

for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, as the first Hispanic woman elected to serve in Congress and as the 2016 Republican co-chair of Running Start, I am proud to recognize the great work that Running Start does to empower young women to become engaged in elective office.

Since its inception almost 10 years ago, Running Start has trained over 10,000 young ladies, many of whom are currently assisting in our congressional offices throughout the Star Fellowship program.

I have seen firsthand the level of commitment and professionalism that these young women possess. My office was introduced to Whitney Holliday, our first Start fellow, in 2009. Since then we have hosted a number of remarkable young women, including Lucinda Borque, Alexandra Curtis, Sarah Pink, and Shannon Carney. One of my staffers, Taylor Johnson, is also a proud alumna of this wonderful Running Start program.

They have all proven to be resilient young women with the skills necessary to thrive and become the leaders of tomorrow.

RECOGNIZING STATE SENATOR
TOMMIE WILLIAMS

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Senator Tommie Williams and his retirement from the Georgia State Senate.

Since first being elected to office in 1998, Senator Williams has spent the last 18 years representing his South Georgia constituents in extraordinary fashion.

Through the years, Senator Williams' hard work and passion has flourished as he has moved through the ranks from majority leader to President pro tempore, always working to keep Georgia's economy growing.

As a true conservative from Lyons, Georgia, a great friend, and a passionate lawmaker, Senator Williams' service to the State of Georgia will be missed. I wish my friend the best of luck in his future endeavors.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE DAY

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

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in celebration of National Agriculture Day. Today we celebrate the farmers and ranchers who literally work to put the food on our dinner tables.

Last week I was in Posen, Michigan, and met the Styma family. They are growing hundreds of thousands of potatoes each year that families across the country will enjoy.

The next time you put a cherry on your ice cream sundae, think of Glen and Ben LaCross, who not only work full time raising cherries in northern Michigan, but also manage a fruit processing business to make delicious products, like maraschino cherries and pie fillings, available in Michigan and around the country.

Farmers, ranchers, and agribusiness owners and workers don't just provide food and fiber for the Nation; they are an important part of our economy.

In Michigan alone, the agriculture industry contributes over \$100 billion annually to the economy, accounting for a quarter of Michigan's workforce.

As a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I want to thank the farmers, producers, and agribusiness workers who feed and clothe America's families.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMMER of Minnesota) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 15, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 15, 2016 at 9:29 a.m.:

Appointment:
United States Commission on International Religious Freedom.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 4596, SMALL BUSINESS
BROADBAND DEPLOYMENT ACT,
AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 3797, SATISFYING
ENERGY NEEDS AND SAVING
THE ENVIRONMENT ACT

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 640 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 640

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4596) to ensure that small business providers of broadband Internet access service can devote resources to broadband deployment rather than compliance with cumbersome regulatory requirements. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be con-

sidered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; (2) the further amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) 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. 3797) to establish the bases by which the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall issue, implement, and enforce certain emission limitations and allocations for existing electric utility steam generating units that convert coal refuse into energy. 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 B 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 1 hour.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STIVERS. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Committee on Rules met and reported out a rule for H.R. 4596, the Small Business Broadband Deployment Act, and H.R. 3797, the Satisfying Energy Needs and Saving the Environment Act. House Resolution 640 provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 4596 and H.R. 3797.

The resolution provides each bill 1 hour of debate equally divided between the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Additionally, the resolution provides for the consideration of five amendments offered to H.R. 3797, as well as one amendment offered to H.R. 4596.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the resolution provides for a motion to recommit for each bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the resolution and the underlying legislation. The SENSE Act would modify the EPA's Cross-State Air Pollution Rule and Mercury and Air Toxics Standards as they apply to coal refuse-to-energy power plants, while still requiring those facilities to reduce their emissions.

There are only 19 coal refuse-to-energy facilities in the United States, but they provide an estimated 1,200 direct and 4,000 indirect jobs, many of them in economically depressed areas.

In addition to providing well-paying jobs and generating affordable energy, these power plants also address issues presented by coal refuse at no cost to the taxpayer.

Coal refuse is a waste product of coal mining found near many abandoned coal mines, and they present environmental and safety hazards to communities around the country.

They are a source of major fires. They pollute waters. They are eyesores that threaten economic development in the surrounding areas. In Pennsylvania alone, the cost of addressing coal refuse is estimated to be \$2 billion.

Coal refuse-to-energy plants use coal refuse as an energy to generate affordable and reliable electricity, and it is estimated that these facilities have removed 214 million tons of coal refuse from the environment, again, at no cost to the taxpayer, and they also generate electricity, in addition to removing this coal refuse.

However, only a few of the most recently built coal refuse-to-energy plants can comply with the EPA's Cross-State Air Pollution Rule and their Mercury and Air Toxics Standards, neither of which took the unique characteristics of these facilities into account.

Because coal refuse is a waste product containing varying levels of sulfur and other regulated contaminants, the plants using it need rules that reflect this variability. The EPA refused to provide any flexibility, placing the continued operation of these coal refuse-to-energy plants in doubt.

One way the SENSE Act would correct this is by making adjustments to

sulfur dioxide allowances for these plants, without lowering the overall cap on emissions.

Forcing these plants to close would harm our communities, it would actually hurt jobs, it would make our environmental problems worse, not better, and it would cost our taxpayers more money.

The other bill under consideration is the Small Business Broadband Deployment Act, and it would exempt Internet service providers with 250,000 subscribers or fewer from having to implement the FCC's enhanced transparency requirements under the 2015 Open Internet Order.

Under this legislation, the exemption would remain in effect for 5 years, enabling these small Internet service providers to focus on expanding their networks and improving connectivity.

This is a major issue for my congressional district, which includes a lot of rural communities, and they are in need of faster Internet. Many of the communities I serve in rural southeast and southwest Ohio do not have a 4G-like connection.

I know that this is an issue that is shared by many districts across the country, many Members across the country, from both sides of the aisle. So I am hopeful that this measure will pass with strong bipartisan support.

It is also important to note that the Small Business Broadband Deployment Act does not prevent consumers from accessing information, as the disclosure requirements from the 2010 Open Internet Order remain in effect.

I look forward to debating these bills with my colleagues. I urge support for the rule and the underlying pieces of legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1230

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and the first of the two underlying bills. The second one is largely uncontroversial. The first, the Satisfying Energy Needs and Saving the Environment bill—so-called Saving the Environment bill—the SENSE Act, actually leads to greater risks and more contaminations I will discuss; and then the second, the noncontroversial bill, is called the Small Business Broadband Deployment Act.

I'm a little curious as to why we are going through this particular rule process. This could be scheduled for a suspension vote. We could have possibly even done it with unanimous consent and probably finished it yesterday. But apparently the Republicans don't find that there is anything important that America wants Congress to address, so they have us debating bills that are largely not controversial that we could get done in a matter of minutes and, instead, are spending several hours debating these bills, one of

which will go nowhere, the other of which we could have done very quickly to avoid this Congress having the real discussions that I believe the American people want us to undertake.

When I go back home and have town-halls and hear from constituents, I hear people crying out for a Congress that will do something about our Federal budget deficit and that will actually pass a budget. You will see later in my remarks I will mention that our previous question motion will be one that would require Congress to stay in session until we pass a budget, because there has been discussion—I hope it is not true—that the Republicans are thinking of giving up on passing a budget in the House and simply sending all of Congress home for a vacation.

I think, already, Congress is scheduled to finish Wednesday of next week. Most Americans have to work Thursday and Friday of next week. I don't know why Congress only has to work 2½ days. But that is what they are telling us. If we can't even accomplish a budget during those 2½ days, I don't know what we expect the American people to think we are doing.

So we should be talking about the tough decisions we need to make: How do we reduce the deficit and make the necessary investments in growth? How do we pass a budget? How do we fix our broken immigration system with one that works, one that secures our borders, unites families, and has a pathway to citizenship for those who work hard and contribute to our country? How do we make sure that we can improve and build upon the successes of the Affordable Care Act, recognize its shortcomings, and make the improvements necessary to move it forward?

But, no, instead, we are not doing that. We are taking up a controversial bill, the SENSE Act, that won't become law. It has a misleading title. It won't do anything to satisfy American energy needs and certainly will not help the environment, which is why it is opposed by many environmental groups. The SENSE Act makes anything but sense.

What would make sense, of course, is discussing and voting on a budget. What would make sense is passing immigration reform. What would make sense is making progress towards balancing our budget. What would make sense is investing in research to cure cancer. What would make sense is doing our best to make America secure.

But, no, instead, we are discussing something that the Republicans have given the title the SENSE bill to, perhaps to overcompensate for the fact that it simply doesn't make sense.

Now, Republicans know the SENSE Act won't become law. Instead, we are spending, I don't know, half a day, three-quarters of a day bringing up yet another partisan attack on the Environmental Protection Agency, whose job it is to protect our air. We all breathe the air. Democrats, Republicans, Independents, animals, and

plants all breathe the air. What we need is common sense to improve our air quality and move forward. What we need are solutions to break through congressional gridlock.

Again, this set of rules in this bill—which I call upon my colleagues to vote down—is clear that the Republicans are not serious. They are either unable or unwilling to bring forward fresh ideas or address the issues that our constituents are crying out that we need to deal with. This bill is simply another form of pandering when we should be taking advantage of the few remaining weeks we have of session to address the real problems of our Nation.

Now, these two bills under one rule are completely unrelated. When the Speaker came into office, he promised we would move bills with regular order. I don't understand why we can't pass the noncontroversial one. I would have gotten it done already and then had more of an open process. We did an amendment in Rules Committee to allow for an open amendment process on the SENSE Act, but it was voted down on a partisan vote. Unfortunately, the two were combined under one rule, and I am very disappointed it is not an open rule.

We need to move forward on FAA reform, making sure that we reauthorize the Federal Aviation Administration to keep our skies that we rely on for commerce and tourism safe and open. We face an imminent expiration of that. We need to reauthorize the Child Nutrition Act, the Higher Education Act, find a solution to the affordable housing crisis. And, yes, we need to pass a budget. All of those things should be done before Congress gives itself another vacation. I think that is common sense.

We wonder why, in poll after poll, Congress has an approval rating of 12 percent or 14 percent. I sometimes wonder who those 12 percent are. I wonder who those 12 percent are, because I haven't met any of my constituents that have said: "Congress is doing great. Keep on doing what you are doing." I think they misunderstand the question and they are probably answering in the negative, because I don't understand how any American could be satisfied with a United States Congress that punts and punts and punts on issue after issue and instead spends its entire days and weeks, on the rare occasion when it is in session, debating bills that won't go anywhere and won't be signed into law and then promptly give themselves additional vacation time as an extra bonus while patting themselves on the back. That is not the Congress that the American people want.

First, let me talk about the Small Business Broadband Deployment Act. Again, it is a bipartisan bill. I think we could have done it on suspension or unanimous consent on Monday. We could have finished it.

I come from the private sector. I operated several businesses, grew them

over time and played various roles. Do you know what? In the private sector, when you can get something done quickly, the last thing you want to do is draw it out, to spend a couple of days on it. So if we have something that Congress could have finished Monday evening so that we could get moving and discussing and debating the important issues that the American people are crying out for Congress to address, why didn't we do it then? Why didn't we do it then? If they are drawing out something and having us spend half a day on something, then I think, because of the hard work of many Members who collaborated on this, we could probably complete it in 10 or 15 minutes.

This legislation is important, of course. I think we can pass it. The bill would make the temporary exemption that the FCC granted to ISPs with 100,000 or fewer subscribers and extend and expand the cap to ISPs with 250,000 or fewer subscribers that addresses bipartisan concerns about speeds and costs and gives regulatory certainty to Internet service providers, keeps the exemption level at a level that protects consumers, keeps the Internet free and open, doesn't allow large Internet service providers to act as gatekeepers that favor some content over others; and Congress should take notice of the administration's statement on this legislation, which cautions about bills that move towards threatening the open Internet. But on this exemption, specifically, I don't think we have enough information to know whether it needs to be made permanent, so I support the efforts of this bill to spur the FCC to provide needed information.

Again, I think there are a lot of Democrats and Republicans who have worked hard on this bill. We probably could have dispensed with it on Monday. But, hey, here we are. We are dealing with it under this rule. I thought, if we are going through the rulemaking process, we should at least offer an open rule. Every piece of legislation, even if it is passable, ought to encourage ideas from Democrats and Republicans in amendments to make it better. But, no, under this rule, the Rules Committee shut down the open amendment process and is not allowing Democrats or Republicans to offer germane, relevant amendments on the floor to the Small Business Broadband Deployment Act.

Now, moving on to the SENSE Act—or the non-SENSE act, as I like to call it—it won't become law. We spend a lot of time debating bills that won't become law. In fact, this House, apparently for lack of anything more important to do, has voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act over 60 times. The good news is we are not doing that again today. I thank the Speaker for not having us repeal the Affordable Care Act for the 65th time this week. That would have been a waste of time.

Instead, the Republicans are being creative about how we are going to

waste our time. This is a new way to waste our time. Rather than discussing the budget or the FAA reauthorization or childhood nutrition or balancing our budget or fixing our broken immigration system, rather than doing any of those important things, we found a new and clever way to waste the time of the United States Congress in debate of a bill that will not become law.

Now, thank goodness it won't become law because the non-SENSE act is bad for Americans and poor for our health. It is a convoluted, senseless manner going after the Environmental Protection Agency's Cross-State Air Pollution Rule, which is called CSAPR, and going after the Mercury and Air Toxics Standards, which is called MATS. Specifically, this bill would change the requirements for plants that use coal refuse.

Now, there are about 20 of these coal refuse plants in the entire country. What this bill would do is it would abandon the market-based approach for sulfur dioxide emission allowances in favor of a one-size-fits-all Federal Government approach. So this bill is effectively a Federal takeover of the regulatory structure around our coal refuse plants.

Again, it is a particularly creative way to waste Congress' time, and it is ironic because the Republicans often attack efforts to take away control from the States. They say: How dare you Democrats suggest that anything can be done better at the national level. How dare you suggest that. How dare you suggest something that contravenes the 10th Amendment.

Do you know what? In this bill, the Republicans are proposing taking away State authority and a Federal takeover, because currently States have control over the incentives and work with coal refuse plants, but this simply says the Federal Government should override that work.

Now, that seems hypocritical. It seems against the philosophy that many Republicans have come here arguing, and it leads me to believe that many proponents of this bill seem to value their special interest pork over their philosophical integrity.

Now, this bill would create a system that the government picks winners and losers rather than markets. CSAPR has a trading program that allows plants to conform to emissions standards in different ways, like trading emission allowances; and that program, that market-based program, would be thrown out of the window with this legislation and the keys would be handed over to the Federal Government. Even more astonishing is allowing coal refuse plants to slip through loopholes in order to balance our credits actually makes it harder for regular coal plants to meet their pollution reduction goals.

I honestly don't know if the Republicans have thought about the impact of this bill or what it would do.

Now, again, knowing that it won't become law is simply a creative way

for Congress to waste its time as congressional approval sinks even lower. I know that the Republicans have often accused some Democrats of engaging in a war on coal, but with this particular bill, they are the ones attacking the coal industry.

The Republicans claim that this legislation is needed to allow coal refuse plants to be able to meet various air quality standards under the MATS rule, yet throughout the entire rule-making process there hasn't been any evidence that they can't meet the standards that are already in place. That was recently confirmed by the D.C. circuit court.

Now, it is apparent that both CSAPR and MATS are workable, smart rules that approximately 20 coal refuse plants in our country can abide by in flexible, market-oriented ways. I want to be clear. Leaving coal refuse to spontaneously combust or seep into the ground via acid rain is simply unacceptable, and we need to be cleaning it up; but allowing the plants that are processing it to do so with a weak compliance system is harmful to our health, our homes, our communities, and the environment.

Simply put, this bill is an unnecessary, imprudent bill that does nothing to help our environment or put our country on the right track. I oppose the rule, in addition to H.R. 3797.

Today we could have shown the American people that Congress can come together and do something to solve important issues in a bipartisan manner, to keep our skies safe and open, protecting commerce, by reauthorizing the FAA to pass a bipartisan budget which balances our budget and deals with our deficit; to improve the Child Nutrition Act, the Higher Education Act, any of the myriad challenges that I hear about and, frankly, I believe my Republicans hear about in their townhalls.

I don't think when we are home and hearing from our constituents—by the way, I haven't received a single letter about this coal refuse bill. I haven't heard it in any of my townhalls or gotten calls from any of my constituents. They want us dealing with the pressing issues facing the American people.

We have 84 days of session left in this Congress. By the way, Congress works 84 days. Most Americans have at least 145 days that they go to work. As an example of that, Congress is scheduled to leave town next Wednesday, will have 2 days off that week, then 2 weeks off, then another day off. So that is the type of schedule we are running here.

People wonder what Congress is doing. The answer is we are not doing anything. When we are here, we are spending more time than necessary on uncontroversial bills and we are debating bills that won't become law, and then we all go home and take a vacation. That is the Republican Congress. That is the image of what the Republican Congress is and how they are running this institution. It spends a lot of

time debating something that you don't even need to. It spends other time debating things that aren't going to become law, like repealing the Affordable Care Act over 60 times and like this non-SENSE Act, and then gives Congress much greater vacation time than the American people enjoy because, apparently, Republicans think this Congress is doing so well that we all deserve a lot of vacation.

Democrats want to stay here and work on the budget. That is going to be our previous question. We believe we should get a budget done. We would like it to be a bipartisan budget. It certainly is a governing majority. We encourage Republicans to pass a budget, but if they don't have the votes, then, by all means, let's do a bipartisan budget that makes sense for our country.

□ 1245

You will find us willing to roll up our sleeves and get to work, stay here this weekend, stay here next Thursday and Friday, stay here the following week. Let's get this done. This is the work the American people want to see done.

They want to see a budget. They want to see competence. We need to show people that Congress and competence are not mutually exclusive; yet, we continue to do the exact opposite by this course under this rule of debating a bill—and wasting a day—that won't even become law.

Now, look, we have an opportunity here. A vote on this rule is an important vote for that reason. If we defeat this rule—and I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do so—we can truly send the message that we want to spend time debating the issues that the American people care about.

We want to fix the budget, the deficit, immigration, health care. Let's roll up our sleeves and get to work rather than continue to blame the President for this or that or blame the Democrats for this or that.

I am honestly curious. If we can't blame the President because he was on time with his budget and you can't blame the Democrats because we are willing to roll up our sleeves and work with you on a budget deal, who are the Republicans going to blame if they can't deliver a budget?

I remember the Republicans assailing the Democrats for not delivering budgets. I am sure my colleague will remind me of that yet again. But, again, that is something that you criticized us on.

If you can't deliver a budget yourself, what is the use of the American people even having the Republicans here? What use was that criticism of the Democrats for not delivering budgets on time if the Republicans themselves don't have the ability to deliver a budget?

Now, look, we can deliver a budget with you. If the Republicans are unable to because there is freedom this or liberty that or all these different

buzzwords out there for people who don't want to vote for a budget, we are happy to work with the Republicans on a budget.

Ultimately, what comes out of this process between the House and the Senate is usually some bipartisan buy-in into the budget, anyway.

We are happy to start here with you. The perfect time to do that is now. The perfect time to do that is next Thursday and Friday and the following week. I think we owe the American people a budget rather than an enormous vacation, a paid vacation, for Members of Congress.

Look, we can do better by voting down this rule. I promise you we will do better.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would like to clear up some misconceptions about the calendar, the budget, the rule, and the SENSE Act.

With regard to the calendar, Mr. Speaker, I don't know how the gentleman from Colorado manages his calendar. But when I go home to my district—and I won't speak for every Member of Congress—it is certainly not a vacation.

I am home meeting with constituents, touring businesses, and letting my constituents talk to me so that I know what they think so that I can do my job of representing them. That is how most of the 435 Members of this Chamber treat the district workweeks.

To assume that we are only working when we are in Washington, the other side of the aisle might love Washington, but I prefer to be home in my district working with people and then come back to Washington to represent them.

With regard to things we have done, the gentleman talked about the Affordable Care Act, but he ignored the fact that I believe—and I may get this wrong, but I am close—seven of the changes to the Affordable Care Act were signed into law.

The gentleman talked about a budget. He did finally acknowledge that, when the Democrats were in charge, Mr. Speaker, they didn't pass a budget.

I have been here since 2011, when we took over the majority, and we have passed a budget every year and have passed a budget that balances.

I believe we are going to pass a budget this year. I hope not to be proved wrong, Mr. Speaker, but we are working hard at it.

With regard to the rule, the gentleman seems to want to have it both ways. He says that the Small Business Broadband Deployment Act should have been done on suspension, on the one hand, and then he wants an open rule that would eat up even more time, on the other hand. I am not sure which it is he wants here, but let's have it one way or the other.

And then, finally, on the SENSE Act, the gentleman from Colorado ignores the fact that this bill does not change

the overall emissions cap. He wants to talk about how it loosens the overall emissions cap. It does not.

Let's be clear. It does not change the overall emissions cap. It provides flexibility for only 19 refuse-to-power plants across this country, and it saves money because it would cost \$2 billion in Pennsylvania alone just to clean up that refuse around these coal mines.

It is dangerous and it is bad for the environment. Providing this flexibility does not change our overall emissions, but it does help get those reclamation sites cleaned up cheaper, not as a cost to the taxpayer, and provides an additional benefit of jobs in energy. That sounds pretty American to me.

I think it is time to end this war on coal that some people in this administration and the other side of the aisle have. That is what the SENSE Act would do.

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

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

The gentleman from Ohio talked about what we do when we are back home. Of course we tour businesses, meet with people, and do all of those wonderful things. What I hear from them is: Why aren't you back in Washington solving problems?

Look, I represent one of the most beautiful districts in the entire country: Winter Park, Vail, the beautiful Flatirons near Boulder, Rocky Mountain National Park, Estes Park, the great Arts Center in Loveland, and Fort Collins. I love nothing more than going home.

But when we got elected to this position, Mr. Speaker, we promised our constituents that we will make a sacrifice. Part of that sacrifice is saying: You know what. We are going to take some time away, leave our friends and family, to work for the good of the country, to roll up our sleeves and actually solve problems.

As much as I would like to be back in Colorado, in my beautiful district, right now and I would rather personally be hiking in the hills above our home in north Boulder than I would be debating the finer points of coal refuse policy with the gentleman from Ohio, that is what I signed up for.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that that is what he signed up for, too. We signed up to do work. We owe the American people a budget. We should stay here until we complete that budget, even if it means canceling the vacation that we have scheduled.

And, yes, that vacation—when we are back home, we can't do legislative work. Sure, we can put on an apron and visit a local kitchen. We do, and I do. And you know what, it is part of the job. I am happy to do it.

But we can't pass a single law while we are back home. It is impossible, Mr. Speaker, to pass a budget while we are all back home and Congress is not in session. It is not possible if Congress is not in session.

The gentleman asked: What is a better way to proceed with this non-controversial bill and the controversial bill? Look, either way is fine if we had an open rulemaking process, an open rule.

At least there would be some point to these discussions on the floor. There would be Republicans and Democrats who might have ideas to make these bills better that would be bringing them forward. At least there would be some point to it.

But, no, there is no point to it. Because we are debating it, we know the outcome, and Republicans and Democrats can't even offer their bills to enhance it.

We are prohibited during all of this time debating one bill that is largely noncontroversial and one bill that isn't going anywhere and won't become law.

We are spending the entire week debating these bills—or most of the week. I know we will be back to discuss another court case relating to immigration later this week.

But the bulk of the week is debating this rather than the budget, securing our border, keeping the American people safe, growing the economy, creating jobs, investing in infrastructure, FAA authorization, any of those issues.

But when I am back home and visiting businesses, I hear about it from my constituents. You would think that, with all the time we spend back home that the gentleman from Ohio calls nonvacation time because we are always listening to people, we would listen more and actually do what the American people say.

Are the American people saying to address the miniscule aspects of the coal refuse plant and CSAPR and MATS?

Let me be honest, Mr. Speaker. Until this debate, I thought CSAPR was just a friendly ghost, because the American people back in my district are not really about CSAPR and MATS.

In fact, once I understood them, I thought they sounded good. They are market-based approaches. I don't think this Federal takeover that the Republicans are proposing is a good idea.

Instead, if we are spending all this time listening back home, which we certainly are because Congress is hardly working here, then at least let's listen to what the American people say.

I believe they are speaking strongly with one voice, whether they are Republican or Democratic. I hear the same things from my constituents, the unaffiliated constituents, the Republicans, the Democrats, the Greens, the Libertarians. What they all tend to say, what they all say, is: Go do your job. Pass a budget. Pass a budget.

Democrats believe that. Republicans believe that. Unaffiliated voters believe that. Greens, Libertarians, and the American Constitution Party believe that. If I have left out any other parties, I am pretty sure in saying that they also think that Americans should have a budget.

We have budgets for our households. I have a budget for my household. We have budgets for our States. Doesn't the American Congress owe the American people a budget?

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to prohibit the House from going on recess next week until we do our job and pass a budget.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

I would just like to remind the gentleman from Colorado that, when the Democrats were in charge of Congress, they went on—I will use his word—vacation 4 years in a row without passing a single budget, not a single budget.

We have passed a budget every year, and I believe we are going to pass a budget this year, just as a reminder to the gentleman of what happened. I think he wants to have it both ways again, and I would just like to remind him, Mr. Speaker.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), who listened to his constituents to deal with an issue that is very important to him. I will let him address it.

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

In addition to listening to my constituents, I have been listening to my good friend from Colorado about wanting to come here to solve problems. Well, the SENSE Act is about solving a problem.

I, too, have a beautiful district. I consider it the most beautiful district in the country. You get on top of some of those mountain vistas and it is breathtaking.

But unlike the gentleman from Colorado, there are some scars when you look up at some of those vistas. The scars are a vestige of ages-ago mining.

That is why the SENSE Act, Mr. Speaker, is a smart and important legislative fix to ensure that the coal refuse-to-energy facilities can be held to strict, but achievable, standards.

Coal refuse, as some of you may know—and perhaps this is an educational moment for people in this country to learn more about what we have up there in Pennsylvania—is a by-product of historic coal-mining operations. Anyone who has driven through coal country has seen the towering black mounds of this material that loom beside cities and towns and countryside.

These mounds catch fire, burning uncontrollably and sending hazardous smoke into the air. Rainwater leaches terrible chemicals from those mounds, polluting nearby rivers and streams.

The coal refuse-to-energy industry turns this material into energy and uses the profits and beneficial residual material to remediate these formerly polluted sites at no cost to the taxpayer. It is really the only feasible solution to this massive environmental problem.

I have seen the tremendous work done by the hardworking men and women in this industry firsthand. I have stood on coal refuse piles in the process of remediation. I have walked on the restored sites. Parks and meadows now are regarded as community assets rather than liabilities.

Despite all the good that this industry does for Pennsylvania, coal refuse-to-energy facilities are under attack from the EPA. The people of my State and other coal States expect us to stand up for them as their environment and livelihoods come under threat from Washington.

As we debate the rule for this legislation and prepare for general and amendment debate, I want to share a few stories from the people in this industry. These are people who are proud of the great work they have done for their communities. Unfortunately, their way of life is currently endangered.

Bill Turner is a shift supervisor at the A/C Colver coal refuse facility in Cambria County. Bill has served at Colver for 22 years. He is a long-term resident of western Pennsylvania and has lived alongside coal refuse piles for many years.

Bill and his colleagues are proud of the reclamation work that his plant and others in the area have been able to complete over the years.

He was able to put three kids through college, thanks to his job at Colver, and I should mention that these kids grew up playing soccer on a field reclaimed from a coal refuse site.

□ 1300

When I asked him about the prospect that his industry might be destroyed by the EPA, he remarked, "To see it disappear would be a travesty."

Tim is an operations shift supervisor—a younger man, in his early thirties, with a wife and two small kids. Wages at his plant are well above the area average, and he is planning on building a new house near the plant for his young family.

Again, Mr. Speaker, these plants are in economically challenged areas. These jobs that these individuals have are not replaceable. Allowing inflexible EPA orthodoxy to shutter his plant, a plant that supports family-sustaining jobs and that repairs the local environment, would be a disaster for Tim and his family.

At least 5,200 jobs are at stake, and each one of those jobs is more than just a number. Each job lost is a Tim or a Bill. Each job lost represents a major hardship for an American family.

As we debate the SENSE Act, please keep in mind what the bill's supporters

are fighting for. The SENSE Act is about protecting family-sustaining jobs and is about ensuring the continuation of the environmental success story of the coal refuse-to-energy industry.

I urge all Members to support this rule and the SENSE Act today so that we can begin to solve problems.

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

I would, of course, like to remind the gentleman from Pennsylvania that my mountains are higher than his mountains. I also want to let the gentleman know that my district is no stranger to coal mining as well. Coal mines in northern Colorado existed throughout my district and near my district in Marshall, Superior, Louisville, Lafayette, Erie, Dacono, Frederick, and Firestone. The mines employ thousands of people.

Just 2 years ago, we observed the 100th anniversary of the Ludlow Massacre, which was an attack by the Colorado National Guard and the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company guards on a tent colony of 1,200 striking coal miners and their families in Ludlow, Colorado, on April 20, 1914.

Unfortunately, in that tragedy, two-dozen people were killed in that black mark on our Nation's labor history. I would like to think how far the United Mine Workers have come and how far we have come in protecting workers' rights.

Certainly we understand the legacy of not just coal mining in my district. The gentleman mentioned abandoned mines in the mountain territory of our district. We have many abandoned silver and gold mines. We have an active molybdenum mine right near my district. Many workers live in my district and, of course, mining remains an important part of the West and, of course, of the East as well.

Again, I would certainly advance the argument that even coming from a mining district, Congress spending an entire week, basically, debating these two bills is not something that justifies our time here.

The gentleman from Ohio rightly mentioned that Democrats did not produce a budget, and yes, that might have been one of the reasons the American people said, "Okay. Republicans, we will give you a chance. You guys produce a budget."

Do you know what?

If you guys don't produce a budget, you guys are blowing that opportunity, Mr. Speaker. If the Republicans can't deliver a budget, I think the Democrats have learned from experience.

I certainly will go out and campaign on—and I think many of my colleagues will say—"Look. The Republicans could not deliver a budget."

Most Democrats have learned our lesson. We are going to get back in the majority and we are going to deliver a budget to the American people. I certainly will work very hard to do that.

I am proud to be one of about 16 Democrats and a similar number of Re-

publicans who voted for a bipartisan budget in the last Congress. It didn't pass. It was the only budget that had Democrats and Republicans supporting it. Of course, it also had Democrats and Republicans opposing it in greater numbers, unfortunately; but that is at least the spark—the kind of idea we need to pursue—to be able to work together to govern this country.

Rather than spinning our wheels and spending a lot of time debating a bill that isn't controversial and a lot of time debating a bill that isn't going anywhere, we should take up important legislation. We should address comprehensive immigration reform; securing our borders, making sure that workers who are important to our country have a way out of the shadows; uniting families; and protecting the security of the American people rather than wasting time in trying to change commonsense rules for 20 coal refuse plants—rules that are working and that have been affirmed by the district court.

We could be addressing the Nation's pressing issues like climate change and carbon emissions and out-of-control student debt or how we can improve opportunities for the struggling middle class.

Rather than wasting the American people's time and taxpayer dollars on debating a special interest provision, we could take up the Email Privacy Act, which would protect the American people's privacy and which has 312 cosponsors—more than any other bill in this Congress and which has a solid veto-proof majority.

We could take up criminal justice reform, which I know many people on both sides of the aisle feel very strongly about and which I strongly support, which could improve our economy, reduce crime, reduce costs, and is a moral imperative; or as I mentioned, we could take up our budget, as is the duty and responsibility of Congress, rather than all go back to our districts and put on aprons and serve lattes and meet people in our local diners.

I urge the House majority to take up these important pieces of legislation, which are supported by a majority of Americans, that are critical to our economy and align with our values rather than to debate stale, unnecessary miner bills that won't even become law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would just like to remind the gentleman from Colorado that it is not a "minor" bill for the 5,200 people whose jobs are on the line every day right now.

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. It is a "miner" bill. I was spelling "miner" a different way than you.

Mr. STIVERS. Okay. That kind of "miner" I am good with. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), an esteemed member of both the Rules and Budget Committees.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend from Ohio for yielding the time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I had not planned on coming down here. I know we are on a clock and we are trying to get some things done, but I heard the passionate words of my friend from Colorado—and he is my friend from Colorado.

I think about what is, sadly, the sometimes short list of folks who are on the other side of the aisle with whom you can grapple with the really difficult issues of the day in this institution.

Mr. POLIS is one of those folks to whom you can always go and have a very candid and serious conversation about things, even those things on which you disagree, which I think is why it has so distressed me to hear some of the words that he had to share today.

Now, I confess that this is sometimes part of the show down here on Rules Committee day, and sometimes folks have the talking points, and they are obligated to go through those talking points. Yet, as a member of the Budget Committee and as a relatively young Member in this institution, I would say to my friend from Colorado that the reason approval ratings in this institution are so low is that you and I stand up here and we tell our constituents that they are supposed to be so low.

Instead of telling our constituents that we have been working on a budget the way we are supposed to work on a budget—line by line, word by word because it is a serious challenge that deserves a serious solution—we tell folks we have just thrown up our hands and quit. Not true.

I sit on the Budget Committee. Tomorrow, from dawn until dusk, we will be in that hearing room doing nothing but budgeting. We will hear every single idea, every single alternative. Every choice that can be made, we are going to make tomorrow. Now, that is not just one day of budgeting; that is the culmination of days, weeks, and months of working together, trying to get this budget done.

My friend is right. When I hear constructive criticism about how Republicans ought to work to pass budgets, I know that doesn't come from this decade, because Democrats have not passed a budget this decade. This House has. Together we have, and I am very proud of that.

Every year since I have come to this institution—5 years ago—we have come together and we have passed a budget. Last year, we came together and we passed a budget for the entire United States of America. For the first time in a long time, we got the Senate to move.

This is a cooperative exercise, and I am proud to be in it; but we can't tell people that we are letting them down when, in fact, we are delivering.

I look at my friend from Pennsylvania who is delivering on the SENSE Act. I think the non-SENSE Act is a clever term, but the truth is the “non-sense” is suggesting that he is doing anything except the job his constituents sent him to do. He has facilities in his district that are closing down. He has families in his district who are losing their jobs. He has people who are depending on him, his bosses back home in the district depending on him to come and make a difference for them.

I get it. Folks over here might not like it, folks over there might not like it, but it is what he gets paid to do. To suggest that bringing his ideas down here is a waste of time is something I reject in the most forceful terms. He is doing what he is supposed to do.

I would tell you that, if we all spent less time being focused on being good Republicans and less time on being good Democrats and more on being good servants to the people who sent us here, those approval ratings would take care of themselves.

These campaign seasons drive me crazy. Folks spend 18 months not doing their jobs and 6 months raising money, trying to convince people they were. I believe if we do our jobs, we are going to get rewarded for it; and if we don't do our jobs, we are going to be punished for it; but we have got to be clear about what our job is.

KEITH ROTHFUS' job is not to make anybody in the great State of Georgia happy or anybody in the great State of Colorado happy. His job is to stand up for families who can't stand up for themselves in Pennsylvania, and I applaud him for it. His job is to do the things that nobody else in this institution is going to do, because he works for them.

This is not a waste of time today. This is exactly what we are supposed to be doing. Don't you worry about that budget. Your Budget Committee is going to deliver for you, and you are going to be proud of the work product that we do; but we have got to tell folks that representative government still works. We have got to tell folks that Congress still works. We have got to tell folks that they are still the boss of the United States of America.

You look at this Bernie Sanders phenomenon and this Donald Trump phenomenon. Folks think they are no longer the boss. I look at KEITH ROTHFUS' State, and I know of the good men and women of Pennsylvania who sent him here to stand up in the face of attacks from all sides. He is delivering for his people back home. Vote “yes” or vote “no.” It is your voting card—do what you want to with it—but let's never impugn one of our colleagues for doing exactly what he was sent here to do, and that is to stand up for the men and women we represent back home.

Again, I say to my friend from Colorado, when it comes to the really hard issues of the day, there is no one who I

am more comfortable working with. There is no one who is more willing to reach across the aisle, and I admire that vote on the bipartisan budget that he took. That was the very first year that I arrived here. Yet we can't let these political seasons turn into telling each other why everybody up here is a scoundrel and a cheat. There are some good men and women up here. The gentleman from Colorado is one, the gentleman from Ohio is one, and the gentleman who brings the SENSE Act here before us today is absolutely one. I am proud to serve with each of you.

Mr. POLIS. Does the gentleman from Ohio have any remaining speakers?

Mr. STIVERS. I am prepared to close.

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

I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his thoughtful remarks. Certainly there is no one in this debate who has called anybody a scoundrel or anything of the sort.

The specific concerns of Mr. ROTHFUS would best be addressed in Harrisburg. For the Republicans, that is the capital of Pennsylvania. Don't worry. I had to ask as well. That is where this could best be addressed. The Republicans have talked a lot about empowering the States to solve problems rather than always coming to Washington to solve our problems for us.

Guess what?

Harrisburg is empowered to deal with this issue today, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania would be best served in spending time with his Governor, the State regulators, and the State legislature to address the very issues for which he is trying to do this end run in coming to Congress to spend our time here, debating.

The gentleman from Georgia also mentioned that they are hard at work on the Budget Committee. I hope so. I mean, I trust the gentleman. I am sure they are. They are working. I hope that this Congress will stay in session long enough to see the results of that and to pass a budget. That is what our “previous question” motion would do. It would simply say that we prohibit the House from going into recess until we do our job and pass a budget. It is entirely consistent with the work that the Budget Committee is doing that will ultimately have to then be reflected in the rank-and-file membership on both sides being a part of that process as well, and we owe it to the American people to let that process be completed and to pass a budget.

I urge the Republicans to take up these important pieces of legislation that I have talked about—a budget, the FAA reauthorization, the Child Nutrition Act, securing our border and fixing our broken immigration system, balancing our budget, investing in infrastructure, tax reform. These are actions that I hear about back home every day I am back, and I think it is important that we act on them. They are important to our economy and they

are important to our values as Americans—rather than debating bills that might feel good but won't become law and ultimately are not the right way to solve our problems.

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

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, before I close, I would like to urge my colleague from Colorado to use his 5 legislative days to ensure the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD does appropriately say it is a minor act—M-I-N-E-R instead of M-I-N-O-R act—where he said it was a minor act. I think that is a very important distinction, and it is a distinction with a difference. He made the statement earlier, so I hope he does use his 5 legislative days to correct the RECORD on that.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 640 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS

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

SEC. 3. It shall not be in order to consider a motion that the House adjourn on the legislative day of March 23, 2016, unless the House has adopted a concurrent resolution establishing the budget for the United States government for fiscal year 2017.

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1331

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia) at 1 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 640;

Adopting House Resolution 640, if ordered;

Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 2081; and

Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 3447.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4596, SMALL BUSINESS BROADBAND DEPLOYMENT ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3797, SATISFYING ENERGY NEEDS AND SAVING THE ENVIRONMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 640) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4596) to ensure that small business providers of broadband Internet access service can devote resources to broadband deployment rather than compliance with cumbersome regulatory requirements, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3797) to establish the bases by which the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall issue, implement, and enforce certain emission limitations and allocations for existing electric utility steam generating units that convert coal refuse into energy, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 177, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

YEAS—235

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