For decades, the Voting Rights Act has stood as the guardian for all Americans to exercise their right to vote. But 2 years ago, the Supreme Court reversed course on expanding voting rights when it ruled that section 4 of the Voting Rights Act was unconstitutional. Just hours after that ruling, my home State of Texas immediately began enforcing discriminatory laws against minority citizens from voting.

I sued the State to fight these unconstitutional efforts in Veasey v. Perry, which the United States district court agreed that Rick Perry, then the Governor of Texas, signed an intentionally discriminatory Texas voter photo ID law. It was under Perry's watch as Governor of Texas that the State legislature passed the most egregious voter ID law in the entire country.

Mr. Speaker, as we await the decision of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals on Veasey v. Perry, House Democrats will continue to fight against obstacles to voter participation and talk about the importance of restoring the Voting Rights Act. As you can tell by what is going on in Texas, it needs to be done now.

FIGHTING FOR THE UNBORN

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

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today with a heavy heart.

Recently, videos have been released showing senior employees at Planned Parenthood discussing a horrific topic: the proper way to preserve the heart, liver, and lungs of a child during an abortion in order to harvest those organs for sale.

Consider the illogical nature of the conclusion that an infant is not a life, that an infant is not worthy of preservation, but the organs, which give it life, are worthy enough to be kept and sold.

Pro-life or not, this should strike at the conscience of every human being, and, in a larger sense, it should strike at the conscience of a nation that this practice is permitted and allowed.

Following the release of these videos, House leadership called for an investigation into Planned Parenthood, which I commend and fully support.

I am often asked back home if I consider myself pro-life and, if so, why. My answer to them is simple: I will never forget hearing my daughter's heartbeat for the first time. That heartbeat had a name, and its name was Colby.

AMERICANS BELIEVE MEDIA IS INTENTIONALLY BIASED

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Americans are increasingly skeptical about the national news they receive. A new study released this month conducted by the First Amendment Center and USA Today found that only 24 percent of Americans believe the media try to report the news without bias. This is a record low since the question was first asked a decade ago.

Mr. Speaker, 70 percent of respondents believe that news reports are intentionally biased. This represents a 15 percent increase just since last year. Millennials are even more suspicious about the news. Only 7 percent of Americans 18 to 21 years old said that the media report news objectively.

Media bias is both real and unfortunate. Americans will continue to reject the bias of the national liberal media until the media stops telling them what to think.

RECOGNIZING KATHY ARTS OF THE FOURTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, Walt Whitman explained the story of mankind when he said: ''The powerful play goes on, and you will contribute a verse.''

I rise today to recognize the many verses contributed by an extraordinary lady, Kathy Arts. Kathy has managed my district office for nearly 7 years and is retiring to contribute still more verses through her family, her friends, colleagues, community, and church.

Whether as a small-business owner for the past 28 years, a volunteer coordinator for local county fairs and community festivals or a charity fundraiser, Kathy is the paragon of a go-to person.

Kathy's most conspicuous virtue is her genuine concern for helping others, and that has been a godsend to my office and to the people of the Fourth Congressional District of California. In this, she is irreplaceable.

When I think of a meaningful life, I think of Kathy Arts and rise to thank her for her public service.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

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

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of protecting the lives of the unborn and condemn the barbaric practices of Planned Parenthood as described by the foundation's medical directors in recently released video footage. The heartless and blatant disregard for the sanctity of life reveals the systemic problems with this organization, specifically, their culture of death.

Mr. Speaker, let's think about this: How can life-giving organs be considered more valuable than the very life of the baby from which they are taking those organs?

Hopefully, these sobering clips will embolden the Senate to move on finishing the fight to protect the unborn that are medically documented to feel pain at 20 weeks and pass H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, as the veil is pulled back and the practices of Planned Parenthood are further exposed, I remain steadfast in preventing taxpayer dollars from funding this organization. We must protect the innocent lives of the unborn in every way that we can.

HONORING HAL COXIN OF LAKE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contributions of Hal Coxin to our community in Lake County, Illinois. Hal is literally an institution in Lake County, and there are few local leaders or organizations that have not benefited from Hal's leadership, generosity, and friendship.

On July 28, Hal is retiring from Consumers Credit Union, where he and his team led efforts to open the door for credit to thousands of people who otherwise would never have thought it possible.

Hal recognized that Consumers could do more for its customers than provide financial services and that they could also play a role in helping improve people's lives in other ways. It was not uncommon to find Hal and his team holding workshops or helping in the library, working to volunteer with organizations and helping them raise much-needed resources for very, very worthy causes.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to call Hal my friend. He will surely be missed, but there is no doubt that he will continue to help people in our community even in retirement.

Thank you, Hal.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1599, SAFE AND ACCURATE FOOD LABELING ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1734, IMPROVING COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUALS REGULATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 369 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 369

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. 1599) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act

with respect to food produced from, containing, or consisting of a bioengineered organism, the labeling of natural foods, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-24 modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1734) to amend subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act to encourage recovery and beneficial use of coal combustion residuals and establish requirements for the proper management and disposal of coal combustion residuals that are protective of human health and the environment. 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 Energy and Commerce. 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 part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. 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.

□ 1230

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. House Resolution 369 provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 1734, the Improving Coal Combustion Residuals Regulation Act of 2015, and H.R. 1599, the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, when I am back in southwest Alabama for district travel, I spend a lot of time visiting with small-business owners and holding townhall meetings. At almost every event I hold, someone mentions how regulations are having a negative impact on them, their business, and their employees. These regulations cover everything from energy to health care to tax policy. Too many of my constituents are drowning in red tape, and they are forced to spend too much money and time complying with burdensome regulations.

Now, I get it; a lot of people in Washington think that they know best. These bureaucrats get in a room, and they start scheming on how they can solve all these problems, and our answer is almost always that we need more rules and regulations.

Mr. Speaker, this is entirely the wrong approach. This kind of top-down, Washington knows best strategy is not working, and it is putting a real burden on my constituents in Alabama and people all over the country. That is why this rule allows for the consideration of two bills that are focused on simplifying the regulatory process in two very important areas, energy and agriculture.

Being from Alabama, I know a thing or two about these topics. Anyone who has ever spent time in lower Alabama during July or August knows just how hot it can get, so that means families down there have to spend a pretty penny on their power bills during these summer months.

Well, under the Obama administration's EPA, regulations on the energy sector have skyrocketed. The costs from these regulations are most certainly passed on to the consumer in the form of higher power bills, and the compliance burdens associated with these regulations are making it harder and harder for utilities to deliver reliable power to their customers.

That is why the current enforcement structure of EPA's rule on coal combustion residuals, or CCRs, is so concerning. While most of us were pleased that the EPA decided to regulate CCR as a nonhazardous solid waste, we are left with civil suits in place of commonsense enforcement measures to make sure the industry is complying with EPA standards. This creates uncertainty among industry and a patchwork of interpretations by various courts around the country.

The EPA rule also creates some unintended consequences when it comes to Federal and State jurisdiction. That is why the Improving Coal Combustion Residuals Regulation Act empowers States and allows them to establish permit programs to meet or exceed regulatory requirements set forth in the EPA's final rule.

It only makes sense that each State, with their unique topography and geographic conditions, should be able to set the permitting requirements most appropriate for their conditions in order to meet these EPA standards. In fact, States already govern the disposal of solid and hazardous waste under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, or RCRA, and have done so since 1976.

It is important to point out that these regulatory reforms do not change the minimum requirements under the EPA rule, which are designed to protect human health and the environment. This legislation actually codifies these standards and sets them as the baseline for State permitting programs nationwide.

Mr. Speaker, I expect that some of my friends on the other side are going to argue that this legislation, in some way, weakens standards. Let me tell you what will result in weakened standards, allowing different Federal judges from all across the country to decide how the law should be interpreted and how standards should be set, despite the fact that these judges have no real background in regulatory matters regarding these sorts of hazardous wastes, these sorts of wastes at all.

Instead of that flawed system, let's allow States to create their own permitting system, which must comply with the EPA standard. By getting frivolous civil lawsuits out of the way, estimates project that this legislation will protect around 316,000 jobs. If my colleagues on the other side think that

this is a waste of time, then I want them to tell that to these 316,000 families.

H.R. 1734 is a good bill that makes some very sensible reforms that simplify the process for the safe management and disposal of coal ash while providing a realistic enforcement mechanism for existing environmental standards.

The second bill covered by this rule, the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act, deals with agriculture. Now, agriculture is the top industry in my home State of Alabama, with over 500,000 jobs. I have heard from a number of farmers who support this bipartisan legislation.

H.R. 1599 will provide much needed clarity and uniformity in the labeling of food products containing genetically engineered plants or ingredients. This commonsense legislation is supported by almost 500 associations and farmers from Hawaii to Maine.

The current regulatory system is a patchwork of State and local regulations, which create unnecessary costs among consumers and food manufacturers without really helping to increase consumer awareness. In fact, a study by Cornell University found that food prices could rise for American families by as much as $500 a year if something isn't changed.

This legislation would streamline the labeling process and create a national, voluntary food labeling standard for products derived from GMOs. By doing so, America's farmers and food manufacturers won't be burdened with inconsistent and costly regulations.

This legislation isn't just good for producers and farmers; it creates a uniform system driven by consumer demand. Under this bill, consumers will be able to easily identify products and make their own decisions about what products are best for them and their families.

Mr. Speaker, these bills are both about reducing the regulatory burden and simplifying the regulatory process. From consumers to small-business owners to rural electric cooperatives to family farmers, people shouldn't have to spend precious time and money figuring out how to comply with regulations.

Instead, here in Congress, we should be focused on getting government out of the way and allowing the American people to actually do their job, and that is what both of these bills do.

This is a fair rule, and I urge its support. The coal ash rule allows for six amendments, all but one of them Democrat amendments. The food labeling rule allows for four amendments, all of them Democrat amendments, including one amendment that is a complete substitute for the bill.

The Rules Committee has worked very hard to make a very fair amendment process, and I believe that is exactly what this bill has done.

I do urge support for this rule.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) for the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I rise in very strong opposition to this rule, which provides for consideration of H.R. 1599, the so-called Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act, and H.R. 1734, the Improving Coal Combustion Residuals Regulation Act.

This week, we are back on the floor with our twenty-fourth grab bag rule, one rule that governs debate for two completely unrelated measures. Today, the Republican majority has chosen to group together a bill that undermines an EPA rulemaking designed to protect public health and our environment with a bill designed to make it harder for consumers to know whether or not their food has been produced with genetically engineered ingredients.

Utilizing this kind of rule for two completely separate bills leads to disjointed debate. It limits the time that people have to be able to talk about these issues, but it is a deliberate attempt by the Republican majority to suppress debate. They don't want to bring serious issues to the floor, and they certainly don't want serious debate, and I regret very much that this has become a pattern.

I also oppose this rule because neither bill is an open rule. A lot of Members, I am sure, have a lot of issues they want to raise on both these bills, but they are not going to have that opportunity. The Rules Committee denied a whole bunch of amendments on the GMO labeling bill last night in committee.

I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand up for open debate and an open process and reject this. Send a message to the Republican leadership that enough is enough.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to H.R. 1734, the so-called Improving Coal Combustion Residuals Regulation Act, this bill continues the Republicans' antiscience, antienvironment, antipublic health fight. There is not a week that goes by that we don't have a bill that seeks to try to undermine regulation or rulemaking that is designed to help protect the people of this country.

This bill undercuts EPA's new coal ash rule, putting many communities at risk of exposure. Coal ash is highly toxic and needs to be properly disposed of, and the devastating health effects from exposure to neurotoxins in coal ash—like lead, mercury, and arsenic—are well known.

This bill is just another Republican bill attempting to undermine common sense, health, and safety protection from toxic chemicals. The American people deserve much better. I am glad the White House has issued a veto threat against the bill.

I include the Statement of Administration Policy in the RECORD.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 1734—IMPROVING COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUALS REGULATION ACT OF 2015

(Rep. McKinley, R–WV, and 44 cosponsors; July 21, 2015)

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 1734, because it would undermine the protection of public health and the environment provided by the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) December 2014 final rule addressing the risks posed by mismanaged impoundments of coal ash and other coal combustion residuals (CCR). The 2008 failure of a coal ash impoundment in Kingston, Tennessee, and the 2014 coal ash spill into the Dan River in Eden, North Carolina, serve as stark reminders of the need for safe disposal and management of coal ash.

EPA's rule articulates clear and consistent national standards to protect public health and the environment, prevent contamination of drinking water, and minimize the risk of catastrophic failure at coal ash surface impoundments. H.R. 1734 would, however, substantially weaken these protections. For example, the bill would eliminate restrictions on how close coal ash impoundments can be located to drinking water sources. It also would undermine EPA's requirement that unlined impoundments must close or be retrofitted with protective liners if they are leaking and contaminating drinking water. Further, the bill would delay requirements in EPA's final CCR rule, including structural integrity and closure requirements, for which tailored extensions are already available through EPA's rule and through approved Solid Waste Management Plans.

While the Administration supports appropriate State program flexibility, H.R. 1734 would allow States to modify or waive critical protective requirements found in EPA's final CCR rule. Specifically, H.R. 1734 authorizes States to implement permit programs that would not meet a national minimum standard of protection and fails to provide EPA with an opportunity to review and approve State permit programs prior to implementation, departing from the longstanding precedent of previously enacted Federal environmental statutes.

Because it would undercut important national protections provided by EPA's 2014 CCR management and disposal rule, the Administration strongly opposes H.R. 1734. If the President were presented with H.R. 1734 as drafted, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

□ 1245

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to spend most of my time talking about the other bill, which I also strongly oppose, H.R. 1599, which they have titled the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act of 2015, one of the most misnamed pieces of legislation that I think we have considered this year.

Mr. Speaker, I believe at the center of the debate about this bill is Americans' fundamental right to know what is in the food they eat and how it is grown. I believe people ought to have the right, plain and simple.

This isn't a debate about the science behind GMOs. That is a separate debate. Yet, whether you love GMOs or hate them, you ought to know if the food that you are feeding your family is made from them.

Mr. Speaker, the Food and Drug Administration requires the labeling of

thousands of ingredients, additives, and processes, many of which have nothing to do with safety or nutrition.

For example, the FDA requires the mandatory labeling of juice when it is from concentrate. Food labels are a simple and a reliable way to tell people what is in their food and how it is made.

Americans have told us loud and clear that they want to know what is in their food. Poll after poll indicates the widespread support for labeling GMOs. A recent poll by the Mellman Group found that 91 percent are in favor of labeling with 81 percent saying they strongly prefer GMO labeling.

The support for labeling cuts across party identification, gender, age—you name it. As well, three States—Vermont, Maine, and Connecticut—have listened to their citizens and have passed laws requiring that GMO foods be labeled, and dozens more are considering similar initiatives, including my home State of Massachusetts.

I understand the concern with 50 different States passing 50 different State labeling laws. I get it. That is why I support mandatory GMO labeling. We need a national standard that eliminates confusion and puts the American people in charge.

Unfortunately, the bill before us only adds to the confusion. It codifies the existing voluntary labeling system for GMO foods that hasn't worked and that hasn't provided consumers the information that they want.

It preempts States from responding to consumer demand and requiring GMO labeling, and it invalidates State laws already in place. It continues to allow foods that contain GMOs to be labeled as ''natural'' despite the fact that 60 percent of Americans believe that ''natural'' means GMO-free.

Mr. Speaker, I have a stack of letters here from a variety of organizations that are opposed to H.R. 1599—the National Farmers Union—representing family farmers and ranchers across the country.

They oppose this bill as well as the Consumers Union, the National Black Farmers, and 125 CEOs and business leaders from Massachusetts and across the country, including Whole Foods Market co-CEO Walter Robb; Chipotle CEO and chairman Steve Ells; Clif Bar, Inc., CEO Kevin Cleary; Newman's Own Organics cofounder Nell Newman; Panera Bread, Inc., CEO Ron Shaich; Patagonia, Inc., CEO Rose Marcario; American Sustainable Business Council CEO and cofounder David Levine; Sweetgreen, Inc., cofounder Nicolas Jammet; chef and founder of the Think Food Group, Jose Andres; Craft Hospitality CEO and well-known chef, Tom Colicchio; and many, many, many others.

The supporters of H.R. 1599 oppose mandatory GMO labeling, claiming that GMO labeling would increase food prices for consumers. This is just simply untrue. I want to read a section of a letter from the CEO of Ben & Jerry's that proves the point:

''As an ice cream company that operates in more than 30 countries, many of which require mandatory GMO labeling, we are not swayed by arguments that mandatory labeling will be expensive. The truth is, we regularly make changes, sometimes big, sometimes small, to our packaging.''

He continues:

''Every year, we make changes to between 25% and 50% of our packaging. Over the last 7 years, we've gone through three full line redesigns. In other words, we have changed the packaging on every single pint in our product line as a matter of normal business. I can tell you unequivocally that changing labels does not require us to raise the price of our products. Lots of things impact the cost a consumer pays for a pint of Ben & Jerry's. Label changes are not one.''

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that adding a label to indicate that a product contains GMOs ought to be pretty straightforward.

So, to the supporters of H.R. 1599, I would simply ask: What are you afraid of? Why is giving the American people more information about their food such a bad idea?

Perhaps supporters of keeping the American people in the dark believe that, if consumers know that GMOs are in their food, they won't buy it. I don't believe that to be the case. I myself consume GMO foods, as does my family, and we will continue to do so even if there is a label, but that is my choice.

H.R. 1599 really is a Washington-knows-best approach. I mean, this is the epitome of a Washington-knows-best approach. It says, We don't care what people want. We don't care what people think. We politicians in Washington know best.

I am going to tell you something. That is why people hate Congress. That is why people are frustrated with Congress. They don't think we listen.

Let me suggest to my colleagues a radical idea—and brace yourselves because this is a really, really radical idea—give the American people what they want.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I was listening to the gentleman's remarks. If he believes that, by codifying the EPA regulation that this bill is undermining the EPA, I just don't follow that reasoning. That is what this bill does.

It takes the EPA regulation and it codifies it. It puts it into statutory law. It sets it as a minimum, and it allows the State regulators who are already regulating solid and hazardous waste to use that as a minimum and to go above it.

Far from undermining the EPA's authority here, far from undermining the effort to get a clean environment for the people of America, this enhances it by putting it into law and allowing the States to go above it if that is what they want to do.

What this bill really does that is new and is different from what the EPA is trying to do is that it takes the enforcement of this away from different Federal courts around the country, and it gives it to the State regulators, who are already providing this regulation in other common areas and who have been since 1976.

I am a lawyer and have practiced in Federal courts. We have many fine Federal district judges around the country, but they are not experts in this area. If you bring a lawsuit in their courts, they and their law clerks will work very hard to make sure that they get it as close to right as they can.

But in not having their experience and their expertise, we are going to get a lot of differences. We are going to get a patchwork. Whereas, if we go to the State regulators, who are doing it now, we are going to get something that makes sense within each of these individual States, given their different geographies and topographies and other things that we should consider. This coal ash bill does not undermine the law. It enhances the law.

Now, on the food labeling law, we had discussion about this in the Rules Committee yesterday. I am a consumer. I go to the store. My wife sends me to the store, and she says to get this, this, this, and this. She does a lot of studying before I do that, but sometimes I have to read the labels.

Now, imagine that I go to a store where I live in Alabama and that I am an hour away from Mississippi and an hour away from Florida. Somebody has got to put a product on store shelves up and down the gulf coast, and they have got to comply with all three States' regulations on what has got to be on the label.

I am going to pick up a can, and there are going to be all of these different disclosure requirements, but they have been put on the same can because they have got to make sure they can market it in all of these States.

I have got to figure out what does all of that mean as opposed to having one common, uniform disclosure. If somebody chooses not to disclose—if a producer of a given food product chooses not to disclose whether or not it contains GMOs—I am going to assume that there are. If I have a problem with GMOs, I am not going to buy it.

Five percent of the consumers in America today won't buy GMOs, and they are pretty educated consumers. What they are going to do is they are going to go into the store and say, ''All right. Who has got GMO labeling and who doesn't? If they don't, I am not buying it.''

If the producers of those foods want to sell something to those customers, they had better start taking advantage of what is happening through this common rule, this uniform rule, across the country to market themselves.

Far from hurting the consumers, this helps the consumers. That is what this

bill has tried so very hard to do, and I think they have done a good job with it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), a member of the Rules Committee and a farmer himself.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I would like to thank my colleague from Alabama, a member of the Rules Committee, as well as joining Mr. MCGOVERN with whom we share a Rules Committee assignment.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule that we are considering as well as the underlying legislation, both bills, but I would like to specifically speak to H.R. 1599, which is, I believe, accurately labeled the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act. I think, also, I would like to talk to the positive impacts that it will have on our Nation's food supply.

Many of you may know that, prior to coming to Congress, I was the director of the Washington State Department of Agriculture. Shortly after my time at the WSDA, several groups in my home State of Washington proposed a ballot initiative, I–522, which would have required mandatory labeling of biotech food products or of those using ingredients that had biotech ingredients, also referred to as GMOs.

Now, I opposed I–522 for a couple of reasons but mainly because of the impact that we could see it would have on our farmers and on our ranchers and on our grocers but, more importantly, on our consumers, the families who are making food decisions in the grocery stores, who, in the end, would pay higher food prices as a result of this mandatory labeling law that was being considered.

In our State, we have the Washington Research Council, and it conducted an independent study, showing that the mandatory food labeling of biotech ingredients would cost the average family at least—at a minimum—$450 a year in increased food costs. That is assuming that Washington was the only jurisdiction to create such a law.

Now, if other States and other cities—other localities—decided to follow suit and pass their own laws, such as Seattle or New York or Boston or San Francisco or Oregon, food producers would face an incredible, unworkable patchwork of legal definitions of what a ''GMO'' is and how to label it.

I can only imagine a food producer having to print, say, 100 different labels for its products depending on where they were destined, where they were to be sold, and the liability they would face if, for instance, a box of food labeled for Phoenix ended up in Las Vegas or in Los Angeles or in Salt Lake City.

Many producers are considering stopping or have stopped selling products in the State of Vermont, which is the most recent State to adopt mandatory labeling standards, because of this increased cost, because of the uncertainty and the liability that separate jurisdictions would create.

In my estimation and what the people of my State have said is that what we need is a national voluntary label, much like organic, a label which gives consumers who want to purchase non-GMO foods the freedom to do so, but that will not impose higher costs on producers or consumers.

Mr. Speaker, critics of this bill, H.R. 1599, unfairly claim it will limit the ability of consumers to know what they are purchasing; but let me say that that just simply is not the case, that it is not true.

If you go into a grocery store and want to purchase an organic product, that is something that you are easily able to do, and that is exactly what this bill will do for GMO foods. It will create a similar label.

So make no mistake. If buying non-GMO is important to any of you as a consumer, then you will have every ability to do so when you walk into a grocery store and make your purchase.

You will have the confidence of the United States Department of Agriculture's system of making sure that those labels are consistent from one State to the other; so you will know what you are buying by what that label says.

Mr. Speaker, the Founders of our Nation gave Congress a tool in our Constitution to regulate interstate commerce to prevent the types of legal patchworks and market distortions that we are beginning to see on this issue.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the rule, to support H.R. 1599, and protect the Nation's access to safe, affordable food.

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

I appreciate the comments from my colleagues from Washington and Alabama. Both serve on the Rules Committee with me, and I respect them; but I do not think they were paying attention to my speech.

I am not arguing here for a patchwork of 50 different rules and regulations with regard to labeling. What I am saying is that what my friends are proposing here, which is voluntary labeling on non-GMO products, should be replaced with mandatory GMO labeling across the country.

That is what people want, and that is what this bill would deny. You are not only preempting States and telling States that they have no role in this debate and you are not only preempting the will of the American people here, but you are setting a standard here so that people will be kept in the dark.

□ 1300

I want uniformity, but I want more information, and this idea that somehow labeling will increase food prices is just baseless; it is baseless. There are plenty of things that increase the prices that we pay at the grocery store—transportation costs and ingredients costs, those all add to the cost—but GMO labeling is not one of them. In study after study, we have seen that a simple GMO disclaimer on food packaging will not increase food prices.

I just read to you the letter from the CEO of Ben & Jerry's. Food companies change their labels all the time to make new claims. All food companies will soon have to change their labels to make important changes to the nutrition fact panel.

Adding a few words on the back of the food package about genetic engineering will not impact the cost of making food. That is just not a real argument; that is just baseless. Let's focus on what this bill really does. It basically keeps the American people in the dark about what is in their food.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the speakers who preceded me, and the gentleman from Massachusetts is absolutely right. The simple solution is to adopt a uniform national mandatory standard that would give that information on the label. Eighty-eight percent of the American people who regularly are polled say: We would like that information on the label.

It will not add cost any more than printing ''red dye no. 2'' on the label adds cost to the label. It will add no cost. It would have a uniform national standard. You wouldn't have to worry about a proliferation of the States, and then you wouldn't have to contradict yourselves as Republicans when, every day, you are down here screaming about states' rights, and now, when States do something you don't like: Oh, my God, states' rights, out of here.

It is not just the labeling. Yeah, there are three blue States that have labeled, and you don't care if you preempt their laws—got that; but there are a lot of red States and purple States and blue States where the departments of agriculture have recognized the reality of GMO and the potential pollution of conventional non-GMO and organic crops.

We had a little incident in Oregon where all our wheat export was stopped because GMO-modified wheat was found in the middle of a very large conventional farm. Until they could figure out how it got there and how much pollution there might be or cross-contamination of Oregon's huge wheat exports, they were all stopped because 64 countries around the world require this labeling, and somehow, the U.S. conglomerates who make food and export processed food are able to label over there.

I have a Hershey's label from the EU. I will show it tomorrow. It's beautiful. It's got an American flag on it, made in the USA, contains GMOs. They can do it over there, but they can't do it here because it would just drive the price up stratospherically. That seems odd.

In fact, this would help them. If we adopted a national standard here—and the way my bill is written, it would be essentially the same as that required in the European Union and 64 other countries—then they could ship their food to all 50 States, the territories, and 64 countries around the world without having to make any changes. They might save some money then if labels are so expensive.

But, no, we are going to have a meaningless, voluntary label. Even worse, we are going to create a new label. We are going to say that ''natural'' means GMO. When you mate a flounder with a tomato plant—which is what they do, just like hybridizing, flounders, tomato plants, they get together all the time—then that is natural.

Or when you take a salmon and you introduce an eel gene—they mate, cross-breed all the time—well, no, actually, they don't—and the salmon grows twice as fast as normal salmon, then that is natural.

You won't be able to say ''contains GMOs'' if you can say ''natural'' and ''natural'' means contains GMOs, unless they want to voluntarily go on and say: Well, under the new ''natural'' label, I can have GMOs, but I am going to put it is natural, but it contains GMOs.

This has the prospect of causing tremendous chaos with a new, very confusing label for the American consumers.

Back to the cross-contamination—again, this is not just a blue State issue; it is a red State issue. We have huge export markets, and those 64 countries will not accept products that contain GMOs. If you strip out State regulations, how they claim they have fixed the bill, and they don't strip out all the State department of agriculture regulations in some 35 States around the country, many of them very red States.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, they claim to have fixed it, but the language is still a little bit ambiguous. Many people who have read it—experts say no, actually, it looks like we are preempting State department of agriculture on separation and buffer zones and other things to protect conventional farmers, organic farmers from the GMOs.

I had a very simple amendment that would just say this does not preempt any State department of agriculture which has adopted for the purposes of redacting conventional crops, non-GMO, and organic crops for reasonable buffer zones and other sorts of provisions to prevent that cross-contamination. That is wiped out by this bill, in my opinion and the opinion of many other experts. My amendment was not allowed.

I am thankful that I had one amendment allowed which will say, if you are already labeling it in countries all around the world, you have got to label it here. That is good, but preferably, we would have uniform labeling of everything in the 50 States and internationally by just requiring that you disclose that it contains GMOs.

There is another amendment that will be offered tomorrow which will do away with this new ''natural'' standard, ''natural'' meaning mandatorily under Federal law contains GMOs. ''Natural'' can contain GMOs. I think that is pretty disingenuous, and I am not sure who slipped that little beauty in there.

If you want to talk about confusing consumers, ''organic,'' ''natural.'' Whoa, what is the difference between ''natural'' and ''organic''? Well, I like ''natural.'' ''Organic,'' that sounds kind of complicated; I will go with ''natural.'' Oh, that contains GMOs. Well, it doesn't say that. No, it doesn't. It says ''natural.'' ''Natural'' contains GMOs.

If the gentleman is really concerned about consumer confusion, you should support that amendment tomorrow to do away with this new disingenuous label.

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

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to assure my friend from Massachusetts that the gentleman from Washington and I are indeed paying attention to him, as we do in the Committee on Rules. He is a very knowledgeable gentleman and certainly makes very interesting points.

The problem is that, as I listened to you talk, what you were saying, the gentleman says, I think quite eloquently, that we need a national standard, and right now, we don't have a national standard. This bill will provide a national standard.

If you want a national standard, the status quo doesn't get you there. If you want a national standard, this bill gets you there. That is why the bill has been offered. That is why we have this rule today, and that is why it is so important that we have this debate and the debate on the underlying rule, so we can make sure we are all straight about what this bill does and does not do.

This bill does something that is not being done right now. It provides a national standard for GMO. The gentleman, I think, would like for it to be mandatory; the bill calls for it to be voluntary. We can disagree about whether or not that is advisable, but we can't disagree about the fact that there is no national standard now, and this bill provides one.

I want to make sure the gentleman knows, we listened to him. He makes very interesting points that are always educational to us, but we don't agree with his line of thought here. This bill, in our judgment, gets us where I think he is trying to take us to go.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just simply say to the gentleman, I agree with him that this bill that will be considered tomorrow that this rule will make in order does create a national standard.

The problem is that it is a national standard that keeps consumers in the dark about what is in their food. Many of us would prefer a national standard that kind of shines some light on what is in people's food so that consumers know what they are buying. That is what consumers want.

I will go back to what I said in my opening statement. I know this is a radical idea in this particular Congress, but we ought to try something different. We ought to try giving the American people what they want. On this issue, they want to know what is in their food. They want to know whether their foods contain GMOs.

Again, this is not a debate about whether GMOs are good or bad. As I said before, I eat GMOs; I consume GMOs; my family consumes GMOs. That is not what this debate is about. This is about information, transparency, and giving consumers what they want.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question, and if we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3064, a comprehensive 6-year surface transportation bill that is partially paid for by restricting U.S. companies from using so-called inversion to shirk their tax obligations.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Budget, to discuss this proposal.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I do just want to take a break from the GMO debate to talk about a huge problem confronting our country, and that is the infrastructure that is in disrepair, from roads to bridges to transit ways around this country.

The American people know it, and they are backed up in what they can see in front of them by a report from the American Society of Civil Engineers. They are the nonpartisan pros; they are the experts.

They have looked at the state of American infrastructure and given us a grade of a D-plus—D-plus. Nobody should be happy with a D-plus. The sad thing is that this Congress should get an F grade for failing to respond to the bad grade with respect to our failing infrastructure.

In the face of this big problem, what did the House do? Well, we are about to run out of money in 8 days. We are about to see the end of the authorization in 8 days; so the House of Representatives, instead of coming up with

a long-term plan to address this issue, which is what we should do, came up with another kick-the-can-down-the-road Band-Aid approach. They said, we are going to provide an extension of the inadequate funding for just 5 more months, just to December of this year.

Now, we are a great country, and I think everybody knows that if you are planning to make major investments in infrastructure, whether it is our roads or our bridges or transit ways, you need a little more certainty and stability than that.

Certainly, the private sector couldn't plan on 5-month intervals, and we are asking these companies and these workers and these States to come up with long-term plans for our States and for our country on infrastructure, but we are only going to give them 5 months of certainty going forward. We think that is a bad idea. Guess what. Senate Republicans also think that is a bad idea. They came up with a 6-year plan.

Now, what we are providing this House today is the opportunity on the very next vote to vote for the opportunity to vote on a robust 6-year transportation infrastructure plan that is fully funded for the first 2 years.

How do we pay for that 2-year installment? We pay for it, Mr. Speaker, by getting rid of this egregious tax loophole that many multinational corporations are using to escape their responsibilities to the American taxpayer.

Here is how it works. You have an American company. Their headquarters are here; their people are here; everything they do is here. Then they go and they purchase a small company, a small foreign company, and they move their mailing address overseas to that small company, and then that American company benefits from the educational system we have here in the United States.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, they purchase a small foreign company, and then they move their mailing address overseas to that small company. They then say to the American taxpayer: Guess what. We don't have to pay any more taxes in the United States. We don't have to pay taxes for the infrastructure that we have that does support us. We don't have to pay for the education system that supports us. We want a free ride.

Now, we need to close down this tax break. More and more companies every day are taking advantage of it.

□ 1315

If you close that loophole, you generate $40 billion. And you use that money that otherwise would go to the bottom line of these corporations that are trying to escape their responsibility to the American people and you invest it in infrastructure right here at home. You help modernize your infrastructure, and you put more people to work.

We have introduced a piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, to do that. The bill is H.R. 3064. And if we defeat the previous question, we as a House will have an opportunity to vote on a 6-year, robust transportation plan that is funded for 2 years by closing this egregious tax loophole that is being exploited by corporations.

Let's defeat the previous question. Let's do the right thing for American workers and American infrastructure.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the points of the gentleman from Maryland. I, too, would like to see a 6-year highway bill. If you come to my district and see Interstate 10 going through Mobile at rush hour, on a holiday weekend, or on a summer weekend, you will see cars backed up just about every direction. We need another I–10 bridge across the Mobile River. We can't do that with a short-term highway bill.

So I strongly support what you are trying to accomplish—maybe not exactly how you are trying to get there, but I certainly support the concept there.

Here is the problem, though. Your idea, whatever it is, hasn't been vetted through committee. You are just going to put it up here in place of whatever we have got, and there really won't be an adequate opportunity for the Members of this House to understand all the details, and the details are going to matter.

Also, I was listening to the gentleman from Massachusetts in his initial statement talk about how inappropriate it is that we put two different bills on two different topics under one rule, and now we are going to interject transportation. Well, if agriculture and energy are confusing, if we add transportation, it is going to be further confusing.

So as much as I appreciate the idea that the gentleman from Maryland has—perhaps not the specifics, but the idea—this is not the appropriate place, and this is certainly not the appropriate rule for us to be discussing it.

When the time comes to be appropriate, I will actually move the previous question, but I will also ask all of my colleagues to support the previous question when I do so. I believe that is the appropriate way for this House to handle a matter of this magnitude, and it is a matter of great magnitude.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Before I close, I will insert in the RECORD a letter from the National Farmers Union supporting mandatory GMO labeling and opposed to H.R. 1599; a letter from Dr. John W. Boyd, Jr., the Founder and President of the National Black Farmers Association; a letter from Ben Burkett, the Executive Director of the National Family Farm Coalition, opposed to H.R. 1599; a letter from the Consumers Union opposed to H.R. 1599; a letter from Jostein Solheim, the CEO of Ben & Jerry's, opposed to the underlying bill; a letter from Tom Colicchio on behalf of the Food Policy Action group, opposed to H.R. 1599; a letter from Scott Faber, Senior Vice President for Governmental Affairs at EWG, opposed to H.R. 1599; a letter from the Consumer Federation of America opposed to H.R. 1599 and in support of mandatory GMO labeling; a letter from the CEO of National Co+op Grocers, opposed to the bill; and a letter from a group called Just Label It, signed by a whole bunch of people opposed to the bill and for mandatory GMO labeling.

[From the National Farmers Union, July 21, 2015]

NFU REITERATES SUPPORT FOR MANDATORY GMO LABELING, OPPOSES POMPEO BILL BUT NOTES PROGRESS

WASHINGTON.—In light of the U.S. House of Representatives' consideration of the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act (H.R. 1599), National Farmers Union (NFU) President Roger Johnson again highlighted NFU policy on Genetically Modified Organism (GMO) labeling. The policy supports conspicuous, mandatory, uniform and federal labeling for food products throughout the processing chain to include all ingredients, additives and processes, including genetically altered or engineered food products.

''NFU appreciates efforts by Representatives Pompeo, R-Kansas, and Davis, R-Illinois, to reduce consumer confusion and standardize a GMO label;'' said Johnson. ''The bill passed out of committee makes significant improvements over previous versions of this bill. Absent a mandatory labeling framework, however, NFU cannot support this bill.''

Johnson noted that the bill has changed several times from the one introduced during the last Congress. Improvements include additional authority for the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), a labeling framework that if utilized could reduce consumer confusion, greater emphasis on the Food and Drug Administration's role in safety reviews, and a GMO label that works in conjunction with USDA's organic seal instead of counter to it.

''Consumers increasingly want to know more information about their food, and producers want to share that information with them,'' said Johnson. ''It is time to find common ground that includes some form of mandatory disclosure for the benefit of all aspects of the value chain, but this bill is not that common ground.''

JULY 15, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Office of the Speaker of the House.
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Office of the Democratic Leader.
Re ''Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act,'' H.R. 1599

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND LEADER PELOSI: The National Black Farmers Association (NBFA), a non-profit organization representing African American farmers and their families with tens of thousands of members nationwide, urge you to oppose the ''Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act'' (also known as the ''Deny Americans the Right to Know (DARK) Act'').

NBFA strongly supports mandatory labeling of genetically engineered foods (commonly called ''GMOs''). But in spite of its name, the ''Safe and Accurate Food Labeling

Act'' undermines farmworker safety and labeling by:

Preempting states from regulating GMO crops to protect farmworker health, public health, and the environment;

Codifying the current, broken voluntary labeling system;

Allowing ''natural'' foods to contain GMO ingredients and preempt state efforts to end misleading ''natural'' claims; and

Virtually eliminating FDA's ability to craft a national GMO labeling system.

While NBFA does not object to farmers growing GMO crops per se, we are aware of the increased use of toxic weed killers associated with herbicide-tolerant GMO crops. As farmers, NBFA members know firsthand that consumers are demanding more information about the food they feed their families—not less.

NBFA stands with the vast majority of Americans who are in favor of labeling GMOs. Because the ''Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act'' does not require GMO labels, we urge you to oppose the bill.

Sincerely,

DR. JOHN W. BOYD, JR.,
Founder and President,
National Black Farmers Association.

NATIONAL FAMILY FARM COALITION,
Washington, DC, July 21, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE, On behalf of the family farmers, ranchers and fishermen we represent, the National Family Farm Coalition (NFFC) urges you to oppose H.R. 1599, the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act. H.R. 1599 proponents claim it would establish a national standard for labeling products containing GMOs. In reality, this bill fails to provide more accurate labeling and significantly curtails the ability of state, local and municipal governments to protect their constituents.

H.R. 1599 would establish a voluntary national standard that companies could use to label their products as GMO-free, but FDA guidelines have provided this option for companies since 2001. An overwhelming 88 percent of consumers favor required labeling of food products containing GMOs in a Mellman Group study, but H.R. 1599's voluntary program would also allow companies to label products containing GMOs as 'natural', which is vague and misleading to consumers.

H.R. 1599 would invalidate dozens of state and local laws across the nation. The GMO labeling laws that citizens and legislators worked for diligently in Vermont, Maine and Connecticut would be preempted. Furthermore, H.R. 1599 would block laws creating buffer zones around schools and hospitals to protect children and patients from pesticide exposure, as in Hawaii.

For non-GMO farmers, H.R. 1599 would be disastrous as it would preempt laws designed to protect them from GMO contamination of their fields. Farmers have already suffered through the contamination of wheat, rice and other crops, having lost export dollars to Asian markets that demand non-GMO varieties. Without strong regulations and oversight, farmers' crops and livelihoods are at risk in ways that they, their families and their communities cannot afford.

Striking down the laws around food and food production that a broad array of citizens and officials have worked to enact undermines the democratic processes guaranteed by our constitution. The NFFC asks you to oppose H.R. 1599, thereby preserving the rights of people to know what they are growing and consuming.

Sincerely,

BEN BURKETT,
NFFC Executive Board President.

CONSUMERSUNION®,
Washington, DC, July 21, 2015.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Consumers Union, the policy and advocacy arm of Consumer Reports, strongly urges you to vote no on H.R. 1599, introduced by Representative Pompeo, which we understand the House will consider this week. The bill would very broadly preempt state laws relating to genetically engineered (GE) food and crops, and ban any level of government from requiring GE food to be labeled as such.

Consumers Union supports mandatory labeling of GE food, and opposes H.R. 1599, for several reasons. First, consumers want labeling. Polls, including our own, show that more than 90% of consumers want GE food to be labeled accordingly. Yet H.R. 1599 would codify current prevailing federal policy, in which any labeling of GE food must be the voluntary choice of the food producer—a policy which has only generated confusion. The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) adopted this policy 15 years ago, and today there is not a single food product on the market that carries a label indicating it contains GE ingredients.

Second, there are numerous precedents for mandatory labeling. FDA already requires labeling of food if it is homogenized, frozen, or made from concentrate. Some 64 countries, including most of our major trading partners, require labeling of GE food.

Third, states have begun to act on the clear requests of their citizens for information on whether the food they buy contains GE ingredients. Vermont, Maine, and Connecticut have passed legislation requiring labeling of food from GE plants. Other states, including New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Illinois, have considered bills. Whether enacted by state legislatures or approved by voters, the ability of states to act democratically to carry out the wishes of their citizens on GE food labeling should not be impeded by Congress.

Fourth, H.R. 1599 would permit the use of ''natural'' claims on the labels of GE food until FDA finalizes a rule defining ''natural'' and decides whether it will continue to allow this practice. The bill would also prohibit states from taking their own steps to regulate the use of these claims. Polling by Consumer Reports has found that more than 60% of consumers are misled, in that they already believe a ''natural'' label on a product means it does not contain genetically modified ingredients. Fully 85% of consumers think that a ''natural'' label on packaged or processed foods should mean no genetically modified ingredients were used. Yet Consumer Reports testing last year identified five food products labeled ''natural'' that actually did contain such ingredients. By allowing foods labeled as ''natural'' to contain GE ingredients, H.R 1599 would authorize a deceptive practice that is highly inconsistent with consumer expectations.

Fifth, mandatory GE food labeling would not be expensive. An analysis commissioned by Consumers Union and conducted by an independent economic research firm found from a review of published research that the median cost of requiring GE food labeling is $2.30 per person annually—less than a penny a day for each consumer. This figure takes into account one-time implementation expenses, so the actual cost per person could be even lower.

Finally, H.R. 1599 goes beyond the question of labeling to explicitly prohibit state or local requirements related to the use of GE plants for food in interstate commerce. Restrictions on growing such crops in California, Oregon, Washington, and Hawaii would likely be severely restricted or invalidated. These measures were adopted for a variety of reasons, including to prevent the contamination of specialty crops destined for export, protect against invasive species, and limit the use of toxic pesticides, such as glyphosate, which many GE crops have been engineered to tolerate and which was recently classified by the World Health Organization's cancer research arm as probably carcinogenic to humans.

We therefore strongly urge you to vote no on H.R. 1599, which is contrary to what consumers want, and which would profoundly interfere with the ability of state and local governments to respond to the needs of their citizens.

Sincerely,

JEAN HALLORAN,
Director, Food Policy Initiatives, Consumers Union.
URVASHI RANGAN,
Director, Consumer Safety and Sustainability, Consumer Reports.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I write on behalf of Ben & Jerry's to urge you to oppose H.R. 1599, the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act of 2015, otherwise known as the DARK Act.

As you know, national public opinion polling shows that more than 90% of Americans want to know whether the products they purchase contain genetically engineered ingredients (GMOs). Just like labels that require disclosure of farm-raised salmon or orange juice from concentrate, mandatory labeling of GMO food will provide consumers the information they need to make choices for themselves and their families. Only mandatory GMO labeling will ensure that American consumers have the same right to know what's in the food as citizens in 64 other countries around the world, including many where Ben & Jerry's operates. H.R. 1599, with its voluntary framework for labeling products without GMOs, will only enhance confusion in the marketplace.

As a Vermont-based company, we are particularly troubled that H.R. 1599 would preempt Vermont's Act 120, which beginning in July of 2016, will require labeling of food products with GMO ingredients sold in Vermont. As a food company doing business in all 50 states, we'd prefer a national standard for mandatory GMO labeling, but absent that, we support states like Vermont passing legislation that ensures transparency and consumers' right to know.

As an ice cream company that operates in more than 30 countries, many of which require mandatory GMO labeling, we are not swayed by arguments that mandatory labeling will be expensive. The truth is, we regularly make changes, sometimes big, sometimes small to our packaging. Every year, we make changes to between 25% and 50% of our packaging. Over the last 7 years, we've gone through three full line redesigns. In other words, we have changed the packaging on every single pint in our product line as a matter of normal business. I can tell you unequivocally that changing labels does not require us raise the price of our products. Lots of things impact the cost a consumer pays for a pint of Ben & Jerry's. Label changes are not one.

I'd be more than happy to discuss this issue and how it would impact a large international food company like ours in more detail with you or your staff. I urge you to stand with the more than 90% of Americans

that support transparency in our food system by opposing H.R. 1599.

All the best,

JOSTEIN SOLHEIM,
CEO, Ben & Jerry's.

FOOD POLICY ACTION,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I urge you to oppose H.R. 1599, legislation designed to block state and federal GMO labeling laws and to weaken regulation of GMO crops.

As a chef, I want to know what I am feeding my customers. And, my customers want to know what's in their food and how it's grown.

So, I am shocked that some legislators in Washington are trying to deny consumers this basic right.

Next week, legislators in the U.S. House of Representatives will consider H.R. 1599, legislation that would block states from requiring GMO labels and that would make it virtually impossible for FDA to craft a national GMO labeling system.

But that's not all. H.R. 1599 would also block states from regulating GMO crops to protect farmers and public health.

Nine out of ten consumers tell us they want the right to know whether their food contains GMOs—just like consumers in 64 other nations. But, H.R. 1599 would deny them this right.

Congress should be leading efforts to give consumers more information about what's in their food and how it's grown, not less.

I urge you to oppose H.R. 1599.

Sincerely,

TOM COLICCHIO.

EWG,
Washington, DC, July 20, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: EWG strongly opposes H.R. 1599, the so-called ''Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act of 2015.'' We urge you to vote NO.

Consumers have the right to know what is in their food and how it is grown. H.R. 1599 would deny consumers this basic right by preempting state GMO labeling laws, virtually eliminating the ability of the Food and Drug Administration to craft a national mandatory GMO labeling system, by enshrining a voluntary GMO labeling system that has failed consumers, and by allowing ''natural'' claims on GMO foods.

Nine out of ten consumers want the right to know whether their food has been produced with genetically modified food ingredients—just like consumers in 64 other nations. GMO labeling has not increased food prices in other nations, and studies show that a modest GMO disclosure on the back of food packages will have no impact on food prices or food security needs.

In addition, H.R. 1599 would preempt state and local GMO crop regulations designed to protect farmers from economic harms caused by GMO crops. More than 40 states and counties have adopted rules designed to protect farmers and rural residents from the impacts of GMO crops.

Consumers should have the right to know what it's their food and how it's grown. We urge you to vote NO on H.R. 1599.

Sincerely,

SCOTT FABER,
Senior Vice President for Government Affairs, EWG.

CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, July 20, 2015.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: On behalf of Consumer Federation of America (CFA), I urge you to vote in opposition to the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act of 2015 (H.R. 1599) when it comes up for a full floor vote. CFA is an association of 250 nonprofit consumer organizations across the country that was established in 1968 to advance the consumer interest through research, advocacy and education.

Contrary to its name, the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act is not an appropriate solution to labeling genetically modified organisms (GMOs). Instead, the Act would codify the current voluntary system which has not provided consumers the information they want to know. It would pre-empt state GMO labeling laws passed to provide their constituents with accurate information about their food. The Act would also create consumer confusion in the marketplace by allowing food companies to continue making ''natural'' claims on products containing GMO foods.

More and more, American consumers want information about the food they feed to their families. American consumers have a right to know what is in their food, just like consumers in 64 countries who already have the right to know whether their food contains GMOs. Voluntary labeling, as proposed in the Act, is not effective because it does not provide consistent information to consumers. Instead, consumers get information only from some companies who choose to provide it and not from other companies. A better solution is the GE Food Right to Know Act introduced by Senator Boxer and Representative DeFazio, which would require GMO foods to be labeled, providing consumers with the consistent information they deserve.

I urge you to oppose the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act of 2015 (H.R. 1599) when it comes up for a full floor vote.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

CHRIS WALDROP.

NATIONAL CO+OP GROCERS,
Iowa City, IA, July 17, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: National Co+op Grocers (NCG) supports consumers' right to information, including sufficient product labeling, so that people can make their own informed purchasing decisions. We strongly oppose The Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act (H.R. 1599) because it:

1. Lacks transparency. H.R. 1599 merely codifies the status quo of voluntary labeling. In the 14 years since the FDA has allowed companies to voluntarily label foods that have been produced using genetic engineering, no single company has labeled them as such. Only mandatory labeling fulfills consumer demand for transparency regarding GMOs.

2. Undermines public will. Multiple surveys have shown that the majority of Americans, regardless of age, income, education, or party affiliation, want GMO foods to be labeled. H.R. 1599 nullifies GMO labeling laws that are already on the books in Vermont, Connecticut and Maine. Furthermore, the bill preempts states by blocking any future state legislation or ballot initiatives that would require GMO labeling. While NCG favors a national solution, we support states' efforts in the absence of federally regulated mandatory labeling.

3. Heightens consumer confusion. Newly inserted language would allow food companies to continue to make ''natural'' claims on foods produced using genetic engineering and would also block state efforts to protect consumers from misleading ''natural'' claims. Because many consumers believe that ''natural'' foods are produced without genetically engineered ingredients, H.R. 1599 would only perpetuate consumer confusion in the marketplace.

NCG is a business services cooperative for retail food co-ops located throughout the United States. We represent 143 food co-ops operating over 195 stores in 38 states with combined annual sales of over $1.7 billion and over 1.3 million consumer-owners. We urge Congress to reject H.R. 1599.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this issue.

Sincerely,

ROBYNN SHRADER,
National Co+op Grocers CEO.

JUST LABEL IT!,
Washington, DC, July 20, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We urge you to oppose H.R. 1599, which would deny Americans the right to know whether their food contains genetically modified food ingredients.

National polls show that nine out of ten Americans want the right know if their food contains GMOs. Regardless of age, income, education level or even party affiliation, Americans want the right to know what is in their food and how it was produced—the same right held by citizens in 64 other nations.

As business leaders, we hope that you will reject H.R. 1599 and instead require food companies to label products that contain GMOs.

If enacted, H.R. 1599 would limit the FDA's ability to create a national GMO labeling system, weaken our broken voluntary labeling system, and block state initiatives to give citizens this basic information about their food.

Congress has long recognized that Americans should be given basic information about their food and trusted to make the right choices for their families.

We urge you to honor this longstanding tradition and to reject H.R. 1599.

Sincerely,

Andrew Abraham, Founder and CEO, Orgain Inc., CA; José Andrés, Chef and Founder, Think Food Group, DC; Summer Auerbach, Second Generation Owner, Rainbow Blossom Natural Food Markets, KY; Dan Barber, Chef/Co-Owner, Blue Hill at Stone Barns, NY; Brandon Barnholt, President and CEO, KeHE Distributors LLC, IL; Fedele Bauccio, CEO, Bon Appétit Management, CA; Rick Bayless, Chef/Owner, Frontera Grill, IL; Andy and Rachel Berliner, Co-Founders, Amy's Kitchen, CA; Trudy Bialic, Director, Public Affairs, PCC Natural Markets, WA; Mitch Blumenthal, Founder, Global Organic Specialty Source Inc, FL.

Marco Borges, CEO, 22 Days Nutrition, FL; Doug Brent, CEO, Made in Nature LLC, CO; Clifford Brett Jr., CEO/Owner, Kimberton Whole Foods, PA; Peter and Janie Brodhead, Owners, Brighter Day Natural Foods Market, GA; David Bronner, CEO, Dr. Bronner's Inc., CA; Michael Branner, Founder and Chairman, UNREAL Inc., MA; Jonas Buehl, Owner, The Crunchy Grocer, CO; Jon Cadoux, Founder/CEO, Peak Organic Brewing Company, ME; Yvonne Chamberlain, Owner, The Market @ Tree of Life Center, TN; Kevin Cleary, CEO, Clif Bar & Company, CA.

Morty Cohen, CEO, Falcon Trading Company, CA; Tom Colicchio, CEO, Craft Hospitality, NY; Kerry Collins, CEO, Applegate Inc., NJ; Kit Crawford, Co-Owner, Clif Bar & Company, CA; Nicole Dawes, President, COO, Late July Organics, MA; Joel Dee, President, Edward & Sons Trading Company, CA; Valerie Deptula, President, The Good Earth Natural Foods Co., MD; Steve Diakowsky, President and CEO, Taste of Nature Foods Inc., CA; Norman Dill, Owner/President, Rebecca's Natural Food, VA; Adnan Durrani, CEO, Saffron Road Inc., CT.

Steve Ells, Chairman and CEO, Chipotle, CO; Shane Emmett, CEO, Health Warrior, VA; Gary Erickson, Co-Owner and Founder, Clif Bar & Company, CA; Susie Farbin, Co-Owner, Mama Jean's Natural Market, MO;

Jerry Farrell, Owner/President, Rising Tide Natural Market, NY; Mark Fergusson, Chief Executive Officer, Down to Earth Organic & Natural, HI; Mike Ferry, President, Horizon Organic, CO; John Foraker, CEO, Annie's Inc., CA; Leonard Freeke, CEO and Founder, The Veri Soda Company, NY; Michael Funk, Co-Founder and Chairman, United Natural Foods Inc., RI.

Robert Gerner, President, The Natural Grocery Company, CA; Diane Gibb-Lahodny, Owner, Campbell's Nutrition, IA; Neal Gottlieb, CEO, Three Twins Ice Cream, CA; Gail Graham, General Manager, Mississippi Market Natural Foods Coop, MN; Jerry Greenfield, Co-Founder, Ben & Jerry's Inc., VT; Hitesh Hajarnavis, Founder, esSVee, Life, NJ; Kristi Harwell, Owner/CEO, New Leaf Community Market, CA; Ben Henderson, Owner, Bare Essentials Natural Market, NC; Belinda Higuera, CEO, Berryvale Grocery, CA; Gary Hirshberg, Chairman, Stonyfield Farm Inc., NH; Roland Hoch, Vice President, Global Organics Ltd., MA.

Janie Hoffman, CEO and Founder, Mamma Chia, CA; Stephanie Hong, CEO, Real Food Company, CA; Steve Hughes, Founder and CEO, Boulder Brands Inc., CO; Cheryl Hughes, Owner, The Whole Wheatery, CA; Nicolas Jammet, Co-Founder, Sweetgreen Inc., DC; Mindee Jeffery, Product & Standards Analyst, Good Earth Natural Foods, CA; Blair Kellison, CEO, Traditional Medicinals, CA; Rosanne Kiely, Owner, West Village Market & Deli, NC; Ashley Koff, CEO, Ashley Koff RD LLC, DC; Jesse LaFlamme, CEO, Pete and Gerry's Organic Eggs, NH.

Donna Layburn, President, Alameda Natural Grocery, CA; Lanis LeBaron, Owner, Lupines Natural Foods, CA; David Levine, Co-Founder and CEO, American Sustainable Business Council, DC; Grant Lundberg, CEO, Lundberg Family Farms Inc., CA; Susan and Maury Lyon, Owners, Cornucopia Natural Food & Fine Cheese, IL; Rose Marcario, CEO, Patagonia Inc., CA; Matt McLean, Founder and CEO, Uncle Matt's Organic, FL; Danny Meyer, CEO, Union Square Hospitality Group, NY; Paku Misra, Owner/CEO, Sunflower Natural Foods Market, NY; Sam Mogannam, Founder and President, Bi-Rite Market, CA.

Marie Montemurro, Owner, Lovey's Natural Foods and Cafe, NC; Rod Moyer, Co-Founder, Beverage Innovations Inc., FL; Dean Nelson, President, Dean's Natural Food Markets, NJ; Nell Newman, Co-Founder, Newman's Own Organics, CT; Ted Niehaus, Owner/CEO, Naturally Organic, IL; Michel Nischan, President/CEO, Wholesome Wave, CT; Bu Nygrens, Co-Founder and Director of Purchasing, Veritable Vegetable, CA; Doug Obenhaus, Grocery Manager, Royal River Natural Foods, ME; Gwyneth Paltrow, Founder and CCO, goop.com, CA; Nick Pascoe, Owner/President Bear Foods Natural Market & Café-Cr êperie, WA; John Pittari Jr., President, Proprietor, New Morning Market, CT.

Mark Polson, Owner/CEO, Polson's Natural Foods, IL; Michael Potter, Chairman and President, Eden Foods, MI; Angela Reusing, Chef-Owner, Lantern, NC; Douglas Riboud, Co-Founder and Co-CEO, Harmless Harvest, CA; Evan Richards, Founder, Rejuvenative Foods, CA; Walter Robb, Co-CEO, Whole Foods Market, TX; Maria Rodale, CEO, Rodale Press, PA; Edouard Rollet, Co-Founder, Alter Eco Foods, CA; Layne Rolston, Communications Director, Good Food Store, MT.

Scott Roseman, Founder and CEO, New Leaf Community Markets, CA; Bob Scaman, President, Goodness Greeness, IL; Mark Schoninger, Owner, Bath Natural Market ME; Erin Schrode, Co-Founder and Spokeswoman, Turning Green, CA; Mathieu Senard, Co-Founder, Alter Eco Foods, CA; Ron Shaich, CEO, Panera Bread Inc., MA; Alan Shepherd, Owner, Rocket Market, WA; Corinne Shindelar, CEO, Independent Natural Food Retailers Association, MN; Ron Sjoquist, General Manager, Good Harvest Market, WI.

Robynn Shrader, CEO, National Co+op Grocers, IA; Craig Sieben, President, Sieben Energy Associates, IL; George Siemon, CEO, Organic Valley, WI; Irwin D. Simon, Founder, Chairman, President and CEO, The Hain Celestial Group Inc., NY; Jim Slama, President Family Farmed, IL; Joel Solomon, CEO, Joel Solomon Company, TN; Jimbo Someck, President, Jimbo's Naturally, CA; Tom Spier, CEO, Boulder Food Group, CO; Steve Spinner, CEO, United Natural Foods Inc., RI; Mark Squire, President and CEO, Good Earth Natural Foods, CA; Adam and Debra Stark, Owners, Debra's Natural Gourmet, MA; Arran Stephens, Co-Founder and CEO, Nature's Path Foods, WA.

Bobby Sullivan, General Manager, French Broad Food Co-op, NC; Kelly Swette, CEO, Sweet Earth Natural Foods, CA; Sam Talbot, Founding Executive Chef, The Surf Lodge, NY; Shazi Visram, Founder/CEO, Happy Family Brands, NY; Dennis Wagner, President, Rainbow Grocery Cooperative Inc., CA; Laughing Water, Owner, Real Food Market & Deli, MT; Bill Weiland, President and CEO, Presence Marketing, IL; Cindy Weinfurter, Owner, The Free Market, WI; Tim Westwell, CEO, Pukka Herbs Inc., DE; Bill Whyte, CEO and Founder, W.S. Badger Company Inc., NH; Stephen Williamson, CEO, Forager Project CA; John Wood II, Owner, The Green Grocer, RI; Alex Young, Zingerman's Roadhouse, MI.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 7½ minutes remaining.

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

First of all, I oppose the rule because it is not an open rule. A number of amendments were not made in order. Again, it is kind of a hodgepodge, grab-bag rule where we are dealing with multiple issues that are not related. We have to end this practice. Voting against this rule is one way to demonstrate your dissatisfaction.

But let me close talking about H.R. 1599 and basically urge my colleagues to be opposed to this bill. The fact of the matter is, as a parent—and I think I speak for all parents—I think we want to know what is in the food that we are feeding our family. That is why I support mandatory GMO labeling. Not 50 different labels of 50 different States, but mandatory, standardized GMO labeling.

Americans want to know what is in their food. American consumers want the same right as consumers in 64 other countries who already have the right to know whether their food contains GMOs. Why we should not have that same right is beyond me, but I guess Washington knows best.

Support for GMO labeling crosses demographic boundaries. Polls show more than 90 percent of Americans want the right to know, regardless of age, income, education, or party affiliation. Millions of Americans have taken action. More than 1.4 million Americans have joined a petition to FDA demanding the right to know what is in their food.

H.R. 1599, which has been dubbed the ''Dark Act,'' will basically block State GMO labeling laws. This will preempt GMO labeling laws that have already been passed in Vermont, Maine, and Connecticut, and pending in 17 other State legislatures.

This bill also will allow the bogus natural claims to continue. It allows food companies to continue to make natural claims on GMO foods and block the State efforts to protect consumers from this misleading natural claim. As I pointed out, when consumers see a product that says ''natural,'' they think it means no GMOs.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard my colleagues say that GMOs are safe and why is this labeling necessary. This debate is not about the safety of GMOs. As I mentioned before and I will mention again, I consume GMOs, my family does. This is about consumers' right to know what is in the food they put on their tables. We ought to give them that right.

This debate isn't about what the label should say. We can work on the label. We aren't proposing a skull and crossbones on the packaging. It is not a warning to consumers. It is a label simply disclosing the presence of GMOs. Consumers are free to use this information as they wish, but those who want to know should be able to know.

We had a fight about mandatory uniform nutrition labels in the 1980s, and I think there is no doubt consumers are better off for it. People are better served by knowing the nutrition information in their foods.

Why do my friends want to keep Americans in the dark? I would just say people who are listening to this debate ought to call their Representatives and tell them that they want more information, not less. They want to be more informed about what they are purchasing for their families.

This shouldn't be a controversial idea. This shouldn't be a radical idea. Let's give the people what they want. Let's do that for a change. Maybe our approval ratings will go up.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question and ''no'' on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts' interest in this very important topic.

We said it several times. I am going to say it again. What this bill does is provides a national label where there is no label now at the national level; and we believe so strongly in that, that we put forward this bill. Our side put forward this bill to give us a national label because there is none now. There is zero, and you would be, as a consumer, totally depending upon your local government, your State government, coming up with it. You may find that your government at the local level has one thing, your State government

at the State level has another, a community down the road has a different one. The idea behind the uniformity is to give consumers a uniform way of understanding what this information is.

I do wonder, by the way, what some people at home may be thinking when they hear all this talk about GMOs. They may be running to the refrigerator and saying, What is this GMO stuff?

The truth of the matter is we all are probably consuming GMOs, because they have actually been a tremendous benefit not just to the agricultural industry, but to us consumers. It gives us so many different varieties of good quality food that we didn't have before.

So this is not about whether GMOs are a good thing or a bad thing. They are about our side providing a vehicle to give a national labeling system today, where there is none today. I think the consumers of America will appreciate the fact that we did that.

I do want to go back and say one last thing about the coal ash bill. There has been a lot of talk about somehow this bill weakening the EPA regulation. Totally to the contrary, this bill codifies the regulation in statutory law. Whereas under the present regime at the EPA they are not going to do any oversight over how it is going to be implemented, they are going to rely upon people to file lawsuits in various Federal courts around the Nation, this bill provides that State regulators who are already doing this for the most part will be the ones to provide that regulation with their substantial expertise and experience, which, I can tell you from my years of practicing law in Federal courts, the vast majority of our Federal judges don't have that. They will do their jobs. They will do their homework. Their law clerks will work with them, but they won't bring to it what these State regulators have.

So we have substantially enhanced the regulation here. We have substantially enhanced its implementation by having this bill before the House and the House adopting it.

As they consider these two bills, I would urge everyone to understand that what we have offered in these bills is good for consumers and it is good for the economy of the United States because it lessens that regulatory burden I have talked about at the beginning.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 369 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3064) to authorize highway infrastructure and safety, transit, motor carrier, rail, and other surface transportation programs, 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 Transportation and Infrastructure 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. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3064.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. BYRNE. 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.

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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 369, if ordered; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 167, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 450]

YEAS—239

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

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

NAYS—167

Adams
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hastings
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—27

Aguilar
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Bridenstine
Buchanan
Carter (TX)
Castro (TX)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Costa
Esty
Graves (MO)
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Hurt (VA)
Israel
Kennedy
Kirkpatrick
Lynch
Moore
Sarbanes
Schiff
Smith (WA)
Waters, Maxine
Welch
Yarmuth

□ 1352

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 450 on H. Res. 369. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Stated against:

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 450, had I been present, 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.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 175, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 451]

AYES—242

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
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
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
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

NOES—175

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hahn
Hastings
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez

Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Buchanan
Carter (TX)
Castro (TX)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Esty
Graves (MO)
Gutiérrez
Heck (WA)
Lynch
Moore
Stewart
Waters, Maxine
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1401

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

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my vote was not recorded on rollcall No. 450, the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question to the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1599 and H.R. 1734. I was not present for the vote due to attending a national security briefing at the White House. I intended to vote "nay." On rollcall No. 451, the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1599 and H.R. 1734, I intended to vote "nay."

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 249, noes 169, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 452]

AYES—249

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Ashford
Barletta
Barton
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bonamici
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (FL)
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Cook
Cooper
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Emmer (MN)
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fleischmann
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garrett
Gibbs
Goodlatte
Graham
Granger
Graves (LA)
Grayson
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Hahn
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hensarling
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Huelskamp
Huffman
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Knight
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Levin
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)
Lummis
Maloney, Carolyn
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mica
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
O'Rourke
Olson
Palmer
Pascrell
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Reichert
Ribble
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Royce
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stutzman
Takai
Takano
Thornberry
Tiberi
Titus
Trott
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Wagner
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman Schultz
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—169

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Babin
Barr
Bass
Benishek
Beyer
Bishop (MI)
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Capuano
Carter (GA)
Castor (FL)
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clyburn
Coffman
Collins (GA)
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Costa
Costello (PA)
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duckworth
Duffy
Ellmers (NC)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleming
Flores
Foxx
Fudge
Gibson
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Guinta
Hanna
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck (NV)
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga (MI)
Israel
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Joyce
Kennedy
Kilmer
Kind
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Lance
Langevin
Lawrence
Lee
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo
Lowey
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Miller (FL)
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mulvaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
Nugent
Palazzo
Pallone
Paulsen
Payne
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Price, Tom
Rangel
Ratcliffe
Reed
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Rigell
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schrader
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Stivers
Swalwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Tipton
Torres
Turner
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Whitfield
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Gohmert
Tonko

NOT VOTING—13

Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Buchanan
Carter (TX)
Clawson (FL)
Esty
Graves (MO)
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Heck (WA)
Lynch
Moore
Waters, Maxine

□ 1408

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPH OF 114TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 292, this time has been designated for the taking of the official photo of the House of Representatives in session.

The House will be in a brief recess while the Chamber is being prepared for the photo. As soon as the photographer indicates that these preparations are complete, the Chair will call the House to order to resume its actual session for the taking of the photograph. At that point the Members will take their cues from the photographer. Shortly after the photographer is finished, the House will proceed with business.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess while the Chamber is being prepared.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1414

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.

(Thereupon, the Members sat for the official photograph of the House of Representatives for the 114th Congress.)

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.