

## RECORDED VOTE

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. 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 241, noes 181, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 376]

## AYES—241

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

## NOES—181

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

## NOT VOTING—11

Bost	Hastings	Turner
Buchanan	Nadler	Westmoreland
Delaney	Nugent	Whitfield
Elmers (NC)	Takai	

□ 0003

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 524, COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2016; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES**

Mr. BYRNE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-670) on the resolution (H. Res. 809) providing for consideration of the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 524) to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription

opioid abuse and heroin use; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

**FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUCK). Pursuant to House Resolution 794 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5485.

Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. DONOVAN) kindly take the chair.

□ 0005

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5485) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, with Mr. DONOVAN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 21 printed in House Report 114-639 offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 22 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . Each amount made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 1 percent. In the preceding sentence, the term "this Act" includes titles IV and VIII.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I know especially our ranking member has been looking so forward to having this amendment come to the floor tonight because we have such great, robust discussions every year when I bring this amendment forward. It is calling for a 1 percent across-the-board reduction in the spending that is allowed through this appropriations bill.

The reason I continue each year to move forward with presenting these is because across-the-board spending reductions work. It is a way that you hold the entire agency accountable for making those reductions. It is a way

that you say: No, you are not going to be able to reposition money that maybe was for one thing and you really want to spend it on another.

This is money that goes back. You are not going to spend it because the taxpayers continue to tell us they are overtaxed, that government has overspent. And we are piling on the debt every single year. Quite frankly, the American people are tired of it.

I can tell you that, as our millennials come of age and look at government spending, they are, indeed, tired of it. They feel like it is time for this House to get back into good fiscal shape, to get to fiscal health.

Now, I commend the committee for the work they have done. It is \$21.7 billion base that is in this bill. It is \$2.7 billion below the President's request. It is \$1.5 billion below the enacted 2016 level.

This is work that is to be commended, but I really believe there is more that needs to be done. The spending reduction of 1 percent across the board is turning to our Federal employees, rank-and-file employees, and saying: Help us with this. Be a part of the team. Let's push back to fiscal health. It will save us \$217 million.

This is something we should accept the challenge on. So should our Federal agencies. We should do this for our children and our grandchildren.

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

□ 0010

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment, my good friend from Tennessee.

I appreciate her concern for the out-of-control spending that goes on in Washington. I think a lot of people are concerned about that. The problem is that she has got the wrong approach. She pointed out very clearly that we have already reduced the spending in this bill by 6.5 percent. We oversee and fund about 20 different agencies, and we have said we are going to reduce the overall spending by \$1.5 billion, 6.5 percent.

But when you do an across-the-board cut, you lose sight of the fact that some programs are actually working well and others are wasting money. And we did that. That is what the appropriations process is about. We have eight different full hearings. We have 1,800 Member requests from both sides of the aisle.

While we reduce spending overall, we have some good programs that I think my good friend probably really doesn't want to cut. For instance, we have something called the Small Business Administration. That is an agency that helps small businesses finance their next big deal, and we increased the

spending for SBA because they are the ones that create jobs. They are the ones that grow the economy. They have programs that help women-owned businesses, and I don't think she really wants to cut them because they are doing the job they ought to do.

You have got other things like HIDTA. You hear people talk about that, the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas. This is a combination of the Federal and the State and local government. They all work together to stop this epidemic of drugs. Opiates, we have got more people dying from heroin overdose than we have 4 straight years. Those are programs that we added money to while we reduced the spending overall.

When you cut across the board, you treat all the agencies just alike. Her amendment would treat the IRS just like the SBA, and, obviously, they are different, because one of the things we do, we reduced spending heavily with the IRS. We cut them \$236 million.

So that is the right approach. This appropriations subcommittee has taken that approach. We have looked hard. The programs that work, we fund them, give them additional money; programs that don't work, that waste money, we cut them. So that is the way you do it.

We have done it here well, so I am going to have to reluctantly ask everyone to actually oppose this wonderful amendment that my good friend has brought. It is just a little misguided.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, a couple of thoughts there.

Across-the-board reductions work. This is what we see our States use. Indeed, in Oklahoma, one of our former colleagues who is the Governor there, December, 3 percent cut, came back in March, 4 percent across-the-board cut because everyone has some skin in the game.

Of course, there are good programs like the Small Business Administration, absolutely, good programs there. But I guarantee you, if you challenge those employees, yes, they can find a penny out of a dollar, absolutely. They can, just like their friends and colleagues at the State level or at local levels. They can do that. They can find the savings. And they need the opportunity to participate in getting our national debt under control and ending these annual deficits.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, can you tell me how much time I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), the ranking member.

Mr. SERRANO. I join you, Mr. Chairman, in opposition to this amendment.

With all due respect to the gentleman, I think she hasn't read this particular committee's bill over the

last few years. It has been cut and cut and cut and cut.

If I was going to give cutting budgets high marks, I would have to say the Republicans have done a great job because they have cut and they have cut and they have cut. So I don't see the purpose of across-the-board cuts being more effective than the cuts that are taking place now—if cuts are, indeed, effective. I think they are not. I think they hurt agencies. I think they hurt programs. I think they hurt the ability to propose changes and to make our economy grow.

But if you think that they are good, then just look at the percentage cuts that this committee has taken. Where else could we cut from? We have got agencies where we have practically destroyed their ability to do their work, and now we want an across-the-board cut. Across-the-board cuts simply sound good, but they don't propose anything.

What we need to do is really try to get back to regular order, to try to make the Appropriations Committee what it used to be, a committee that appropriated and not a committee that cuts. That is all we do now: we cut and we cut and we cut.

Somewhere along the line, it is going to hurt us because somewhere in this country, right now, in another time zone, there is a young man or young woman, or both, working with lab coats on, trying to find a cure for some disease, trying to deal with the Zika virus, and yet we keep cutting and cutting and cutting.

So across the board sounds good. Across the board is a big mistake. It should be defeated.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would remind my colleague across the aisle that it was individuals from his party over in the Senate that chose not to handle the Zika funding last week. That is very unfortunate. Zika is something that is going to be such a challenge for families and individuals during our time, and I find those actions to be most unfortunate.

Another thing that I would like to say, not to see the purpose in spending reductions, we have \$19 trillion worth of debt. If we are going to spend over \$3 trillion this year, you want to tell me that we don't need to be making some spending reductions?

There is \$21.7 billion worth of spending here, so the Appropriations Committee is appropriating money. Many times it is money we don't have. It is money taxpayers do not have in their pockets. And we have children and grandchildren today who are paying for programs that they do not want, programs that we do not need, that have outlived their usefulness, programs that could be more efficient with utilization of new technologies.

Should we be reducing what we spend and right-sizing government and getting Federal agencies off the back and out of the pocketbook of the American taxpayer? You better believe we ought

to be doing that. And if it means another penny out of a dollar, absolutely, absolutely, make another reduction.

Challenge employees to come to the table with their best ideas. It is the way Governors do it, the way mayors do it. It is the way this House should do it. I encourage support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, why not 2 percent? Why not 5 percent? Why not another 10 percent?

The point is, Mr. Chairman, this subcommittee has done its job. It has reduced spending, 6.5 percent cut. We take the IRS back to what they were funded in 2008. We have done our job, and good programs receive more money. We ought not to be cutting them.

So I appreciate her interest in controlling spending, and I guess she would compliment us for the work that we have done and, therefore, we don't need the amendment that she has offered. So I urge everyone to vote "no" and reject that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee will be postponed.

□ 0020

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. BUCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 23 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay the salary of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, during the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on January 20, 2017, at a rate of pay greater than a pro rated annual rate of pay of \$0.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is necessary because of the serious mistakes by the IRS.

The IRS targeted political groups just because they disagreed with the groups' political beliefs, a practice that is patently un-American. But the prob-

lems with the IRS didn't just stop with the discrimination. The IRS destroyed evidence that Congress requested, by subpoena, for a congressional investigation into the discrimination issue. This action was, at the very least, incompetent and unethical.

The IRS is out of control, a problem that ultimately rests with President Obama; but the President has been unwilling to work with Congress on this issue. Because of his unwillingness to address these serious ethical violations at the Nation's tax collection service, Congress must take immediate action to eliminate the position of IRS Commissioner. The Commissioner is appointed by the President and serves at the pleasure of the President. Unfortunately, we simply cannot trust anyone that President Obama appoints in that position.

Under this amendment, the salary for the IRS Commissioner will not be restored until January 20, 2017, when the next President can appoint a commissioner the American people can trust.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. It would cut the pay of the IRS Commissioner down to zero. I thought that this was what the Republicans wanted to do to the whole Federal budget, but I guess this is a start.

This is nothing more than a political cheap shot. I am sure there are those out there who think that Members of Congress should be paid nothing or next to nothing, and so this could start a trend.

Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to this amendment. I think people should realize that this is really the worst kind of statement possible.

How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RENACCI).

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Chairman, it is not too often I come to the floor to oppose an amendment, especially at this late hour; but when I was sworn in as a Member of Congress, I took an oath to defend and uphold the Constitution. I have grave concerns that this amendment is unconstitutional.

The U.S. Constitution expressly prohibits the Federal Government from enacting what are known as bills of attainder. A bill of attainder is a law that legislatively determines guilt and inflicts punishment upon an identifiable individual without provision of the protections of a judicial trial.

Courts use two main criteria to determine whether legislation is a bill of attainder: one, whether specific individuals are affected; and, two, whether legislation inflicts punishment.

Clearly, the specific prong is met here: this amendment punitively targets a specific individual—the IRS Commissioner. The Supreme Court has held that targeting specific employees for reduction in pay is punishment. Specifically, in *United States v. Lovett*, the Supreme Court held that a provision in an appropriations bill which cut off the pay of certain named government employees was punishment and struck down that provision as unconstitutional.

Under this precedent, punitively targeting the IRS Commissioner in an appropriations law by reducing his pay is an unconstitutional act.

Some might claim that because the IRS Commissioner is appointed, the precedent is somehow not applicable. To the contrary, in *Lovett*, the three government employees who had their pay cut were, in fact, political appointees.

Others might claim that because it names an office rather than an individual, it will somehow pass a constitutional test. This is a distinction without a difference. There is only one Commissioner of Internal Revenue. He is readily ascertainable.

My fellow colleagues, this is not about whether you believe the IRS Commissioner has done a good job or whether you believe he has committed an impeachable or censurable offense. This is a separate question, and this should be dealt with in a separate process.

This is not about defending the IRS Commissioner. This is about defending the United States Constitution. We should uphold our oaths, and we should defeat this amendment.

Mr. BUCK. May I inquire how much time do I have remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. BUCK. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Colorado. I just want to come here to praise what he is doing because I think this amendment is not only constitutional, I think it is common sense.

I would say that at three different levels. I would say first it is about accountability in government. One of the reasons that people back home have told me they like the Trump candidacy is because they believe he would actually fire people in Washington, D.C., something that doesn't ever seem to happen. Whether you like the Trump candidacy or not, this notion of something other than an endless trail of words being the only measure of accountability in Washington, D.C., is

something that, indeed, makes common sense to most regular folks that I talk to back at home.

Two, I think this is about common sense in affirming Congress' power of the purse. In fact, the only real power that Congress has is the power of the purse, not ultimately for the executive branch or the judicial branch to decide, but for Congress to decide what do we fund, when do we fund it, and how much do we fund it by?

Finally, this is about common sense in reasserting authority with regard to Article I, section 9, clause 7. People talk about too much in the way of executive overreach. They are weary of it.

What article I says there is that "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

What I think is interesting—with due respect to my colleague from the Midwest in what he just raised—is I am sure that he voted to defund Planned Parenthood, and I am sure he voted to defund ACORN. I have raised amendments that would, for instance, defund the Alaska regional commission where there is one employee.

Congress has that power to go out and say that this does or doesn't make sense, whether there are one, 50, or 500 employees at a given locality. If we lose that right, we lose real jurisdiction in moving forward within the three-branch system of government. So I think that this is both constitutional and common sense. I think it is important that we assert this authority.

I thank the gentleman for allowing me to speak on the amendment.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, despite what my colleague from Ohio contends, this amendment comports the ruling of the United States v. Lovett, a 1946 Supreme Court case dealing with a bill of attainder. The guidelines in Lovett, this amendment singles out no individuals, but, rather, attempts to restructure the managerial level of a government agency, a task well within Congress' power of the purse. This task is necessary because the position has proven especially wasteful over the past few years, failing to rein in abuse within the agency that led to congressional investigations.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I want to apologize to Mr. RENACCI for wrecking his name. It has happened to me a lot of times.

Secondly, I am not a lawyer, but what the gentleman said made a lot of sense to me. I wonder—I wonder—if what applies to us could, in front of some judge with some good lawyers around, also apply to this agency.

We can't raise or reduce our salary during one period or during one congressional period. We have to do it for the next Congress. We can't do it for ourselves. I wonder if someone could rule that you can't just lower the salary of the commissioner to zero during the term of that commissioner.

Now, here is the other thing. We know that the argument is being made that it is a reduction to the agency, to bring the director of the agency, whoever he is, to zero. But there is nobody silly enough here to think that it is not directed at one person, and that is really very silly to just direct at one person and to start this trend of having zero as a salary.

□ 0030

There is only one person in this country right now that is running for something that can afford not to get paid, and he will probably get paid.

I yield back the balance of my time.  
The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK).

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 24 will not be offered.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to use this time to engage in a colloquy with my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

Instead of moving forward with my amendment, as I had intended, that would enable our agriculture producers to sell products to Cuba on credit for the next fiscal year, we have agreed to work together and find a long-term solution that will work for our agriculture producers over time.

Until today, there seemed to be no path forward for an agreement, but I have gotten commitments from the leadership and my friends from Florida that there will be a proper path forward. We have agreed to find a solution that does a number of things:

Supports a long-term solution for our agriculture producers to sell commodities to Cuban buyers by eliminating restrictions in current law that weaken our producers' competitiveness;

Lists a number of the impediments, a cash restriction being one of those, a cash requirement for purchases;

Support for the thorough examination of the Cuban market potential for

agriculture producers through a deliberative process across each relevant committee of jurisdiction; and

Examines other long-term solutions that enable the United States to expand market access to the Cuban people.

At a time when net farm income has dropped by more than 55 percent, it is critical that we work together to find ways to make this work on a long-term basis because there is no easy fix. Our producers are ready to sell products to the 11 million people in Cuba that represent a market value in excess of \$1 billion a year.

I thank the hard work and efforts of the agriculture, business, humanitarian, and religious organizations in supporting this amendment. I look forward to working with my colleagues from Florida, the committee chairs, the leadership, and the Agriculture Committee on a solution we can all agree on.

Mr. CRENSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I understand how important this issue is for the gentleman from Arkansas and for his constituents and salute him for his efforts.

As we all know, our farmers are some of the most patriotic Americans. I believe we should do everything we can to help them sell American agricultural products throughout the world. But we cannot, at the same time, help a Communist regime that harbors and supports terrorists and fugitives from U.S. law, the largest confiscator of U.S. property in history, fails to pay its debt, is one of the worst violators of human rights and religious freedom in the Western Hemisphere, is a top counterintelligence threat to the United States and a threat to democracy in Latin America.

I commit to my friend that I will sit down with him, along with my colleagues Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. CURBELO, to come up with a solution that meets the needs of the farmers that we all represent but does not endanger our national security or support the Castro regime, its military, or intelligence services.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, add the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to change Selective Service System registration requirements in contravention of section 3 of the Military Selective Service Act (50 U.S.C. 3802).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman

from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Congress, in Article I, section 8 of the Constitution, has the power to raise and regulate armies. That relates to the Selective Service System. We have decided to use the Selective Service System to register men for the draft for many years now.

During the course of this year, there has been discussion here in Washington about requiring women to register for the draft. Many families back home aren't aware of this, and especially many young women aren't aware of this, Mr. Chairman.

I am asking that no funds from this appropriation be used for the Selective Service System to modify the current requirements. The purpose of that would be to let Congress do our job—to go back home and talk to our families and talk to our young women, listen to them, and come back here. If we are going to modify the Selective Service System, we do that with purpose and intent and we do that here in Congress. We don't let the administration or yet another executive agency decide something of their own accord or yet let the courts reach in.

We should be clear in our intent to the courts that we don't need them or want them to come in and decide the rule. It is ripe for that unless we act.

In *Rostker v. Goldberg* in 1981, the Supreme Court upheld that the Selective Service registration for men was, in fact, constitutional and not discriminatory, primarily because it was to register for combat. At that time, Congress had made it clear that women were not permitted to be in certain combat roles. Since 2013, that has no longer been the case, so it is ripe for the courts to reach in as well.

As Congress, we really need to act. My intent by asking that none of these funds be used by the Selective Service System to modify the current rule is that it would give us time to talk with our families, talk with young women, and then take a more considered action. It does not prevent anything that is being discussed in the Armed Services Committee or in our military, women being in any type of role. It doesn't take a position on any of that. It doesn't take a position on the future of the Selective Service. It just says let's not change it right now, and let's make sure that Congress takes action on it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, this may come to be known as the "just in

case bill" because it takes out something that doesn't exist anywhere in a House bill. That is why I am opposed to this amendment.

First, this is a policy issue that should be left to the Armed Services Committees.

As you know, the Senate version of the FY 2017 National Defense Authorization Act included a change to military policy that would, for the first time, require young women to register for the draft.

Defense Department leaders have already backed the idea of adding women to the draft, while emphasizing they do not see any scenario where a draft will actually happen.

For the RECORD, no Americans have been pressed into involuntary service since the last draft ended in 1973.

Furthermore, lawmakers have also included in the legislative language requiring a full review of the Selective Service System and possible "alternatives" to the current system.

I believe, since the Department of Defense lifted the ban on women in combat roles, every American who is physically qualified should register for the draft or we should do away with it.

I urge all Members to vote their beliefs on this issue. That is the proper way.

Republican leadership did not allow this to be a vote on the defense bill. Now Members have a chance to deal with this issue and be on the record if they support Selective Service allowing women to be part of the draft.

Now, we know that this is a touchy issue. We know that there are differing thoughts and this is very emotional, but some of us would say that this is a very fair issue. If we are going to register people, knowing there is no draft in place at this point, then let everyone be registered. And to suggest that there are young ladies who are out there afraid of what is going to happen to them, they are in the same situation as young men, and young men know that there is no draft.

□ 0040

I think this is something that is sort of a what-if situation. Just in case you are thinking of doing this, don't do it. I don't think we should legislate that way. If it reaches a point at which everybody has to sign up, then everybody will be doing his part for the country. I don't see a problem right now, and we shouldn't create a problem where a problem does not exist.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from New York rightly pointed out, the Selective Service is under review right now in terms of what we shall do with it. It is in the right place. It is here in Congress.

We should be doing that and not trusting the administration or the Selective Service System to come up with its own decrees. That is the concern, that there has been too much of that during the past 7-plus years and

that families aren't looking for yet another edict to be decreed from Washington, D.C., and to catch them off guard. As Members of Congress, we don't need to go back home and have families and young women ask us: Where were you on this? This does give us a chance to say here is where we are. This bill, frankly, buys us time to do a more considered action.

Why complicate things in the midst of further consideration by trusting the administration, which has not proven to be trustworthy on issuing rules and edicts, to stay the course with us? In fact, it is likely to not do that. The hope here is that we take the considered action that we will, and we should do that with the advice and consent of the well-informed public back home.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON).

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio will be postponed.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CRAWFORD) having assumed the chair, Mr. DONOVAN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5485) making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DELANEY (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and July 7 on account of death in family.

Mr. NADLER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of medical.

#### EXPENDITURES BY THE OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL UNDER HOUSE RESOLUTION 676, 113TH CONGRESS

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, July 6, 2016.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 3(b) of H. Res. 676 of the 113th Congress, as continued by section 3(f)(2) of H. Res. 5 of the 114th Congress, I write with the following enclosure which is a statement of the aggregate amount expended on outside counsel