shuster			
Heck (WA)	Heck (NV)	Simpson			
Hensarling	Heck (WA)	Sinema			
	Hensarling	Sires			

## NAYS—3

Amash	Loudermilk	Sanford
-------	------------	---------

## NOT VOTING—8

Bass	Payne	Takai
DeFazio	Ros-Lehtinen	Titus
Hinojosa	Ruppersberger	

□ 1351

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 526, S. 1177, as amended, is considered as passed.

## TRIBAL LABOR SOVEREIGNTY ACT OF 2015

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 526, I call up the bill (H.R. 511) to clarify the rights of Indians and Indian tribes on Indian lands under the National Labor Relations Act, 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 526, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and the Workforce, printed in the bill, shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, shall be considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 511

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

*This Act may be cited as the "Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act of 2015".*

**SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF EMPLOYER.**

*Section 2 of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 152) is amended—*

*(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting "or any Indian tribe, or any enterprise or institution owned and operated by an Indian tribe and located on its Indian lands," after "subdivision thereof,"; and*

*(2) by adding at the end the following:*



“(15) The term ‘Indian tribe’ means any Indian tribe, band, nation, pueblo, or other organized group or community which is recognized as eligible for the special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians.

“(16) The term ‘Indian’ means any individual who is a member of an Indian tribe.

“(17) The term ‘Indian lands’ means—

“(A) all lands within the limits of any Indian reservation;

“(B) any lands title to which is either held in trust by the United States for the benefit of any Indian tribe or individual or held by any Indian tribe or individual subject to restriction by the United States against alienation; and

“(C) any lands in the State of Oklahoma that are within the boundaries of a former reservation (as defined by the Secretary of the Interior) of a federally recognized Indian tribe.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 511.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 511, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act of 2015. There are more than 550 federally recognized Native American tribes across the United States. Each of these tribes has a unique history and distinct culture that have helped shape who they are today. And each tribe has an inherent right to self govern, just like any other sovereign government does.

That right is rooted in the Constitution and has been reaffirmed by courts for almost 200 years. Because of it, tribal leaders are able to make decisions that affect their people in a way that makes the most sense for their tribe and best protects the interests of their members—or, rather, they should be able to make those decisions.

We are here today because, for the past 10 years, the National Labor Relations Board has ignored longstanding labor policy and involved itself in tribal activities. Since its 2004 San Manuel Indian Bingo and Casino decision, the Board has used a subjective test to decide on a case-by-case basis whether a tribal business or tribal land is for commercial purposes, and if it is, the Board has asserted its jurisdiction over that business.

Now, if the Board were to do the same with a school, a park, or any other enterprise owned and operated by a State or local government, no Member of Congress would stand for it. Why, then, should we stand back and allow the NLRB to impose its will on businesses owned and operated by Na-

tive American tribes? The answer is simple: we shouldn't. In fact, we have a responsibility to protect tribal sovereignty, and that is exactly what H.R. 511 will do.

The bill under consideration will amend the National Labor Relations Act to reaffirm that the NLRB cannot assert its authority over enterprises or institutions owned or operated by a tribe on tribal land. It very simply reasserts a legal standard that was in place for decades and returns to tribes the ability to manage their own labor relations—as they have a sovereign right to do.

I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), my colleague, for his leadership on this issue and for continuing the work of those in Congress who have helped lead the fight to protect tribal sovereignty over the years. It is time for all of us to join that fight, stand with the Native American community, and restore to Indian tribes the ability to govern their own labor relations.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act of 2015.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act of 2015, legislation that would strip employees of protections afforded under the National Labor Relations Act at any enterprise owned by an Indian tribe and located on Indian lands.

At issue are two solemn and deeply-rooted principles: one, the right of Indian tribes to possess as distinct independent political communities retaining their original rights in matters of local self-government; and, two, the rights of workers to organize, bargain collectively, and engage in concerted activities for their mutual aid and protection.

Rather than attempting to reconcile these two competing principles, H.R. 4511 chooses sovereignty for some over the longstanding rights of others. This bill strips hundreds of thousands of workers of their voice in tribal-owned workplaces such as casinos, hotels, and mines. It should be noted that some 600,000 workers are employed in tribal casinos, but fully 75 percent are not members of tribes.

This legislation would jettison a carefully drawn balance between tribal sovereignty and workers' rights that was adopted in 2004 by a Republican-led NLRB. That decision, known as the San Manuel Indian Bingo and Casino, restricted the jurisdiction of the NLRB if it touches on the exclusive rights of self-governance in purely intramural matters or aggregated rights guaranteed under treaties.

Furthermore, the NLRB stated that it would also take into account and accommodate the unique status of Indians in their society and legal culture in deciding NLRB jurisdiction.

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

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

□ 1400

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Today I rise in support of H.R. 511, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act, to restore self-governance for the Saginaw Chippewa and all tribes and to stop the National Labor Relations Board from further hindering business owners and entrepreneurs with more regulations and costs.

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

Mr. ELLISON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Workers who are in the union are far more likely to have retirement benefits, paid sick leave, and other medical benefits. Workers who have organized at their casinos have turned low-wage

service sector jobs into good-paying jobs with benefits. This legislation would take those jobs away.

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), my friend and colleague on the Education and the Workforce Committee and a veteran of this great Nation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So this is a bill that is looking for a problem, because the true test of what is going on here today is trying to take those rights of having a level playing field away from those who don't have a voice. Well, we stand here today as that voice.

My career was as an electrician who later had the opportunity to become a business agent. I have been to National Labor Relations Boards many, many times. I have lost some. I have won some. But one thing I can tell you is it was a fair fight. And that is what we want to give those on tribal lands, a fair fight.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

During a time of political and partisan gridlock, empowering tribes and the lives of their people is a bipartisan issue that both sides should be able to find common ground on. We need to protect tribal lands from Washington's constant overreach.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose H.R. 511. One of the most important things

we can do in this body is help the middle class to have every opportunity for their family.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1415

If you want to address some of the Tax Code disparities that hinder tribes

from encouraging economic development on their lands, especially renewable energy projects, let's do that bill. But we are not addressing the real pressing issues that affect tribes in our country. Instead, we are only going after workers' rights in the veil of tribal sovereignty, and that is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote.

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

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

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

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

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

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

For 70 years after the enactment of the National Labor Relations Act, the Federal Government recognized the internal independence of these tribal governments established of, by, and for their rightful members. It recognized that unless Congress specified otherwise, the Indian nations were free to conduct their own affairs on their sovereign lands and to organize their enterprises according to their own traditions, customs, conditions, and necessities—that is, until 2004, when the National Labor Relations Board decided to shatter these decades of legal precedents and usurp the legislative powers of the Congress.

The NLRA was never intended to apply to governments, and the American Indian nations have always been recognized as governments—that is, until the NLRB decided to radically and fundamentally change the law that created it in the first place.

The question before the House is whether Congress will reassert its authority over a rogue executive agency and, for a change, honor the promises of tribal sovereignty made to these nations more than 100 years ago.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume

to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for yielding and for his leadership in support of working men and women.

Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues, I am a strong supporter of tribal sovereignty and believe that we must recognize the rights of tribal governments. But I am also a strong supporter of labor rights, the ability of hardworking men and women to join together in collective bargaining to improve their workplace and the lives of their families.

Union membership has many advantages: higher wages, better benefits, and safer working conditions. It is no coincidence that we have seen the middle class shrink dramatically at the same time that union membership has declined. That is why we need to act to expand labor rights and why we should be concerned about the bill before us.

I believe that the 2004 National Labor Relations Board decision in San Manuel Indian Bingo & Casino struck the appropriate balance between respecting tribal sovereignty and upholding labor rights. In its decision, the NLRB stated the National Labor Relations Act does not apply if it would undermine the "exclusive rights of self-governance in purely intramural matters" or "abrogate Indian treaty rights." However, the NLRB clarified that labor law would apply if an entity is a purely commercial enterprise and employs or caters to individuals who are not tribal members. That is an appropriate test, whether we are talking about casinos or construction companies, hotels and resorts, or mines or power plants.

H.R. 511 would overturn the NLRB's carefully crafted decision and could take away existing bargaining rights from hundreds of thousands of workers. We know that workers at tribally owned casinos have benefited from union membership. A UNITE HERE! union study of tribal casino workers in California documented higher wages, lower healthcare costs, and less worker reliance on public benefits like Medicaid to meet the needs of their families. Employers, too, gain when workers are more productive and turnover is reduced.

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

Madeline, a worker at Foxwoods, was suspended because she was forced to clock out when she went to see a nurse for a work-related injury, which put

her over the casino's attendance points system. Her union won her reinstatement and backpay. And the company provided a mandatory OSHA training program for management.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Second, if State or local workers want to push for laws to obtain or protect collective bargaining rights, they have the ability to participate in the political process and vote in elections. That is one reason that the vast major-

ity of State and local public employees have those rights. Non-tribal workers at tribal-operated commercial enterprises lack that ability. They don't vote in tribal elections, and they have no direct ability to affect labor policies for tribal governments.

Mr. Speaker, we should fight for workplace rights and support the balanced approach taken by the NLRB. I ask my colleagues to join in opposing this bill.

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

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act of 2015.

Minnesota is a proud home to seven Ojibwe reservations and four Dakota communities. We have a strong and deep Native American history and are proud of the work we have accomplished through centuries of working together.

The Federal Government has long recognized that Native American tribes have the capacity and ability to govern themselves in an efficient and meaningful manner that is consistent with their heritage. The legislation being discussed today is of grave importance to the communities that have contributed so much to our Nation's history.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). The gentleman from Virginia has 12 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Tennessee has 21½ minutes remaining.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to also say to my friend from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), he and I are good friends and have done a lot of work together, but on this we disagree.

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

I can't think of anyone in this House who does not believe strongly in the principle of protecting the sovereignty of American tribes and their governments. I know surely that is where I

am. I presume all 434 of my colleagues are there. It is the least we can do, having treated the Native Americans so badly when we got here and thereafter.

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

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

Democrats are proud to stand shoulder to shoulder with Native American tribal communities across this country, and we are going to continue working with them to fight for more investment in education. Hear me. We need to put our money where our mouth is: Native American housing, health care, education, along with continuing to protect their sovereignty in governing themselves according to their cultures and traditions.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Courts have ruled that tribes must also comply with the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Occupational Safety and Health Act and many criminal laws, among others. Should we repeal that and have unhealthy working conditions in commercial enterprises? Perhaps that is the next bill you will bring forward in the name of Native sovereignty.

□ 1430

Why is the NLRA being singled out from among these laws of general applicability by the proponents of this bill? I suggested why at the beginning

of my comments: because that side does not support National Labor Relations Act rights.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to send a strong and unequivocal message—two messages: A, we support strongly the sovereignty of our tribes, but, secondly, we also support the decency and safety and pay of working Americans, tribes and non-tribes alike. I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just for clarification, Mr. Speaker, many Federal labor laws specifically exclude Indian tribes from the definition of employer, including title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act, and the Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act. In contrast, statutes of general application, including the NLRA; Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act; Age Discrimination in Employment Act, ADEA; Fair Labor Standards Act; Family and Medical Leave Act; and Employee Retirement Income Security Act, ERISA, are silent in their application to Indian tribes. Federal courts have held that the statutes of general application—specifically, FLSA and ERISA—do apply. Otherwise, they do not.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM), my good friend, which I had the privilege of visiting her beautiful State about a month ago.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind everyone, in light of the debate that we have had today here on the floor, that this bill is extremely bipartisan. It is supported by tribes all across the Nation. It is something that they have been asking us for. In fact, in the last two Congresses, I carried the bill. I was the sponsor of it because it needs to be done, and I was asked to do so by tribes across the country.

This is an issue of sovereignty. No other level of government in the country is subject to the National Labor Relations Act. It is time that Congress clarifies the law and reaffirms its commitment to tribal governments and self-determination.

The bipartisan policy of economic development through self-determination has helped create economic opportunity in Indian country. Tribes across the country and in my home State of

South Dakota work daily to overcome the high rates of poverty and unemployment that they face. They continue to develop their businesses and lands for the benefit of their people and communities. The last thing that they need is to have the National Labor Relations Board meddling in their economic development affairs when they are trying to make life better for the people who live in their communities.

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

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

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the fine gentleman from Tennessee.

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

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

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

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

It is time that this House reaffirm its constitutional role, defined in article I, section 8, and lead the Federal Government in its relations with Indian tribes, not this overreaching board.

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

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

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

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

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

This Nation must continue to recognize the rights of Indian tribal sovereignty, and this Congress must up-

hold the Constitution and sovereign treaties with those tribes.

Those opposed to this bill, Mr. Speaker, say that it will take away the rights of workers. As a Representative from Oklahoma, whose Fifth District has more than 13 percent Native American, our largest minority, our constituents know that the actions of the rulemakers will take away the rights of sovereign tribes. Congress must restore these rights with the passage of this bill.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM).

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

As you have heard today, tribes have a right to govern themselves, manage their own land, and regulate tribal enterprises according to their own culture, traditions, and law. They have

the right to regulate labor relations with their employees as a result, and I expect tribal governments to view this legislation, in fact, as an opportunity to strengthen their own worker protections.

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

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

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

Congress should provide tribes the resources they need to develop and implement labor laws and regulations at Native American enterprises. Employee protections and tribal autonomy are not opposing values.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and to work for protecting workers' rights.

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

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

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

Going on:

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

"It is thus possible to protect both tribal sovereignty and workers' rights, and the administration can only support approaches that accomplish that result. Therefore, the administration can support a bill which recognizes tribal sovereignty in formulating labor relations law and exempts tribes from the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board only if the tribes

adopt labor standards and procedures applicable to tribally owned and operated commercial enterprises reasonably equivalent to those in the National Labor Relations Act."

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

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

(Rep. Rokita, R-IN, Nov. 17, 2015)

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

The President's commitment to tribal sovereignty has taken many forms—from establishing the White House Council on Native American Affairs, to reaffirming tribal authority to prosecute non-Indians under the Violence Against Women Act, and to promoting tribal self-determination by signing into law the Helping Expedite and Advance Responsible Tribal Homeownership (HEARTH) Act so that tribes may lease their lands without the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

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

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

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

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

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I guess what sovereignty means for an Indian reservation is you can be sovereign as long as we tell you what to do.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE). New Mexico has been a very active voice on this issue.

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

H.R. 511, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act, says it all. All we are trying to do is to provide Native American tribes the sovereignty and autonomy they deserve, ensuring that they have the same rights as other businesses off the reservation, and that they have the same standards as States and local governments.

Now, we have heard on this floor from those who reject the bill, those who oppose it, about where after is decency, safety, and pay. I am proud of New Mexico. I represent the tribes. And I will tell you we are falling far short of those objectives of those who oppose the bill.

Many of the tribes are looking to get into their own businesses now. They want to compete off reservation. They want to put tribal members to work. But they are hamstrung by the National Labor Relations Board, which currently chooses on a case-by-case basis which tribes are regulated and which are not. They are dependent on the government to give them permission. That is not what sovereignty sounds like in New Mexico, and tribes across this country are rejecting the status quo, saying: Let us move forward. Let us be in charge of our own destiny. We do not want to be responsible—we don't want to be wards of the government any longer. Give us our freedom to compete.

I see tribal companies that could compete easily if they are allowed to by this government. And just the phrase being "allowed to by this government" is one that chafes, and should chafe, Native Americans.

So the resulting confusion from the current status quo, which is trying to provide decency, safety, and pay, and is not doing that, the confusion from some being chosen and some not being chosen is one that needs to be overturned. H.R. 511 does that. I rise to support it, and appreciate the gentleman's time.

□ 1445

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

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

Ms. MOORE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

When Congress originally passed the National Labor Relations Act in 1935, Congress exempted Federal, State, and local governments from the definition of employer. What we have seen since then, Mr. Speaker, is that local units of government have allowed labor unions to develop, and we have seen the growth and the development of the middle class because labor unions have been in place.

Nowhere in the NLRA are Indian tribes mentioned. For nearly 60 years, the NLRB treated tribes as local units of government and the Board declined to apply the NLRA over tribal activities in Indian Country. However, in

2004, the NLRB abruptly reversed course with the San Manuel ruling, asserting that the NLRA does apply to tribal enterprises. The ruling meant that tribes would no longer be treated as local units of government.

H.R. 511 is a narrow legislative fix that simply adds tribal governments to the list of other governments that are specifically excluded from the definition of employer in the NLRA. This bill simply ensures that the American Indian tribes are treated with parity, as our other local units of government are treated.

As a longtime labor advocate, I support this bill because I believe in tribal sovereignty. I have seen tribes afford their workers good pay, good health care and benefits. I respect their sovereignty, and I respect them to do as our cities and our States do. Sovereignty means respecting the individual authority and the decision-making of our country's first nations. That is what H.R. 511 does.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If we are going to have this debate about sovereignty, let's talk about sov-

ereignty, let's talk about the funding for the Bureau of Indian Affairs' schools, let's talk about lifting some of those tax laws that make it harder for them to invest in renewable energy. Let's talk about those laws and not just the ones you want to.

This is like when I was a kid. When I had to take a pill, it came in the middle of something sweet. You are trying to take something really bad, like taking away workers' rights, and are putting it in a tribal bill because we support the tribes and because we support the unions, and you want to split that up.

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

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

Mr. POCAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is we just want to have that debate. Let's talk about sovereignty. But I am not hearing anything about the other issues that affect the tribes.

I have a tribe in my district, as we have many tribes in Wisconsin, and I have had a good, long relationship in my time in the legislature with these tribes. I have fought on behalf of changing Indian mascot names. I have fought on behalf of making sure that they have spearfishing rights in the State of Wisconsin.

The U.S. Chamber and all of those groups were never there. The U.S. Chamber is only here because they want to go after workers' rights. This bill is only here because you want to go after workers' rights. Let's just be honest about it.

If you want to have a debate on sovereignty, talk about the many issues we have brought up, because that is not what this bill is about. I support tribal sovereignty. I also support the many people who work in these facilities. We have to ensure that they still have the protections. I urge a “no” vote.

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

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), my very good friend and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education.

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the gentleman not only for the time, but for his leadership on the committee and in helping bring the bill to the point it is today.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not a new product. It has been around for about 10 years. But it hasn't gone as far as it has gone today. That is a compliment to all of the proponents of the bill, to Members like KRISTI NOEM, who has talked earlier and who had this bill in the past, to Members like Chairman JOHN KLINE, who has carried it in the past, and all the way back to J.D. Hayworth. We thank them all for get-

ting us here. I, for one, am a Member who has picked up this product and has run with it to help get it here.

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

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

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

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

Let me give you an example.

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

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

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

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

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

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

So I would say to those opponents: What makes you smarter than the people who elect the tribal government?

What makes you better and your judgment superior to those who have been duly elected by the members of a tribal nation?

The fact of the matter is the arguments that have been made by the opposition do not apply to what is right here. The right thing is to ask ourselves: Are tribal communities sovereign or are they not? Should they at least be in parity with State and local governments or should they not?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“While elements of indigenous peoples' sovereignty have been invoked by the proponents of this Bill, the central question revolves around the manner in which the United States Government can best assure throughout its territory the full application of the fundamental principles of freedom of association and collective bargaining. From an ILO perspective, while the variety of mechanisms for ensuring freedom of association and collective bargaining rights may differ depending on distinct sectorial considerations or devolution of labor competence, it is critical that the State (the national authority) takes ultimate responsibility for ensuring respect for freedom of association and collective bargaining rights throughout its territory.

“Given the concerns that you have raised, it would be critically important that, at the very least, a complete legal and comparative review be undertaken to support assurances that all rights, mechanisms and remedies for the full protection of internationally recognized freedom of association rights are available to all workers on all tribal lands. In the absence of such assurances, it would appear likely that an exclusion of certain workers from the NLRA and its mechanisms would give rise to a failure to ensure to these workers their fundamental freedom of association rights.” Therefore, it would be in violation of the ILO.

This isn't about labor rights. This is about whether or not we are going to fulfill our obligations under the International Labour Organization as a government that subscribes to those.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the full letter from the ILO and several other letters in opposition to the legislation.

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE,  
*Geneva, Switzerland.*

Mr. R. L. TRUMKA,  
*President, AFL-CIO,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. TRUMKA, I acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 22 October 2015 requesting an informal opinion and guidance from the International Labour Organization in respect of a Bill being considered by the United States Congress.

In particular, you have raised concerns about the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act (H.R. 511) which you state would deny protection under the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) of a large number of workers employed by tribal-owned and tribal-operated enterprises located on tribal territory and ask for the informal opinion of the Office as to whether such an exclusion of workers employed on tribal lands would be in conformity with the principles of freedom of Association which are at the core of the ILO Constitution and the ILO's Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work.

In conformity with the regular procedure concerning requests for an informal opinion from the International Labour Office in respect of draft legislation and its possible impact on international labour standards and principles, the views set out below should in no way be considered as prejudging any comments or observations that might be made by the ILO supervisory bodies within the framework of their examination of the application of ratified international labour standards or principles on freedom of association.

Your links to committee reports of the congressional majority and minority and other background information have enabled the Office to consider the views of the parties both for and against the proposed amendment and they all appear to confirm recognition of the United States' obligation to uphold freedom of association and collective bargaining. While the proponents of the Bill assert that this can be achieved through the labour relations' regimes autonomously determined by the tribal nations, the opponents—and you yourself in your request—maintain that excluding tribal lands from the NLRA will in effect result in a loss (or at the very least inadequate protection) of their trade union rights. Not only do you refer to tribal labour relations ordinances which in your view provide inadequate protections in this regard, but you also refer to instances where there are no tribal labour relations ordinances at all.

While elements of indigenous peoples' sovereignty have been invoked by the proponents of this Bill, the central question revolves around the manner in which the United States Government can best assure throughout its territory the full application of the fundamental principles of freedom of association and collective bargaining. From an ILO perspective, while the variety of mechanisms for ensuring freedom of association and collective bargaining rights may differ depending on distinct sectorial considerations or devolution of labour competence, it is critical that the State (the national authority) takes ultimate responsibility for ensuring respect for freedom of association and collective bargaining rights throughout its territory.

As you have indicated, the 2004 San Manuel Indian Bingo and Casino decision assures possible recourse to the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), an overarching mechanism aimed at ensuring the protection of freedom of association, while also maintaining deference to the sovereign interests of the tribal nations so as to avoid touching on exclusive rights of self-governance.

Full abdication of review via an exclusion from the scope of the NLRA for all workers employed on tribal lands as described might make it very difficult for the United States Government to assure the fundamental trade union rights of workers. In cases like those mentioned where there are no tribal labour relations ordinances, undue restrictions on collective bargaining, excessive limitations on freedom of association rights or lack of protection from unfair labour practices, workers on tribal territories would be left without any remedy for violation of their fundamental freedom of association rights, short of a constitutional battle. Furthermore, the exclusion proposed, with no avenue for federal review or overarching mechanism for appeal should there be an alleged violation of freedom of association, would give rise to discrimination in relation to the protection of trade union rights which would affect both indigenous and non-indigenous workers simply on the basis of their workplace location.

Given the concerns that you have raised, it would be critically important that, at the very least, a complete legal and comparative review be undertaken to support assurances that all rights, mechanisms and remedies for the full protection of internationally recognized freedom of association rights are available to all workers on all tribal lands. In the absence of such assurances, it would appear likely that an exclusion of certain workers from the NLRA and its mechanisms would give rise to a failure to ensure to these workers their fundamental freedom of association rights.

In accordance with ILO procedure concerning requests for informal opinions on draft legislation, this communication will also be brought to the attention of the United States Government and the representative employers' organization, the U.S. Council for International Business.

Yours sincerely,  
CORINNE VARGHA,  
*Director of the International Labour  
Standards Department.*

UNITED AUTO WORKERS,  
*Washington, DC, November 16, 2015.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the more than one million active and retired members of the International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW), I urge you to vote against the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act (H.R. 511). This misguided bill would deny protection under the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) to hundreds of



thousands of workers employed by tribal casinos alone. Tribal casinos have created over 628,000 jobs. This legislation does not only apply to casinos. It could impact dozens of other businesses, including power plants, mining operations, and hotels.

UAW deeply believes in tribal sovereignty and has a strong record in supporting civil rights throughout our history. This bill, however, is misleading. It is an attack on fundamental collective bargaining rights and would strip workers in commercial enterprises of their rights and protections under the NLRA. Supporters of the bill argue that the bill creates parity for the tribes with state and local governments who are not covered under the NLRA. However, there are some significant differences.

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

Tribal casinos have a significant and growing presence throughout our country. In 2013, 449 tribal gaming facilities made \$28 billion in revenues. Seventy five percent of the workforce is non-tribal members. In fact, at Foxwoods, where the UAW represents the workers (and many other casinos), well over 95% percent of employees and patrons are not tribal members. These employees are working for a tribal enterprise which is simply a commercial operation competing with non-tribal businesses.

Having a union and a legally binding contract has made a real difference in the lives of UAW members who work as dealers and assistant floor supervisors. Hundreds of dealers have been promoted to benefited and supervisory positions because of provisions in the contract that maintain minimum percentages of full-time, part-time and supervisory positions. Work rules, wages, and benefits have all improved because of the right to collectively bargain. H.R. 511 would put all of these hard fought gains in jeopardy. Under the terms of this bill, when a labor contract expires, a tribe could unilaterally terminate the bargaining relationship with the union without legal consequence under the NLRA, because the employer's obligation to bargain could be eliminated.

H.R. 511 seeks to overturn a decision by the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) in San Manuel Indian Bingo and Casino, 341 NLRB No. 138 (2004). In that decision the Board concluded that applying the NLRA would not interfere with the tribe's autonomy and the effects of the NLRA would not "extend beyond the tribe's business enterprise and regulate intramural matters." The ruling does not apply in instances where its application would "touch exclusive rights of self-governance in purely intramural matters" or "abrogate Indian treaty rights." The NLRB has taken a nuanced view on this matter and has ruled on a case-by-case basis. Congressional interference is not justified. Finally, it would create a dangerous precedent that could be used to weaken hard fought worker and civil right protections for employees on tribal lands (minimum wage, OSHA, ERISA).

At a time of growing wealth inequality and shrinking middle class, the last thing Congress should do is deprive workers of their legally enforceable right to form unions and

bargain collectively. We urge you to oppose H.R. 511.

Sincerely,

JOSH NASSAR,  
*Legislative Director.*

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD  
OF TEAMSTERS,  
*Washington, DC, November 6, 2015.*  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The International Brotherhood of Teamsters urges you to oppose H.R. 511, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act (H.R. 511). This legislation would exempt all tribally-owned and—operated commercial enterprises on Indian lands broadly defined from the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA).

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

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

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

The NLRB will not assert jurisdiction where it would interfere with internal governance rights in purely intramural matters or abrogate treaty rights. Otherwise, the NLRB will protect workers' rights at tribally owned enterprises by asserting jurisdiction. With its case-by-case approach, San Manuel takes a careful approach to balancing tribal sovereignty interests with Federal labor law.

It should be noted that other important federal laws that protect workers apply to Indian businesses, such as the Occupational Safety and Health Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, and Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act. Indeed, courts have denied attempts to gain exemptions on numerous occasions ruling commercial tribal enterprises should not be excluded from such laws. NLRA rights and protections should not be treated differently.

Proponents assert that they are seeking the same exemption as state and local governments. However, this is wrong. The NLRA only exempts actual government employees and not private sector employees performing contracted out government functions. Also, a substantial majority of workers at these enterprises are not Indian or tribe members, and thus have no ability to influence tribal governance, since non-tribal members are prohibited from petitioning a tribe.

The bill could also undermine enforcement of existing labor contracts and the decision workers made to organize and bargain collectively. When a collective bargaining

agreement expires, a tribe could unilaterally terminate the relationship with the union without consequence under the NLRA. The employer's obligation to bargain could be eliminated.

Employees of tribal enterprises have no constitutional rights to protect against employers. Only the NLRA gives them free speech rights. Absent the NLRA they have no protection. Workers cannot be left without any legally enforceable right to form unions and bargain collectively just because they are employed by at tribally owned enterprise.

Finally, the United States requires its trading partners to implement and abide by internationally recognized labor standards, while H.R. 511 deprives workers at these tribal enterprises of these core rights: the right to organize and bargain collectively.

To focus solely on the NLRA raises the question of the true motivation for this legislation. It is regrettable that the principle of tribal sovereignty is being used to cloak an attack on the basic rights of workers to organize and bargain collectively. The Teamsters Union respects tribal sovereignty. However, we do not believe that this principle should be used to deny workers their collective bargaining rights and freedom of association. We urge you to oppose the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act and to Vote No on H.R. 511.

Sincerely,

JAMES P. HOFFA,  
*General President.*

UNITED FOOD & COMMERCIAL  
WORKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION,  
*Washington, DC, November 17, 2015.*  
To All Democrats of the House of Representatives.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As you know, the House of Representatives is scheduled to vote this week on the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act (HR 511). This bill is a blatant attack upon hardworking families, and their right to organize and earn a better life. As such, we will be scoring HR 511 in our upcoming congressional scorecard. We urge you to stand with millions of hard-working men and women and vote against this bill.

Our union family is proud to represent 1,000 men and women who work hard every single day to support their families at casinos that operate on Indian land. If this proposed legislation passes, their ability to negotiate a better life, their rights, and the rights of countless others, will be forever worsened.

Every American, and every worker, has the right to earn a better life, and those rights should never be jeopardized or taken away.

We urge, regardless of party, to do what is right for your constituents, hardworking families, and this nation and vote NO of HR511.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY M. PERRONE,  
*International President.*

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR  
AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,  
*Washington, DC, November 16, 2015.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The AFL-CIO urges you to oppose the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act (H.R. 511), which would deny protection under the National Labor Relations Act to a large number of workers who are employed by tribal-owned and -operated enterprises located on Indian land. Among these workers are over 600,000 tribal casino workers, the vast majority of whom are not Native Americans. In recent years, there has been a substantial expansion of enterprises that would be impacted by this legislation—not only casinos, but mining operations, power plants,

smoke shops, saw mills, construction companies, ski resorts, high-tech firms, hotels, and spas. These are commercial businesses competing with non-Indian enterprises. The Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act, as proposed, would strip all workers in these many commercial enterprises of their rights and protections under the NLRA.

The bill, introduced by Representative Rokita, seeks to overturn a decision by the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) in *San Manuel Indian Bingo and Casino*, 341 NLRB No. 138 (2004), which applied the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) to a tribal casino enterprise.

In *San Manuel*, the NLRB looked to Supreme Court and circuit court precedent to articulate a test for whether the NLRB should assert jurisdiction over tribal enterprises, whether located on tribal lands or outside them. (Before *San Manuel*, NLRB jurisdiction was determined based solely on location: on tribal land, no jurisdiction, off tribal land, jurisdiction. Under the *San Manuel* test, the NLRA will not apply if its application would “touch exclusive rights of self-governance in purely intramural matters.” Nor will the NLRA apply if it would “abrogate Indian treaty rights.” The Board in *San Manuel* also considered other factors, including that the casino in question was a typical commercial enterprise, it employed non-Native Americans, and it catered to non-Native American customers.

In *San Manuel*, the Board concluded that applying the NLRA would not interfere with the tribe’s autonomy, and the effects of the NLRA would not “extend beyond the tribe’s business enterprise and regulate intramural matters.” However, the test articulated in *San Manuel* provides for a careful balancing of the tribal sovereignty interests with the Federal Labor law protections provided through the NLRA. In a companion case, the Board tipped the balance the other way, and the NLRB didn’t assert jurisdiction. *Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation*, 341 NLRB No. 139 (2004).

The AFL-CIO does support the principle of sovereignty for tribal governments, but does not believe this principle should be used to deny workers their collective bargaining rights and freedom of association. While the AFL-CIO continues to support the concept of tribal sovereignty in truly internal, self-governance matters, it is in no position to repudiate fundamental human rights that belong to every worker in every nation. Workers cannot be left without any legally enforceable right to form unions and bargain collectively in instances where they are working for a tribal enterprise which is simply a commercial operation competing with non-tribal businesses.

This view has been confirmed by the International Labor Organization (ILO), an agency of the United Nations, in response to a question about whether excluding workers employed on tribal lands from the NLRA would be in conformity with the principles of freedom of Association which are at the core of the ILO Constitution and the ILO’s Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work. In response, the Director for the International Labour Standards Division wrote that in the absence of tribal ordinances offering full protection of internationally recognized rights, “it is critical that the State (the national authority) takes ultimate responsibility for ensuring respect for freedom of association and collective bargain throughout its territory.” In other words, if the tribes themselves don’t guarantee these basic rights, and many do not, the U.S. government must not abdicate its responsibility to protect them.

Notwithstanding the importance of the principle of tribal sovereignty, the funda-

mental human rights of employees are not the exclusive concern of tribal enterprises or tribal governments. In fact, the vast majority of employees of these commercial enterprises, such as the casinos, are not Native Americans. They therefore have no voice in setting tribal policy, and no recourse to tribal governments for the protection of their rights.

The AFL-CIO must oppose any effort to exempt on an across-the-board basis all tribal enterprises from the NLRA, without regard to a specific review of all the circumstances, as is currently provided by current NLRB standards. Where the enterprise is mainly comprised of Native American employees, with mainly Native American customers, and involving self-governance or intramural affairs, that may be the appropriate result. However, where the business employs primarily non-Native American employees and caters to primarily non-Native American customers, there is no basis for depriving employees of their rights and protections under the National Labor Relations Act.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SAMUEL,  
*Director, Government Affairs Department.*

UNITE HERE!

*Las Vegas, NV.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: UNITE HERE represents over 275,000 hardworking union members in the hospitality industry and strongly urges you to oppose the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act (H.R. 511).

Quite simply, if this bill were to become law, American citizens working for Native American businesses would lose their U.S. rights under the NLRA, including “full freedom of association” and “self-organization” without “discrimination.” The legislation as drafted would exempt all businesses owned and operated by Indian nations of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) on broadly-defined “Indian lands”. Tribal businesses, including but not limited to Indian-owned casinos, have workforces and customers that are almost all non-Indian. Over the last 30 years, as Indian enterprises entered the stream of interstate commerce, a number of federal laws protecting the workplace have been applied to Indian businesses: Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA), Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA), Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), and National Labor Relations Act (NLRA).

Congress should not treat the rights Americans have under the NLRA any differently than these other important laws that protect all other American workers.

In this time of growing income inequality in our country, Congress should be working to expand the rights of American workers and their ability to earn a decent living for themselves and their families, not finding ways to take them away. H.R. 511 is no different than the law signed by Governor Scott Walker in Wisconsin that attacked the basic rights of workers to organize and collectively bargain. Again, our union urges you to oppose H.R. 511.

Sincerely,

D.R. TAYLOR,  
*President.*

UNITED STEEL WORKERS,  
*November 16, 2015.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The United Steelworkers (USVW) represents hundreds of workers in the gambling industry in Nevada and Ohio, and has recently filed a Petition with the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) to represent over 100 workers at the Saganing Eagles Landing Resort and Casino in Sandish, MI. Saganing Eagles Landing Resort and Casino is owned and operated by the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe but employs

a majority of non-tribal workers. If HR 511, were to become law it would exempt all Indian-owned commercial enterprises operated on Indian lands from the protections of the National Labor Relations Act depriving Indian and non-Indian employees across the nation their right to form or join unions, and collective bargaining for better wages, hours and working conditions.

HR 511 would prohibit the NLRB from examining, on a case-by-case basis, whether or not to assert jurisdiction on workers’ petitions to form unions and collectively bargain. It is long standing federal policy that private sector workers should be able to engage in collective bargaining with their employer. In cases where Tribal enterprises are involved, the NLRB, after a complete examination on a case-by-case basis, determines whether the enterprise is governmental or commercial. To ensure both fairness for workers and sovereignty on tribal matters, the NLRB has adopted a three prong test:

1. The enterprise is ‘exclusively involved in Tribal self-governance and purely intramural matters’;

2. Application of the NLRA would ‘abrogate rights guaranteed by Indian treaties’; or

3. There is proof ‘by legislative history or some other means’ that Congress intended NLRA not to apply to Indians on their reservations.

HR 511 would stop the NLRB from applying this test, and deny workers the protections of the Act. Collective bargaining allows workers to negotiate with their employer for better wages and working conditions, and reduces incidents of workplace discrimination and sexual harassment. Unfortunately, many workers in the gambling industry experience sexual harassment and discrimination due to the nature of the work environment. Women are often required to wear provocative uniforms and interact with inebriated customers in a 24/7 work environment.

On June 16, 2015 before the House Education and Workforce Committee, Gary Navarro (a member of the Pomo Nation, one of the largest tribes in California, and a worker at the Native-owned Graton Casino & Resort) illustrated this very point. Mr. Navarro testified he witnessed fellow co-workers suffer harassment by supervisors stating:

“I became active in my union because of unjust treatment of casino workers by their managers and how nothing could be done about even sexual harassment because of sovereignty. Exercising our right to organize turned out to be the only way to protect ourselves and our co-workers. Don’t strip us of these rights.”

Since the 1980s Tribes have expanded their business interests, operating many different revenue producing commercial enterprises on Indian lands—not just casinos. Tribes operate and employ both Tribal members and non-members working in mines, smoke shops, power plants, saw mills, construction companies, ski resorts, hotels and spas, gift and farmers markets. Many of these enterprises are dangerous with high incidents of worker injury and death, and jobs are not typically well paid. Only through the benefit of collective bargaining can workers be assured of improving their wages, hours and working conditions, including their safety. Because the vast majority of workers employed by Tribal enterprises are NOT Tribal members, they would have no ability to influence Tribal policy or governance.

In 2011 before the Senate Indian Affairs Committee, the National Indian Gaming Commission testified that of 566 federally-recognized tribes, 246 operate 460 gaming facilities in 28 states, and that the vast majority of employees (up to 75 percent) were non-Tribal members. That same testimony reported in 2009 that tribal casinos generated

gross gaming revenue of \$27.2 billion, only a fraction of the estimated \$100 billion U.S. gambling industry revenue. As of September 2014 the Federal Gaming Commission estimated there were 733,930 people directly employed by the gambling industry in the United States. Gambling industry jobs are typically low-wage jobs, and it is only through collective bargaining that workers can enjoy some of the profits from their hard labor.

In 2004, the Bush Administration NLRB ruled for the first time that Tribal casino workers should have the benefit of NLRA protections, San Manuel, 341 NLRB No. 138 (2004). Yet, since the San Manuel ruling, the NLRB has stepped very carefully, taking jurisdiction on a case-by-case. Just this spring the NLRB declined jurisdiction citing the 1830 Treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek and 1866 Treaty of Washington stating:

"We have no doubt that asserting jurisdiction over the Casino and the Nation would effectuate the policies of the Act. However, because we find that asserting jurisdiction would abrogate treaty rights specific to the Nation." Chickasaw Nation Windstar World Casino, 362 NLRB 109 92015).

Similarly the NLRB declined jurisdiction: ". . . when an Indian tribe is fulfilling a traditionally tribal or governmental function that is unique to its status, fulfilling just such a unique governmental function [providing free health care services solely to tribal members]." Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation, 341 NLRB 139 (2004).

Finally, the Tribes asking for this bill assert they are seeking the same NLRA exemption as state and local governments. This argument is erroneous, because the NLRA only exempts actual government employees and not private sector employees performing contracted-out governmental functions. Hundreds of thousands of private sector workers employed by private sector contractors perform state, local and federal governmental functions; thus, are covered under the NLRA.

Casinos and resorts are not inherently governmental operations, and casino employees are not performing inherently governmental functions by serving cocktails, running Keno numbers, or dealing cards. On June 16, While Tribal witnesses asserted air traffic controllers and casino workers should be treated similarly under the law as critical government workers and be prohibited from striking, common sense would suggest otherwise.

Finally, depriving Tribal casino employees of their ability to gain the industry standard negotiated by their counterparts working for hugely profitable commercial gambling operators like Trump, MGM or Wynn Enterprises should not be decided by Congress as a blanket exemption to the NLRA. HR 511 would deprive thousands of workers of their fundamental labor law protection under the guise of Tribal Sovereignty. H.R. 511 is union busting—plain and simple, and would deny Indian and non-Indian workers alike their ability to collectively negotiate wages, hours and working conditions and improve their lives and the livelihood of their families. Please vote NO on H.R. 511.

Thank you for your consideration and please contact Alison Reardon, USW Legislative Representative for additional information.

Sincerely,

HOLLY R. HART,  
*Assistant to the International President,  
Legislative Director.*

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

□ 1500

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Mr. SCOTT. He is a de-

light to work with, and I want to thank him for working with me on this.

Policymakers on both sides of the aisle have long agreed on the importance of protecting sovereignty of Native American tribes. Today, we have an opportunity to prove that we are committed to that bipartisan goal.

In my packet here, I have literally page after page of tribes that have supported this piece of legislation. To me, being sovereign means that you are able to make your own decisions. What we are seeing the NLRB do is nibble away a little bit at a time at the authority that the local tribes have over local matters. Look, the political job I had before I came to Congress was being mayor of a city. I had more rights than the Native Americans who occupy this land, many of them my district, the Cherokee Nation.

The Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act of 2015 is a simple, commonsense measure; but it means a great deal, particularly to those in the Native American community. As tribal representatives have said, this bill will prevent unnecessary and unproductive overreach into tribal affairs. It will empower tribal governments to make decisions that are the best for their people, and it will ensure the Federal Government honors and respects the sovereignty of the tribal nations.

Just as importantly, it shows that we are serious about honoring the commitments and making good on promises we have made to Native Americans and broken many, many, many times.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 511.

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

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my support of the bipartisan H.R. 511, the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act. I wish to recognize the work of my colleague, Mr. ROKITA, as well as the efforts of the Committee on Education and the Workforce on this legislation.

If enacted, this important legislation would amend the National Labor Relations Act to ensure that any enterprise or institution owned and operated by an Indian tribe would be treated with parity by any state or local government.

This legislation is necessary to reverse a 2004 National Labor Relations Board's ruling which increased the jurisdiction of the NLRA to cover tribal operations. H.R. 511 promotes tribal sovereignty and allows the tribal governments to regulate appropriate labor practices on lands without the further overreach and infringement of the federal government.

Because of these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act to ensure that our Native American citizens can achieve parity with other exempted governments.

Vote "yes" on H.R. 511.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing a district that covers a large portion of the reservation that is home to the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians.

From my meetings and visits with members of the Pechanga tribe, as well as with Native Americans from across the country, I know that there is perhaps no greater priority than protecting tribal sovereignty.

In 2004, the National Labor Relations Board issued a ruling that, I believe, inappropriately applied the National Labor Relations Act to tribally owned businesses on tribal lands. That ruling was contrary to previous court-established precedents because it clearly conflicts with the Constitution's recognition of tribes as sovereign governments. That's exactly why in 2011, a U.S. District Court in Oklahoma ruled in Chickasaw Nation v. National Labor Relations Board that tribal businesses on tribal land do not fall under the jurisdiction of the Board on grounds of tribal sovereignty.

Since that ruling, the National Labor Relations Board has filed an appeal and similar legal conflicts have arisen with other tribes across the country.

Rather than allow these lawsuits and legal proceedings to carry on indefinitely, Congress should step in and reaffirm Native American tribal sovereignty by clarifying that the National Labor Relations Act does not apply to tribally owned businesses.

As a proud original cosponsor of the Tribal Labor Sovereignty Act and friend of our Native American tribes, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this long overdue bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 526, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 1177, STUDENT SUCCESS ACT

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 526, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

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

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, this is a motion to authorize a conference on S. 1177. This bill, with the House amendment, helps improve elementary and secondary education in the Nation.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

Mr. KLINE, Ms. FOXX, Messrs. ROE of Tennessee, THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, GUTHRIE, ROKITA, MESSER, GROTHMAN, RUSSELL, CURBELO of Florida, SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. FUDGE, Mr. POLIS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

There was no objection.

#### TRIBAL LABOR SOVEREIGNTY ACT OF 2015

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

[Roll No. 633]

YEAS—249

Abraham	Dent	Jenkins (KS)
Aderholt	DeSantis	Jenkins (WV)
Aguilar	Deutch	Johnson (OH)
Allen	Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam
Amash	Duffy	Jolly
Amodel	Duncan (SC)	Jones
Ashford	Duncan (TN)	Jordan
Babin	Ellmers (NC)	Kelly (MS)
Barletta	Emmer (MN)	Kelly (PA)
Barr	Farenthold	Kildee
Barton	Fincher	Kilmer
Becerra	Fleischmann	Kind
Benishek	Fleming	King (IA)
Beyer	Flores	Kline
Bilirakis	Forbes	Knight
Bishop (MI)	Fortenberry	Labrador
Bishop (UT)	Fox	LaHood
Black	Franks (AZ)	LaMalfa
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	Lamborn
Blum	Garrett	Lance
Boustany	Gibbs	Latta
Brady (TX)	Gohmert	Lieu, Ted
Brat	Goodlatte	Long
Bridenstine	Gosar	Loudermilk
Brooks (AL)	Gowdy	Love
Brooks (IN)	Granger	Lucas
Buchanan	Graves (GA)	Luetkemeyer
Buck	Graves (LA)	Lujan Grisham
Bucshon	Graves (MO)	(NM)
Burgess	Griffith	Luján, Ben Ray
Byrne	Grothman	(NM)
Calvert	Guinta	Lummis
Cárdenas	Guthrie	Marchant
Carter (GA)	Hanna	Marino
Carter (TX)	Hardy	Massie
Chabot	Harper	McCarthy
Chaffetz	Harris	McCaul
Clawson (FL)	Hartzler	McClintock
Coffman	Heck (NV)	McCollum
Cole	Heck (WA)	McHenry
Collins (GA)	Hensarling	McMorris
Collins (NY)	Herrera Beutler	Rodgers
Comstock	Hice, Jody B.	McSally
Conaway	Hill	Meadows
Cook	Holding	Messer
Cramer	Hudson	Mica
Crawford	Huelskamp	Miller (FL)
Crenshaw	Huizenga (MI)	Miller (MI)
Cuellar	Hultgren	Moolenaar
Culberson	Hunter	Mooney (WV)
CurbeLO (FL)	Hurd (TX)	Moore
DelBene	Hurt (VA)	Mullin
Denham	Issa	Mulvaney

Neugebauer	Rohrabacher	Thornberry
Newhouse	Rokita	Tiberi
Noem	Rooney (FL)	Tipton
Nugent	Roskam	Trott
Nunes	Ross	Turner
Olson	Rothfus	Upton
Palazzo	Rouzer	Valadao
Palmer	Royce	Wagner
Paulsen	Ruiz	Walberg
Pearce	Russell	Walden
Perry	Salmon	Walker
Peterson	Sanchez, Loretta	Walorski
Pittenger	Sanford	Walters, Mimi
Pitts	Scalise	Walz
Poe (TX)	Schrader	Weber (TX)
Poliquin	Schweikert	Webster (FL)
Pompeo	Scott, Austin	Wenstrup
Posey	Sensenbrenner	Westerman
Price, Tom	Sessions	Westmoreland
Rangel	Sewell (AL)	Whitfield
Ratcliffe	Shimkus	Williams
Reed	Shuster	Wilson (SC)
Reichert	Simpson	Wittman
Renacci	Smith (MO)	Womack
Ribble	Smith (NE)	Woodall
Rice (SC)	Smith (TX)	Yoder
Rigell	Stefanik	Yoho
Roby	Stewart	Young (AK)
Roe (TN)	Stivers	Young (IA)
Rogers (AL)	Stutzman	Young (IN)
Rogers (KY)	Thompson (PA)	Zinke

NAYS—177

Adams	Frankel (FL)	Murphy (FL)
Bass	Fudge	Murphy (PA)
Beatty	Gabbard	Nadler
Bera	Gallego	Napolitano
Bishop (GA)	Garamendi	Neal
Blumenauer	Gibson	Nolan
Bonamici	Graham	Norcross
Bost	Grayson	O'Rourke
Boyle, Brendan F.	Green, Al	Pallone
Brady (PA)	Green, Gene	Pascarell
Brown (FL)	Grijalva	Payne
Brownley (CA)	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Bustos	Hahn	Perlmutter
Butterfield	Hastings	Peters
Capps	Higgins	Pingree
Capuano	Himes	Pocan
Carney	Honda	Polis
Carson (IN)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Cartwright	Huffman	Quigley
Castor (FL)	Israel	Rice (NY)
Castro (TX)	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Chu, Judy	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Cicilline	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Clark (MA)	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Clarke (NY)	Joyce	Sánchez, Linda T.
Clay	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Katko	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Keating	Schiff
Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Schiff
Connolly	Kennedy	Scott (VA)
Conyers	King (NY)	Scott, David
Cooper	Kinzinger (IL)	Serrano
Cooper	Kirkpatrick	Sherman
Costa	Kuster	Sinema
Costello (PA)	Langevin	Sinema
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Sires
Crowley	Larsen (CT)	Slaughter
Cummings	Lawrence	Smith (NJ)
Davis (CA)	Lee	Smith (WA)
Davis, Danny	Levin	Speier
Davis, Rodney	Lewis	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Lipinski	Takano
Delaney	LoBiondo	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	LoBiondo	Thompson (MS)
DeSaulnier	Loeb	Tonko
Dingell	Lofgren	Torres
Doggett	Lowenthal	Tsongas
Dold	Lowe	Van Hollen
Donovan	Lynch	Vargas
Doyle, Michael F.	MacArthur	Veasey
Duckworth	Maloney,	Vela
Edwards	Carolyn	Velázquez
Ellison	Maloney, Sean	Visclosky
Engel	Matsui	Wasserman
Eshoo	McDermott	Schultz
Esty	McGovern	Waters, Maxine
Farr	McKinley	Watson Coleman
Fattah	McNerney	Welch
Fitzpatrick	Meehan	Wilson (FL)
Foster	Meeks	Yarmuth
	Meng	Zeldin
	Moulton	

NOT VOTING—7

DeFazio	Ros-Lehtinen	Titus
DesJarlais	Ruppersberger	
Hinojosa	Takai	

□ 1534

Messrs. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, MACARTHUR, and Ms. KAPTUR changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. SALMON, KIND, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama 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. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I regrettably missed rollcall vote No. 633, passage of H.R. 511—the Tribal Land Sovereignty Act of 2015. As a cosponsor of this bill, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I was not able to vote today for medical reasons.

Had I been present on rollcall vote 629, I would have voted “no.”

Had I been present on rollcall vote 630, I would have voted “no.”

Had I been present on rollcall vote 631, I would have voted “yes.”

Had I been present on rollcall vote 632, I would have voted “yes.”

Had I been present on rollcall vote 633, I would have voted “no.”

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3770

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove myself as a cosponsor of H.R. 3770.

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

There was no objection.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

#### CONDEMNING TERRORIST ATTACKS IN PARIS, FRANCE, ON NOVEMBER 13, 2015

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 524) condemning in the strongest terms the terrorist attacks in Paris, France, on November 13, 2015, that resulted in the loss of at least 129 lives, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 524

Whereas on Friday, November 13, 2015, three groups of Islamist terrorists launched coordinated attacks against six sites across

Paris, France, resulting in the loss of at least 129 innocent lives and the severe wounding of many hundreds;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Whereas the precise coordination of these attacks at multiple sites across Paris, along with the recent downing of a Russian airline in Egypt and the double suicide bombing in a shopping district in Beirut—brutal attacks also claimed by ISIS—indicates the planning, operational, and logistical capabilities of ISIS appear to have advanced significantly, and their focus now includes large scale external attacks;

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

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

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

Whereas France is an indispensable ally in our joint coalition efforts to defeat ISIS;

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

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

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns in the strongest terms the terrorist attacks in Paris, France, on November 13, 2015, that resulted in the loss of at least 129 lives;

(2) expresses its condolences to the families and friends of those individuals who were killed in the attacks and expresses its sympathies to those individuals who have been injured;

(3) supports the Government of France in its efforts to bring to justice all those involved with the planning and execution of these terrorist attacks;

(4) remains concerned regarding the flow of foreign fighters to and from the Middle East and West and North Africa and the threat posed by these individuals upon their return to their local communities; and

(5) expresses its readiness to assist the Government and people of France to respond to the growing terrorist threat posed by the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS) and its terrorist affiliates.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on this resolution.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

It was just after 9 p.m. on Friday, November 13, when a night of terror fell over Paris, France. That is when ISIS launched three waves of terrorist attacks on the French capital, killing at least 129 people and wounding more than 350 others. At least one American, Nohemi Gonzalez of El Monte, California, was killed in the attacks, while several more were injured.

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

The second wave involved shooting at several restaurants, bars, and cafes in an area known for its nightlife in Paris. A suicide bomber blew himself up on a nearby street.

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

In claiming responsibility for the attacks, ISIS called them “the first storm.” The Paris attacks came a day after ISIS carried out a double suicide

bombing in Beirut, Lebanon, and 2 weeks after ISIS claimed responsibility for downing a Russian passenger jet in Egypt’s Sinai Peninsula.

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

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

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

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

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

Our intelligence-sharing with allies, already strong, will need to get sharper; border checks will need to be improved; online recruitment of terrorists need to be checked; and coalition efforts to destroy ISIS will need to be stepped up.

I urge all Members to support this resolution.

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

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

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

Like so many around the world, we are heartbroken. We are outraged. We are stunned. The perpetrators of these brutal and brazen attacks in Paris are our enemies, just as they are the enemies of France. We must remain vigilant in the face of this challenge.

Terrorists, Mr. Speaker, want to make their enemies live their lives in fear and retreat from the freedom which underpins our society. But I

think the fanatics responsible for this attack underestimate the French people.

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

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

But, let's be clear: friendship and solidarity aren't all that is needed in the wake of these attacks. What is needed is clarity, resolve, and action.

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

□ 1545

We need to keep pushing for a resolution to Syria's civil war, which has created the conditions for ISIS to flourish. We need to increase our support for those on the ground in Syria and Iraq that are already fighting ISIS so that they can keep building on their recent successes. We need to stem the flow of foreign fighters traveling to the Middle East to join the ranks of ISIS and figure out how to counter the radicalization of vulnerable populations. And we need bring to justice those responsible for the Paris attacks to send a clear, strong message that murder and terrorism will never go unanswered.

These terrorists, they are not religious people. They are fascists. They think they can use terror to further their political ends. They won't succeed.

This resolution conveys our deepest condolences to the French people. Just as importantly, it shows that the United States stands ready to assist France in its time of need and to respond to the growing threat of ISIS.

I urge all my colleagues to support this measure.

Long live France. Long live liberty. Vive la France. Vive la liberté.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank the chairman, Chairman ROYCE, and Rank-

ing Member ENGEL for the great leadership they are providing at this moment in our history when we need that type of leadership the most.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. SCHIFF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. LATTA. I thank the chairman for yielding.

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

France as we mourn the loss of innocent life.

We are unified in our dedication to the protection and preservation of liberty and committed to ensuring those who have perpetrated these attacks are brought to justice.

ISIS poses a clear and present danger to the United States and to our allies across the world. They are a threat to all those who promote freedom. Our strength is in our solidarity. The United States and our allies, including those in NATO, must stand together with great resolve to defeat this threat and ensure the security of freedom-loving people across the world.

I urge passage of the resolution.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend.

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

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

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

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

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

I support this legislation.

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

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, our prayers go out to the families whose loved ones were murdered or wounded in the pointless acts of violence carried out in Paris on November 13.

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

I commend the French President for calling this what it is: an act of war. This is, indeed, a war declared on Western civilization—in fact, all of civilization—by Islamic terrorists who are so consumed with pure evil that they believe that the slaughter of innocence is the path to paradise.

We will never give up in this war. France is the oldest ally of the United States. In fact, a portrait of the Marquis de Lafayette, whose assistance was integral to the birth of our Nation, hangs in this very Chamber. If France is at war, the United States must be at war as well.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from California.

I think many of us will come to the floor and emphasize that we stand with both Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ENGEL for this very strong statement of commitment by the people of the United States to stand with the people of France.

My heart cried and my soul was disturbed as the video began to unfold and the most heinous acts of attacking innocent persons, persons who had gone to a stadium to be with friends and relatives; maybe fathers with young sons; maybe families with two or three or four children, maybe brothers and sisters, as was noted by one of the soccer players whose sister was lost, who had come to see him play; maybe as the beautiful young woman from California experiencing her dreams, a beautiful designer—I pay tribute to her courage and inspiration—who just was enjoying the ambience and culture of France in the beautiful outdoor cafes that many travel to France just to experience. She lost her life, a beautiful flower, someone that America can be proud of, someone who was going to be a young lady who would obtain her dreams.

They didn't care about that. All they cared about was the vile violence of killing.

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

We have been vigilant. We have changed our ways since 9/11. We do "see something, say something." But I believe as we proceed, we must act not out of fear, but of rational thought.

We must deal with the radicalization of young people; and the efforts of the administration, countering violent terrorism, extremism, has been an effective tool of meeting Muslim communities all over America, letting them know that if they see something, they can say something.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, for centuries Paris has been known to the world as the City of Light.

The title is richly deserved because Paris has been a world leader in the march of human progress in the arts, culture, science, democratic theory and governance, and in embrace the challenges and opportunities of the modern world.

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

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

They will be joined by the United States and the other countries of the civilized world.

The French are justly proud of their national motto, "Liberté, égalité, fraternité," (liberty, equality, fraternity) and no act of terrorism by cowardly perpetrators will succeed in leading them to renounce their heritage of freedom and justice.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Their horrible and heinous acts are their responsibility, and theirs alone, and for which they can be assure that they alone will be held accountable.

We will never forget what happened on Friday, November 13, 2015, which will be forever known in France and throughout the civilized world as "Black Friday."

And we will always remember the many innocent lives cut short by the outrageous and heinous acts of terrorism that shocked and rocked the people of Paris last Friday and earned the lasting enmity of peaceful and freedom loving people around the world.

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

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

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H. Res. 524.

Like all Americans, I was shocked and saddened by the terrorist attacks in Paris, France. As Americans, we must stand united with the people of France.

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

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

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

My congressional district and the Greater St. Louis region have a long and admirable track record of welcoming refugees fleeing war and turmoil. However, the safety and the security of the American people must always be our number one priority.

We mourn with our brothers and sisters of France. I am Paris. Je suis Paris.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the world needs America to lead with clarity and resolve in the fight against terror. Contrary to the President's assertion that ISIS is

contained, the world now knows they are not. Hope is not a strategy in defeating terror.

ISIS has openly declared war on America, France, and our very way of life. We must respond. This is a war, and America needs to lead, defeating ISIS before it is too late.

□ 1600

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. YOHO. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, first, I want to express my, my family's, and our country's thoughts, sympathies, and prayers with the people of France in their loss and in their pain. I am here to stand in solidarity with the French people, France, and all the people and families from around the world who lost loved ones in this tragic and cowardly act.

This is not just an attack on France and innocent people, but people in the West and all societies that love peace, liberty, freedom, and value human life, people who believe that their rights come from a Creator and that we are free to determine the life we choose to live in a civil society, not forced to choose a life from the Dark Ages at the barrel of a gun or live in the threat of terrorism.

I applaud French President Hollande in his rapid response and wholeheartedly agree and support his words that this will be a merciless response. May the terrorists and ISIL's presence on Earth be short. Long live France.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of closing.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake, as we have heard from our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, the United States grieves with France after these horrible attacks. The United States stands ready to assist France in its time of need. But we must look toward the root causes of the atrocity and direct our resolve toward defeating the growing threat of ISIS.

This includes intelligence and information collaboration with our allies and partners. This includes finding a diplomatic solution to the Syrian civil war. This includes addressing the refugee crisis and the separate grievances and risks that this humanitarian crisis breeds. This includes stemming ISIS's recruitment and radicalization efforts of disillusioned Westerners to join their ranks.

We must address the complex and multifaceted layers that contribute to the Paris attacks all while bringing those responsible to justice. We must send a clear and very loud message that international terrorism will not go unanswered.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our Democratic whip.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for bringing this resolution to the floor. It is sad that we bring this resolution to the floor, and it is sad that too often we see the results of terrorism around the world.

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

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

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

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

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

But the French Republic and the American Republic were neither born in fear nor do we live in fear. We were born in hope and in courage. We were born looking forward. Both our nations were founded upon the same ideals of liberty, democracy, and individual rights espoused by Rousseau and Jefferson, Montesquieu and Paine.

The Marquis de Lafayette is the only substantial painting—other than the Father of our Nation, George Washington—to be pictured in this hall of democracy, in this hall of free people. It was the French with the liaison of Marquis de Lafayette as France stood with us for freedom, for equality, and, yes, for fraternity, brotherhood between us and them.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, across the river from the Eiffel Tower, in the middle of a major traffic circle in Paris, one can see a majestic statue of his brother-in-arms, George Washington, raising his sword high in a triumphant salute.

Lafayette and his French officers suffered hunger and cold at Valley Forge to help secure for the American people our freedom. Generations later American Rangers scaled the craggy cliffs of Pointe-du-Hoc to help the people of France regain theirs.

Our history binds us together. So does our future. That is because we believe in tomorrow. Ever hopeful, we believe that the unknown which lies ahead can be shaped by our hands into

a better world than the one we know today. That is what sets us apart from our enemies. That is why those who perpetrated Friday's attacks will never, never, never win.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. It is why, no matter what historians in the future call ISIS or ISIL or Daesh, they will surely be using only the past tense. It is why the people of France and America and all who cherish the freedom to think, to speak, to worship, and to strive for a better tomorrow must stand together, as we have before, and shine the bright light of our values and our principles into the darkness we confront.

We are all French today—*nous sommes français*.

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

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

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, let me just say in closing we have heard impassioned speeches from all our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and this is certainly something with which we agree, certainly something that Congress needs to send a very, very strong message, that terrorism will never triumph, that we have the resolve here in America to join with our friends around the world to stop the scourge of terrorism, and that we stand with the people of France in these very, very troubling times.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, our hearts go out to the people of Paris. I want to thank my colleague, Mr. ENGEL, who worked to make sure that we brought this resolution to the floor today working together so that we in this Congress speak with one voice—speak with one voice—about the attack on France, the foundation, the heart of Europe, the heart of the Enlightenment, and the heart of the concept of freedom, liberty, and equality under the law which animated so much of the thinking of civilization itself.

Indeed, it is an attack on that civilization. It is an attack on those freedoms, the freedom of religion, the freedom of speech, and the freedom of assembly and democracy that are so closely held by us here in the United



States and by our original ally, France, in our own effort to achieve the dream of that freedom. It is that freedom that is under assault.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We have had this relationship tested many times. France has had its relationship with us tested many times. Tonight we stand together with France

in our commitment to see this through and to make certain that ISIS is not merely contained, but to make certain that ISIS is ultimately destroyed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

As a member of the Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing, I offered an amendment, accepted as part of the National Defense Authorization Act, to direct the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury, to shut down ISIL's oil revenues and report on resources needed for these efforts. I also included language in the Intelligence Authorization Act directing the Intelligence Community to dedicate the necessary resources to defeat the Islamic State's revenue mechanisms.

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

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

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

□ 1615

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 524, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1721

AFTER RECESS

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

tempore (Mr. RUSSELL) at 5 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.

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

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

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

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

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am pleased to transmit the 2015 National Drug Control Strategy, my Administration's 21st century approach to drug policy that works to reduce illicit drug use and its consequences in the United States. This evidence-based plan, which balances public health and public safety efforts to prevent, treat,

and provide recovery from the disease of addiction, seeks to build a healthier, safer, and more prosperous country.

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

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

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

BARACK OBAMA,  
THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 17, 2015.*

#### RECESS

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

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

□ 2210

#### AFTER RECESS

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following additional conferees on H.R. 22:

From the Committee on Armed Services, for consideration of section 1111 of the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

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

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of sections 1109, 1201, 1202, 3003, Division B, sections 31101, 31201, and Division F of the House amendment and sections 11005, 11006, 11013, 21003, 21004, subtitles B and D of title XXXIV, sections 51101 and 51201 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. UPTON, MULLIN, and PAL-LONE.

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

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

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of sections 1313, 24406, and 43001 of the House amendment and sections 32502 and 35437 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. GOODLATTE, MARINO, and Ms. LOFGREN.

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

Messrs. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, LAHOOD, and GRIJALVA.

From the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for consideration of sections 5106, 5223, 5504, 5505, 61003, and 61004 of the House amendment and sections 12004, 21019, 31203, 32401, 32508, 32606, 35203, 35311, and 35312 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. MICA, HURD of Texas, and CONNOLLY.

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

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

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of sections 31101, 31201, and 31203 of the House

amendment, and sections 51101, 51201, 51203, 52101, 52103-05, 52108, 62001, and 74001 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. BRADY of Texas, REICHERT, and LEVIN.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the additional conferees.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

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

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

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

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

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 18, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

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

3482. A letter from the Director, Office of Financial Management, United States Capitol Police, transmitting the Statement of Disbursements for the United States Capitol Police for the period April 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 1910(a); Public Law 109-55, Sec. 1005; (H. Doc. No. 114-78); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

3483. A letter from the Deputy Under Secretary for Management and Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's "Public Assistance Program Alternative Procedures—First Quarterly Status Report for FY 2015", pursuant to House Report 113-481 accompanying the Fiscal Year 2015 Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act of 2015, Pub. L. 114-4; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3484. A letter from the Deputy Under Secretary for Management and Chief Financial

Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's "Public Assistance Program Alternative Procedures — Second Quarterly Status Report for FY 2015", pursuant to House Report 113-481 accompanying the Fiscal Year 2015 Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act of 2015, Pub. L. 114-4; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. STIVERS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 529. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1210) to amend the Truth in Lending Act to provide a safe harbor from certain requirements related to qualified mortgages for residential mortgage loans held on an originating depository institution's portfolio, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3189) to amend the Federal Reserve Act to establish requirements for policy rules and blackout periods of the Federal Open Market Committee, to establish requirements for certain activities of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and to amend title 31, United States Code, to reform the manner in which the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is audited, and for other purposes; and providing for proceeding during the period from November 20, 2015, through November 27, 2015 (Rept. 114-341). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. FORBES):

H.R. 4023. A bill to eliminate unused sections of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOK (for himself and Mr. AGUILAR):

H.R. 4024. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public in San Bernardino County, California, to the San Bernardino Valley Water Conservation District, and to accept in return certain exchanged non-public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROSS (for himself, Mr. POSEY, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. COLLINS of New York):

H.R. 4025. A bill to prohibit obligation of Federal funds for admission of refugees from Syria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself and Mr. FLORES):

H.R. 4026. A bill to provide that a concealed handgun license shall be treated as a verifying identity document for purposes of aircraft passenger security screening, and to prohibit the Federal Government from collecting or storing information about an individual relating to a concealed handgun license; to the Committee on Homeland Security, 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 Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 4027. A bill to reauthorize the women's business center program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 4028. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to direct the Secretary to provide additional funds to States to establish and make disbursements from high cost funds; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JOYCE (for himself and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

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

By Mr. PALAZZO:

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

By Mr. BYRNE:

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

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BLUM, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SALMON, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. MASSIE):

H.R. 4032. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for a limitation on the resettlement of refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

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

By Mr. FLEMING:

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

By Mr. FLEMING:

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

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 4036. A bill to prohibit any regulation regarding carbon dioxide or other greenhouse gas emissions reduction in the United States until China, India, and Russia implement similar reductions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FLEMING:

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

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself and Mr. HUDSON):

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

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. TAKAI, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ):

H.R. 4039. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a small business start-up tax credit for veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. NEAL, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LEE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 4040. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and extend certain tax incentives relating to energy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARDENAS (for himself, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HONDA, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FOSTER, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California):

H.R. 4041. A bill to establish a task force to share best practices on computer programming and coding for elementary schools and secondary schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 4042. A bill to provide grants for high-quality prekindergarten programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

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

By Mr. CLAWSON of Florida:

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

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Mr. ELLISON):

H.R. 4045. A bill to establish USAccounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KIND, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. RIBBLE):

H.R. 4046. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 220 East Oak Street, Glenwood City, Wisconsin, as the Second Lt. Ellen Ainsworth Memorial Post Office; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 4047. A bill to amend chapter 329 of title 49, United States Code, to ensure that new vehicles enable fuel competition so as to reduce the strategic importance of oil to the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. FLEMING):

H.R. 4048. A bill to suspend the admission and resettlement of aliens seeking refugee status because of the conflict in Syria until adequate protocols are established to protect the national security of the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), Rules, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LOVE (for herself, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan):

H.R. 4049. A bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 to exempt certain non-financial companies and smaller banking entities from the application of the Volcker Rule; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 4050. A bill to provide for the identification of certain dangerous railroad locations, and for the safety of passenger operations at such locations; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4051. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to change the residency requirements for certain officials serving in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 4052. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prioritize the treatment of veterans with traumatic brain injuries through the National Health Service Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 4053. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make grants for repair and remodeling of community centers, clinics, and hospitals that serve veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 4054. A bill to revise the 90-10 rule under the Higher Education Act of 1965 to count veterans' education benefits under such rule, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Ms. BASS, Ms. LEE, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SIREN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RUSSELL, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. BLUM, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. HAHN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H. Res. 530. A resolution expressing support for the goals of "National Adoption Day" and "National Adoption Month" by promoting national awareness of adoption and the children awaiting families, celebrating children and families involved in adoption, and encouraging the people of the United States to secure safety, permanency, and well-being for all children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 4023.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3, and Article I, section 8, clause 18.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 4024.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 4025.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

—U.S. Constitution, Article I, section 9, clause 7

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 4026.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 4027.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 4028.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. JOYCE:

H.R. 4029.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power \* \* \* To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.R. 4030.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Sec. 8, Clause 4 and Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States of America.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.R. 4031.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4: "Congress shall have Power To . . . establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization . . ."

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 4032.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 18

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 4033.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution. "The Congress shall have the Power . . . To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization . . ."

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 4034.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4, which states "The Congress shall have Power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization," and Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2, which states "The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States."

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 4035.

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 1, Section 8, Clause 3, which states "The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce among the several States."

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 4036.

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 1, Section 8, Clause 3, which states "The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce among the several States."

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 4037.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, which states "The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce among the several States."

By Mr. McCAUL:

H.R. 4038.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 4 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 4039.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"Article 1, Section 8: 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. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 4040.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitution of the United States provides clear authority for Congress to pass legislation regarding income taxes. Article I of the Constitution provides that "Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes . . ." (Section 8, Clause 1).

By Mr. CARDENAS:

H.R. 4041.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 4042.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

The United States Constitution, Art. I, Sec. 8, Clause 18

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4043.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, U.S Constitution

By Mr. CLAWSON of Florida:

H.R. 4044.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 4045.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 Section 8 of Article 1:

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; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 4046.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, The Congress shall have the Power to . . . establish Post Offices and Post Roads

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 4047.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under the following provisions of the United States Constitution:

Article I, Section 1;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:

H.R. 4048.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mrs. LOVE:

H.R. 4049.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: "The Congress shall have power . . . To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 4050.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4051.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 4052.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 4053.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 4054.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 78: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 167: Mr. PALONE.

H.R. 317: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 540: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 546: Mr. TAKAI, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 592: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 604: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 605: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 646: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 654: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 711: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 731: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 771: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 814: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MACARTHUR, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 845: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 879: Mr. BABIN and Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 921: Mr. LAHOOD and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 985: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. ASHFORD, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 1019: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1093: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 1173: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1206: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 1247: Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 1248: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 1255: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 1258: Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 1288: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1292: Mr. CRAMER and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 1310: Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 1346: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1401: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. SALMON, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 1427: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1492: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1567: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1604: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 1610: Mr. WOODALL, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 1670: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 1779: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 1786: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 1793: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 1805: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 1818: Mr. WALBERG and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 1929: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 1941: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 2016: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 2017: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 2125: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 2154: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 2342: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 2366: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 2403: Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. Polis.

H.R. 2434: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2515: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2519: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 2526: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 2533: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 2657: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 2689: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. GRIMALVA.

H.R. 2759: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 2817: Mr. QUIGLEY and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 2847: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. BEATTY, and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 2849: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 2858: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2874: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2903: Mr. WELCH and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2905: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 3105: Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 3110: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. BARR, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 3119: Mr. TROTT and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 3136: Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 3137: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 3177: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 3183: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.

H.R. 3220: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 3222: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. YODER, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 3225: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 3226: Mr. GRIMALVA.

H.R. 3250: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 3268: Mr. BUCK.

H.R. 3296: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 3299: Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 3309: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 3314: Mr. SCALISE, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 3316: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. TITUS, Ms. LEE, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 3326: Mr. LUCAS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 3339: Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. DELAURO, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 3340: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 3375: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 3397: Mr. BARR, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 3406: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 3423: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 3445: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3471: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 3513: Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. JEFFRIES and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3516: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.  
 H.R. 3537: Mr. ALLEN.  
 H.R. 3541: Mr. SERRANO.  
 H.R. 3556: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.  
 H.R. 3573: Mr. HARPER, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ROSS, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mrs. COMSTOCK,  
 Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. WALKER, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. CLAWSON of Florida.  
 H.R. 3591: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. LOBIONDO.  
 H.R. 3665: Mr. LOEBSACK.  
 H.R. 3683: Mr. ROSS and Mrs. CAPPS.  
 H.R. 3706: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. Carson of Indiana.  
 H.R. 3711: Mr. GALLEG0.  
 H.R. 3724: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.  
 H.R. 3730: Mr. MULVANEY.  
 H.R. 3733: Mr. TED LIEU of California.  
 H.R. 3756: Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HARDY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. COSTA.  
 H.R. 3760: Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.  
 H.R. 3765: Mr. BABIN and Mr. BYRNE.  
 H.R. 3793: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TAKANO, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.  
 H.R. 3799: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.  
 H.R. 3802: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.  
 H.R. 3803: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas and Mr. HENSARLING.  
 H.R. 3834: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.  
 H.R. 3845: Mr. BLUM, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 3860: Mr. BARLETTA.  
 H.R. 3865: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.  
 H.R. 3869: Mr. MESSER.  
 H.R. 3870: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES, and Ms. BORDALLO.  
 H.R. 3886: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. HANNA.  
 H.R. 3892: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mr. PALAZZO.  
 H.R. 3914: Mr. MILLER of Florida.  
 H.R. 3919: Mr. LEWIS.  
 H.R. 3940: Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. ABRAHAM.  
 H.R. 3956: Mr. VALADAO.  
 H.R. 3977: Mr. HUFFMAN.  
 H.R. 3986: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.  
 H.R. 3991: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. HONDA.  
 H.R. 3997: Mr. NADLER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. EDWARDS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DEFazio, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CARNEY and Ms. MCCOLLUM.  
 H.R. 4000: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LONG and Mr. FARENTHOLD.  
 H.R. 4003: Mr. TROTT and Mr. FORBES.  
 H.J. Res. 22: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.  
 H.J. Res. 33: Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina and Mrs. ROBY.  
 H.J. Res. 71: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BOST, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.  
 H.J. Res. 72: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BOST, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.  
 H. Res. 28: Mr. VALADAO.  
 H. Res. 32: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. FINCHER and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H. Res. 394: Mr. PASCRELL.  
 H. Res. 416: Mr. PALAZZO and Mr. LOEBSACK.  
 H. Res. 432: Mr. TAKANO and Mr. FOSTER.  
 H. Res. 485: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.  
 H. Res. 513: Mr. HUFFMAN.  
 H. Res. 520: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. JEFFRIES.  
 H. Res. 524: Mr. BOST, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BERA, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SALMON, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. SIRES, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. YOHO, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. TROTT, Ms. BASS, Ms. MENG, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ISSA, Mr. MARINO, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. GRAYSON.  
 H. Res. 527: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

---

#### CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative DENNY HECK (WA) or a designee, to H.R. 3189, the Fed Oversight Reform and Modernization Act of 2015, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

---

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 3770: Mr. VEASEY.