



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 7, 2016

No. 109

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 7, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DANIEL WEBSTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2016, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

CLIMATE CHANGE AND WATER

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to climate change, the data is in and the science clear: Our world is shifting. Sea levels are rising. Glaciers are shrinking. Oceans are becoming more acidic.

What is more? The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change is 95 percent certain that humans are causing the current climate change trend. To sit here and deny the science simply because it inconveniences us does nothing

but cause greater harm for our planet and future generations. Each day that passes without action on climate change is another day we are wreaking havoc on our world.

I think President Obama said it best when he stated: "If anybody still wants to dispute the science around climate change, have at it. You'll be pretty lonely, because you'll be debating our military, most of America's business leaders, the majority of the American people, almost the entire scientific community, and 200 nations around the world who agree it's a problem and intend to solve it."

It is hard to believe that some of my colleagues are so determined to deny climate science that they are willing to sacrifice the health and safety of Americans.

Nowhere is the sacrifice more evident than in our waterways. We use water for everything, from drinking and bathing to growing crops, shipping goods, generating electricity, and recreation. But climate change is creating profound changes to this precious commodity, threatening water availability, access, and quality.

Many areas of the United States, especially in the West, currently face devastating water supply issues. The amount of water available in these areas is already limited, and our demand will continue to rise as the population grows.

One of the greatest examples of this is the Colorado River system, a major source of water supply for the Southwest. In recent decades, water flow through this important river system has been lighter than expected given annual rain and snowfall rates. Not surprisingly, studies show that rising temperatures and climate change are the cause of this decreased water flow.

As greenhouse gas pollution continues to pile up, it traps more heat, continually raising global temperatures, and parches the Colorado River

watershed. Researchers expect that for every degree of Celsius of global warming, the amount of water that gets evaporated and sucked up by plants from the Colorado River could increase 2 or 3 percent. With 4.5 million acres of farmland irrigated using the Colorado River water and with nearly 40 million residents depending on it, the incremental losses that are predicted will have a devastating impact.

As the West continues to experience less rain and an increase in the severity and length of droughts, greater impacts on drinking water supplies are projected.

Unfortunately, it is not just the western U.S. that is in danger. In my own region, the Great Lakes are under threat as they are warming at rates faster than the world's oceans. It is expected that the Great Lakes region will grow warmer and probably dryer during the 21st century, with temperatures in the region warming anywhere from 5 to 12 degrees Fahrenheit.

The impact climate change has on the five lakes will have serious implications for aquatic life, as well as high economic costs for our communities.

Several different climate models for the Great Lakes region all predict that lake levels will decline over the next century. Within another 30 years, Lake Superior may be mostly ice free in a typical winter and has already experienced increased water temperatures. Lake Erie water levels, already below average, could drop 4 to 5 feet by the end of this century, significantly altering shoreline habitat.

We are at the tipping point, and instead of addressing the root of the issue, climate change, my colleagues continue to deny the science.

Our waterways are national treasures. They serve as the backbone for our health, economy, ecosystems, and recreation. We cannot simply stand by while the course of the world is altered.

The science is clear, the data is pointing us in one direction: Now is the

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H4471

time to act on climate change. We are not given a planet with unlimited resources. It is our job to protect our waters and the people that rely on them, and that begins with finding real solutions to our climate crisis.

STOP SPENDING BILLIONS IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am on the floor again today with a prophetic political cartoon. In the cartoon, Uncle Sam is in a wheelchair, and he is at the edge of a cliff that is known as the fiscal cliff. Then, he has President Obama pushing him in the wheelchair; and then the donkey, representing the Democratic Party, is pushing Mr. Obama. And then the elephant, representing the Republican Party, is pushing the donkey and President Obama to push Uncle Sam off the cliff.

What is ironic is that Uncle Sam is yelling like he is excited: "I can see Greece from here." Well, we know what has happened to the economy of Greece. It is in total collapse.

Mr. Speaker, we are \$19.2 trillion in debt. I was here in the year 2000 when Bill Clinton left office. We were the majority in the House and the Senate. We were headed for a surplus. The debt in 2000 was \$5.6 trillion. Now we are here 16 years later and it is \$19.2 trillion.

The reason I bring this up is because we have an opportunity to stop spending billions and billions of dollars in Afghanistan. It is nothing but a waste. It is a waste of our young men and women in uniform. It is a waste of the taxpayers' money.

Recently, in an article in The Washington Post titled "Former Afghan Leader Karzai: Military Action Cannot Resolve Conflict in Afghanistan," the former President of Afghanistan, Hamid Karzai, told The Washington Post recently that he doesn't think a military effort will bring peace to Afghanistan. He said: "We did it for the last 14 years and it didn't bring us that, so how do we know . . . military action will bring us that now?"

We are going on 15 years of being in that country—and the waste, fraud, and abuse in Afghanistan is worse now than it has ever been.

I think about the needs of our veterans, I think about the needs of our children, I think about the needs of our senior citizens, and so many other needs. We passed a bill yesterday to help with the mental health issues of America, yet it is not funded. But, yes, we will find the money to fund Afghanistan so we can continue to waste and spend the taxpayers' money and get nothing for it. It is just absolutely ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker, I voted against the Department of Defense bill last week simply because there is another \$43 billion

in there going to Afghanistan. This is OCO funds, it is slush funds, and it can't even be accounted for.

The taxpayers are frustrated with both parties and fed up because we are not doing our jobs. We are not doing what is necessary. We ought to be debating Afghanistan on the floor of the House and we ought to be saying, "Is it worth it or is it not worth it," and have an up-or-down vote. No, we just let it continue to go down this road with no end to it.

Mr. Speaker, I close this way, because to me this tells you more about Afghanistan than anything I could say today. Afghanistan is known as the graveyard of empires. Well, I know one empire that is headed for the graveyard, and it happens to be the United States of America. And if we continue to fund and waste the taxpayers' money in Afghanistan, then I hope that graveyard will have a headstone, and it will one day, that says "USA," because we will be in the graveyard of Afghanistan.

GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a vice chair of the House Gun Violence Prevention Task Force and in solidarity with the majority of Americans who are demanding that Congress take meaningful action to prevent gun violence.

We all know the statistics. Whether it is through mass shootings that make the headlines or the unseen violence that happens daily on our streets, gun violence takes the lives of more than 30,000 of our Nation's citizens each year, a number that far exceeds other industrial countries.

Now, all these countries have their share of violent extremists and madmen, but only our country gives easy access to weapons of mass killing. And that makes all the difference for America.

Rather than seeking out commonsense solutions to address this crisis, the Republican majority continues to cower to the gun lobby and the firearms manufacturers. Now they plead the Second Amendment, but Constitutional Law 101 would tell us that all of our rights, including the precious freedoms of religion and speech, must be balanced to protect innocent third parties and to protect the safety of the wider community.

One commonsense measure we should all agree on is background checks to keep guns out of the hands of criminals, domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill. You can't shout "fire" in a crowded theater because of your freedom of speech, and neither should you be able to buy a weapon if you have a history of violence and criminality.

In fact, almost 90 percent of Americans, including the majority of gun

owners, support universal background checks for all gun purchases. The problem is that our present background check system is rife with loopholes. Background checks are not required for private sales at gun shows. They are also not required for Internet sales.

Bipartisan legislation has been introduced by Representatives PETER KING and MIKE THOMPSON that would finally close this egregious loophole. It is an entirely sensible reform that would have a measurable impact on the safety of our schools, homes, and neighborhoods, without preventing law-abiding citizens from using guns for self-defense or recreational purposes.

Despite attracting 186 cosponsors, including several Republicans, the background check legislation has never been brought to the floor or even received a hearing in committee. It has been languishing for more than 15 months. Meanwhile, the shootings and the suicides and the massacres continue to accumulate.

My colleagues, we must do better. Our fellow citizens are totally fed up, both with the unspeakable killing and suffering and with a feckless Congress that hasn't lifted a finger to prevent it.

Now, this week, after intense public criticism and a historic protest by Democrats on the House floor, Republicans seemed for a while to be willing to hold a vote on legislation they claim would prevent suspected terrorists from purchasing firearms. After all, nearly 2,500 individuals on the terrorist watch list have successfully purchased weapons in this country.

But rather than embrace existing bipartisan legislation to actually fix the problem, Republicans put forth a woefully inadequate proposal that would require law enforcement and courts to grapple with unworkable processes, unreachable standards, to be completed in an unreasonably short period of time.

Their bill would allow suspected terrorists to receive firearms by default after only 3 days if the court is unable to work through a complicated process. That is the same flaw that allowed the White supremacist Charleston shooter to obtain the weapon that he used to murder nine people at Emanuel AME Church.

In other words, the bill is totally inadequate. Now, under pressure from their most extreme Members, Republican leaders refuse to even put this bill on the floor.

What should be on the floor is bipartisan legislation, H.R. 1076, that would permit the Attorney General to block gun sales to suspected terrorists. This legislation, based on a proposal from the Bush Justice Department, would still allow individuals to challenge the government in court to restore their gun ownership rights.

We don't have to choose between protecting our communities and respecting due process.

□ 1015

And so, Mr. Speaker, we ask our colleagues how much longer must we

wait? How many more people have to die to move us to act? How many more American towns and cities must be added to the constantly growing list of places like Orlando and Columbine and Aurora and Charleston and Newtown?

Moments of silence aren't enough. Thoughts and prayers are not enough. In fact, the Scriptures teach us that such pieties give grave offense when they mask a refusal to do what we know is right. We need action. I call on my colleagues to bring these common-sense proposals to the floor for a vote.

ONGOING PEACE PROCESS IN COLOMBIA

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud and encourage the ongoing peace process in Colombia.

Over the last 52 years, Colombia has witnessed an armed conflict between the government and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, or FARC. The conflict has taken a serious toll on the country: 220,000 people have been killed and more than 6.8 million people have been forced from their homes. The fighting has been especially difficult for the rural areas of the country.

But a new day is on the horizon for the people of Colombia. The country is on the verge of a historic peace agreement with the FARC. In fact, the government and the FARC signed a ceasefire agreement on June 23. This was seen as one of the few remaining roadblocks to a final peace agreement.

With all that is going on in the world today, it would be easy to miss the important progress taking place in Colombia. The peace process isn't garnering the media attention that some other foreign affairs are, but it is going to have just as important an impact on global affairs.

Last year, I had the opportunity to travel to Colombia with the Committee on Armed Services and my colleague from Arizona, Mr. GALLEGRO, whose mother is from Colombia. It didn't take long for me to realize that Colombia is a beautiful and fascinating country, and I was very impressed with the hospitality of the Colombian people. It also became clear during my trip that the majority of Colombian people want things to be better in their country, and they are committed to the peace process.

Mr. Speaker, Colombia is our closest and strongest ally in Latin America, so the peace process is very important not only to Colombia, but also to the United States. Their future opportunities are also ours.

Colombia has a growing economy with immense potential based on their abundant natural resources and a culture that values hard work. A more stable Colombia will allow the country to further expand their economy, which would be a benefit to us right here at home.

At a time when there are so many foreign policy challenges around the globe, Colombia is a rare success story. The country was literally on the verge of becoming a failed state, but now they are a leader in the region. The United States maintains significant bilateral relations and has provided important diplomatic assistance to the Colombian Government, but we have done so without becoming overly involved in their local affairs.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize my strong support for the Colombian peace process, and I call on every Member of this House to also lend their support to that process. We need to encourage our neighbors in South America. I want to commend President Santos for his leadership and his commitment to a lasting peace.

I also want to highlight the important work of Ambassador Pinzón. I appreciate his friendship, and I applaud his work to strengthen the partnership between the United States and Colombia.

Ultimately, only the people of Colombia can reach the lasting peace agreement that restores justice and order to their country, but the United States can—and I believe we must—stand ready to assist the Colombian Government as they finalize this process and then as they move their country out of conflict and into a period of stability and lasting peace.

ANOTHER AMERICAN SHOT DOWN BY THE POLICE

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I had planned to talk about something else this morning, but the events of the last 12 hours changed my plans.

I watched this morning on TV and online—like a lot of Americans—another of our fellow Americans shot down by the police. This time it was in St. Paul, Minnesota. Earlier this week, it was in Baton Rouge. But we know it is everywhere—in Chicago, in Baltimore, in South Carolina.

It seems that every week or month another Black man is shot by the police, and we always have the same reaction: Oh, it is a tragedy; there should be an investigation. A lawsuit is filed, and another settlement. Oh, the Justice Department and the FBI need to oversee the investigation because we cannot trust the police to police themselves. And then we go back to business as usual, and nobody actually does anything.

State by State, city by city, and county by county, we might make this reform or that reform, but there is no national strategy to stop police from killing people, especially Black people, especially Black men.

I wept this morning as I watched the mother of Philando Castile describe her son. She said he had a job, he served children in the cafeteria, and

that he was a calm young man. She also said that he was not a thug.

Why does a Black woman in the 21st century in the United States of America, while a Black man sits in the Oval Office, almost 50 years after Martin Luther King, Jr., was gunned down, why does she have to start her description of her son with "He was not a thug"? She said: "We are being hunted."

Mr. Speaker, this is another sad chapter in American history.

I do not feel compelled to say in describing my grandson Luisito: Well, first and foremost, he is not a gang banger, he is not a thug. But for this Black mother and for a lot of African American mothers in this country, that is something they feel a necessity to say.

This mother did everything right. Her son was still shot dead by the police. This young man was riding in the passenger seat of a car with his fiancée and 4-year-old little daughter in the backseat.

He had a permit to carry a weapon, which he announced to the police. So he had gone through the background check, gone through the training, and had the concealed carry permit. But he was shot dead in front of his loved ones, his fiancée and daughter.

Why is it in 21st century America we have to have a conversation about how to avoid being shot by the police? Why do I have to instruct my grandson about deescalation if he comes in contact with the police, about strategies to prevent a sworn public servant, an officer of the court, a trained member of law enforcement, and I have to instruct my teenage grandson how to prevent that person from shooting him to death for no reason? Why, Mr. Speaker?

We have no national strategy, no national conversation. When Americans are literally crying out in the streets that, yes, Black lives matter, we have no response from the Congress, the people's House. None.

The head of the FBI announces he won't press charges against a candidate in the Democratic Party. Stop everything; we need to have hearings, congressional hearings. Benghazi, let's spend millions on hearings, political hearings. Planned Parenthood, let's form a special committee to do what the majority party feels is important from their political point of view.

But a young Black man is shot by police in his car in cold blood? Nothing. Young men are shot by police, videotapes are withheld from the public, and nothing happens.

Mr. Speaker, I think Black lives matter. I think the lives of young men in inner cities across this country matter. And I think this Congress should be the place where America comes together to decide what we are going to do about young Black men getting shot by the police. Not next week, when it is going to happen again. Not next month, when it is going to happen again. Not waiting safely until after the election,

when it happens again, again, and again.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress needs to come together and lead, and we need to start right now.

RESTORING ACCESS TO MEDICATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Restoring Access to Medication Act, introduced by my good friend and colleague, Congresswoman LYNN JENKINS.

Mr. Speaker, for far too long, Missouri families have suffered from the never-ending financial burdens and health consequences imposed by the Affordable Care Act. From limited access to physicians to skyrocketing premiums, ObamaCare has failed our country and our people.

For years, Missouri families have used health savings accounts and flexible spending accounts as an important tool to save and help pay their medical expenses, including over-the-counter drugs. In the United States, more than 20 million individuals and families have taken advantage of HSAs and FSAs. They have counted on them to help protect against unexpected healthcare expenses and better plan for medical costs throughout the year.

Under ObamaCare, the administration did its best to get rid of these HSAs and FSAs by limiting the amount of savings people could contribute to them and how that money could be used. They even mandate that funds in HSAs and FSAs cannot be used to purchase over-the-counter medications without a prescription from a physician. Simply put, this administration added yet another layer of "Washington knows best" red tape to how to spend your money and how to manage your health care.

As a mother of three, I remember sick children, cold and flu seasons, and late-night runs to the drugstore for cough syrup and fever reducers. I know that these unexpected expenses directly impact families that are fighting to make ends meet. Adding another doctor's visit just so you can use your already saved money to purchase over-the-counter medications is unfair, it is wrong, and it is downright senseless.

The Restoring Access to Medication Act will repeal this portion of the law that unfairly targets pocketbooks and reduces access to everyday medications like aspirin and allergy relief. This legislation will put Americans back in the driver's seat, restoring control of the family's day-to-day health expenses and needs.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to this legislation increasing access to over-the-counter medications that families need, it allows Americans to, most importantly, increase the amount of money they contribute to their health savings accounts. While doubling the

amount both individuals and families can contribute to their accounts in 2017, this new law will also have a net decrease of \$2.2 billion for our Federal budget over the fiscal years 2016 through 2026.

Mr. Speaker, I am thrilled that the House has passed this bipartisan, commonsense legislation which places the healthcare needs of families above the liberal interests of bureaucrats in Washington. It will save families money and put them further in control of their healthcare decisions, something the ever-failing Affordable Care Act will never do.

HISTORY OF THE ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, during my 28 years representing Seattle in the Congress, there have, unfortunately, been several mass shootings in my district, including one in 2006 at the Jewish Community Center and another one in 2014 at Seattle Pacific University. I know the pain and the frustration that members of the delegation from central Florida are feeling 3 weeks after the shooting in Orlando.

As a psychiatrist, I know and understand the trauma that these types of violent events inflict on individuals and communities. As someone who was around Congress in 1994 when the first assault weapons ban was passed, and in 2004 when it expired without action, I thought it would be useful to talk for a few minutes today about the history of that ban and how Congress capitulated to the gun lobby and allowed weapons designed for killing to flood our communities.

Congress began consideration of an assault weapons ban after two mass shootings in California. In January, in 1989, a disturbed man with a long criminal history walked into the Cleveland Elementary School in Stockton, California, and fired 106 rounds in 3 minutes from his semiautomatic rifle, killing 5 children and wounding 32. Nothing happened. It is no surprise that we have the same thing happen in Connecticut and nothing happens.

Four years later, in 1993, a failed businessman opened fire in the Pettit & Martin law firm in San Francisco with a pair of semiautomatic pistols, shooting hollow point ammunition.

□ 1030

The predictable public outcry and strong support for an assault weapons ban following these shootings led Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN to put forward legislation that would ban semiautomatic weapons. In an unprecedented show of bipartisan support, former Presidents Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan, and Gerald Ford joined together to publicly urge Congress to "listen to the American public and to

the law enforcement community and support a ban on the further manufacture of these weapons."

A ban on assault weapons eventually passed the Congress in 1994 as a part of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act. However, in order to get that legislation through the House, a costly consensus was made to gun rights supporters and the NRA that allowed the ban to sunset or expire after 10 years. So, despite the importance of the assault weapon ban, it was allowed to expire.

From 2003–2008, Senator FEINSTEIN led numerous efforts to reauthorize the ban, but not a single bill left her committee. We had the same here in the House. Carolyn McCarthy made the plea over and over again. Her husband and son died on a Long Island Railroad train from a guy who came into the train and shot up the aisle and killed them. One hundred four people were gunned down during this time period in mass shootings, and all Congress did was to send a message that weapons designed for use in the theater of war were acceptable for use on our streets.

While I certainly do not want to minimize the loss of lives, I find it important to point out that Congress felt compelled to act on an assault weapons ban in 1994, following two shootings that killed a combined total of 13 people. For some reason, this body can't seem to summon the courage to act after 27 are killed in Connecticut, 24 in San Bernardino, 9 in Oregon, 12 in Colorado, and 49 in Orlando. And I could go on and on and on for my entire speech.

The question you have to ask is: Have we become so numb to the pain of mass shootings that, no matter how many innocent people are gunned down, we won't find the will to act? Has the NRA desensitized my Republican colleagues so much that the slaughter of children in a kindergarten doesn't even result in a single vote on the floor, a denial to bring the issue out here and debate it in public?

What is the price that the American people must pay before Republicans quit this obstruction? 100 killed? 200? Fifty doesn't seem to hit threshold.

I understand reinstating the assault weapons ban will be tough, but, Mr. Speaker, we must have that debate if we are going to have a society in which we all feel safe.

BRING THE BILLS FOR A VOTE

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

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I don't like being here. I had meetings I had to cancel. I had phone calls I had to put off. But I am committed to doing everything I can to get two votes on the floor—just two. They are simple issues: no fly, no buy, and closing the gaping loopholes in background checks for the purchase of a gun. That shouldn't be a

problem. I don't know anybody who opposes those items.

We can't get a bill on the floor because the Republican majority is afraid of their own position. They are scared to let the American people know where they stand on these issues.

Just yesterday, we had to use a legislative gimmick called a motion to recommit, which nobody in America understands—I didn't understand it before I got here—but it was the only way we could get the issue on the floor. And even then, when Mr. THOMPSON offered it, it was ruled out of order.

Through machinations of rule on rule on rule, we weren't even allowed to vote on that. The item was ruled non-germane and a motion was made to lay it on the table. The only vote we got was to overrule the ruling of the Republican chair to lay it on the table.

The people who voted to lay it on the table yesterday voted to allow terrorists to buy weapons. The people who voted to lay it on the table yesterday voted to allow criminals and terrorists to continue to buy guns under our current gaps in the background check law. That is what that vote was.

Now, I know no Republican who voted that way will go home and explain it to their constituents. They will say: Oh, no, it was just a procedural motion. And many of them will probably get away with it. That is a shame.

What I don't understand is why people claim this is somehow against due process—and, by the way, the bills have due process in them; written by a Republican during a Republican Presidential administration—when there is plenty of due process. If anybody wants to add more, we will add more.

No one was concerned about due process when they voted for the PATRIOT Act that allowed the NSA to listen to everybody's cell phone conversations. No one was caring about due process when Americans grabbed people from around the world and kept them under lock and key for as long as we want. But now we are concerned about it. God forbid we offer an amendment to deal with their concerns.

All I want is a vote. All I want is Members of this body to have the courage of their convictions. If you think those bills are bad, bring them to the floor and vote "no" and go home and explain it to your constituents. I do it all the time. That is why I came here. I thought that is what we did.

We are not supposed to be the people who hide. We are supposed to be leaders. Lead. Don't cower in fear behind political nonsense and gimmickry because you haven't got the courage of your convictions.

This issue will not go away. The American people are tired—and have been for a long time—of politicians who refuse to stand up and be counted for their principles.

We don't mind disagreements. I don't mind losing on an issue here and there. I do mind not being given the opportunity to debate and vote on the im-

portant issues of the day, issues that everybody in America wants. Mr. Speaker, that is why I am here.

We will debate the merits another time—if we are lucky—but it will not go away, and you cannot hide from your refusal to allow a vote on these two simple, commonsense proposals.

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the outstanding comments of my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO). I couldn't agree with him more.

I am, proudly, a member and co-chair of our task force against gun violence. I proudly support every American's right to own a firearm. I believe as strongly as anyone in this room that all we are trying to do here is get a vote, a simple vote—let the votes fall where they may—a simple vote on closing loopholes as they relate to background checks and making sure terrorists can't buy guns if they can't even fly.

Now, over the last many months, I have spent many 5-minute talks about all those who have died because of mass shootings in this country. I have a memorial wall outside my office that is filling up quite quickly with all the lives that have been lost because of mass shootings.

During our sit-in on the House floor last week, we read the names of those in Orlando who were victims. Today, I am going to remember the 54 other victims last month in 51 other mass shootings that took place in the month of June. Even excluding Orlando, so many people last month were affected by mass shootings that I don't have time within my 5 minutes to list those who were injured but survived.

Here are those who died in mass shootings in June that were not victims in Orlando:

Devonne Burton, 28; Sean Pointe, 27; and Derrius Woods, 27; were killed on June 4 in Denver, Colorado.

Brian Harris, 44, and Robert Sykes, also 44, were killed when a gunman opened fire in a motel on June 5 in Phoenix, Arizona.

Jeremy Taylor, 54, and Sean Strickland, 26, were killed when a gunman opened fire in a convenience store on June 7 in Cape Coral, Florida.

Raekwon Brown, 17, was killed outside a school on June 8 in Dorchester, Massachusetts.

Adrian Potts, 20, was killed outside of a university apartment complex on June 11 in Charlotte, North Carolina.

Stephanie Gonzalez, 17, and her sister, Kimberly Gonzalez, 13, were killed by their mother's ex-boyfriend on June 11 in Los Angeles, California. The shooter also wounded their mother and brother.

Cynthia Villegas, 34, and her daughters, Yamilen, 14, Cynthia Janeth, 11,

Abby, 7, and Ida, 3, were killed by their husband and father on June 11 in Roswell, New Mexico.

An unidentified 30-year-old man was killed outside an ice skating park on June 11 in Stockton, California.

Reggina Jefferies, 16, was killed as she was attending a memorial service on June 14 in Oakland, California. She had just performed a praise dance honoring two boys who drowned.

Robert Marto, 54, and Jason Moore, 41, were killed outside of a bar on June 18 in Warren, Ohio.

Cameron Wilkins, 21, and Felicia Williams, 32, were killed in a housing complex on June 18 in Waycross, Georgia. Cameron had seven children.

Ronald Graves, 30, was killed in a house on June 19 in Exmore, Virginia.

Gary Porter, 41, was killed at a party on June 19 in Syracuse, New York. He had four children.

Monte Compton, 24, and his cousin, Donte Jefferson, 29, were killed on June 21 in Louisville, Kentucky.

Gerald Berkey, 36, Jackson Edens, 28, and Terron McGrath, 31, were killed in a trailer on June 22 in Lacey, Washington. Terron leaves behind two daughters, 8 and 12.

An unidentified man was killed on June 22 in DeKalb County, Georgia.

Carlina Renee Gray, 50, Jan Marie Parks, 55, and Allen Rowlett, 60, were killed on June 24 in District Heights, Maryland.

Treavon Lewis, 22, and Jordan Larkin, 18, were killed at a dance club on June 25 in Fort Worth, Texas.

Fernando Wingfield, 44, was killed outside a bar on June 26 in Atlanta, Georgia.

An unidentified man was killed on June 26 near a pool in Houston, Texas.

Ruben Rigoberto-Reyes, 60, Edmundo Amaro-Bajonero, 26, and Katie Gildersleeve, 30, were killed on June 27 on a blueberry farm in Woodburn, Oregon.

Phoukeo Dej-Oudom, 35, and her children, Dalavanh, 15, Xonajuk, 14, and Anhurak, 9, were killed by their husband and father on June 29 in Las Vegas, Nevada.

Chanda Foreman, 37, was killed while sitting in her car on June 30, in Chicago, Illinois. It was her birthday and she was going out to celebrate.

This carnage must end. Just give us a vote on two modest bills to help stem the bloodshed.

A MESSAGE 68 YEARS IN THE MAKING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I love my country. No one says the Pledge of Allegiance with greater enthusiasm than I. No one sings "God Bless America" with more love for country than I.

□ 1045

Mr. Speaker, I consider it a pre-eminent privilege to stand in the well

of the Congress of the United States of America to address some of the great issues of our time.

Mr. Speaker, the message that I deliver today has been 68 years in the making. The message that I deliver today had its genesis with my mother, who cautioned me that I must behave a certain way in the presence of the constabulary, the police; a mother who was concerned for her son, who always made it very clear to me that I had to say yes, sir and no, sir, and that I had to always accept whatever the police said to me.

This message is 68-plus years in the making, Mr. Speaker. The message is, in part, based upon what my uncle, who was a deputy sheriff, shared with me about my behavior in the presence of the police; that I must always, always yield to the police; submit to the police; never challenge the police. Sixty-eight years in the making, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my heart is heavy after what has happened over the last 2 days to Black men in the United States of America. My heart is heavy. I had the unfortunate circumstance of seeing what happened to that man in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, on the ground with his hands flailing, blood flowing from his chest.

I heard the young lady this morning pleading to God: Jesus, God, don't let him be dead. Maybe not her exact words, but very much what she said: Don't let him be dead; don't let this happen.

Mr. Speaker, we have to do something about the killing of Black men at the hands of the constabulary in this country. If you don't want to investigate the police, if you don't want to investigate the system, the culture that causes it, investigate Black men. Find out why they want to run out in front of bullets.

Let's find out why they are the ones who are consistently, and with some degree of systemic order, forcing themselves upon the police such that they find themselves dead. Investigate us.

I am a Black man in the United States of America. I have lived what I am saying. Sixty-eight years in the making, that is how long this speech has been made. I don't need a written piece of paper. I know what is going on. I was a judge for 26 years. I saw it. I can give firsthand testimony about what is going on. It is time for us to investigate what is happening to Black men in this country.

Black lives do matter. These people are trying to tell us something, these young people. We must listen to them. Let us not ignore what is going on. The camera's eye doesn't lie. If you look at these videos and you use your common sense, you know that there is something going on, and we need to investigate it.

And it is pervasive, it is not just one-off circumstances that we are having to contend with. These things are happening across the length and breadth of

this country. Every venue has some account that can be called to our attention. It is time for us to do something.

Mr. Speaker, I call on you. Mr. Speaker, you are the Speaker of the whole House. Mr. Speaker, I call on you to assemble the House so that we can address the issue of Black men dying at the hands of police in this country. And we ought to investigate it to the extent that we come to conclusions about the people that are involved in these tragedies. We should not have to have another mother to have her child in the car, 4 years of age, when her boyfriend is killed.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time, and I thank God for giving me 68 years to develop this message. And I pray, Mr. Speaker, that you will do something about what is happening to Black men in this country.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE CHANHASSEN HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS SOFTBALL TEAM

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Chanhassen High School girls softball team on their State championship.

After finishing their regular season with a record of 17-3, and in second place in the West Metro Conference standings, the third-seeded Storm went on to win four games straight to win the Section 2 championship. And then, as Section 2 representatives in the State tournament, the Storm won over Forest Lake, Hopkins, and Buffalo, outscoring their opponents 19-5 on their way to the championship.

Mr. Speaker, it is accomplishments such as these that are a testament to the skills and the values that all high school athletics teach, and these young ladies demonstrated determination and toughness on the field as well as drive and responsibility in the classroom.

Balancing schoolwork and athletics can be challenging, but these student athletes proved themselves to be both leaders on the diamond and in the classroom. The families, teachers, friends, and our entire community are very proud of these young ladies. I congratulate the Chanhassen High School softball team on their win.

LIFE AS A BLACK MAN IN AMERICA

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, my topic today was going to be on the issue of gun violence, mass shootings, the need for Congress to take some action to keep America safe, the fact that 90 percent of the people of this country want Congress to take some action. I was going to speak about that today.

But I would be remiss, as a Black man in America, to pass up the opportunity to comment about life as a Black man in America, in an urban setting, particularly when it comes to police community relations, you see, because we live in a gun culture, and nowadays, everybody has a gun.

Some folks have a culture of growing up shooting, hunting. Nothing wrong with that. Take the kids to the gun show, the family, on a Saturday afternoon. And at the gun show there is a bunch of unlicensed gun dealers there selling weapons of mass destruction to any and everybody. That is a part of the culture because everybody wants a gun.

Well, it is time for universal background checks. That is a simple piece of legislation, closing the gun show loophole, which that loophole is bigger than the Goodyear Blimp traveling sideways. That loophole is so big that you could fit the Goodyear Blimp through it sideways, and it is worth nothing because unlicensed gun dealers can sell guns to any and everybody. Any and everybody can purchase a gun over the Internet, no background check required. We need to close that gun show loophole by passing legislation that enforces the notion that there will be universal background checks.

I wanted to talk about that today, and I still think that is important. But even if we have universal background checks in this country, there is still a problem for Black folks who decide to arm themselves.

I mean, we had the case of Philando Castile in Falcon Heights, Minnesota, yesterday, pulled over for a busted taillight. Here is a working man in the car with his girlfriend and her 4-year-old daughter, and he is armed, as everyone else in America is. But he is a Black man riding in the streets of a city in America, and so he must not be allowed to have that gun or, at least, if he has one, everybody is in such fear that they develop a trigger finger. And when he reaches for his license, then he gets blasted four times and his life is snuffed out. That is what happens to Black folks in America.

Now we find out that the man had a valid license to carry that firearm. In many States now, due to what the NRA lobby has done, you don't even need a license to carry the firearm in your car. So the man was acting lawfully. He gets blasted. He is no longer with us.

The day before, Alton Sterling got a little hustle going on. He is selling CDs at the store, at the corner store. Why shouldn't he be allowed to have a weapon? He has got a weapon in his pocket. Everybody else has got a weapon in their pocket. But no, he is a Black guy, and so we automatically develop a trigger finger when the police approach. Take him down hard, two on one, throwing him all across the car. You saw the video.

If the man had wanted to shoot, he would have pulled the gun out much

quicker than when they threw him across the car and had him on the ground pinned to the ground. And he ends up getting shot in the back and in the chest.

This is life in America. This is our culture of gun violence that this Congress has allowed to manifest itself in this way.

We shouldn't have to live like this. Nobody should have to live like this. People walking around afraid of what their neighbor is going to do to them because they know that he has got a mental problem and he should not have a weapon, but he was able to get it over the Internet or through the gun show, unlicensed firearm dealers.

So weapons have proliferated into our society. We are now at war, not with a foreign enemy, but with ourselves, with our neighbor. It is not fair to any of us.

But I tell you, when America coughs, Black folks have always gotten pneumonia. Nowadays, when America coughs, Black folks die, and it really has to stop, ladies and gentlemen. This is not the way that we should live.

A CALL FOR MEANINGFUL ACTION ON GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call for meaningful action on gun violence. The key word in that sentence is "meaningful."

The tragedy in Orlando served as a dark wake-up call to all Americans. Across the Nation, in every major city, to every small town, Americans are speaking with one voice saying: "Enough is enough."

The American people are demanding a no fly, no buy bill that prevents those on the terror watch list from purchasing firearms.

How have Republicans responded?

They have put together a weak, unworkable, and convoluted bill that will not address the real problem.

Imagine, under this legislation, law enforcement must convince a court within 72 hours that the buyer "has committed or will commit an act of terrorism" before it could block a gun sale.

Is this your idea of homeland security? Really? Is this how you protect the homeland?

Mr. Speaker, the standard is simply unreachable and unworkable. Now, one has to wonder where Republicans got such an unfeasible idea.

□ 1100

The answer is as simple as it is sad. The NRA, which represents large weapon manufacturers, wrote this legislation. We need a real, effective no fly, no buy bill that stops those on the terrorist watch list from purchasing firearms. The Republican legislation is simply a giveaway to the NRA that

will hobble law enforcement. We also need a system of effective, universal background checks that keeps guns out of the hands of those who would do us harm.

Once again, House Republicans are standing in the way. They are preventing consideration of this measure that is supported by 90 percent of the American people. Why? Just to keep their friends in the NRA lobby happy with them. Why? Follow the money.

Mr. Speaker, this is unconscionable. The week after the Orlando slaughter, I read on this floor the names of the victims. At that time, I said that while we will never forget them, their memory will inspire us to real change. But this is not real change. We do not honor the victims of Orlando by passing legislation written by the NRA and gun manufacturing lobbyists. In fact, if anything, this legislation is an insult to the intelligence of the American people. Well, I have news for you. The American people see through this, and they are not buying it.

I urge my colleagues: do what is right. Reject this unworkable NRA-backed trick so that we can vote on real, meaningful legislation to address gun violence in this country.

GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, I joined with my colleagues here in the House of Representatives, and we took an extraordinary action. We sat in, we rallied, we challenged the Republican leadership, and we spoke out about gun violence in a way that we had never done before.

We said to the leadership: Enough is enough; we have got to do something about these mass murders; we have got to do something about these guns.

We challenged the leadership because we all know that the gun lobby has too much influence and too much control in this House. We also know that too many of our Members will not confront this issue on the opposite side of the aisle because, as it has been said, they are the handmaidens of the NRA. So we gathered, we spoke out, and we were talking about two simple bills that we wanted them to vote for.

We are trying to educate the American people that those who do not want to go against the gun lobby will have the American citizens believe that we are trying to take away their guns. We are not trying to take away anybody's guns. This is not about the Constitution or the Second Amendment. We simply said we want to bring to the floor two simple pieces of legislation.

One is no fly, no buy. What does that mean? It simply means if you are on the list of persons who are prevented from flying because you are suspected of being a possible person involved in

terrorism or something of that sort, you cannot get on an airplane. It is something about your background, what you have done, and the connections that you have that will not allow you to place our people on the airplane at risk.

So what we are saying is if you can't fly because you will place fliers at risk, you shouldn't be able to buy a gun. So that is what no fly, no buy is all about. If you are too dangerous to fly, then you shouldn't be able to go and purchase a gun. That is very simple.

The other is universal background checks, and that is very simple. We have some background check laws, but still there are people who sell guns out of the back of their car at these gun shows, and they have no background checks. They could be murderers, they could be people who are involved with serious domestic violence, they could be people who are dangerous, and they could be mentally ill. We are saying we have to have universal background checks.

What is controversial about those two bills? But they won't pay attention. They will not take up the bill. As a matter of fact, the leadership is threatening us. They want to charge us with violations of the House rules, take us to the Ethics Committee, and have us sanctioned in some way because they say we have violated the rules.

Well, I say to them: I won't be intimidated. I am not afraid of them or the Ethics Committee. If they want to take us to the Ethics Committee, come on, let's go, because we are going to stand up for what we believe in, and we are not going to be intimidated by being charged with violation of the rules of the House.

Now, while I am talking about not being intimidated by anybody, I want to congratulate and thank Mr. AL GREEN of Texas for what he says has been a 68-year journey where he got up in our caucus today, and he took this floor in a way that I have not seen any Member of Congress in the years that I have been here take the floor and just bare their hearts and just say what is on their mind. I have never seen a Member of this House come to tears and beg us to do something about the killing of Black men, in particular, that is going on.

While we are dealing with gun violence—and we are dealing with gun violence to protect everybody—I want to tell you, I have been here when we have had the mothers up here from Newtown. I went to Charleston, South Carolina, where the Emanuel Nine were killed, and I stayed up all night with people placing flowers in front of the church. I literally went to Mr. AGUILAR and sat with him when the San Bernardino massacre happened. We were here when Columbine happened, and we all thought at that time that we have got to do something. We have done nothing.

Then there is Orlando, Florida; there is Aurora; there is Arizona; there is

Virginia Tech; and on and on and on. We have been fighting to do something about these massacres. The police should be with us. The police should not complicate our job by doing what is being done.

You have heard about the latest two killings in Baton Rouge and in Minnesota. They are absolutely heart-breaking. I listened last evening to this woman crying, screaming, and saying: "God, please don't let him die."

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Well, you may stop me now because my time is up. But I will be back. I will not stop on these two issues: massacres and the killing of Black men in particular.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today as someone who supports the Constitution, including the Second Amendment. I stand here today as someone who believes in protecting our national security. In fact, I have risked my life to defend it. I stand here as someone who supports the will of the American people because that is my job.

In my previous job, I was an infantry officer in the United States Marine Corps. Over the course of four tours in Iraq, I used guns every single day to do my job. In fact, guns saved my life. I do not want to take away guns from me or any other law-abiding American citizen. But I do want to make sure that terrorists, criminals, domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill do not get guns they shouldn't have.

All we need to do to accomplish that are two simple, commonsense things: background checks for all sales of guns with no loopholes that criminals and terrorists can exploit; and, second, if you are too dangerous to fly, you are too dangerous to buy.

These simple, commonsense gun safety measures are supported by nine out of 10 Americans. So if we are going to do our job here in Congress, if we are going to follow the will of the American people, if we are going to protect our national security, and if we are going to continue to uphold the Constitution, then we should do these things.

The reason that they are so important is because of the Americans who have been killed by senseless gun violence.

Mr. Speaker, the following is a list of mass shooting victims from just 2016 alone:

Antoine Bell, age 17.
Raymon Blount, age 29.
Ira Brown, age 20.
Joshua Steven Morrison, age 18.
Randy Peterson, age 64.
Sean Marquez, age 19.
Marvin Douglas Lancaster, III, age 21.

Jennifer Jacques, age 42.
Ernesto Ayber, age 29.
Carlos Bates, age 29.
Isaiah Major, III, age 43.
Dwight Hughes, Jr., age 21.
Trisha Nelson, age 28.
Armando Curiel, age 17.
Raul Lopez, age 19.
Angel Lopez, age 20.
Officer James Lee Tartt, age 44.
Manuel Ortiz, age 28.
Mary Lou Nye, age 62.
Dorothy Brown, age 74.
Barbara Hawthorne, age 68.
Rich Smith, age 53.
Tyler Smith, age 17.
Emma Wallace, age 37.

The Buckner family, including mother, Kimberly; father, Vic; 18-year-old daughter, Kaitlin; and 6-year-old daughter, Emma.

A deputy sheriff, Corporal Nate Carrigan, age 35.

Renee Benjamin, age 30.

Josh Higbee, age 31.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has the responsibility under clause 2 of rule I to preserve order and decorum. As the Chair ruled on June 12, 2003, an exhibition involving Members trafficking the well is a breach of decorum.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 15 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Every day work is done on this Hill that is building toward legislation meant to improve the lives of Americans and guarantee a future of hope for our children.

On this day, the eyes of our citizens are especially focused here. May the day be marked by openness, clarity, and goodwill, so that as these months lead up to an election that will give us the confidence to believe that You are with us throughout, and that for those who love You and place their trust in You, as we claim to do, all things work for good.

Bless the Members of the people's House with wisdom and patience this day.

And may all we do be done for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

CONGRATULATIONS TO MITCH HERRICK ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate a dear friend and a patriot, Mitch Herrick, who will be retiring after 30 years of invaluable service to our great country, first as a U.S. marine, and then as an air traffic controller.

I have known Mitch for almost a decade, when he began working at the Miami air traffic control tower at Miami International Airport, located in my congressional district. During his time there, Mitch has also represented the National Air Traffic Controllers Association, or NATCA, as its local facility vice president and also as its local facility legislative representative.

Representing NATCA on Capitol Hill and in my south Florida district has been a labor of love for Mitch, almost as much as he loves his dogs and his old Mitsubishi Galant.

In 2013, NATCA was proud to present its highest legislative affairs honor, the Trish Gilbert Legislative Activism Award, to Mitch.

I thank Mitch for his exceptional service and his commitment to public safety. I wish Mitch and his wife of over 20 years, Michelle, all the best on this well-deserved retirement.

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

(Ms. FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the

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

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, 90 people a day are killed by a firearm in the United States of America. That is more than 33,000 families devastated by gun violence last year. Those are statistics. I want to tell you and read the names of real people in my hometown whose families got that dreaded, unimaginable knock on the door:

Jacob Walsh, age 25;
Greg Bryant, Jr., age 21;
Zedward Jackson, age 52;
Gary Martin, age 52;
Ledarius Fitzgerald, age 18;
Herman Denis, age 18;
Jack Bellino, age 28;
Courtney McGriff, age 29;
James Cartigiano, age 16;
Anne Nau, age 21.

And the list goes on. Who will get the next knock on the door?

ISIS IS A REAL THREAT

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, less than a month ago, an American of Afghan descent shot and killed 49 people in Orlando. He did so while pledging allegiance to ISIS. In the words of the actual gunman, this was a terrorist attack.

What is worse is that many of my colleagues across the aisle have attempted to hijack facts and muddy the conversation. Why? Because this attack further disproves the President's narrative that ISIS is contained.

Don't even get me started on the fact that the President won't say the words "radical Islamic terrorist." The administration even attempted to remove mention of ISIS in the 9/11 transcription.

Folks, ISIS has declared war against our American way of life, and we need to work together to protect all Americans from future attacks, and our Commander in Chief finally needs to come up with a strategy to defeat ISIS.

THE TIME FOR BOLD ACTION IS NOW

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I understand the Republican majority has pulled a bill from the floor agenda that would have created a new loophole allowing terror suspects to get a gun. That is good news. The bill they pulled was the Cornyn-NRA gun lobby bill, and we are pleased that they pulled that bill. It is a terrible proposal that will only make matters worse in our country.

But now it is time to bring up the meaningful bipartisan bill, the no fly, no buy legislation, and the meaningful

background check legislation. And know this: until you do so, Mr. Speaker, we are not going away. We are not going anywhere because this issue is not going away.

Putting aside Orlando for a moment—the last gentleman's comments—since the House gaveled back in on Tuesday, nearly 200 people have been killed or injured due to gun violence. I don't know how many more people must fall victim to gun violence before this body, before House Republicans will get the message.

The time for bold action is now. I do know my Democratic colleagues and I are prepared to keep up this fight for as long as we have to get meaningful gun legislation passed.

THE THREAT OF RADICAL ISLAMIC TERRORISM

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express grave concern over the threat of radical Islamic terrorism.

What we need is a comprehensive strategy to destroy terrorist organizations like ISIS. Instead, the administration is ramping up the release of Guantanamo Bay detainees.

Make no mistake, these detainees are the worst of the worst. One former detainee has become a leader of al Qaeda's affiliate in Yemen. Another, released last month, was Osama bin Laden's bodyguard. Just weeks before the Olympics, here we are again. Authorities in Brazil are on the hunt for a former detainee who went missing.

With another two dozen detainees cleared for this summer, I worked to include key safeguards in next year's National Defense Authorization Act, like requiring written agreements with foreign nations that accept these GTMO transfers. I introduced legislation with Senator STEVE DAINES to block all GTMO transfers until these safeguards are signed into law or until the end of the year.

The President wants to empty GTMO and bring the remaining terrorists to U.S. soil. Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow these terrorist detainees to put American lives at risk.

CLOSE THE CHARLESTON LOOPHOLE

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to once again call upon Members of Congress to enact some commonsense gun reform because I really believe that we are misusing the word "reform" every time we talk about this issue. Reform means a change for the better. It doesn't mean just to go through a process. It means a change for the better.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen that our gun laws need to change. I am very

emotional for nine souls in my congressional district who lost their lives because of an inadequate, nonsensical background check law that says that no matter what the situation might be, if you wait for 3 days, you can go get the gun. Irrespective of your mental condition, irrespective of your background, irrespective of your intentions, you can still buy the gun.

We need to close this Charleston loophole, and we need to enact a law that says, if you are not qualified to buy a plane ticket, you are not qualified to buy a gun.

A FAILURE OF OUR JUSTICE SYSTEM

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the revelations of the last few days have been, at best, an injustice and, at worst, government corruption of the highest degree.

Earlier this week, FBI Director James Comey acknowledged that former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton sent or received 110 emails that contained classified information through her unsecured server. He went as far as to say that Secretary Clinton's actions were "extremely careless." Despite the FBI Director's harsh criticism of Secretary Clinton's ability or inability to protect highly sensitive material, it appears she will walk away without punishment.

In an era where cybersecurity has become one of the most important pillars of U.S. national security, this carelessness is totally unacceptable. What is even more unacceptable is that the Nation's top prosecutor met with Secretary Clinton's husband, former President Bill Clinton, in private 1 week before the Justice Department decided not to press charges.

Mr. Speaker, it is possible Secretary Clinton threatened the security of this great country. There are those who have committed far lesser crimes who have faced far harsher consequences. The Attorney General's decision not to prosecute Secretary Clinton is a failure of our justice system.

In God we trust.

NOW IS THE TIME TO ACT

(Mrs. TORRES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, last week on this floor, I told a story of a 911 call that I took where an 11-year-old girl was murdered at the hands of her uncle. Her name was Yajaira. Today I want to tell you about Ethan Esparza.

In 2006, when I was mayor of Pomona, Ethan was shot and killed while he was playing in his front yard during his birthday party. He would have turned 4 years old the next day.

The murders of Yajaira and Ethan were completely senseless, but they are not rare. Every day, 91 people are killed because of gun violence. In the United States, you are more than 10 times likely to die because of a firearm than in any other developed country.

We have a problem, a problem that isn't going to be solved by simply putting our heads in the sand. It is time to stop this silence. We aren't going to solve this. Now is the time to act. Now is the time to have a discussion about it.

REMEMBERING PENN STATE STUDENT MADISON HILL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of 19-year-old Madison "Maddie" Hill, a student at Penn State University, who, sadly, passed away after a long battle with cancer last week.

Madison was not originally from Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District. In fact, she was a native of York County, but she was no stranger to Penn State University even before she started classes there as a student.

Following her cancer diagnosis, Madison benefited from the Penn State IFC/Panhellenic Dance Marathon, or THON, the largest student-run philanthropy in the world, which raises funds and awareness for the fight against pediatric cancer.

Upon enrolling in Penn State, Madison worked to provide that same support for other cancer patients as a volunteer and family relations co-chair with THON. She was also a member of the university's Blue & White Society.

I join the entire Penn State community in mourning the loss of Madison and offer my thoughts and prayers to her family and friends.

□ 1215

FOUR-YEAR-OLD BOY SHOT IN ALTADENA

(Ms. JUDY CHU of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning, I woke up to the news that, overnight, a 4-year-old boy in my district, in Altadena, California, became one of the latest victims of gun violence.

Salvador Esparza III was sitting on his front porch with a family friend when a car drove up, fired at least 13 rounds, and drove off, leaving two bodies. Hours later, we finally heard the tragic news. Little Salvador was dead. I was heartbroken.

Now, I know the doctors did everything they could to save his life. But what are we doing in Congress? Nothing. Another life cut short, another family torn apart, another day of silence from Congress.

The NRA tells us the solution is more guns. Well, we already have more guns than any other country in the world, and it is not working. Having more guns would not have helped 4-year-old Salvador. But we could have.

Enough is enough. We must pass no fly, no buy and we must pass universal background checks.

AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES AWARENESS WEEK

(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, this week marks Aquatic Invasive Species Awareness Week.

This is a good time to consider the threat that invasive species pose to all of our districts. Northern Michigan's economy depends on the Great Lakes and our beautiful outdoors. Invasive species represent a direct threat to our way of life.

Even before I came to Congress, I was working on invasive species issues. I live on an inland lake, and we had a really difficult invasive weed get out of control. I have been working for years with my neighbors to control it, so I know just how difficult, and important, it is to get local buy-in for this fight.

Volunteers throughout northern Michigan are working right now to attack invasive species on the ground. State officials are working to educate the public on how we can lessen the chance of spreading these invasive species.

These efforts are in addition to the great work in my district by professionals at institutions like Northern Michigan University and the Hammond Bay Biological Station.

I hope this week we will bring further attention to this fight and help Congress to focus more resources on this issue.

ADDRESSING THE URGENT NEED TO PASS NO FLY, NO BUY AND BACKGROUND CHECKS

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

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to stress the urgent need to pass legislation to keep our communities safe from those with evil intent and who wish to harm innocent Americans.

I am a strong supporter of the Second Amendment, and I believe we must uphold the tradition of my home State of New Hampshire for responsible, law-abiding gun ownership. But as we saw in Orlando, it is far too easy for individuals with evil intent to get ahold of firearms and target innocent American lives.

That is why I strongly urge my colleagues to pass legislation to ban those on the terrorist watch list from purchasing guns. What is more, we must

increase background checks to prevent tragedies like the one in my home State of New Hampshire in 1997, when an incredibly disturbed man fatally shot Judge Vickie Bunnell, two State troopers, and a newspaper editor. Individuals like this should not be given access to lethal weapons. Rather, we should give access to mental health treatment.

Let's put aside party politics and do what is right to keep our communities safe.

NETWORKS' COVERAGE OF ORLANDO ATTACK BIASED

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Media Research Center recently issued a report highlighting the three major news networks' slanted coverage of the Orlando terrorist attack.

The Center found that ABC's, NBC's, and CBS' broadcast network programs "flooded their shows with statements favoring gun control over gun rights by a ratio of 8 to 1."

The Orlando attacker was a radical Islamic extremist who pledged his allegiance to ISIS before committing the worst terrorist attack on U.S. soil since September 11, 2001. Instead of focusing on gun control, the liberal national media should tell the American people the full story about the Orlando attacker's radical Islamic views as the cause of these killings. Not a single gun control measure in Congress would have prevented his actions.

GUN LOBBY

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, gun violence permeates every aspect of our lives, from the streets of Chicago to law enforcement officers to Congress. Everybody is affected by what is going on. But we can do something about it by passing two bills that we have been talking about: the no fly, no buy and universal background checks. Neither is a solution to the entire problem, but both are good steps.

The reason we haven't done anything is simple: the \$15 million a year gun manufacturing industry. And by preventing action here through their campaign donations and Capitol Hill lobbyists, they are controlling the discussion.

When I can't act, when you can't act, this House is being controlled by the gun industry. We—all of us, on both sides of the aisle—are looking to blame each other when the real culprits are the gun manufacturers.

REPLACE OBAMACARE

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, “Do Democrats really realize how difficult it has been on working-class Americans to finance ObamaCare?”

This question was asked at a town-hall with a Democratic nominee by an Ohio woman who saw her premium more than double, from \$490 a month to \$1,081 a month. The answer she received? Just keep shopping on the exchange until she finds a better deal.

For the millions of Americans who continue to see their costs skyrocket, this is not an acceptable answer. From losing coverage, soaring premiums, and excess regulations, this system is simply unsustainable.

Rather than propping up a failing system with temporary, costly fixes, let’s replace it with the patient-centered policies that actually work. That is what Republicans are proposing to do. One with more choices, not mandates, one that increases flexibility in coverage, spurs competition so rates will go down and not up, and puts doctors and patients, not D.C. bureaucrats, back in charge of healthcare decisions.

These are just some of the commonsense ideas Republicans are advancing, and they really do represent a better way for people’s choices.

ObamaCare has not, is not, and will not work. Let’s start giving people more choices and the answers they deserve.

KEEP AMERICANS SAFE FROM GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I urge Speaker RYAN to bring commonsense gun violence prevention legislation to the floor this week.

Justice will never be served for the victims of Tucson, Aurora, Newtown, Charleston, San Bernardino, and Orlando as long as this body refuses to act and once again accepts the status quo.

I support the Second Amendment and the right of Americans to own firearms, but I believe it is the responsibility of this body to ensure effective laws are in place to keep all Americans safe from gun violence. Congress did nothing after 20 children were fatally shot in Newtown in 2012, and nothing following what happened in Orlando, where 49 innocent people were murdered.

Congress must pass legislation that will require comprehensive background checks and close the gun show loophole. That is why I am a cosponsor of the Thompson-King legislation. We must make progress in gun safety and mental health awareness and support gun safety lock laws.

PRAYERS FOR BEN CRAIG

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ben Craig, a long-time community leader in Overland Park, in my district, who is, sadly, battling liver cancer. Ben is known around town as the “Grandfather of Overland Park” and “Mr. Johnson County.”

As a founder of the Overland Park Chamber of Commerce, he helped develop and expand Johnson County Community College, a crown jewel in the metro area. As a member of our Rotary Club, Ben has set the bar pretty high, with 52 years of perfect attendance.

Ben truly embodies our Rotary motto “service above self.” Whether it was raising money for the college, Harvesters, or for one of my family’s favorite destinations and landmarks in Overland Park, the Deanna Rose Children’s Farmstead, he encourages others to step up and be part of our community and to give back.

I consider Ben a mentor and friend, and I am grateful to know him. His impact will be felt for generations.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in saying a prayer for Ben and his family in these hard times as he fights against this horrible disease.

VOTE ON COMMONSENSE LEGISLATION

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

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, my home State of Massachusetts has enacted some of the most comprehensive gun violence prevention laws in the Nation, including universal background checks.

Thanks to these commonsense reforms, Massachusetts has one of the lowest rates of gun deaths in the Nation. Nevertheless, lax gun laws in other States make us a net importer of firearms, and we are certainly not immune from the tragic impacts of gun violence.

Americans have a right to be free from violence in our own communities, in our homes, in our schools, in our churches, and in our workplace. But it is clear that the States cannot do it alone. Congress must do more to keep guns out of the hands of criminals, domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill. You can’t know if someone falls into one of these categories without a background check.

Mr. Speaker, our constituents sent us here to cast a vote on their behalf, and that is what we should be doing. Let us have a vote on commonsense, bipartisan legislation that allows background checks for all gun sales.

WHERE THERE IS HELP, THERE IS HOPE

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

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, today, there are over 11 million Americans struggling without proper treatment and care for mental health illnesses.

Our system is riddled with inefficiencies, as various agencies patch together different programs with little to no coordination. Because of this massive failure, patients far too often end up in the criminal justice system or on the streets, because the services are just not available.

This week, Congress took decisive action to fix this problem by passing a bill that I helped introduce with Representative TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, 422-2. Our bill will genuinely save lives and improve the quality of life for families all across this Nation.

The bipartisan Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act is a perfect example of what we can accomplish when we set aside partisan differences and get to work for the people that we represent. This bill prioritizes treatment to proactively prevent tragedy, emphasizing programs and resources that focus on getting patients the care they need.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan bill takes mental illness out of the shadows of ignorance, because we know that where there is help, there is hope.

GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, I joined my colleagues in an historic sit-in on the House floor, demanding action on gun violence in the wake of yet another mass shooting. Since then, I have heard from hundreds of Rhode Islanders who, like over 80 percent of Americans and a high percentage of gun owners themselves, support our efforts for commonsense legislation to keep guns out of the wrong hands and to address this public health crisis.

Frustratingly, sadly, and inconceivably, Republican leaders in this Chamber continue to ignore the demands of the American people and, most especially and sadly, continue to ignore the pleas of so many victims of gun violence and their families.

Republicans trot out old, tired arguments, saying that we oppose the Second Amendment, that we oppose due process, that backgrounds checks are ineffective. Mr. Speaker, these assertions are simply not true. But rather than allow an open debate and a vote, Republicans continue to follow the playbook of the gun lobby.

But, Mr. Speaker, we will not allow silence to fill that void of leadership.

Until the House acts on meaningful gun violence prevention legislation, my colleagues and I will continue to speak for Americans who demand action. We will be silent no more.

□ 1230

MICHELLE KELLY-LOVE WAS NOT JUST A NUMBER

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

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, this is a photo of my former coworker, Michelle Kelly-Love. Michelle and I worked together at the same company in Los Angeles in the early nineties, and she was kind and funny and warmhearted, a person who was very generous, and a dear friend of mine.

On February 27 of this year, Michelle was dropping off her son, Jordan, at his home in a quiet neighborhood in Carson, California. They were parked in her car in front of the house when they were attacked by a drive-by shooter. Both Michelle and her son were struck multiple times and died at the scene. Michelle's mother, the grandmother of Jordan, was in the back seat and survived.

Michelle's funeral was one of the saddest I have ever attended. She and her son were taken from us so randomly and so suddenly.

You have heard a lot of numbers and statistics related to gun deaths, but Michelle was not just a number. She was friend and a mother and had a long life ahead of her. Her 27-year old son was not just a number.

We cannot stand by and do nothing as our friends and neighbors continue to die. We have lost too many lives to gun violence. The time for action is now. Please.

GUN VIOLENCE LEGISLATION

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, today I also rise on behalf of the families who have lost loved ones to gun violence, including in my very own district in Isla Vista, California, on May 23, 2014. That horrific act killed 6 and injured 14—young people full of life and promise: Katherine Cooper, Veronica Weiss, Christopher Martinez, Cheng Yuan Hong, George Chen, and Weihang Wang.

When these lives were tragically cut short, our community banded together to say "Not One More" life should be lost due to gun violence. But that message has fallen on deaf ears with the leadership of this House, resulting in countless Americans wondering each day if their community will be next. This is simply unacceptable. We cannot delay action any longer.

Mr. Speaker, this House must vote on a bill to address the gun violence epidemic in our country. Americans de-

serve a bill that will truly make our country safer, and they deserve a bill that seeks to ensure "Not One More" can become a reality.

BIPARTISAN, COMMONSENSE LAWS TO PREVENT GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I joined with many of my colleagues here on the House floor to demand a debate on commonsense gun legislation to increase background checks and keep terrorists from buying guns.

Despite the fact that the microphones and C-SPAN cameras were turned off, the discussion we held over the next 24 hours was seen and heard by millions of Americans. It was seen and heard because my colleagues and I took out our smartphones, and we took photos and streamed video, and we tweeted. We posted to Facebook and we broadcast on Periscope.

We call this Chamber "the people's House." In the time that I have been serving here, there has never been a moment that has felt more like the people's House than that 25 hours. Yet now we hear that some are calling for us to be punished for bringing that debate and discussion to the American people. It is "behavior unbecoming" of the House of Representatives, they say.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of what my colleagues and I did, and if that is what it takes to get us a vote on bipartisan, commonsense laws to prevent gun violence, I hope we will do it again.

GUNS AND OUR PRIORITIES

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, there is something seriously wrong with the priorities in Congress. Time and time again, this body is choosing to put political posturing above the interests, safety, and well-being of the American people.

Earlier today, I attended an Oversight and Government Reform Committee hearing that was termed an emergency because the committee Republicans did not approve of a decision by career officials at the FBI and Justice Department to end the email case involving Secretary Clinton. In this hyper-partisan era, that counts as an emergency.

But the continuing plague of gun violence, one that takes over 32,000 innocent lives a year, has been, once again, put on the back burner. There is no sense of urgency. No bill, no vote.

Mr. Speaker, this is no way to take care of the American people's interests.

GUN SAFETY

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, "Teen killed in shooting that led to crash near ER in Charlotte."

"Man shot and killed in uptown Charlotte."

"Man found shot to death in Thomasville July 4th."

"Man shot in Freeman Mills Shopping Center."

"Shooting outside Florida Street Grocery Store in Greensboro."

"Winston-Salem woman caught in crossfire."

The media and my Republican colleagues have focused attention on which words we have used instead of the need to define the terms. As a former educator, let me define the word "epidemic."

Webster defines it as something "affecting a disproportionately large number of individuals within a population, a community, or a region at the same time."

The headlines I cited earlier define the term "gun violence epidemic," an epidemic faced in my home State of North Carolina and across this country, an epidemic so vast that it took the life of Kevin Rodas, a 7-year old boy shot while playing in the front yard of his Charlotte home.

Let's cure these epidemics. Pass sensible, bipartisan gun safety legislation to prevent future acts of gun violence like Orlando or the one that took little Kevin's life back in my district.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 7, 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 July 7, 2016 at 11:56 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 38. With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 809 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 809

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider 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. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the conference report to its adoption without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate; and (2) one motion to recommit if applicable.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution—

(a) the House shall be considered to have: (1) taken from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2943) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; (2) stricken all after the enacting clause of such bill and inserted in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 4909, as passed by the House; and (3) passed the Senate bill as so amended; and

(b) it shall be in order for the chair of the Committee on Armed Services or his designee to move that the House insist on its amendment to S. 2943 and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 809 facilitates the process to allow us to go to conference with the Senate on the National Defense Authorization Act. The resolution also provides for consideration of a conference report related to our efforts to combat the opioid crisis that is wreaking havoc in communities all across the United States.

I want to talk first about the need to get to conference with the Senate on the National Defense Authorization Act. For 54 straight years, the House and Senate have come together to fulfill our most important responsibility: to provide for the common defense.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk a lot about regular order. Well, there is no greater example of regular order than the National Defense Authorization Act. This legislation has gone from the subcommittee level to the full committee, to the full bodies of both Houses; and now we need to continue the process by allowing for this House to enter into negotiations with the Senate.

Between the House and the Senate, hundreds of amendments have been adopted to this legislation. Members from both sides of the aisle have had an

opportunity to have their input on this legislation, and the separate bills passed both by the House and the Senate have bipartisan support.

Now, there are some differences between the House and the Senate versions of the National Defense Authorization Act, and that is why we have to have the conference committee process. This will allow us to iron out our differences.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I can personally attest to just how important it is we get a strong, reform-based NDAA signed into law this year.

Our military is in the midst of a readiness crisis. Aircraft cannot fly due to maintenance issues. There are even reports of mechanics having to take parts off of planes inside museums in an effort to repair damaged aircraft.

Think about that for a minute. The United States, home to the greatest fighting force on the face of the Earth, is having to use plane parts from museums in an effort to keep some of our aircraft operational. That is simply stunning.

And readiness is so important these days given the serious threat posed by radical Islamic terrorism. Every morning, it seems we wake up to reports of another attack. Whether it is in Bangladesh, Baghdad, Istanbul, Kabul, Saudi Arabia, or right here in Orlando, or San Bernardino, these attacks just reinforce the fact that radical Islamic terrorism must be defeated.

The NDAA is also important because it is a great opportunity to put reforms in place at the Pentagon. Whether it is reducing bureaucratic obstacles, improving military health care, or updating the command structure, the NDAA is the perfect tool to ensure efficiency and effectiveness from the Pentagon.

So I hope my colleagues from both sides of the aisle will join me in voting to get us to conference so we can keep the streak alive of passing a strong NDAA each year.

The other portion of this rule provides for consideration of the conference report dealing with the opioid crisis.

I recently heard a story of a young man from southwest Alabama who suffered an injury playing sports. He was prescribed opioid-based pain medication by his doctor, but, unfortunately, he became addicted. Next thing he knew, his addiction had spiraled out of control and he found himself using heroin. Ultimately, he became seriously ill.

Thankfully, this young man was able to enter a treatment program and receive help, but not everyone who suffers from opioid addiction is so fortunate.

Studies show that approximately 46,000 Americans die because of a drug overdose each year. That number adds up to over 130 deaths a day. Tragically, young Americans are disproportionately impacted.

One of the worst things about opioid abuse is that it can start so innocently.

Whether it is a high school athlete who suffers an injury or an individual who undergoes a medical procedure as simple as dental work, no American is immune from this tragedy.

That is why this legislation is so very important. It authorizes new programs and reforms others to ensure that those struggling with opioid addiction can get the help that they need.

The bill includes new grants to States to carry out comprehensive opioid abuse responses with education, treatment, and recovery efforts, and prescription drug monitoring programs.

The bill also has multiple provisions dealing with prevention, including a new intergovernmental task force to identify, review, and, as appropriate, determine whether there are gaps or inconsistencies between best practices for chronic and acute pain management.

Treatment and recovery are also a priority, with reforms to multiple existing grant programs and a new grant program to provide grants to community organizations to develop, expand, and enhance recovery services and build connections between recovery networks, including physicians, the criminal justice system, and employers.

□ 1245

The bill also helps women, families, and veterans. This includes reauthorization of a grant program for residential treatment for pregnant and postpartum women who have an opioid abuse disorder and a new pilot program to enhance the flexibility of funds so States can more broadly support family-based services for pregnant and postpartum women and their children.

Moreover, this bill contains other commonsense reforms such as clarifying that pharmacists coordinating with a doctor and patient may not fill the entire amount of a prescription for a Schedule II substance, such as opioids.

Mr. Speaker, these are just some of the numerous and important pieces of this legislation. I am pleased to report that 200 different organizations from every corner of our country have already come out in support of this conference report.

Now, this bill probably doesn't do everything that every Member would like for it to do. In my time up here, I have yet to see a perfect bill. But this is a good bill, and I honestly doubt there is anything in this bill that my colleagues disagree with.

I understand some of my colleagues have concerns over funding, but let me remind my colleagues about the important distinction between appropriations and authorizing. This bill authorizes programs to address the opioid crisis. The Appropriations Committee has made clear that they are going to do everything that they can to provide funding for these programs, and I take them at their word. But putting funding in an authorization bill is not the proper way to address this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I worry we are seeing a larger issue here that started with the Zika virus legislation a few weeks ago. My colleagues on the other side demand action on issues, the process plays out, the House and Senate work together on legislation, and then my colleagues on the other side announce their opposition to very similar bills to the ones they previously supported.

Let's not forget that the House passed our opioid legislation by a vote of 400-5, and the Senate passed their bill by a vote of 94-1. Neither of those bills included funding. So it is stunning that now many of my colleagues on the other side say that they are going to oppose this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I worry that this is about politics instead of policy. I fear that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want an issue to debate on the campaign trail instead of actual solutions to the problems facing our country.

I sincerely hope that that is not the case because the American people deserve better than that. They can turn on their TVs every night and get enough political theater. But here in this body we should rise above that temptation and actually work on solutions.

The minority will not get everything they want. That is the nature of compromise, and that is the reality of being in the minority. But this has been a truly bipartisan process, and I hope it will not fall victim to political grandstanding.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 809 and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, 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 the rule today providing for consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2017, a bill that the President has said he would veto, and the conference report to accompany S. 524, the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2016. Many of us support the underlying bill, but, unfortunately, it doesn't allow for—despite nine times having funding being waived—any funding to deal with defeating the cycle of addiction or the health issues around opioid abuse. So while it is an innocuous bill and might help a little bit, it is in no way commensurate with the challenge that families across our country face in dealing with opioid addiction.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that would require the House to consider the bipartisan no fly, no buy legislation which would bar the sale of firearms and explosives to those on the FBI's terrorist watch list.

My amendment would not prevent the House from considering either of the underlying measures of this rule. It would simply give the House an oppor-

tunity to finally vote on keeping terrorists from assembling arsenals of weapons legally in our country.

Mr. Speaker, we can't wait any longer for Congress to take meaningful action.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Without question, the NDAA is a very important and serious bill. However, the bill before us today is one that the President has said he would veto. I have argued on this floor in an amendment that I supported a 1 percent cut to the authorization levels. By spending more on the military than we can afford as a country and plunging ourselves deeper into debt, we make ourselves less secure, not more secure. By making ourselves economically beholden to countries like China and Saudi Arabia, we are less secure rather than more secure. Frankly, this bill is more of the same, and if it passes and were to become law—which it won't because the President would veto it—it would also make it less secure.

But this rule and this day it is notable for what we are not doing rather than what we are doing. We are not under this rule considering two simple, plain, commonsense pieces of legislation that everybody knows will help protect American lives and prevent terrorist attacks in our Nation. One is simply to require a background check when a person obtains a gun. Another would prevent terrorists from assembling arsenals of weapons.

In my home State of Colorado, we already have universal background checks, and they have led to law enforcement arresting 114 fugitives since the beginning of the year.

It is our duty to simply vote on these bills that strengthen and enhance our Second Amendment rights by ensuring that law-abiding gun owners will continue to be able to purchase guns and keeping guns out of the hands of violent criminals and those who don't have the legal right to own them. Both of these bills do this, and each has over 100 cosponsors, including Members on both sides of the aisle.

As we stand here today, we are still reeling from the deadliest mass shooting in our country's history nearly 1 month ago. Pulse nightclub in Orlando was a targeted act of terror against the gay community, our allies, and the entire Nation.

In my home State of Colorado, we have been hard hit with mass shootings: Columbine, Aurora, and the Planned Parenthood center in Colorado Springs to name a few. It is time for action, and the simple, commonsense measures before us offer a good first step to ensure that we get that done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation to honor the memory of Xavier Arnold, a victim of gun violence who never ever received a moment of silence on the House floor.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from California—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend for one moment.

The Chair would advise that all time has been yielded for the purpose of debate only.

Does the gentleman from Alabama yield for the purpose of this unanimous consent request?

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I reiterate my earlier announcement that all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only, and I will not yield for any other purpose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama does not yield; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation to honor the memory of Kelly Russler; Jayden, her son, and Laing, her son; victims of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Alabama has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request. She is a leader on the issue of reducing gun violence.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background check legislation to honor the memory of Serge Pierre Dumas, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Alabama has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. I ask the gentleman from Alabama: How many of us have to come down requesting this until you grant it?

Well, your silence speaks words.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation in honor of the memory of my friend, Michele Love, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Alabama has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request. She is a leader on the issue of reducing gun violence.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation in honor of Elizabeth Janie Woods, a victim of gun violence who never received a single moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Alabama has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation to honor the memory of Trooper Chad P. Dermeyer, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Alabama has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation to honor the memory of Jamie Wilson, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Alabama has not yielded for that purpose; therefore, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation to honor the memory of Mr. Rayland "Ray Ray" Maryland, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to inquire of the gentleman from Alabama how many people we need to have more come down here until our request is granted?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BYRNE. May I ask the Chair if I am on the time of the gentleman from Colorado in answering his question?

Mr. POLIS. You are. It is my time. I am yielding for an answer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is speaking on his time.

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, the parliamentary inquiry in his asking about the time should not be detracted from my time, so that, as well as this, need to be subtracted.

Now, we go back to my time, and I yield to the gentleman to ask him how many people we need to come down here so we can have our vote?

Mr. BYRNE. We are here today to consider—

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, that is not an answer. It is a simple question with a number.

I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation to honor the memory of Davon Jones, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation to honor the memory of Dajae Coleman from my district, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation to honor the memory of Keiwan Murray, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation to honor the memory of Dana Rhoden, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (MICHAEL F. DOYLE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation to honor the memory of Gino Nicholas, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I just received devastating news in a story that was just broken by Politico: House Republicans indefinitely delay gun control votes. They have indefinitely postponed a vote on the antiterrorism package leaving Congress with no legislative response to last month's massacre in Orlando.

□ 1300

I would hope that this new information will lead the gentleman from Alabama to consider this very important request from my colleague, Mr. HUFFMAN.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Tanya Skeen, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, given the new information that I entered, with regard to what has just broke a the Politico article, I think it would be important to hear from Mr. BYRNE again about whether he would entertain a unanimous consent request at this time, understanding his previous answer was no.

So I would like, Mr. Speaker, if you will, you to pose that question to him for consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Colorado yielding to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. POLIS. I am not yielding. I am asking the Chair to confirm that, in fact, his stated preference is still valid, and if he would ask the gentleman from Alabama if that is still the case.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is still the Chair's understanding that the gentleman from Alabama will not yield for such a request.

Therefore, the previous unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of the memory of Delhaun Jackson, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Diamond Dawson, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Hanna Rhoden and Christopher Roden, Sr., victims of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Alabama how many people we need to have come down until the gentleman from Alabama would be willing to simply entertain a unanimous consent request to have the vote?

I understand that the gentleman from Alabama is opposed to the underlying measures. If a majority of the House is, so be it. But at least I would like to know how many requests we need to make until we can simply have this vote.

I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Alabama for an answer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair continues to understand that the gentleman from Alabama has not yielded for the purpose of these unanimous consent requests.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield the gentleman from Alabama from my time to ask how many more unanimous consent requests we need to have until we can have this vote.

Reclaiming my time, his silence continues to speak volumes, as does the silence of the Republican majority and the Speaker in the wake of an unprecedented wave of violence and terrorism in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Anpha Nguyen, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Andres Camacho, III, the son of a dear friend of mine and a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Chris Rhoden, Jr., a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Miss RICE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Natalie, Sienna, and MJ Srinivasan with the shooter Jeremy Srinivasan, three victims of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Rheba Mae Dent, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Angelo Barboza, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of AJ Boik, the nephew of a friend of mine, Police Sergeant Dave Hoover, who was killed at the Aurora movie theater during the premier of the Batman movie.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Kenneth Rhoden, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Roosevelt Burns, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor. God bless Mr. Burns.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Lizzy Williams, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the minority whip, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation. I do so, Mr. Speaker, in honor of Shelly Williams, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire again of the gentleman from Alabama how many more requests we need to make until this very simple request is granted to allow us a vote on these bills.

I am happy to yield for an answer as to how many more people we need to request a vote on these bills.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, we are here today on House Resolution 809—

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, I am in control of the time. I yielded for an answer. The gentleman from Alabama didn't give it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request that would save lives and prevent terrorism.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Roderick Nelms, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) for a unanimous consent request to prevent terrorist attacks in our country.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Recco Cobb, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Carolyn Ann Sanders, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, now that, in addition to so many rank-and-file Members having made this request, the Democratic leader and the Democratic whip have joined in this request personally and have come down here, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama if he would be willing to consider the unanimous consent request at this point.

I am happy to yield for an answer.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 809 is on the National Defense Authorization Act—

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, again, I think no matter how the gentleman from Alabama says it, the simple translation of that is: no, we won't consider that request.

So at this point, we have a very important request that would save lives and help prevent terrorist attacks in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Devin Hamb, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), the vice chair of the Democratic Caucus, for a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Billie Jo, Courtney, and Collin Hettinger, victims of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the assistant Democratic leader, for a unanimous consent request to fight terrorism.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 3051, a bill that would close the Charleston loophole that allowed the assassination of Reverend Clementa C. Pinckney and eight of his parishioners.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to save lives.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. First, the Chair will make an announcement.

As the Chair advised on January 15, 2014, and March 26, 2014, even though a unanimous consent request to consider a measure is not entertained, embellishments accompanying such a request constitute debate and will become an imposition on the time of the Member who yielded for that purpose.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to be clear that the various speakers have not embellished to this point; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has not deducted time to this point.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Laquan

McDonald, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of the memory of Gladys Tordil, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

□ 1315

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) for a unanimous consent request to fight against terrorism and save lives.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of the memory of Mike Dawid, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) for the purpose of a very important and timely unanimous consent request.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Cora Wilson, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, that strikes close to home, I would say to Mrs. DAVIS. That is the name of my daughter as well, Cora; so that is particularly emotional to me as a father.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Alicia Norman, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up

H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of the memory of Reid Williams, a victim of gun violence who never received his moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request to combat the terrorist threat to our country.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of Zanyrah Taylor, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I inquire of the gentleman from Alabama how many more motions for unanimous consent we need to make until it is granted and we, simply, allow an up-or-down vote on this issue?

Again, the silence speaks volumes not only from the gentleman from Alabama but from the Republican majority that continues to prevent a vote on these commonsense measures to reduce deaths and violence and terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Malcolm Winfel, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request. He is the chair of the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent—because it is more than just time for a moment of silence—that we bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Shannon Johnson, a victim of gun violence, who died during the mass shooting in San Bernardino, California, who never received a moment of silence on this House floor, to dignify the passing and the need to do something for him and his family.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentleman from Colorado will be charged.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, which is the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation. I do so to honor the memory of Welland “Buddy” Short, a victim of gun violence who, himself, never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Gerardo Hernandez of Chatsworth, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for a very important and timely unanimous consent request.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Justin Michael Murray, from my district—a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Councilman James E. Davis, who was assassinated at the New York City Council on July 23, 2003, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor his memory.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request that would save lives and prevent terrorist attacks in our country.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Jerome Wright, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Jadarrion Spinks, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, given that not only have we had so many Members from across the country make this unanimous consent request but that they have been joined by every member of the Democratic leadership, I inquire of the gentleman from Alabama if he would be willing to entertain the next unanimous consent request that will be made shortly by the gentlewoman from California.

I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, we are here to speak on House Resolution 809, the National Defense Authorization Act.

Mr. POLIS. In reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ), who has a very important unanimous consent request that would save lives and prevent terrorist attacks.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. I thank my colleague from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Kiara Kinard, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of the memory of Mercy Cordova, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence here on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

I point out, on my own time, that granting this request does not take away from considering the other two underlying bills. They, too, will be considered, but it simply means that these additional two bills to reduce gun violence, preventing terrorists from assembling arsenals legally in our own country, and making sure that convicted felons can't legally acquire firearms, are common sense. I think they

would pass this House fairly overwhelmingly.

We are simply saying, in addition to the bills that are already being considered—which some of us may personally be opposed to in the case of NDAA, but we are not standing in the way of those. We are simply allowing for the consideration of these additional bills.

Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request only, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of Gary Rhoden, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS) for a unanimous consent request that would prevent terrorists from assembling arsenals that they would use to cause harm to our fellow Americans.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of the memory of Jones Pidcock, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I was truly hoping that the motion by Ms. TITUS would be accepted because, frankly, Ms. TITUS' unanimous consent request would have saved lives, prevented convicted felons from acquiring firearms and would have prevented people on the terrorist watch list from silently assembling arsenals for them to commit terrorist acts in our country.

While I am disappointed that Ms. TITUS' unanimous consent request was rejected out of hand, I yield to—and I am hopeful that the gentleman from Alabama will accept—the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Christopher Houston, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, a point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BYRNE. I do not.

Mr. Speaker, I note for the record—

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, a point of parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Chair to bring the House to order.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, a point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized on his own time.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I note for the record that the Member who just spoke has made the same unanimous consent request three times. I would also note that other Members have made the same unanimous consent requests multiple times, and the Chair has indicated that he cannot entertain that request.

Mr. Speaker, for the record, at some point, this ceases to be an effort to debate the issue before the House and, rather, becomes an effort to obstruct the House from completing its work.

I reserve the balance of my time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, a point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, how is the gentleman from Alabama able to seize my time before I have even made my opening statement and simply speak on his own time while I control the time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair was alternating recognition between the minority manager and the majority manager. The gentleman from Alabama was recognized using his own time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, we have a gentleman with us here today from the great State of Missouri, who has a very important unanimous consent request that would save lives and prevent terrorists from doing harm to our fellow countrymen.

I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Michael Brown, one of my constituents and a victim of gun violence at the hands of a trigger happy policeman. Michael Brown never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentleman from Missouri will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

□ 1330

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out on my own time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. POLIS. The gentleman from Alabama mentioned the word "obstruction." And, Mr. Speaker, I would like you to consider—and, Mr. Speaker, I would like the American people to consider—who and which party is obstructing here when there is a very simple request for a vote that so many

Members of this body feel fervently about.

Those who stand in the way of that vote are those who are obstructing, not those who simply seek a vote to prevent terrorists from acquiring explosives and firearms.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Jordan Croft, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of the memory of Lana Carlson, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Alabama how long he plans to continue obstructing this body and preventing this body from going about its business to vote on these underlying bills by objecting to these very simple, common-sense, unanimous consent requests to prevent terrorists from acquiring explosives and firearms.

Again, the silence speaks volumes. It sounds like the Republicans and the gentleman from Alabama plan on continuing to obstruct this body from going about their business.

However, luckily, thanks to the gentlewoman from New Jersey, there is another chance for this body to accept a very important unanimous consent request.

I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Tre Lane, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request to prevent terrorists from silently acquiring arsenals that they would kill our fellow Americans with.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation.

Here is Zina Daniel, who was murdered when her ex-husband bought a weapon from the Internet.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentlewoman will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, we are joined by the ranking member of the Rules Committee, and I hope that my colleague from Alabama will be willing to grant her very important request that she is about to make that will prevent convicted felons from acquiring guns legally and also help keep explosives and weapons out of the hands of terrorists.

I am proud to yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for a unanimous consent request.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Valerie Short, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for the purpose of a critical and timely unanimous consent request.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, a bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of Kendrick Forrest, a victim of gun violence from my district who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, in the face of Republican obstructionism on this important issue, I am joined by a colleague from the great State of California. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request in an attempt to break through this gridlock.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Jerry Nguyen, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the

bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Simon Carrillo, a victim of gun violence who never received his moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, would that we run out of victims. Mr. Speaker, would that we run out of victims, but, tragically, that is not the case.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Davon Barrett, a victim of gun violence who never received his moment of silence here on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request that would save lives.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of the memory of two of my constituents: former Deputy Sheriff Rick Del Fiorentino and former Fort Bragg Councilman Jere Melo. They are both victims of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. AGUILAR) who has a very important and timely unanimous consent request to prevent terrorists from acquiring arsenals to attack our fellow Americans.

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of Kenneth Cornelious Loggins, a victim of gun violence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) who has a very important and timely unanimous consent request that would save lives.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Joanne Woods, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of action on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Ala-

bama (Mr. BYRNE) how many more Members need to make this very simple request until it is a simple courtesy they agree to simply hold these votes.

I would be happy to yield for an answer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado yields to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, I hear nothing but silence.

Mr. BYRNE. Well, I thought he yielded to me for—

Mr. POLIS. Not to yield for an answer—absolutely. How many more—

Mr. BYRNE. Do you yield or not?

Mr. POLIS. I did. You were standing—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. BYRNE. You didn't allow me to say a word.

Mr. POLIS. How many more requests—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. POLIS. Do we need to make?

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, we are here to talk about House Resolution 809 that deals with the National Defense Authorization Act—

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BYRNE. And an opioid bill and not anything else. And I—

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is out of order.

Mr. BYRNE. I can yield—

Mr. POLIS. The gentleman is out of order. I reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. POLIS. Yes. And yet the gentleman from Alabama continues to obstruct the consideration of those very underlying measures by not granting this simple request, this very simple request to consider these two bills.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, a bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Tony and Quinn Carlson, victims of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) who has a unanimous consent to break through this Republican obstruction and allow these bills to come forward.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of my constituent, Essence Christal, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of action on the House Floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) for the purpose of a very important and timely unanimous consent request.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of the memory of Cory James Connell, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of the memory of Reginald Williams, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of action on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request to prevent terrorists from acquiring explosives and firearms.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Jean Carlos Nieves Rodriguez, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) for the purpose of a timely, important, and critical unanimous consent request.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Claudina Molina, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of action on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) for a unanimous consent request to prevent convicted felons from legally acquiring firearms.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Officer Steven Todd Dooley, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of action on this House floor.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know: What are you afraid of? Why won't you give Officer Dooley his time? What are you afraid of, Mr. Speaker? Bring the bill to the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentleman will be subtracted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, would that we ran out of victims. Sadly, that is not the case.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request that would save lives.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Laseam Hogan from my district, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of action on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, again, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Alabama: When will the Republican obstructionism end?

I am happy to yield for an answer.

Mr. BYRNE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. DELAURO. I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Elton Wayne Madison, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of action on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

□ 1345

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent that would save lives and prevent convicted felons from acquiring weapons.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Mr. Tevin Eugene Crosby, who was a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor, unlike other victims in this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), my colleague on the Committee on Rules, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded back-

ground checks legislation, to honor the memory of Rigoberto Jose Castillo, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPP) for a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. CAPP. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to please bring up H.R. 1217. It is a bipartisan bill, the expanded background checks legislation, and I am doing this today in honor of this beautiful young mother of 2 from Chicago, a victim of gun violence. She never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentlewoman from California will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request only.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, hoping you will change your misinformed judgment, again, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Enedia Branch, a victim of gun violence who never received one moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request that will save lives.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Jamar Small; Tamara, or Tammy, Wilson-Seidle; and both Cristina LoBrutto and Bryan Breen. These are Cristina and Bryan. They are four victims of gun violence from my district who never received a moment of action on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) for the purpose of a very important and timely unanimous consent request that will save lives.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Alison Parker, a victim of gun violence whose family wants more than a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request that will save lives.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of 5-year-old Aaron Shannon, Jr., a victim of gun violence shot down in his backyard, who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, as someone with a background in law enforcement and someone who lives with the damaging effects of what guns can cause every day, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, also to honor the memory of Doris Dooley, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of action on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish that we had the time to adequately remember all of these victims like Doris Dooley and so many others, but given the limited time we have, I think our priority at this point is breaking through the Republican obstruction and achieving a simple up-or-down vote on these commonsense, bipartisan bills.

To that end, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Betty Mungin; her daughter, Alexis Mungin; her daughter, 8-year-old Armani Mungin, victims of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor. Enough is enough, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for a very important unanimous consent request that will save lives.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Javier Jorge-Reyes, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of action on this House floor. In his memory, we beg the Republican leadership,

please, let us have a vote on a bill that has been awaiting passage for years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, we have been eagerly awaiting the arrival of Mr. KILDEE, and I am glad to say that he is not only here, but he has an excellent idea to break through this Republican obstruction and save lives.

I am honored to yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for a very important unanimous consent request.

Mr. KILDEE. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Cederrius Hastings, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the floor of the United States House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the local hometown representative, the esteemed representative from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) who has a very important unanimous consent request.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of the memory of Brishell Jones, who at 16, with her friends, was gunned down in a drive-by shooting, but who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Alabama how many more unanimous consent requests we need to make until the Republicans stop this obstruction and allow the bill to come forward. I am happy to yield for an answer.

Mr. BYRNE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, I think it is clear that we will not allow the Republicans to continue to obstruct these commonsense, bipartisan bills to prevent terrorists from assembling arsenals to kill our fellow Americans and to prevent convicted felons from legally acquiring firearms.

We are joined by a leader from New York, and I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan—that

means Democrats and Republicans—expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Jonathon Edwards, 22 years old, from Georgia. He was a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of action here in the House of Representatives. He is deserving of that action, Mr. Speaker. Twenty-two years. No action. Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to act. The American people need for us to act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentlewoman from New York will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for a very important unanimous consent request that will save lives.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, which would fall under the Committee on the Judiciary on which I serve as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, to honor the memory of Ronald McPhatter, a child of some mother and some father, and honor the memory of Ronald McPhatter, a victim of gun violence, who never received a moment of silence or action on this House floor. Ronald McPhatter needs justice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentlewoman from Texas will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request that would save lives.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to the floor to honor the memory of David Washington. David Washington is a victim of gun violence. He can't speak for himself anymore, and he never received a moment of silence or a moment of action on this House floor, but he deserves one.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentleman from New York will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request only that would save lives.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Trayvon Martin from my district, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of

silence on this House floor. And to all the mothers of murdered children in Miami-Dade County and Broward County, I extend to them a moment of silence now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentlewoman from Florida will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for the purpose of a very important and timely unanimous consent request.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of the memory of Leatrick Benjamin, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor, let alone a moment of action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of 14-year-old Richard Newton from my district, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on this House floor, let alone a moment of action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES), who has a very important and timely unanimous consent request.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Pomona Police Officer Shaun Diamond, murdered at the hands of a Mongol gang member. The silence has to stop. We need action. To honor his memory, I would like the House to take up this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentlewoman from California will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, and this is to honor the memory of Carl Batie, a former Mercer County corrections officer who was an innocent bystander killed in a hail of gunfire in a gang-related fight in the city of Trenton in my district. I do this to

honor Mr. Batie, who was that victim, and I do this because he never received a moment of silence and he has never received a moment of action on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentlewoman from New Jersey will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

□ 1400

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, the definition of obstruction in the dictionary is "a thing that impedes or prevents passage or progress; an obstacle or blockage."

The only obstruction here is the failure of the Republicans to simply remove that blockage or that thing that prevents passage of this commonsense measure to keep guns out of the hands of convicted felons and prevent terrorists from quietly assembling arsenals to conduct their terrorist acts.

I hope that, now that my colleague from New York (Mr. ENGEL) has joined us and he will be making a very important unanimous consent request in just moments, that will finally allow this body an opportunity to break through this obstruction, move to consideration of both bills under this rule, and move to consideration of the bipartisan bill that will prevent convicted felons from acquiring weapons.

I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of this brave soldier, Captain Antonio Davon Brown.

I also want to honor the memory of people in my district who were victims of gun violence: Brandon Lawrence, New Rochelle, New York; Charles Smith, Mount Vernon, New York; Wilbert Francis, Mount Vernon, New York; Kevin Shaw, Mount Vernon, New York; Allashun Clay, Mount Vernon, New York.

We want to honor their memories. They are all victims of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor. We ought to be passing sensible gun control legislation in a bipartisan fashion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentleman from New York will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington State (Ms. DELBENE) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Amanda Alvear, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of action on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) for the purpose of an important and timely unanimous consent request.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, bipartisan expanded background checks legislation. It is really to honor the memory of Paul Terrell Henry. He was a victim of gun violence in Orlando, who never received a moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY), who has a request that will break through this Republican obstruction and save lives, for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Landon Dooley, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of action on this House floor.

Enough is enough. Put this commonsense legislation forward today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIBBLE). As previously announced the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. POLIS. Point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. It is a new Speaker pro tempore, and I was wondering if the new Speaker pro tempore would be willing to pose a unanimous consent request to the gentleman from Alabama.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has been informed that the gentleman from Alabama will not yield for the purpose of the gentleman's request.

Mr. POLIS. Very well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) who has a very important unanimous consent request.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Elbert L. Merrick, III, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of action on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Alabama how many more unanimous consent requests we need to make until he agrees to allow for consideration of this bill.

I am happy to yield for an answer.

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

Mr. POLIS. Sadly, the gentleman from Alabama is unable to reserve or stop criminals from legally acquiring weapons or terrorists from silently assembling arsenals to conduct terrorist acts in our country. The only way the gentleman from Alabama can prevent those acts is to prevent the obstruction of this body by granting this very simple unanimous consent request that is about to be made by the gentleman from Florida.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Stanley Almodovar, III, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) for the purpose of a very important and timely unanimous consent request.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation to honor the memory of Lori Dooley and Brooke Dooley, a mother and daughter, victims of gun violence who never received legislative action on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for the purpose of an important unanimous consent request to save lives.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Eugene Liscomb, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence and never received a moment of action on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Eric Ivan Ortiz Rivera, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence or who never received any action on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Luis Vielma, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CHU) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request that will save lives.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Brenda Lee Marquez McCool, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of action on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Alabama how many more requests we need to make until the Republicans stop their obstructionism and allow a simple vote on the bill.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) for the purpose of a very important unanimous consent request that would save lives.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank my friend from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Daniel Mauser. He is a young man who was a victim of gun violence at Columbine High School and was the son of a friend of mine, Tom Mauser.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, in a just-breaking Politico article, it says that House leader infighting has forced GOP leaders to indefinitely postpone a vote on an antiterrorism package.

You know, I don't know who is going to tell the terrorists that we are postponing a vote on an antiterrorism package. I would hope that the Republicans would join us Democrats in trying to prevent terrorists from quietly assembling arsenals of explosives and guns and weapons to conduct coordinated attacks on the people of our country—that is what we are hoping to do—and break through this Republican obstructionism on this issue.

Hopefully, there will be a new, breaking story based on the acceptance of a unanimous consent request that is forthcoming from my colleague from Ohio.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R.

1217, the bipartisan King-Thompson expanded backgrounds checks legislation, to honor the memory of Juan Ramon Guerrero, a victim of gun violence who never received either a moment of silence or a moment of action on this House floor. We ask Speaker RYAN to allow the vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, in honor of the memory of Darryl R. Burt, II, yet another Black man who lost his life to senseless violence. He never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentlewoman from California will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. POLIS. Point of parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. The Chair has stated the last several times that the unanimous consent requests cannot be received. Is it that it cannot be accepted or that it is willfully not accepted by the gentleman from Alabama?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has been yielded for the purpose of debate.

Mr. POLIS. Further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. When a unanimous consent request is made, is it not at the discretion of the gentleman controlling the time, the gentleman from Alabama, to agree to that request?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama has yielded time for debate only.

Mr. POLIS. Further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Can the gentleman from Alabama accept a unanimous consent request to yield for the purpose of a bill being brought forth?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama has not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, point of parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Does the gentleman from Alabama have the ability to yield for that purpose?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama has control of the time on his side.

Mr. POLIS. Reclaiming my time, again, the gentleman from Alabama can agree to these unanimous consent requests. The way that the answer has been framed, he has not agreed to them.

The gentleman from Alabama and the Republicans are obstructing this body and preventing us from going about our business and getting to these bills, but it is certainly well within the authority under this rule for a unanimous consent request to be accepted.

With that, I am actually glad to say we have a unanimous consent.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

□ 1415

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217. It is a bipartisan piece of legislation called the expanded background checks bill, and I do so today in honor of a particular person who was a victim in the Orlando massacre. Her name is Mercedes Marisol Flores, a young woman who has never received her own moment of silence on this House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

The time of the gentlewoman from California will be deducted from the gentleman from Colorado's time.

Mr. POLIS. Well, Mr. Speaker, they could be entertained, if the gentleman from Alabama would simply agree to them.

We actually have a forthcoming unanimous consent request. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that you are willing to pose it to the gentleman from Alabama to see if he would, in fact, agree to what I think is a very reasonable request, to bring forward a bipartisan bill.

I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) for the purpose of just such a unanimous consent request.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Edward Sotomayor, Jr., a victim of gun violence in Orlando at the Pulse Nightclub who never, ever has received a moment of action on this floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, would the Chair be willing to pose the question as to whether that unanimous consent request is accepted to the gentleman controlling the time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Alabama will not yield for any such request.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, again, I know that the previous Speaker pro tempore had posed that question some time ago; but I was hoping, by this point, the gentleman from Alabama would have been moved to change his position.

I am not going to ask every single time, but I would appreciate if the Chair would pose that question to the gentleman from Alabama about whether he would be willing to accept the most recent unanimous consent request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) to save lives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado may yield to the gentleman from Alabama for a response.

Mr. POLIS. I would be happy to yield if the gentleman from Alabama would be willing to accept the unanimous consent request from Mrs. BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN.

Mr. BYRNE. All time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I will take that as no. And, sadly, we are not about to run out of victims, Mr. Speaker.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 1 minute.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background check legislation, to honor, once again, the memory of Carolyn Ann Sanders, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) for the purpose of a unanimous consent request.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 1217, the bipartisan expanded background checks legislation, to honor the memory of Eddie Jamoldroy Justice, a victim of gun violence who never received a moment of silence on the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously announced, the unanimous consent request cannot be entertained.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, so many of us have made unanimous consent requests.

I have asked the gentleman from Alabama how many times we have to make this motion until the Republicans end their obstructionism. I have not received an adequate answer.

I was hopeful that the gentleman from Alabama would have accepted this unanimous consent request by now.

I was hopeful that the Chair would have posed a question to him multiple times, rather than accept his very first

answer, now that the Democratic leaders and rank-and-file Members have all come forward in support of bringing forward this bill and breaking through the Republican obstructionism.

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have been trying all day to convince the Republican leadership to bring up H.R. 1217. The reason being is that, for the last 3½ years, we have been trying to get a vote on this bipartisan, pro-Second Amendment bill. And in the course of those 3½ years, 34,000 people have been killed in our country by someone using a gun; 34,000. That is someone's child, someone's brother, someone's loved one, someone's wife, someone's husband, someone's partner; and it is absolutely shameful.

Now we heard yesterday on the steps of the Capitol a terrifying story from a woman whose 10-year-old daughter was murdered by someone with a gun, someone who couldn't legally buy a gun because he couldn't pass a background check. He was a felon. But he got around that law because he went online. He found the same gun that you could buy in a gun store online but without the requirement to pass a background check. He bought that gun. He shot that brave woman, and he murdered her daughter.

We can take a step today to do something about that. We can bring up the background check bill. It is bipartisan, pro-Second Amendment. It has 186 co-authors in this House. We can bring it up for a vote, and we can pass it. That will provide the first line of defense against people who shouldn't be able to buy guns from buying guns.

Who are these people? Criminals, domestic abusers, terrorists, those who are dangerously mentally ill. They should not be able to get their hands on a gun.

Now, can we stop it in every instance? No. But we know that background checks work. We know that we can make a real difference.

Every day, every day in the United States of America, 170 felons are stopped from buying guns because of the background check program. Every day in the United States of America, 50 domestic abusers are stopped from buying a gun because of the background check system. It works. We know it works.

Why won't we bring that bill up for a vote?

That woman stood on the steps of the Capitol yesterday. That was a courageous stand she took. She lost her daughter. She watched her daughter be murdered right in front of her eyes. She, herself, was shot. But she is out advocating for sensible, pro-Second Amendment, reasonable gun laws that will protect people. That is brave.

What is brave about avoiding a vote on this bill, a bipartisan bill, a bill that

supports the Second Amendment, a bill that has both Democrats and Republicans as coauthors: 186 coauthors, a background check bill, perfectly constitutional, perfectly reasonable, supported by gun owners, both Democrats and Republicans, supported by 90 percent of the American people.

Ninety percent of the people that we collectively represent are asking us: Do something about this tragedy that is taking place over 30 times a day in the streets of America. Ninety percent. That is unbelievable support.

And what has the Republican leadership done? Nothing.

Thirty-four thousand deaths in the last 3½ years that we have been trying to take up this bill; 1,182 mass shootings since we have tried to take up this bill; 30 moments of silence on the floor of this House; zero, zero votes to protect the people that we represent; zero votes to do anything regarding responsible, Second Amendment gun laws that will protect the people that we represent.

Mr. Speaker, we are not asking for a lot. We are asking for a vote. We know that background checks work. Your side knows it, and our side knows it.

One of the previous speakers on the underlying bill today said: It is time to put politics aside and look at the policy.

What in the world is going on with background checks? The policy is solid. They work. One hundred and seventy felons a day are stopped from getting a gun because of background checks. Fifty domestic abusers a day are stopped from getting a gun because of background checks.

It sounds like pretty solid policy to me, Mr. Speaker. It must be the politics on the other side that are getting in the way. And the American people do not want that to continue.

Ninety percent of the people who we represent are with us. They say that criminals, terrorists, domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill should not be able to get guns and that the men and women who they send to the Congress of the United States of America should take responsible action to stop that from happening.

Please, give us a vote on the background check bill. Help keep our constituents safe.

Mr. POLIS. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

We are here on House Resolution 809. House Resolution 809 deals with two underlying bills. The first one is a conference report related to efforts to combat the opioid crisis that is wreaking havoc in communities across the United States. 46,000 people die—

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of parliamentary procedure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BYRNE. I do not.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I am not asking the gentleman to yield.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking you for a point of parliamentary procedure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama is under recognition. The gentleman from California may not make a parliamentary inquiry unless yielded to for that purpose.

The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. BYRNE. As I was saying, 46,000 people die every year of drug overdose. That is one of the things that is covered in the bills that are underlying in this resolution, and we just had over 2 hours of obstruction to try to keep us from considering that bill.

The resolution also contains the effort to get us to a conference on the National Defense Authorization Act, which is the policy that defends the United States of America. If we want to keep terrorists from murdering people in the United States, we need to defeat them over there so that they don't come over here.

I would ask everybody in this House to get back focused on what this resolution is about: trying to save people who are tragically dying from drug overdose and protecting the people of the United States of America, the number one thing that we in this Congress are here to do.

So I am glad that we are back to that because that is important business for this House.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 809 and the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 809 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1076) to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to a known or suspected dangerous terrorist. 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 the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1076.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the further consideration of H.R. 5485, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 794 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House on 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 Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE) kindly take the chair.

□ 1439

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. RIBBLE (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, July 7, 2016, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 25, printed in House Report 114-639, offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. DUFFY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment 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 implement, administer, or enforce a new regulatory action for which the aggregate costs of State, local, and tribal government compliance or private sector compliance, as estimated under section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform

Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1532), will be \$100,000,000 or more.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that deals with an issue that quite often comes up on this floor. It is an issue about regulation and overregulation. What this amendment would do is prohibit the administration from using any of these funds to implement a rule that would cost the economy \$100 million more. This is kind of like the REINS Act, but the rule doesn't come back for a vote; it is just prohibited.

The reason is there have been so many new rules and regulations that our economy is having a hard time keeping up. Just last year alone, there were 3,400 new rules—administrative rules, not from Congress, but these are from agencies. There were 80,000-plus pages of rules and regulations last year alone, and over half a million regulation pages over this President's administration.

This is having a real impact on the American economy. We have businesses that are having a more difficult time accessing loans to expand their businesses, to grow their innovation, to invest in innovation and create good-paying jobs within our communities. We have an increased cost of financing business expansions and home financing because of the compliance cost of our whole financial sector.

The costs have increased so much because the rules are now so complex and so many that it is trickling down to the business community and to our families. It is impacting our economy.

So I think it is time. At least right now, for a year, in this funding bill, let's take a pause. Let's just take a break on all the regulation. Let's stop, let's review, and then we can have a discussion about how we move forward. But this is a pause on the big regulation.

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

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

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.

It is a surprise to the gentleman that we still have 6 months to go in this Congress and in this administration.

This amendment would limit the administration's ability to propose or finalize important rules or regulations.

The administration issues rules because Congress has conveyed a specific responsibility to them. Rather than enact every contingency into law, we rely on public comment and technical advice to make sure the laws are implemented efficiently.

Taking a myopic view of our Nation's regulatory practices is nothing new for the majority. Time and time again we have seen appropriations riders and authorizing legislation that only looks at the costs associated with agency rules and completely ignores the associated benefits. This amendment is no different.

These proposals overlook the extensive review process that already exists for rules. For example, every new rule is already scrutinized up and down by numerous Federal agencies as well as key stakeholders and the public. For economically significant rules, an agency must provide the Office of Management and Budget with an assessment and, to the extent possible, a quantification of the benefits and costs of the proposed rule.

In accordance with Executive Order 12866, the agency has to justify the costs associated with the rule, and these costs are justified with benefits—something this amendment appears to think don't exist. But that is just false. For example, in its 2015 analysis of the estimated cost and benefits of significant Federal regulations, OMB estimated that, over the last decade, the benefits of these rules outweighed the economic costs by up to 9 to 1.

This amendment would upend years of precedent and could prohibit agencies from revising rules and regulations in response to changes in technology, the economy, or public demand.

Republicans should stop trying to undermine the rulemaking process and should stop ignoring the real-world benefits of these rules to society.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment very strongly, and I urge a "nay" vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1445

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), our chairman.

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

I rise in support of this, and thank the gentleman for bringing this before the House.

We have an administration that just loves to regulate. They love to regulate. They have rules for everything. They have no regard for the cost of the regulations. Small businesses, governments, and States are all hard pressed to do all this stuff. The administration tries to sidestep us by going through executive orders and Presidential memorandums.

All this amendment does is force the administration to seek congressional approval on the most significant of the new regulations.

It is a great amendment, and I urge all the Members to support it.

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

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chairman, I find it interesting that my good friend across the aisle talks about the great review process that we have by Federal agencies. These are the faceless, nameless

bureaucrats who make rules that have huge impacts on our families, on our businesses, and on our economy.

I don't know about you, but people come to me and say: There is a horrible rule. Could you help me out, my Member of Congress? What I do is I write a letter.

We have disenfranchised the American people because we don't make the laws anymore. We have outsourced that to the regulators. Let's take that power back.

When we empower the Congress, we empower the American people to have a say in their government on the rules that have a huge impact on their lives. Let's have the backbone to take tough votes, to say "yes" or "no" to these kind of rules. But let's not outsource it to an agency that has no relationship with the American people and no accountability to the American people.

This is saying "no." Let's take a stop and let's reempower the Congress to have a say, which, again, empowers the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, it is amazing. I think it could be December 31 of this year and we would still be trying to find a way to make the President look bad. That is what this is about. It is about this President having an administration.

If it was up to some on the other side, there would be no Federal agencies, there would be no Federal employees, they might invent a new computer that would run the whole government, and the rest of us would just sit around. But be careful, because then somebody would suggest that there should not be a Congress.

This should be left alone. We have agencies. We have secretaries. These agencies carry out. And when they don't carry out to our understanding, believe me, just look at the appropriations bills. There are riders upon riders upon riders to try to undo what is being done, which, in many cases, is excellent work. This is just more of the same.

It may come as a shock to you, but the President is still around for 6 more months and we are around for 6 more months and those administrators are around for 6 more months, so we better learn to get along for those 6 months.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. CRENSHAW OF FLORIDA

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 794, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 1 consisting of amendment Nos. 27, 48, 53, 56, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, and 69, printed in House Report 114-639, offered by Mr. CRENSHAW of Florida:

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. DUFFY OF WISCONSIN

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 with respect to the case *Rainey v. Merit Systems Protection Board* (United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit; No. 2015-3234, decided on June 7, 2016).

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. ZELDIN OF NEW YORK

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 enforce section 540 of Public Law 110-329 (122 Stat. 3688) or section 538 of Public Law 112-74 (125 Stat. 976; 6 U.S.C. 190 note).

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. JEFFRIES OF NEW YORK

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 for the relocation of the Office of Disability Adjudication and Review of the Social Security Administration located at 111 Livingston Street in Brooklyn, New York.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON OF FLORIDA

Page 11, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,250,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MRS. COMSTOCK OF VIRGINIA

Page 37, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$7,000,000)".

Page 92, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$7,000,000)".

Page 96, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$7,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF CALIFORNIA

Page 46, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 90, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 61 OFFERED BY MR. HIMES OF CONNECTICUT

Page 92, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,784,000)".

Page 96, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,784,000)".

Page 114, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,784,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MISS RICE OF NEW YORK

Page 92, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$800,000)".

Page 96, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$800,000)".

Page 113, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$800,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Page 6, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,300,000)".

Page 92, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,300,000)".

Page 96, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,300,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. WALBERG OF MICHIGAN

Page 37, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 92, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

Page 96, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY OF VIRGINIA

Page 40, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Page 92, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

Page 96, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

Page 117, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL OF NEW YORK

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 lease or purchase new light duty vehicles, for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum-Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON OF FLORIDA

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 enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, as required by Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals—

(1) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for—

(A) commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract;

(B) violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or

(C) commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property;

(2) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated above in paragraph (1); or

(3) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds \$3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, the majority and the minority have agreed to these amendments en bloc. They are noncontroversial amendments that affect a variety of topics, such as whistleblower protection, property disposal, and reducing drug trafficking.

Additionally, the sponsors of the amendments have agreed to the consideration of these amendments en bloc.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, this is going to be a historic moment, so let's pay attention.

I rise in support of the en bloc amendments. I appreciate the chairman's inclusion of amendments for Democratic Members.

I urge a "yes" vote on the en bloc amendment. I think it is a fine example of what we can do every so often.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and the ranking member.

I rise to support a bipartisan amendment that I have offered with my colleague, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), which helps communities combat the opioid and heroin epidemic by increasing funding for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program by \$2 million.

Across the country, HIDTA officials are doing important work to curb drug trafficking and bring law enforcement and community stakeholders together to stem the tide of drugs like heroin and fentanyl. Providing these additional resources will allow for even more local partnerships to fight drug trafficking.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

I rise to offer my amendment to the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act to improve the FTC enforcement of the Do Not Call Registry list, and to improve public education about FTC-supported solutions that can block these malicious and annoying robocalls.

Mr. Chair, all of us have suffered the repeated ringing from calls from unknown numbers from robocalls.

It only takes one day sitting at home to realize how invasive robocalls have become. This is what our elderly and retired citizens have to deal with every single day.

Robocall scammers steal over \$350 million every year from those who fall prey to incessant calls. Without proper enforcement and support from the FTC, these calls will continue and all of our constituents will continue to suffer. This amendment I offer today would increase funding for the FTC for the purpose of additional enforcement of the Do Not Call Registry and for educating for consumers about their options.

The relatively small increase in this amendment would result in 6.5 percent more funds for enforcement. Since 2004, the FTC has brought in \$41 million in penalties. That's a paltry \$3.4 million each year. Considering scammers owe the FTC an estimated \$1.2 billion in penalties, there's a lot more that can be done.

For the past several years, the FTC has held contests to support the development of robocall blocking apps such as Nomorobo and Robokiller. However, many people don't know that they are free and are effective solutions for some consumers. By allowing the FTC to conduct more education and outreach, this amendment would further leverage existing FTC investment in this area.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment. This amendment would provide a significant increase to the FTC's ability to crack down on illegal robocalls and provide our constituents some peace for the constant robocall ringing.

With that, I urge my colleagues to vote yes. Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment which would transfer \$7 million to the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program, also known as HIDTA.

HIDTA coordinates federal, state, and local drug task forces to disrupt and dismantle drug trafficking operations.

So many individuals—and by extension, their families and friends—are suffering the effects of drug abuse.

The heroin and opioid epidemic is affecting all of northern Virginia.

But currently, only part of my district is HIDTA-designated.

Two counties—Clarke and Frederick—have not yet received a HIDTA designation.

But I will not rest until my constituents in the Shenandoah Valley are afforded the same resources to combat this scourge.

The funding increase proposed by my amendment will ultimately save lives.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Chair, those of us in this institution talk a lot about how America is a nation of laws.

But unfortunately, a recent decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals ruled that, while we are a nation of laws, we are not a nation of rules. At least not if you are a Federal worker.

My amendment would prohibit the use of funds made available in the underlying bill with respect to *Rainey v. Merit System Protection Board*.

Allow me to explain the case and why it's relevant to the bill before us today.

Dr. Timothy Rainey is a State Department employee who, while serving as a contracting officer in 2013, was ordered by his supervisor to violate the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

Dr. Rainey refused, and in doing so he was removed from his duties.

When Dr. Rainey invoked the "right-to-disobey" provision of the Whistleblower Protection Act, the Merit Systems Protection Board ruled that the law only protects him from refusing to violate Federal laws, but not rules or regulations.

On June 7th, the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit upheld this ruling.

So what does this mean, Mr. Speaker?

I chair the Financial Services Oversight Subcommittee where we frequently get valuable tips from Federal whistleblowers about questionable and illegal activities at Federal agencies.

This ruling will have the effect of taking away their protections to stand up to bad actors in the Federal workforce.

Let's not forget that our rules and regulations are supposed to be derived from law.

In effect, this ruling will give permission to political appointees and other supervisors in positions of authority to force Federal works to violate the rules and regulations that Congress, through law, directs the agencies to implement.

At the Treasury Department, one of the many agencies funded by this bill, this would mean that Federal workers could be forced to violate sanctions against Russia for its violation of Ukraine's territorial integrity.

Many of those sanctions are enforced through the Code of Federal Regulations pursuant to laws enacted by Congress.

Ultimately, Congress will need to fix the Whistleblower Protection Act.

I intend to work in a bipartisan fashion and with the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform to fix the Whistleblower Protection Act to address this ruling.

In the meantime, I ask adoption of my amendment to put the House on record that Federal workers should follow laws and rules and regulations.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank Chairman CRENSHAW and Ranking Member SERRANO for including my amendment into the en bloc amendment to H.R. 5485, the FY2017 Financial Services Appropriations Act.

I offered this amendment to increase the funding provided to the Treasury Department's Office of Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN) by \$3,300,000. By sharing financial intelligence with law enforcement, private industry, and its foreign counterparts, FinCEN supports financial crime investigations throughout the world. Terrorists' proven ability to move money through innovative means necessitates continued progress in this critical counterterrorism area. The \$3,300,000 is needed to enhance FinCEN's supervisory strategy of Money Services Businesses and to meet the growing demand for FinCEN's expanded national security response efforts.

The amendment would offset this necessary increase through corresponding decreases in the funding provided for the "Rental of Space" account within the General Services Administration.

Through my work as Ranking Member of the Financial Services Committee's Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing and the Co-Chair of the bipartisan Task Force on Anti-Terrorism & Proliferation Financing, I witnessed the vital work that FinCEN engages in to safeguard our financial system from evolving money laundering and national security threats. By analyzing financial intelligence and sharing it with law enforcement, private industry, and its foreign counterparts, FinCEN supports financial crime investigations throughout the world.

At this time, FinCEN needs additional funding to enhance its supervisory strategy of Money Services Businesses (MSBs) and to establish a specialized response team to focus on high priority threats. This is important because banks are increasingly derisking by exiting the MSB market due to the high risks associated with MSB customers. For example, this is making it nearly impossible for families, charities, and businesses to send remittances to people in Somalia. A specialized response team will encourage banks to more consistently service the financial needs of the MSB market that is seen as higher risk.

In addition, FinCEN could use these additional funds to meet the growing demand for its expanded national security response efforts. FinCEN continues to support the broader Department of Treasury efforts by identifying sources of revenue for organizations such as Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and their attempts to access the international financial system. However, without adequate funding FinCEN will be unable to meet the demand for expanded intelligence reporting and increased investigations into terrorism finance.

As evidenced by recent support to the Paris and Belgium terrorists attack investigations, FinCEN's expertise assisted in quickly identifying links between the two attacks. FinCEN

published 51 reports related to the Paris attacks and 2 reports related to the Brussels attack. Many of these reports were generated through engagement with financial institutions by FinCEN, which resulted in increased reports from U.S. financial institutions. Moreover, FinCEN's financial intelligence has played an important role in identifying potential foreign terrorist fighters (FTFs).

With today's increasingly complex and rapidly evolving terrorist networks, we cannot risk our national security by not adequately funding this important Department.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 28 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. GARRETT. 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 by the Securities and Exchange Commission to propose, issue, implement, administer, or enforce any requirement that a solicitation of a proxy, consent, or authorization to vote a security of an issuer in an election of members of the board of directors of the issuer be made using a single ballot or card that lists both individuals nominated by (or on behalf of) the issuer and individuals nominated by (or on behalf of) other proponents and permits the person granting the proxy, consent, or authorization to select from among individuals in both groups.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today on an amendment that would prohibit special interests from having their agendas advanced by Washington bureaucrats, and to refocus the Securities and Exchange Commission on its important threefold policy mission: to protect investors; maintain fair, orderly, and efficient markets; and to facilitate capital formation.

Strong and efficient communication between the boards and management of public companies and their shareholders is foundational to healthy capital markets and to maintaining the ability of companies to innovate and to create jobs for everyone.

Fortunately, recent studies have shown that communication between the investors and the companies has actually improved over recent years, and shareholders are now increasingly able to effectuate change without all of the drastic measures, such as launching a proxy fight.

In fact, according to a 2015 report from Ernst & Young, the number of

companies disclosing engagement on government topics rose from a mere 6 percent of the S&P 500 companies all the way up to 50 percent in 2015. In many ways, this is a private market at work as investors demand that boards and management be more responsive to their request for how to improve the company and their long-term performance.

A number of regulatory hurdles still need to be overcome to improve the U.S. proxy system, which remains one of the primary ways in which public companies communicate between the two. Back in 2010, the SEC put forth a number of ideas, the so-called "Proxy Plumbing" concept release, which explored various ways to improve the transparency, if you will, of corporate government systems here in the United States.

Importantly, the Proxy Plumbing concept release also discussed at length the importance of getting retail investors more involved in the process. For a variety of reasons, retail investors have for years been disenfranchised by the current proxy system, and they rarely exercise the rights of shareholders to engage in improving the way that the companies work.

Unfortunately, for nearly 6 years, the SEC has, and maybe not surprisingly, allowed this Proxy Plumbing concept release to languish and has chosen not to act on it, even on some of the most basic and noncontroversial parts of it.

But then last year, out of the blue, SEC Chair Mary Jo White had directed the SEC staff to develop a rulemaking for what is known as "universal proxy ballots."

You ask: What are universal proxy ballots? Good question. Put simply, while they sound quite benign, actually, universal proxy ballots are a means for special interest groups to easily then nominate their preferred candidates to a company's board, and that would fundamentally change things. It would fundamentally change the way in which public company directors are elected here in the U.S.

This is an initiative that has been pushed for years by insiders and special interests. It has also been pushed by a number of activist pension funds, many of which have been horribly managed themselves and now find themselves with unfunded liabilities that threaten the retirement security of the public sector workers over which they were responsible.

The adoption of the universal proxy rule would only increase the likelihood of high profile proxy fights at public companies, which would then serve to distract the employees and management of these companies from carrying out their core mission.

More importantly, it would make the vast majority of public company shareholders, including the smaller retail investor, pay the price for the costs associated with these big fights.

Finally, it is unfair to those investors who do not wish to carry the water for these special interests.

Aside from these specific policy concerns, there are also issues of how the SEC has been prioritizing its finite resources. The SEC recently missed the rulemaking deadline for yet again another congressional mandate to simplify and modernize our current corporate disclosure regime.

This is an initiative that has bipartisan support and would help boost confidence by making quarterly and annual reports more effective for the small investor by reducing some of the unnecessary and the not material disclosures within them.

Unfortunately, once again, the SEC chose to ignore what Congress mandated and, instead, prioritized rulemakings over such things as that universal proxy I mentioned, which, again, would benefit simply a minority of insider special interests over the vast majority of public company shareholders.

This rulemaking should be nowhere on the SEC's agenda. My amendment would simply disallow the SEC from using its finite resources.

I urge all of my colleagues' support.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for bringing the amendment before us. This is a very good amendment. It keeps the SEC on track, it gets them focused on their core dual mission—investor protection and capital formation.

I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman said it more succinctly than I did in the last 4 minutes, and I thank him.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

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, it is amazing to hear the other side protecting the right of the SEC to do its work when the budget and the bill show just the opposite.

This amendment is yet another attack on the independence and efficacy of the Securities and Exchange Commission. It also represents an attack on shareholders.

When special interests cannot win ballot questions put to their shareholders, they seek protection from Congress to change the rules of the game.

Specifically, this amendment would prohibit the SEC from proposing, implementing, or enforcing any regulatory action on the issue of universal proxy ballots. These universal proxy ballots would let shareholders vote for whomever they wish to represent them on the corporate boards. This is a vital consideration in proxy contests since

board seats and, in some cases, board control are at stake. It would also make for a fairer, less cumbersome voting process.

Right now, there is a two-tiered system governing shareholder elections. Shareholders in attendance at meetings, particularly in proxy contests, have the ability to receive a legal ballot that allows them to pick and choose among all of the candidates who are duly nominated.

□ 1500

Shareholders who are not in attendance do not have that ability and, typically, can only choose from among nominees who appear on management's or a dissident's ballot, but not both. This limits shareholders' choice.

Many advocates and investors, including the Council of Institutional Investors, have written to the SEC and have asked them to address this issue. Indeed, the CII filed a rulemaking petition to this effect. Likewise, the SEC Investor Advisory Committee, which is the group of outside experts tasked with the responsibility under Dodd-Frank to advise the SEC on issues of investor protection, called upon the SEC to take action on this issue.

Corporate governance is only effective when boards are elected in a free and fair manner. The SEC should take steps to eliminate disenfranchisement in proxy contests in cases where shareholders have no ability to "split their ticket" and vote for a combination of shareholder and management nominees.

This amendment would curtail the SEC's existing authority in this regard, to the detriment of shareholders and corporate accountability.

I urge opposition to the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

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 New Jersey will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chair, 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—

(1) designate any nonbank financial company as "too big to fail";

(2) designate any nonbank financial company as a "systemically important financial institution"; or

(3) make a determination that material financial distress at a nonbank financial company, or the nature, scope, size, scale, concentration, interconnectedness, or mix of the activities of such company, could pose a threat to the financial stability of the United States.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chair, I rise to prevent government regulators from expanding the corrupt doctrine of "too big to fail" into even greater parts of our economy.

Under Dodd-Frank, the Financial Stability Oversight Council, FSOC, has the power now to designate companies as systemically important financial institutions, SIFIs. I have heard it said that the SIFI status does not necessarily mean "too big to fail," but that is a ridiculous claim that is on par with the reassurances that there was no implicit guarantee with Fannie and Freddie. In the real world, the Federal Government will never allow a SIFI to fail. The SIFI designation is nothing less than the government's stamp of approval and the enshrining of taxpayer bailouts. Simply put, a SIFI designation is the guarantee that the taxpayers will, once again, be on the hook for the bailouts of Wall Street.

First, megabanks were designated as "too big to fail." Now FSOC is claiming that nonbank firms, such as insurance companies and asset managers, should also be designated as SIFIs. FSOC's words and actions belie its true purpose, which is to grow its regulation of the economy so that every sector of the financial industry is propped up on the backs of taxpayers.

I am offering this amendment to prevent the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the SEC, who are both voting members of FSOC, from designating any additional nonbank companies as SIFIs. When companies become SIFIs, they cease to operate in the free market. Instead, they operate under a new system—a system that protects entities by sparing them from the costs and the consequences that other regular companies face in a competitive market. So, over time, the combination of this protected status and the Fed's risk-averse regulation will zap the energy and competitiveness of this company. Simply put, the government will corrupt the private sector, which, in turn, will corrupt the government.

"Too big to fail" must not take root in the nonbank financial sector. These companies serve as an important counterbalance to the megabanks. You see, Dodd-Frank was built on a foundation of sand—a foundation that mistakenly views the financial crisis as having been caused exclusively by the greed of large financial institutions and that in-

trusive government regulation would have prevented the crisis by keeping them from making risky investments. So it should come as no surprise that, instead of solving the problem, Dodd-Frank gave "too big to fail" the force of the law. FSOC is not working as intended because it is unworkable.

Finally, even with its absolute and unaccountable powers, its faulty premise dooms FSOC to failure. We must prevent FSOC from continuing to dig a deeper hole in free market capitalism and get Wall Street off the backs and out of the pockets of the American taxpayers.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman for bringing this amendment before us, and I urge everyone to support it.

Mr. Chair, FSOC is there to mitigate risk, not to just go around looking for people to designate. In our underlying bill, we say that, before you can designate a nonbank, you have to give it the right to cure whatever the problem is. This takes it one step further in asking: Why do we designate nonbanks as significantly important financial institutions?

We ought to focus on where the focus ought to be and just leave the nonbanks out of this.

I urge the support of this amendment.

Mr. GARRETT. Once again, the chairman said it more succinctly than I. I urge all Members to support the legislation.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, we finally found something we agree on again. This is becoming a habit. We want to keep Wall Street in its place. I wish the gentleman would help us with empowering the SEC to do so.

Dodd-Frank does not designate any entity as "too big to fail," as the Garrett amendment suggests. Instead, Dodd-Frank provides regulators with the tools to address the risks posed by large, complex, and interconnected financial institutions—both banks and nonbanks alike. This is crucial in addressing one of the main regulatory gaps we witnessed leading up to the 2008 crisis. Too many nonbanks were in the shadows, having had escaped critical regulation that could have prevented the crisis.

For example, regulators have already designed AIG as a nonbank systemically important financial institution, a SIFI. Recall that the London arm of AIG's was speculating in derivative products, such as credit default swaps, leading up to the 2008 crisis. By the fall of 2007, AIG Financial Products had already begun a tailspin that helped

spark the worst financial crisis in the U.S. since the Great Depression. By May 2009, various programs of support from the Federal Reserve and the Treasury amounted to more than \$180 billion in bailouts to the company.

Other nonbank broker dealers, like Bear Stearns and Lehman Brothers, were at the center of the creation of toxic assets, which were central to the crisis and necessitated the need for a Wall Street bailout. The Garrett amendment would stop our banking regulators from subjecting the next Lehman Brothers from heightened regulation. Hedge funds were also key intermediaries in the distribution and structuring of toxic assets. Again, the Garrett amendment would stop our banking regulators from providing the heightened regulation of their operations.

The Garrett amendment is an attempt to roll back the critical rules of the road we have passed in the wake of the greatest financial crisis since the Great Depression. Large financial institutions are fighting the SIFI designation because they know that being identified as one means being subjected to regulation that is above and beyond current requirements, including "living wills," which will help regulators plan how to wind down the firms in an orderly fashion in the event they become insolvent. The heightened regulation also includes the ability for regulators to "stress test" the entity to see if it can withstand financial distress, demand more capital, or to demand more stringent reporting.

Former FDIC Chairman Sheila Bair, a Republican appointee, noted in congressional testimony after the passage of Dodd-Frank: "Many institutions are vigorously lobbying against such a designation," and "being designated a SIFI will in no way confer a competitive advantage by anointing an institution as 'too big to fail.'"

The capacity to designate nonbanks as SIFIs is critical to the U.S. financial system for appropriate regulatory oversight. The designation process already has in place multiple procedural safeguards and opportunities for appeal via a lengthy process. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Garrett amendment as it does much more harm than we would think.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chair, the harm that has occurred is from the Dodd-Frank legislation, and the harm that has occurred by the FSOC designations is twofold.

One, the large one, is the fact that it has given a regulator the ability to put financial institutions and non-financial institutions and their problems on the backs of the American taxpayers, meaning that you and I and everybody who is listening to us may someday

have to reach into their pockets and bail out, once again, Wall Street for its bad decisions. That should end now.

Two, the even larger issue, is the failure of Dodd-Frank. In the legislation here, we are trying to fix the fact that it has had a debilitating effect on the overall economy. It has created disincentives in the marketplace, which is bad for the economy, and it is why we are having such a slow growth in the GDP, which translates into less job growth, fewer jobs for the American public, and fewer jobs for your neighbor and my neighbor as well. We need this legislation to fix it.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, the other side doesn't like ObamaCare; it doesn't like Dodd-Frank; it doesn't like the SEC. Maybe I am going to try an amendment on the bailout of the automobile industry to see if they like that one, because that helped a lot of folks.

This amendment is misguided. The gentleman is a good man who honestly believes in what he is saying and in what he is doing, but it is only going to hamper the SEC's ability to do its work. We do that enough in this bill, so it should be left alone. I urge a vote against the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

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 New Jersey will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 30 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, 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 a performance award under section 5384 of title 5, United States Code, to any career appointee within the Senior Executive Service.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer a commonsense amendment with the intent of prohibiting the use of funds in this act to pay a performance award to any senior executive employee within the IRS.

Under the direction of Commissioner John Koskinen, IRS officials have led a coordinated effort to hide the truth about this IRS' targeting of innocent Americans based on their political beliefs. Rather than cleaning up this rogue agency, Koskinen has doubled down on the agency's lawlessness and political culture.

On Koskinen's watch, the IRS intentionally destroyed nearly 24,000 emails from Lois Lerner and failed to comply with a congressional subpoena. To make matters worse, Commissioner Koskinen made a series of false and misleading statements under oath to Congress at multiple committee hearings on this matter.

Koskinen said in March of 2014 that the IRS had turned over all of Lerner's emails and all requested information; yet the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration uncovered more than 1,000 emails that the IRS tried to hide.

□ 1515

The recent transgressions perpetrated by this agency are not only disgraceful, they border on corrupt. The trust Americans once had has been utterly destroyed.

In July 2013, Danny Werfel, Acting Commissioner of the IRS, sought to eliminate bonuses for union employees and senior executives within the agency, sending an email to employees which stated: "I do not believe there should be performance awards this year for IRS employees, managers, or executives."

Unfortunately, Koskinen chose to ignore Werfel's attempts to restore trust within the agency. In February of 2014, Koskinen announced his decision to pay out bonuses to senior IRS bureaucrats in order to improve "employee morale."

In April 2014, the Treasury inspector general reported that more than 1,100 IRS employees with delinquent tax returns received bonuses of more than a million dollars. That same investigation found: "2,800 IRS employees facing disciplinary actions received more than \$2.8 million in monetary bonuses."

The Office of Personnel Management reported that in fiscal year 2014 alone, 61.5 percent of all senior executives within the Treasury Department received performance awards.

Lawlessness within this agency should not be rewarded. This amendment seeks to effectuate a policy of accountability and change the corrupt culture of this agency by prohibiting bonuses and performance awards for Senior Executives Service employees within the IRS.

It is unconscionable that Lois Lerner and other dishonest senior officials

within the IRS have received more than \$100,000 in bonuses in recent years. Committing perjury, purposely disposing of hard drives and more than 2,400 emails in order to stymie an investigation, and providing an extremely poor level of service to taxpayers doesn't warrant a bonus of even a penny, in my mind.

Fifty-seven Democrats joined every single Republican in seeking to prevent senior bureaucrats within the IRS from collecting these lavish bonuses in the fiscal year 2015 by voting in favor of my amendment that passed the House with strong bipartisan support.

The Council for Citizens Against Government Waste supports this amendment and FreedomWorks is key voting in favor of this amendment.

Once the IRS can prove that it will hold rogue employees accountable for their ineptitude, I will cease my efforts to prohibit these awards.

Again, I thank the chairman and ranking member for their continued work on the committee.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I am going to start backwards here.

We are not going to call for a vote on this, and the reason for it is, when people read your amendment, they are going to realize someone didn't write it correctly. It doesn't speak to the IRS. It actually allows for this cut to be across the board on the whole bill, which should make our chairman not very happy, and I am interested in my chairman's happiness.

I rise to oppose the amendment. This amendment would prevent agencies under this bill from giving employees in the Senior Executive Service bonuses. This seems to be aimed at the IRS since the summary on the Rules Committee Web site emphasizes the IRS, but it would have the same effect across the board.

No one is saying that poor performance should be rewarded, but this takes one class of employees and punishes all of them regardless of their individual merits. It will cause us to lose good employees, which is not what we need.

I realize Members on the other side of the aisle are eager to get their kicks in against the IRS—they even put them in bills when they are not the only ones in the bill—but I argue that this amendment would have unintended consequences.

Rather than somehow making the IRS or any other agency better, this is likely to make it worse. This amendment is going to simply ensure that we have less accomplished employees at the IRS and at other government agencies. It would have a negative effect on recruitment and retention of highly talented senior executives necessary to ensure tax administration and other agency duties. It may also conflict

with statutory requirements for SES bonuses that are designed to award strong performance.

I oppose the amendment. It is not well targeted or well thought out.

I think we also should know that this is the one agency that has been reduced in its employee number by the largest in the last few years, so I really don't understand what this is trying to accomplish.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, let me now ask the gentleman from New York a question.

I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) to respond.

If you disagree with my amendment and feel that it will have unintended consequences, name the agencies in the bill that you think should be allowed to dole out lavish bonuses to their senior executives.

Mr. SERRANO. I think that if an—
Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I am asking the gentleman: Name me an agency here that should not be doling out—

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, with all due respect, and I am not answering the gentleman's question, my role is not to tell you what you should have put in the bill.

Mr. GOSAR. Reclaiming my time, if the gentleman from New York can't give an answer—

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I am telling the gentleman from Arizona what he didn't write.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, reclaiming my time, I think most hardworking Americans would agree that the senior bureaucrats with the Customer Financial Protection Bureau, the Federal Labor Relations Authority, and the Federal Communications Commission should not be receiving lavish bonuses when we are \$19 trillion in the hole.

As I mentioned at the outset, the intent of this amendment is to prohibit the use of funds in this act to pay a performance award to any senior executive employee within the IRS. When the staff realized the actual language in the amendment could be more far reaching than intended, we attempted to work with the committee to correct this occurrence.

One thing that this House agrees on is that senior executives within IRS should not be collecting bonuses, and this amendment prohibits exactly that occurrence.

I urge adoption of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I will be brief.

I don't want to read into the gentleman from Arizona's statement, sir, that you were trying to get the chairman not to notice that you were writing the amendment that he dislikes the most across the board—that we both

dislike the most. I just think, you know, what you are talking about is something that, in many cases, has to be looked at. Also, in order to keep good employees, you have to find ways to reward them.

This agency, through the hits it takes, has lost—the one you intend, according to your comments, the IRS—has lost 18,000 employees in a couple of years since 2010, I believe, 18,000 employees. Now we go further here.

Secondly, I am glad to see that you spoke about other agencies, which means you must have read the amendment a little closer. But I still think it is not a good amendment. I still think it should be defeated.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. The Members on both sides are reminded to direct their remarks directly to the Chair and not to each other.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 31 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. GOSAR. 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 in contravention of section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373(a)).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

I rise today to offer a commonsense amendment. The Gosar-Bridenstine-Duncan-Gohmert-Huelskamp-Jones-Barletta-Brat-Brooks-Black amendment prohibits funds within this act from being used in contravention of Federal immigration law for sanctuary city policies.

The concept of sanctuary city policies is in direct opposition to the rule of law and our Constitution. Article I, section 8, clause 4 gives Congress clear jurisdiction on immigration matters.

A nation of laws must enforce established law, not seek ways to skirt around it. Sanctuary cities defy Federal immigration statutes by harboring untold numbers of illegal immigrants and providing safe havens for criminals, many of whom are violent offenders.

Our amendment prohibits the use of funds which are appropriated by this act from being used in contravention of

section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996. This Federal law prohibits sanctuary policies that prevent or obstruct government and law enforcement officials from sharing information regarding a person's immigration status with the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Despite being the law of the land, more than 200 State and municipal jurisdictions across the country have established policies that directly violate the law and shield criminal illegal aliens from enforcement. The shocking case of Kate Steinle in San Francisco in 2015 revealed the danger sanctuary cities pose to our Republic.

Just over a year ago, on July 1, 2015, Steinle was shot and killed by Juan Francisco Lopez-Sanchez, an illegal immigrant who had been deported five times. San Francisco authorities were asked to detain Sanchez until he could be turned over to Immigration and Customs Enforcement officials. The city declined and held Sanchez in jail for less than a month on a 20-year-old drug charge before releasing him on April 15, 2015, less than 2 months before he killed Steinle.

Sadly, Kate's tragic murder is not alone. Between 2010 and 2014, criminal aliens who were released by DHS went on to commit 124 homicide-related offenses across the country.

Let's not forget the many others who have been killed by criminal aliens: Jerry Braswell, Sr., and Jerry Braswell, Jr., of North Carolina; Dani Countryman of Oregon; Chandra Levy of Washington, D.C.; the Gonzalez family of Texas; Kevin Will of Texas; Christopher "Buddy" Rowe of California; Jamiel Shaw of California; Alvert John Mike of Utah; and Grant Ronnebeck of Arizona and countless others.

These brutal murders have called attention to the dangers sanctuary city policies pose to the safety and security of the American people. The Federation for American Immigration Reform supports this amendment stating: "Gosar amendment 31 addresses a critical public safety problem and sends a clear message to sanctuary city jurisdictions that their dangerous policies are unacceptable."

NumbersUSA is key voting in support of this amendment and has stated: "The Gosar Amendment is a targeted approach to sanctuary policies."

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of the Gosar amendment to cut off the funding to sanctuary cities through the financial appropriations bill.

When I came to Congress in 2011, I quickly cosponsored the Enforce the Law for Sanctuary Cities Act, and I have worked to hold these governments accountable ever since. Here is why.

We all know that, for years now, Congress has ceded more and more power to the executive branch. But less

talked about is the fact that, for just as long, Congress has allowed more than 200 State and municipal jurisdictions to do the same exact thing. And this is just plain wrong. Sanctuary cities thumb their nose at Congress; they ignore Federal law; and they endanger the lives of their citizens.

While I urge passage of this amendment, I also believe that we must act by passing my bill, the Stop Dangerous Sanctuary Cities Act, which takes a broad-based approach to defunding sanctuary city policies once and for all.

I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) for his leadership on this issue. I support his amendment.

Mr. GOSAR. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, this is one of those moments where you realize that an amendment is put forth not to deal with an issue but, rather, to put it on the floor so you can discuss it.

First of all, this is not the place to discuss immigration policy. And I can tell you that we would both agree that our immigration policy, our program, is broken and it has to be fixed.

Here is the problem, one that I have been arguing for years, and a lot of other people have been doing the same thing for years and lately, and that is that law enforcement officials, for the most part, will tell you that, regardless of whether we deal with the immigration issue or not, they need to speak to the local people and get information so they can do their job.

If they are seen as agents of the immigration department, if you will, the people won't speak to them who are here undocumented. They won't speak to them. So they are faced with a very difficult situation. They are saying: You guys and ladies are supposed to handle immigration reform. Do it. Take care of it. Do it in the way you want. Take care of that. But in the meantime, let me do my job.

So a guy steals a car, and three people in the neighborhood know who stole it. They go up. If they think that that police officer is also enforcing immigration policy, they are not going to talk to him. That is just a fact of life.

So you may think you are doing a great thing, but you are actually hurting law enforcement in the job that it has to do. What we need to do is have an immigration policy that speaks about all the issues that are covered by immigration policy.

Secondly, we hear from the other side about local control, local control, local control. Well, some cities have decided that they are sanctuary cities, that they are going to deal with the immigration issue differently than other people deal in other places—less mean, less aggressive and being nasty, more understanding of a problem rather than just saying that people come here to rip us off.

We have to keep all those things in mind as we look at this amendment, and this amendment should be defeated.

□ 1530

Lastly, your amendment talks about cutting funds, and the gentlewoman talked about cutting funds. To our knowledge, there is nothing in here that funds anything having to do with sanctuary cities or, for that matter, having to do with immigration. So wrong bill, wrong place, wrong time, wrong idea.

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

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

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 Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. GUINTA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 32 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. GUINTA. 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 by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to implement, administer, or enforce any guidance with respect to indirect auto lending.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. GUINTA. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in March of 2013, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau issued flawed and inaccurate guidance that would threaten to eliminate auto dealers' flexibility to discount the interest rate offered to consumers financing vehicle purchases.

Whether a person seeks to buy an automobile, an RV, or a motorcycle, consumers rely heavily on their neighborhood auto dealer to provide them the best possible rate. However, this faulty and unstudied guidance could increase the cost for consumers, ultimately making it more difficult to obtain an automobile.

Roughly 6 months ago, my good friend across the aisle, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and I, introduced H.R. 1737, which passed the House with an overwhelming bipartisan and veto-proof vote, 332-96. My bill, along with 13 bipartisan letters sent by Congress over

the last 3 years, gave the CFPB a chance to fix the faulty guidance and reissue it, but, unfortunately, they still insist on an anticonsumer policy and chose to keep their faulty bulletin in place.

In fact, the CFPB has refused to change course even with a solution modeled on the Department of Justice consent order that is supported by auto dealers and lenders and do not resort to eliminating dealer discounts. Congress has given the CFPB an opportunity to correct and reissue their guidance, and that would take into account consumers and bring clarity to the market.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment will leave no doubt that either the CFPB will fix this problem they created or Congress will, and if we do it, we will do it in a bipartisan way.

I would like to thank Chairman CRENSHAW and Chairman HENSARLING of the Committee on Financial Services for their support. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. I thank the gentleman for yielding and thank him for bringing this before the body.

Here is another example of the CFPB overregulating, trying to find a solution to a problem that doesn't exist. I support this amendment, and I urge a "yes" vote.

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. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment prohibits the CFPB from implementing, administering, or enforcing any guidance related to indirect auto lending. This is meant as a shot across the bow to the CFPB, telling them not to bring fair lending cases against indirect automobile finance companies. But on a practical level, the amendment will only invite confusion into the industry.

After all, this amendment does nothing to address lenders' obligations under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act. Instead, the amendment only strikes guidance the CFPB has provided to those lenders, providing clarity on how they can meet their obligations under the law.

Discrimination in any finance market is unacceptable, and we know that discrimination is still alive and well in the indirect auto lending marketplace. In the three settlements to date against Ally Financial, Fifth Third Bank, Honda and Toyota Motor Credit, the CFPB secured nearly \$162 million in borrower relief and penalties, finding that minority borrowers paid more than \$200 over the life of a car loan than White borrowers, even when controlling for borrowers' creditworthiness.

Discretionary markups are the source of discrimination in auto lending, and the guidance that this amendment nullifies helps lenders monitor and respond to potentially discriminatory auto lending practices. It is something that we should not be allowing, and this amendment tries to undo a lot of work that we are doing and a lot of work that should be done in the future.

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

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman that there is no place for discrimination. Based on information from the CFPB, CBO expects that the agency would not prepare a replacement bulletin if H.R. 1737 were enacted. That is because the bill would not affect the underlying statute or regulations to implement it. The Bureau can continue to enforce the Equal Credit Opportunity Act without the bulletin. I also remind the gentleman that the minority report also stated that this would not negatively impact the Equal Credit Opportunity Act.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS).

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I thank Mr. SERRANO for yielding.

You just described this as a shot across the bow to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, and you are absolutely right. They are attempting to tell them not to bring fair lending cases against indirect automobile finance companies.

This amendment is about protecting wrongdoers who gouge racial and ethnic minorities with high markups on car loans even when their income, their credit scores, and their financial backgrounds are the same as Whites. The amendment is about protecting companies like Ally Financial, Fifth Third Bank, Honda and Toyota Motor Credit, all of whom have had to enter into settlements with the Bureau over their indirect auto loan practices.

All told, the CFPB, again, has secured nearly \$162 million in borrower relief and penalties to help these borrowers. In their investigations, the Bureau found that minority borrowers paid more than \$200 over the life of a car loan than White borrowers, even when controlling for borrowers' creditworthiness.

Studies have shown that minority borrowers are less likely to be aware of interest rate markups. According to the Center for Responsible Lending, 68 percent of all borrowers were unaware that dealers have the ability to mark up an interest rate above what a lender offers based on their creditworthiness and the car being sold, but nearly 75 percent of African American and Hispanic borrowers are unaware that the practice of dealer markups even exists.

The guidance that this amendment seeks to nullify clearly outlines steps that lenders can take to protect borrowers from potentially discriminatory lending practices that often occur without the borrower even being aware of it occurring. So we know what the intent of this amendment is, but on a practical level, the amendment will only invite confusion into the industry.

After all, this amendment does nothing to address lenders' obligations under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act. Instead, the amendment only strikes guidance the CFPB has provided to those lenders providing clarity on how they can meet their obligations under the law. The issue has come up before in this Congress, but no matter where you stood on H.R. 1737, a bill we considered last year, you should be against this amendment.

To the Members on the opposite side of the aisle, you are supposed to have a poverty agenda, and you claim that you are taking on a new direction, that you want to have reduced poverty and deal with the problems of minorities and people in rural communities, et cetera.

This is what keeps poverty in these communities. We have these blue suede, slick dealers of all kinds—whether they are automobile lenders or payday loans or auto loans, all of this stuff—coming into these communities, taking advantage of the most vulnerable people who want to get out of poverty.

You say you want to help, but then you come in and you attack the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. You hate the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. You want to do everything to undermine their authority.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Members on both sides are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not each other.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Chairman, the Bureau's guidance was issued without public notice or comment and without any study of its impact on consumers or small businesses.

I want to thank the ranking member for authoring the minority report that states: "H.R. 1737 does not alter regulated entities' obligations under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act or the CFPB's examination or enforcement activity pursuant to ECOA." This is nothing more than a continuation of H.R. 1737.

I also want to repeat my thanks to my colleague on the other side of the aisle, Mr. PERLMUTTER, for helping me with a successful 332-96 vote in favor of that bill. This amendment is almost identical to it, and I would appreciate the ongoing support on behalf of consumers not just in New Hampshire, but all across the country.

Mr. Chairman, I would again thank the chair, Mr. CRENSHAW, as well as Mr. HENSARLING, those Members who voted in favor, 332-96, on H.R. 1737. I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA).

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 New Hampshire will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. HUDSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 33 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. HUDSON. 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 in this Act may be used to propose or finalize a regulatory action until January 21, 2017.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support my amendment that prohibits future regulations from the Obama administration. This is a commonsense step to rein in our regulatory system and make it work for the American people and not the other way around.

Since my first days in office, one message I continue to hear is people are tired of an unaccountable government that oversteps its bounds. In April, I was successful in pushing the EPA to withdraw a harmful regulation that would have devastated the motor-sports industry. I recently had the opportunity to visit a national leader in custom auto-racing parts in my hometown of Concord, North Carolina. I spoke with one worker who told me that if this one regulation would have gone through, he would have lost his entire livelihood. That, Mr. Chairman, is unacceptable.

The problem is, agencies have moved beyond their constitutional authority, and Washington bureaucrats are accountable to no one. They show little regard for the real world damage of their new rules on working families, on people looking for jobs, on our economy in general.

From regulatory gut punches like ObamaCare and ever-expanding EPA rules, stacking one on top of the other often before the previous rule is even enacted, regulations under this President have woven a web so complex and large, it risks ensnaring every American. This means fewer job opportuni-

ties, it means lower wages, and more families struggling.

At its core, overregulation is a form of stealth taxation. Working families, working people are paying the price for every new rule that comes out of Washington.

Now, I recognize some regulations are necessary, but we need a regulatory system that is transparent, one that balances the needs of our environment and public safety with economic strength and jobs, one that benefits hardworking Americans, not big government, big labor, and big business. It is time for us to chart a new pro-growth course away from this administration's burdensome regulations so that Americans can get back to work, and this amendment is one solution.

□ 1545

It will prevent the President from unleashing a new hailstorm of regulations in an attempt to cement his legacy in the last months of his administration. I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chairman, 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, it is interesting that there is a new bipartisanship here. I notice that this bill takes effect from now until January 21. So that means we will wait for Mrs. Clinton to become President before any new regulation would take effect.

Secondly, the other side is always complaining about regulations. But every so often, we should step back and, instead of knocking our country so much, kind of pay attention to what some of those regulations have done.

Sure, we have regulations. We have regulations about conditions in coal mines. Is that bad? We have regulations about the water we drink. Is that bad? We have regulations about the air we breathe.

Those regulations make us different from other countries where there is no respect for the population and no protection. There is a regulation that says you have to go to school up to a certain age. That is great. There is a regulation that says no children can be working in factories or in the garment industry in New York. That is wonderful.

So I am not afraid of regulations. Overregulating, okay, we can discuss that. But that side wants no regulation. It wants a computer to run the country. I keep claiming I want to see who is going to invent that computer. Here we go again, just talking about overregulating.

There are questions. This provision, for instance, would also be in direct conflict with other statutory requirements. For example, EPA is required to finalize annual renewal fuel standards regulations by November 30 of each year. I am sure there are others.

This is widely overbroad and can prevent significant regulatory actions in emergency situations, like disaster relief, where required by a court order, or when required by statute.

For another example, the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Trade Bureau, or TTB, in Treasury would not be able to publish implementing regulations relating to taxation of cider and removal of bond requirements for small beverage alcohol producers, and numerous other rules, such as a final rule reducing formula burdens on industry for specially denatured spirits and completely denatured alcohol, and the modernization of beverage alcohol.

It is easy to say: no more regulations from October 1 to January 21. Let the next President deal with it. You are rolling the dice, assuming you think you know who is going to be President. But that is okay, I can roll along with you.

The problem is that this is not the way to go. The dislike of the Obama administration by the other side is so evident, especially in amendments like this, where it is directed. At least, to your credit, you had the honesty in you to say the Obama administration. You called it by name, and I respect for you that. Other than that, I don't have a lot of respect for your amendment.

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

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HUDSON. I thank my colleague for his comments. I do agree that we don't need to eliminate all regulations. That is certainly not what we are saying here. We are saying that, from October 1 until January 21, we don't need new regulations.

With all due respect, I think we have had plenty. The amount of regulations that have come out of the Obama administration has been astounding. If you compare the amount of regulations to all other administrations combined, it is astounding, and they affect every aspect of people's lives.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman mentioned regulations in the past have been good. For example, regulating coal mines. I am sure that there were good regulations on coal mines, but we are at the point now where this administration is going to make coal mines illegal.

The gentleman also mentioned, Mr. Chairman, regulating water and air. We certainly all agree that we want clean air and clean water. But this administration issues a clean air regulation, or a new rule, and even before it goes into effect, they issue the next one to reduce the levels even lower—to levels that even experts agree aren't necessary.

In fact, members of the other party, in our hearing in the Energy and Commerce Committee, testified to the fact that the air today is so much cleaner

than it was before. And science proves that.

In North Carolina, we have got a 20 percent reduction in the coarse particulate matter in our air. We have made great progress, but to say we are going to continue to lower that level even before the science is to determine what the effect of the last regulation was is simply going too far.

What that means is, in places like Montgomery County, North Carolina, where we desperately need jobs, you can't have a new job. You can't have a new road. You can't have a new water-sewer line. You have can't add any new manufacturing jobs. That is ridiculous.

This administration has had 7½ years, and they have used that time wisely if their goal was to overregulate the American people. All I am saying is, in the last few months of this administration, let's put the brakes on.

As my colleague mentioned, we don't know who the next President is going to be. It may be someone from the other party. But that new President will have won a mandate, and that new President can then address the regulatory scheme. I look forward to having that debate. But as far as this administration, the votes are in. We have gotten our results. This administration has gone way too far with regulation.

So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to put on the brakes and say: 7½ years; enough is enough.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, you know, it is amazing. Many of us—and I am not suggesting you—get elected to Congress, and we are in awe of the fact that we come from where we come when we get to Congress. I am in that category. I am very blessed. There are others who come to Congress, and it seems that they come to Congress to undo Congress and undo the government.

We are the greatest nation on Earth. How did we get that?

Obviously, the fighting and the working spirit of the American people. But it was also the protections placed on the American people; the fact that children were told you have to go to school, the fact that we try to get the best water.

We spoke before about an immigration issue. I don't call it a problem.

Why does it exist?

Because people still know that we are the greatest country on Earth, and they want to come here.

So a lot of what you see as government intrusion, a lot of what you see as government being a pain could actually be some of the reasons that we became the great country we are. We just didn't let people go on their own and hurt each other, and so on.

We had people elected by the people to say: Hey, hold on. Why don't we do

this? Why don't we do that? Why don't we curtail this? Why don't we grow that?

And we continue to do that. So we disagree. I think we are great because we have certain rules to follow. And we follow them well.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 34 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. 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 implement, administer, or enforce a rule issued pursuant to section 13(p) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Section 1502 of the Dodd-Frank Act requires the Securities and Exchange Commission to issue a rule mandating that public companies disclose whether the minerals they use benefit armed groups in the Democratic Republic of Congo, also known as the DRC, and its nine neighboring countries.

"Conflict materials" refer to tin, tungsten, tantalum, and gold, which have been used in a huge variety of products, from cell phones, cosmetics, jewelry, chemicals, footwear, and including auto parts made right in west Michigan.

Simply put, section 1502 produced a rule that has failed everyone, and my amendment would, therefore, suspend its implementation for 1 year. The people of central Africa don't want it. President Obama's own SEC chair doesn't want it. Parts of the rule have been judged by the courts to violate First Amendment rights, and businesses throughout America are burdened with a reporting task that even the Department of Commerce has admitted is impossible.

Recently, the European Union—apparently sobered by their own experience in the U.S.—rejected this approach to conflict minerals. It is easy to see why they did so.

As we debate this amendment, let's be clear on what this isn't about. It is

not about who cares more about the plight of the Congolese more, a population that continues to suffer violence at the hands of rebel groups. The question is whether a window dressing disclosure rule at the SEC is the way to address this problem. If we truly care about peace in central Africa, then good intentions aren't enough. We have to demand results, Mr. Chairman.

Sadly, we have gotten the wrong kind of results from section 1502. Recently, I spoke with some missionaries from my own denomination who confirmed this. However, let's start by highlighting the voices of those who too often go unheard in this debate—the voices of the Africans themselves.

I include in the RECORD an open letter from 70 Congolese leaders and other regional experts who wrote:

"But in demanding that companies prove the origin of minerals sourced in the eastern DRC or neighbouring countries before systems able to provide such proof have been put in place, conflict mineral activists and resultant legislation—in particular Section 1502 of the Dodd-Frank Act—inadvertently incentivize buyers on the international market to pull out of the region altogether and source their minerals elsewhere.

"As a result, the conflict minerals movement has yet to lead to meaningful improvement on the ground, and has a number of unintended and damaging consequences."

According to a Washington Post article titled "How a well-intentioned U.S. law left Congolese miners jobless," section 1502 "set off a chain of events that has propelled millions of miners and their families deeper into poverty," with many miners forced to find other ways to survive, including by joining armed groups.

This article goes on to share the story of a Congolese teenager who actually joined a militia because mining could no longer put food on his table. "If we were earning money more from mining, I would not have entered the militia," he said.

I ask my colleagues to remember the Congolese, who aren't alone in their suffering. The SEC rule applies to nine other African nations as if they were all a single country. Section 1502 treats over 230 million people living in 10 distinct nations as one undifferentiated group.

Little wonder that Africans themselves take issue with Washington's one-size-fits-all mentality. In testimony to the Financial Services Committee last November, Rwanda's Minister of State for Mining, Evode Imena, noted that—despite Rwanda's actions to strengthen due diligence in its mining sector, and despite the fact that Rwanda has no armed groups in the first place—"the region is now suffering from an 'Africa-free' and not a 'conflict-free' minerals situation. Section 1502 has caused a de facto boycott by companies in the U.S. and much of Europe on most of our valuable resources." This disaster "has largely

impacted the livelihood of thousands of miners and their families . . .”

The words of Africans harmed by this rule should be enough for us to suspend it. But if we need more evidence of section 1502's failures, let's take a look at hard numbers.

A GAO study found last year that not a single company sampled could determine whether its minerals supported armed groups. Professor Jeff Schwartz of the University of Utah Law School has come to a similar conclusion, after reviewing 1,300 filings under section 1502.

Additionally, I wrote to SEC Chair White asking for a detailed description of the funds and hours expended to date on the SEC conflict minerals disclosure rule. In the SEC response letter, she stated that from July 2010 to March 16, 2015, the SEC spent over 21,000 hours and approximately \$2.7 million on this particular provision which the SEC has little to no experience with.

Given the lack of benefits from this rule, it is no wonder SEC Chair Mary Jo White has said:

“Seeking to improve safety in mines for workers or to end horrible human rights atrocities in the Democratic Republic of the Congo are compelling objectives, which, as a citizen, I wholeheartedly share. But, as the Chair of the SEC, I must question, as a policy matter, using the federal securities laws and the SEC's powers of mandatory disclosure to accomplish these goals.”

I agree with the SEC, and I appreciate support for this amendment.

AN OPEN LETTER

Dear governments, companies, non-governmental organisations, and other stakeholders implicated in efforts of various kinds related to the issue of ‘conflict minerals’: In early 2014, two international industry giants—Intel and Apple—issued refined corporate social responsibility policies for minerals sourced in the eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC). The announcements followed an unprecedented wave of guidelines, law-making, and initiatives over the past few years to ‘clean up’ the eastern DRC's mining sector, and were met with widespread praise.

Perhaps the most widely publicised of these efforts is US legislation known as Section 1502 of the Dodd-Frank Act, which asks all companies registered on the US stock market to reveal their supply chains to the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) when sourcing minerals from the eastern DRC or neighbouring countries. Canada is in the advanced stages of developing similar legislation, and many other countries are looking closely at the issue. The European Union has introduced a voluntary conflict minerals regulation scheme for all member states, and the United Nations (UN) and Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) have developed guidelines on sourcing natural resources in high-risk areas such as the eastern DRC.

These efforts primarily target artisanal (or ‘informal’) mining in the eastern DRC, due to widespread international recognition that so-called conflict minerals (most notably tin, tantalum, tungsten, and gold) produced by artisanal mining in this part of the world have helped conflict actors generate revenue to finance their operations in the DRC over the past two decades.

THE SITUATION

Despite successes of activists in shaping policy, the conflict minerals campaign fundamentally misunderstands the relationship between minerals and conflict in the eastern DRC. First, while the minerals help perpetuate the conflict, they are not its cause. National and regional political struggles over power and influence as well as issues such as access to land and questions of citizenship and identity are just some of the more structural drivers of conflict. The ability to exploit and profit from minerals is often a means to finance military operations to address these issues, rather than an end in itself. Internal UN assessments, for instance, show that only 8% of the DRC's conflicts are linked to minerals, and specific motivations vary greatly across the vast array of different armed groups.

Second, armed groups are not dependent on mineral revenue for their existence. The eastern DRC is a fully militarised economy, in which minerals are just one resource among many that armed groups—and the national army FARDC—can levy financing from. The M23, until recently the most powerful non-state armed group in DRC, never sought physical control over mining activity.

Moreover, few local stakeholders have been included in on-going international policy-making, and as a result realities on the ground have not always been taken into account. Setting up the required systems and procedures to regularly access and audit thousands of artisanal mining sites in isolated and hard-to-reach locations spread across an area almost twice the size of France would be a challenge for any government. In the eastern DRC, where road infrastructure is poor to non-existent and state capacity desperately low, the enormity of the task is hard to overstate. But in demanding that companies prove the origin of minerals sourced in the eastern DRC or neighbouring countries before systems able to provide such proof have been put in place, conflict minerals activists and resultant legislation—in particular Section 1502 of the Dodd-Frank Act—inadvertently incentivize buyers on the international market to pull out of the region altogether and source their minerals elsewhere.

THE RESULT

As a result, the conflict minerals movement has yet to lead to meaningful improvement on the ground, and has had a number of unintended and damaging consequences. Nearly four years after the passing of the Dodd-Frank Act, only a small fraction of the hundreds of mining sites in the eastern DRC have been reached by traceability or certification efforts. The rest remain beyond the pale, forced into either illegality or collapse as certain international buyers have responded to the legislation by going ‘Congo-free’.

This in turn has driven many miners into the margins of legality (for instance, feeding into smuggling rackets), where armed actors return through the loopholes of transnational regulation. Others have simply lost their jobs, and in areas where mining has ceased, local economies have suffered. To put this in context, an estimated eight to ten million people across the country are dependent on artisanal mining for their livelihood. Some former miners have returned to subsistence agriculture, but persisting insecurity levels leave them in abject poverty facing dire living conditions, in fear of missing harvests due to displacement. Others have been prompted to join militias as a means to quick cash in the absence of other opportunities; a particularly perverse impact, when one considers the intentions of the movement.

Alongside the impact on mining communities and local economies, several armed groups have responded by turning to different businesses such as trading in charcoal, marijuana, palm oil, soap, or consumer goods. Those remaining in the mining sector have largely traded mineral exploitation on site for mineral taxation a few steps down the supply chain, operating numerous roadblocks that can bring in millions of dollars a year. Others are reported to have sent in family members or civilian allies to run business for them on site, while they remain safely at a distance.

For the few mining sites fortunate enough to be reached by Joint Assessment Teams responsible for determining their ‘conflict-free’ status, these teams have been unable to provide the regular, three-month validation visits envisaged in legislation. There is an additional delay of several months following these visits before the Congolese Ministry of Mines reviews and approves the assessment at the national level. Given the speed at which situations can change in volatile environments, infrequent assessments and lengthy delays raise concerns over the accuracy of certification and the credibility of the system.

More worrying still, multinational corporations such as Apple and Intel are auditing smelters to determine the conflict-free status of the minerals they source, and not the mines themselves. As smelters are located outside of the DRC and audits are not always conducted by third parties, these processes raise further concerns over whether conflict-free certifications reflect production realities.

By far the most advanced site in terms of producing ‘conflict-free’ minerals for sale to the international market is Kalimbi, a tin mining area home to externally-financed initiatives running an industry-led bagging-and-tagging scheme called iTSCI. Yet even here, despite the establishment of a ‘closed pipeline’ from mine to exportation, the mine still suffers from the sporadic influence of armed actors, and miners are made to bear the additional costs of ‘conflict-free’ schemes. This raises further concerns over the credibility of the system in place, and its suitability for the scale-up and expansion to other, more remote mine sites currently underway. Coupled with slow progress in implementation, the trend towards the monopolisation of ‘conflict-free’ supply chain initiatives, in particular traceability by iTSCI, is economically damaging to local populations since it currently excludes and isolates the overwhelming majority of mining communities from legal access to international markets.

THE ALTERNATIVE

There is broad consensus for the need to clean up the eastern Congo's minerals sector, yet much disagreement about the international community's current model for achieving this goal. As such, efforts to improve transparency in the eastern DRC's mineral supply chains should continue. Yet a more nuanced and holistic approach that takes into account the realities of the eastern DRC's mining sector and the complexity of the conflict is needed. To this end, we make the following five recommendations:

Improve consultation with government and communities: Congolese government and civil society were poorly consulted on Section 1502 of the Dodd-Frank Act prior to its passing, and as a result many were unaware of its implications. The few who were consulted were unanimously pro-Dodd-Frank, creating additional conflicts on local levels where endorsement and dissent compete. More Congolese voices must be listened to, and the local context and power structures

taken into account. This would ensure greater understanding of the local context and better harmonisation with existing national and regional initiatives, such as the International Conference of the Great Lakes Region's (ICGLR) Regional Initiative against the Illegal Exploitation of Natural Resources.

Work towards meaningful reform: The audit process should be designed to improve policies and practices rather than to just provide window-dressing. The dominant belief that static oversight and validation processes ensure 'conflict-free' mineral trade is misplaced given the volatile security situation in most of the eastern DRC. Both mines and smelters should be regularly inspected and the time period between inspection and certification minimized. Where this is not feasible, additional waivers or similar measures should not be ruled out.

Create incentives towards better practice: Legal frameworks must be supported by real projects on the ground that can meet their requirements. If this is not possible—which is clearly still the case today, nearly four years after the passing of Dodd-Frank—then transition periods must be extended and the lowering of excessively high standards for 'conflict-free' minerals should be considered. Similarly, former conflict actors should be incentivised where appropriate to join new 'conflict-free' schemes. This may help avoid the eventual subversion or infiltration of the 'clean' system put in place, as has been seen to date.

Promote fair competition: Regulation must be based on competition that allows not only international businesses but also Congolese producers to influence (i.e. increase) local price schemes. This in turn would encourage a regime that ensures minimum wages which mining cooperatives can guarantee to their members based on their increased leverage on the price fluctuation.

Widen the lens: Root causes of conflict such as land, identity, and political contest in the context of a militarized economy, rather than a single focus on minerals, must be considered by advocates seeking to reduce conflict violence. Furthermore, efforts to eradicate conflict minerals should not overlook the fact that artisanal mining is a key livelihood in the eastern DRC that holds as much potential to help steer the region away from conflict as it does to contribute towards it. More supportive measures are needed—such as those found in the earlier 2009 draft of the US Conflict Minerals Act—that can help capture the economic potential of artisanal mining. Finally, other critical challenges such as access to credit, technical knowledge, hazardous working conditions, and environmental degradation should not be ignored by multinational corporations if they seek to improve business practices and increase transparency in their supply chains.

So far, progress has been made in producing more ethical products for consumers, but stakeholders have not yet proceeded to improve the lives of Congolese people, nor address the negative impact current 'conflict-free' initiatives are having. If the conflict minerals agenda is to lead to positive change on the ground, legislation passed by national governments and steps such as those outlined by Apple or Intel need to be grounded in a more holistic approach that is better tailored to local realities. Failure to do so will continue to seriously limit the ability of conflict minerals initiatives to improve the daily lives of the eastern Congolese and their neighbours. Worse, these initiatives will risk contributing to, rather than alleviating, the very conflicts they set out to address.

LIST OF SIGNATORIES

1. Aloys Tegera (Director, POLE Institute Goma)

2. Ann Laudati (Lecturer at the School for Geographical Sciences, University of Bristol)

3. Ashley Leinweber (Assistant Professor of Political Science, Missouri State University)

4. Ben Radley (Researcher, International Institute of Social Studies & 'Obama's Law' Producer)

5. Bonnie Campbell (Professor of Political Science, Université du Québec à Montréal)

6. Christiane Kayser (Independent Analyst & Civil Peace Service-Bread for the World mobile team)

7. Christoph Vogel (Researcher, University of Zurich & Independent analyst/writer)

8. Cyprien Birhingwa (Executive Secretary, COSOC-GL & Coordinator of CENADEP Kivu)

9. Daniel Rothenberg (Professor of Practice, School of Politics and Global Studies, Arizona State University)

10. David Rieff (Independent Author and Commentator)

11. Deo Buuma (Executive Secretary, Action pour la Paix et la Concorde—APC, Bukavu)

12. Didier de Failly s.j., (Directeur, Maison de Mines du Kivu, Bukavu)

13. Dominic Johnson (Africa Editor and Deputy Foreign Editor, die tageszeitung)

14. Dorothea Hilhorst (Professor of Humanitarian Aid and Reconstruction, Wageningen University)

15. Emmanuel Shamavu (Director, APRODEPED, Bukavu)

16. Eric Kajemba (Coordinator, Observatoire Gouvernance et Paix, Bukavu)

17. Esther Marijnen (Researcher, Institute for European Studies/Vrije Universiteit Brussel)

18. Evariste Mfaume (Executive Director, "Solidarité des Volontaires pour l'Humanité")

19. Gabriel Kamundala (Researcher, CEGEMI & Université Catholique de Bukavu)

20. Ganza Buroko (Cultural Operator & Coordinator of Yolé!Africa, Goma)

21. Godefroid Kā Mana (Professor, ULPGL Goma & UEA Bukavu & Université Kasavubu Boma)

22. Godefroid Muzalia (Professor, Institut Supérieur Pédagogique de Bukavu)

23. Henning Tamm (Postdoctoral Prize Research Fellow, Nuffield College, University of Oxford)

24. Herbert Weiss (Emeritus Professor of Political Science, City University of New York)

25. James Smith (Associate Professor of Anthropology, University of California/Davis)

26. Jean Ziegler (Former UN Special Rapporteur for the Right to Food and Professor at University of Geneva)

27. Jeroen Cuvelier (Postdoctoral Researcher, Wageningen University and Ghent University)

28. John Kanyoni (Independent Consultant and Vice-President of the Congolese Chamber of Mines)

29. Josaphat Musamba (Assistant Professor, Université Simon Kimbangu of Bukavu)

30. Joschka Havenith (Independent Researcher and Consultant, Cologne)

31. Jose Diemel (Researcher, Special Chair for Humanitarian Aid & Reconstruction, Wageningen University)

32. Joshua Walker (Postdoctoral Research Fellow, University of the Witwatersrand)

33. Josue Mukulumanya (President of the South Kivu mining cooperatives board GECOMISKI)

34. Justine Brabant (Independent Researcher and Journalist)

35. Juvénal Munubo (Member of Parliament, Democratic Republic of the Congo)

36. Juvénal Twaibu (Director, Centre Indépendant de Recherches et d'Etudes Stratégiques au Kivu)

37. Ken Matthyssen (Researcher on artisanal mining in eastern Congo, Antwerp)

38. Kizito Mushiizi (Member of Parliament, Democratic Republic of the Congo)

39. Koen Vlassenroot (Director, Conflict Research Group & Professor, Ghent University)

40. Kris Berwouts (Independent Consultant and Author)

41. Kristof Titeca (Assistant Professor, University of Antwerp)

42. Laura Seay (Assistant Professor of Government, Colby College)

43. Ley Uwera (Independent Journalist and Author, Goma)

44. Loochi Muzaliwa (Programme Coordinator, Life and Peace Institute DRC)

45. Micheline Mwendike (Activist, on behalf of LUCHA—Lutte pour le Changement/Struggle for Change)

46. Manuel Wollschläger (Conseiller Technique, ZFD-AGEH in Bukavu)

47. Milli Lake (Assistant Professor, Arizona State University)

48. Nicole Eggers (Assistant Professor of African History, Loyola University New Orleans)

49. Odile Bulabula (Deputy Coordinator, RIO—Network for Organisational Innovation, Bukavu)

50. Pádraic MacOireachtaigh (Regional Advocacy and Communications Officer, Jesuit Refugee Service)

51. Pamela Faber (Researcher, St. Catherine's College, University of Oxford)

52. Passy Mubalama (Independent Journalist and Author, Goma)

53. Paul Muhindo Mulemberi (Member of Parliament, Democratic Republic of the Congo)

54. Paul-Romain Namegabe (Professor of Law, Director of CEGEMI, Université Catholique de Bukavu)

55. Paulin Bishakabalya (Director of Humanitarian Assistance and Development Committee, Bukavu)

56. Peer Schouten (Postdoctoral Researcher, University of Gothenburg)

57. Phil Clark (Reader in Comparative and International Politics, SOAS/University of London)

58. Rachel Niehuus (Postdoctoral Researcher at University of California, San Francisco)

59. Rachel Strohm (Researcher in Political Science, University of Berkeley)

60. Raf Custers (Independent Journalist and Author on Mining)

61. Rémy Kasindi (Director, Centre for Research and Strategic Studies in Central Africa, Bukavu)

62. Rodrigue Rukumbuzi (Coordinator, AGAPE-Hauts Plateaux, Uvira)

63. Rosebell Kagumire (Independent Consultant and Blogger, Kampala/Addis Ababa)

64. Salambo Mulonda Bulambo (Director, PIAP, Bukavu)

65. Sara Geenen (Postdoctoral Researcher, Institute of Development Policy, Antwerp University)

66. Sekombi Katondolo (Director, Radio Mutaani, Goma)

67. Severine Autesserre (Assistant Professor, Barnard College, Columbia University)

68. Thomas Idolwa Tchomba (Consultant and Mining Expert, Goma)

69. Timothy Makori (Researcher, Department of Anthropology, University of Toronto)

70. Timothy Raeymaekers (Lecturer in Political Geography, University of Zurich)

71. Yvette Mwanza (President of the Mining Committee, Fédération des Entreprises Congolaises North Kivu)

72. Zacharie Bulakali (Independent Researcher on mining in eastern Congo)

All the signatories listed express their support to the open letter in its above form but

not necessarily approve of accompanying opinion pieces and/or explanatory notes, which remain their respective authors' views.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

□ 1600

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is just another devious Republican attempt to undermine efforts to end the decade-long scourge of rape and murder in Congo.

I have been in Congo many times. I served in the State Department in Kinshasa. I know the area. And the gentleman's statement that there is no company that is able to do this is absolutely incorrect. There is a company in Coral Gables, Florida, Kemet Corporation. They certify every bit of their metal is conflict-free. It is possible to do.

Now, why is this important? Well, all the 5 million people that have died in eastern Congo since Rwanda in 1992–93 have been from armed militias that are getting their money by taking minerals out of the ground and selling them abroad using slave labor.

The way you enslave a man is to rape his wife in front of him, and then bring him down and chain him and make him dig up the minerals. That is what has been going on there, and it has been going on for a long time, and everyone in this room is benefiting from that.

Everybody who has a cell phone has tin, tungsten, tantalum in it. And what this amendment is about is companies that will not go through the process. They do not want to do it. They want to get it from wherever it comes from. They don't care who it is.

Now, you can't tell me, and I know enough about Boeing and a lot of other companies, that they know their supply chain right down to where it starts in the ground somewhere. Everything that is in a plane, they know where it came from. And for them to say they don't know where it comes from or I can't know is simply that they want to get it on the cheap and don't care about human value in central Africa.

Now, the gentleman has given me the opening, which I didn't know if I would have, but his own church, the Christian Reformed Church in North America, their coordinator of office of social justice says defunding section 1502 and amendment No. 34 is immoral. It will result in violations and will undo work to our conflict-free mining in Africa.

This is a long-time battle, and we have had no one come up with any other way to deal with this except to

cut off the money to the militias. To say there is not armed conflict in eastern Congo is somebody who has got their head buried in the sand; because if you go over there, you know that there is conflict from Rwanda and Uganda and all the countries in that area, because this stuff is valuable and people want it, and they want it on the cheap.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCDERMOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I maybe, possibly like yourself, have occasional differences with my own church denomination. I have challenged them to talk to their own missionaries that are in the surrounding areas, whom I have talked to, who are also out on the coast, who are now seeing minerals exported.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Reclaiming my time, I get your point. You are saying that your church in wherever they are located, in Michigan or wherever, they are out of touch with what is going on on the ground.

I am in touch with the people on the ground. There are groups like HEAL Africa, which have been operating a hospital in Goma, which has been filled with people that come from this whole process. And when you go over there and talk to them, they say the only way you are ever going to do it here is cut off the money, and that means saying to people you have got to know where that tin or tungsten or tantalum came from and was it gotten by using slave labor.

If you are unwilling to do that, as a company, in the United States, you have no moral fiber. If you are not willing to say you will not use slave labor for the material that is in your product, in your cell phone—and believe me, it wouldn't be hard to get a boycott going in this country against some folks who want to, but nobody wants to come out in the open.

This amendment gets slid in at the last minute every year. Senator DURBIN, Senator COONS, Barney Frank, all of us worked on this. We have heard it all.

And of course the SEC doesn't want to do it. They don't want to do anything that doesn't have to do with paper shuffling and letting the derivatives run through the economy. They simply have been given this because they handle the money.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. FARENTHOLD). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

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 pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 35 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. 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 the Securities and Exchange Commission to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce pay ratio disclosure rules, including the final rule titled "Pay Ratio Disclosure", published Aug. 18, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 50103).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit any funds from being used by the SEC to implement, administer, or enforce the ineffective pay ratio disclosure mandate in section 953(b) of the Dodd-Frank Act.

Under Dodd-Frank, section 953(b) requires all publicly traded companies to calculate and disclose, for each filing with the SEC, the median annual total compensation of all employees of the company, excluding the CEO, disclose the annual total compensation of the CEO, and calculate and disclose a ratio comparing those two numbers.

In adopting the final rule, the SEC admitted that the pay ratio disclosure provides "no quantifiable benefit to public shareholders, yet it will cost public companies billions of dollars in initial and ongoing compliance expenses that could otherwise be used for investment in equipment and in job creation."

While the SEC provided modest flexibility in the final rule as compared to its initial proposal, the final rule did not mitigate the most significant burdens that the public companies will face as they collect and calculate the compensation information necessary to comply.

Companies must still all include all employees—including temporary, part-time, seasonal employees—and non-U.S. employees into their pay ratio calculation. The rule's 5 percent exclusion for non-U.S. employees, which includes any foreign employee whose salary data is protected by their home country privacy laws, will not defray the significant compliance costs, which the SEC estimates at \$1.3 billion in initial compliance costs and \$526 million on an ongoing annual cost basis.

Even the former Financial Services chairman, Barney Frank, acknowledged that burden before a September 24, 2010, hearing, stating: "I would note, again, that it was a Senate provision, and I think our inclination is to see to what extent it can be lessened as a burden, and, if not, we would be able to work and try to change that next year."

That was almost 6 years ago, Mr. Chairman. During that same hearing, the Democratic witness, Mr. Martin Baily of the Squam Lake Group, stated: "I am quite concerned about the level of poverty in the United States. I am quite concerned about the fact that ordinary workers have not done very well in the last few years. I don't see how publishing that ratio helps anybody very much, so I am not a big fan of that."

Amen. I could not agree more, Mr. Baily.

In his dissent, SEC Commissioner Gallagher stated: "Addressing perceived income inequality is not the province of the securities laws or the Commission."

Additionally, SEC Chair Mary Jo White has expressed similar concerns about the provision of the Dodd-Frank Act, noting that several provisions "appear more directed at exerting societal pressure on companies to change behavior rather than to disclose financial information that primarily informs investments decisions."

Again, I could not agree more, Mr. Chairman.

This useless disclosure requirement creates a number of lengthy and burdensome reporting obligations whose costs far outweighs any perceived benefits. This includes failing to provide shareholders with useful information or facilitate a better understanding of pay practices, which some falsely trumpet this provision would do.

Mr. Chairman, we are all concerned about creating more jobs in our various congressional districts, and instead of companies being forced to spend millions of dollars trying to comply with a regulatory mandate for which the SEC has been unable to quantify any benefits to the public, shouldn't these burdensome costs, instead, be converted and used by manufacturers, retailers, and other public companies for much-needed investment and job creation? I think so. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of this 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 rise in opposition to this amendment. It would repeal a requirement that companies show just how much more the CEO is paid compared to the company's median worker.

Why are Republicans so scared about reporting this number?

I imagine my Republican colleagues will describe the alleged costs to industry. Indeed, industry has offered wildly exaggerated estimates of the SEC's initial proposal, 10 times what the SEC economists estimated. However, none of these estimates are credible. There is no indication that industry has yet to come up with any credible estimate for the cost of the final rule. In fact, no one has, as the House Financial Services Committee has failed to convene a hearing on the final rule and the flexibility provided by the SEC. Worse, the committee has failed to hold a hearing on the bill, itself, this Congress. Rather, the Republicans are rushing this bill through the House and once again seek to repeal outright this provision in Dodd-Frank.

In the past, and before the SEC finalized its flexible rule, Democrats offered amendments to ease burdens on businesses, but Republicans weren't interested then and are apparently worried that the American public and investors will finally see that not all public companies pay their employees the same. In fact, some companies pay their CEO 400 times the median employee.

My Republican colleagues aren't concerned that CEOs and the rest of the 1 percent continue to take most of the income and wealth of this country. My colleagues aren't concerned that minorities and low-income Americans haven't seen a raise in decades.

The SEC has provided industry with as much flexibility as it could while still being consistent with the congressional mandate. I will also note that the requirement doesn't affect small businesses or emerging growth companies, but it is targeted to companies that retail investors overwhelmingly choose to invest in.

I know that industry, especially the global manufacturers, oppose the SEC rule, but I think that the information provided by this number matters. It will go a long way to identify the disparity between the top 1 percent and the everyday worker. It will go a long way towards enabling everyday investors to fund companies that properly compensate their employees, or punish those that inappropriately compensate their CEO.

I urge my colleagues to think seriously about this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the remaining time on both sides.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Michigan has 1 minute remaining, and the gentleman from New York has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. And I believe I have the right to close; correct?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has the right to close.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to point out to my colleague from New

York that he is actually wrong. We marked this bill up in committee in April of this year.

And the interesting thing, Mr. Chairman, is they want it both ways. We have to follow the SEC until they don't want to do it, and then they disagree with it. They disagree with the statement that the SEC apparently has come up with that this is going to cost \$1.7 billion in this initial year.

They want to say that the Obama economy is great—until it isn't and it doesn't work in their favor.

I, too, am very concerned and join my colleagues of all stripes to say that this economy has not responded the way it needs to and we need to have those wages up. And here we are robbing Peter to pay Paul, because we are going to take that money that could go into investing in equipment and productivity and actual workers, and we are going to do meaningless reports to this that tell us nothing. And the words of the SEC Chair—not my words, the SEC Chair—says that this brings no meaningful information to people in the economy.

□ 1615

So I don't understand why, other than window dressing, once again, and trying to set up a straw man argument, for why the businesses are doing what they are doing, why they would move ahead.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I have never seen a corporation tell you that studying their business practices is well-spent money. Everybody wants to keep everybody in the dark as to what is going on.

The American people have a sense of what is going on. We have heard enough, especially during this last campaign, about the 1 percent and the 99 percent. We have heard enough about how on Wall Street, in my city of New York, part of the problem was the lack of supervision by the FCC and by the SEC. And part of the problem—a large part—was the bonuses that these folks were getting. A \$50 million bonus in some cases and a \$25 million bonus in some cases was not something unheard of.

So I think that every so often the American people need to know and get information that may seem like a waste of money to some people, but actually can get at a problem.

We need to know in this capitalist society that we have—and we are not about to change that. We all like it. I like it. I want to keep it. But I think we have to try to look for ways to balance so that 99 percent of the people are not in danger of hurting while 1 percent of the folks are in great shape.

To find out that CEOs sometimes get 400 times the salary of one of their workers is totally outrageous, and the American people should know that and

should know—especially in the cases of stockholders too, there are a lot of stockholders who are small stockholders—and they want to know what company they are investing in.

So I think that this rule or this approach is good, and I think your amendment just tries to—I am not saying you do—but your amendment, the final result will be to try to cover up the truth, and that is not a good thing.

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

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

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 Michigan will be postponed.

The Chair understands that Amendment No. 36 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. LANCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 37 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. LANCE. 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 the Act may be used in contravention of, or to implement changes to, section 560.516 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on June 22, 2016.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I rise today to offer an amendment to eliminate the potential of Iran's gaining access to the U.S. dollar.

As Iran continues to violate international law with illicit ballistic missile tests, as it undermines U.S. foreign policy, and as it destabilizes the Middle East, the Obama administration may be willing to ease restrictions on Iran's access to the dollar and potentially reward Iran's international provocations with coveted access to world financial markets.

We cannot allow this to happen.

Since agreeing to the Iranian deal last year, the Obama administration has seemingly gone out of its way to appease Iran. Sanctions were lifted with little to show in the way of nuclear disarmament. The rogue regime is now selling oil on the international market, and Iran has received access to tens of billions of dollars held abroad

and has signed deals worth over \$100 billion in foreign investment.

Allowing Iran to have access to the dollar would mark an unprecedented additional concession to the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism. Access to the dollar would be an undeserved reward to a country that tortures its own people, denies human rights to women, and has the blood of Americans and our allies on its hands.

But in an effort to advance the nuclear agreement, I worry that the President may act unilaterally—as he has done so often in the past—and permit the Treasury Department and other Federal entities to proceed with granting Iran the access to the dollar it so desperately wants. A vote for this amendment will eliminate that possibility.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, let me say that this does not change what is currently the situation in this country. Last summer, Treasury Secretary Jack Lew testified that Iranian banks will not be able to clear U.S. dollars through New York, hold correspondent account relationships with U.S. financial institutions, or enter into financing agreements with U.S. banks.

As the Secretary made clear, Iran, in other words, will continue to be denied access to the world's largest financial and commercial market.

This amendment simply puts that promise into statutory law, and that is why I have proposed it. The Lance amendment will eliminate any possibility that we might move in the other direction.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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.

I don't, as you can see, have much to say on this because it is really an interesting situation. It is an amendment looking for a problem that doesn't exist. It is an amendment looking for the possibility that the President—there we go again, the gentleman in the White House—that the President may do something he hasn't said anything about doing.

The Treasury Department says that there are no current plans to amend the regulation and that flexibility is not at issue at this point because no one is discussing this.

The second part to this amendment is the underlying feeling by some Members still that the deal with Iran was a bad deal, that that deal won't work, and that somehow we will be left holding the bag. Well, giving peace a chance, as the song says, is never a bad thing to do.

I would hope that in the future we deal only with amendments that speak to an existing problem and not to an amendment that simply speaks about: What if? We have too many what-ifs in amendments.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I oppose the amendment and would hope that our colleagues would vote against it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chairman, let me say that this is not designed against any one President. This would be put into statutory law, and it would proceed after this President leaves office.

I believe that it is important that this fundamental principle—that Iran not have access to the U.S. dollar—should be in statutory law and not merely a matter of executive action. That is why I have proposed the amendment.

I hope that all Members will consider the amendment.

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

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I would just like to note that we speak about it, and it is not directed at any one President. But we have a unique system. We only have one President at a time. So it is directed at one President.

I suspect that if we were going to stay in session—which we are not—for every week from now until the end of the year, we would see more and more and more bills—up to December 31—bills that would try to limit the power of the office of the Presidency because of who occupies it right now and the disdain that the other side, so many Members, have for our President.

I see it differently. I see the Iran deal as a possibility for peace. Maybe history will say that I was naive. But I know the alternative, and the alternative is war. So any time that I can take a chance on evading and not having war, let's go for it.

Secondly, to legislate by suggesting that something could happen and therefore we have to head it off at the pass is not the way to legislate.

I would hope that we could vote against this amendment. I urge opposition to it.

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

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chairman, let me conclude by saying that the Iranian agreement is, of course, extremely controversial. It was voted down by the House of Representatives. Unfortunately, there was never any vote in the other House because cloture was not achieved.

The President submitted the Iranian agreement as an agreement, not as a treaty, based upon the fact that legislation has been passed to make it an agreement. I think it is important that as a matter of statutory law we make sure that Iran not have access to the U.S. dollar, and that is why I propose the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 38 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, Number 38.

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 enforce Executive Order 13166 (August 16, 2000; 65 Fed. Reg. 50121).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is an amendment that I offered before in the past. It simply says: "None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce Executive Order 13166."

That is an executive order that was filed by then-President Clinton on August 16 in the year 2000, in the last months of his Presidency, that directs all Federal fund recipients—and that would include Federal contractors, State and local governments, as well as the Federal Government—to facilitate language interpretation with anyone who seeks to engage with them.

That has been an executive order that has been highly costly not only to the taxpayers, but to the consumers in this country, in time and in money. It was one of the initial things that began to slow down this process of assimilation in America.

We know that a common language is the most powerful unifying force known throughout all of history, whether it is English or whether it is some other language in some other country, and that we have a strong effort to establish English as the official language of the United States.

I happen to be the author of that accomplishment in the State of Iowa. Thirty other States have English as the official language, and some 83 percent of Americans support this policy. Yet President Clinton's executive order subverts this and works to fracture us rather than unify us.

So it will save us billions of dollars. I didn't bring that figure to the floor with me, but we know it has been very expensive over time. We are 16 years into this. It has been destructive to the unity of the American people. I want to see us united as a people, and this is one of the steps that we can take.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim 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 won't speak in Spanish. I will only speak in English. The gentleman is a person that we all know well. He can't pass up the opportunity to say something about immigrants and say something about English as the official language.

Let me start off by saying this: I don't speak for any community, and I certainly don't know what other communities go through. But I can tell you that in the Hispanic/Latino community, when people sit around the dinner table and the issue of language comes up, it is not a plot against the English language. It is usually a conversation about how the children and the grandchildren no longer speak Spanish; they speak only English. That is just a fact.

Number two, this assimilation issue, do you really think that someone would leave all their small belongings behind, leave in many cases their wife and their children to come into this country undocumented—assuming we are talking about undocumented people—before they can find a way to bring the rest of the family, to not learn English, to purposely keep themselves away from immigrating into the American society?

On the contrary, some of the jokes are that some of the better—not better, but stronger-feeling Americans, the ones who want to vote, the ones who want to wave the flag strongly and proudly, are people who came from other countries.

□ 1630

Just about everybody has somebody that came from another country, either now or a long time ago.

The reason that President Clinton and so many of us have supported the issue—and I am speaking about the first President Clinton, not the next one—the fact that we support the issue of giving service is because in many ways this could be a constitutional question.

I will give you an example. I am not a lawyer, but it says life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, that is what we are promised. Well, life could be a paramedic being able to speak to you in a language that you understand. Liberty could be you in a trial getting an interpreter so what you have to say to that judge and to that jury can be understood. And the pursuit of happiness, of course, is a separate issue, but it allows you to grow two cultures at the same time.

I speak Spanish, I speak English, and I am a Member of the U.S. Congress. I don't think the fact that I speak Spanish has made me a worse Congressman or a worse American. I was born in an American territory that speaks a lot of Spanish. I grew up speaking Spanish and English at the same time. I am still working on both to be better at them every day, but I am a living example that there is nothing wrong with speaking more than one language.

We in this country have a couple of fears that set us apart from the rest of the world and make us less than the rest of the world, and that is the fear of languages. In some other countries, in Europe and so on, children at the age of 10 speak two, three, or four languages; grownups speak a couple of languages. It doesn't hurt them in any way.

What is wrong if you speak another language?

But here we are talking about services, going to the Department of Motor Vehicles and getting someone who can understand what you are saying until you learn to speak English. But trust me, the big line here is "until you speak English," because no one wants to come here and remain only speaking Spanish or their own country's language and forgetting English.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would say first in response to the gentleman, and I respect his position and his background, but I would say if he had a development in the Greek language, he might think of that pursuit of happiness as what our Founding Fathers did. They called it eudaimonia, E-U-D-A-I-M-O-N-I-A, the Greek word. That means developing the whole human being—the body, the mind, the spirit, and the soul—all together.

That pursuit of happiness wasn't about a tailgate party. It was about becoming the best human being that you could. That is a little difference in the translation of the language that got lost. It is an example of how we are divided by language rather than unified by a common language.

Another example would be Israel. It became a country in 1948. In 1954, they adopted Hebrew as their official language. I asked them why, and they said: Because we saw the example of the United States, that you have embraced English as your common language. It has unified the people. We needed to have a language to unify the Israelis.

And it has been successful, and I could give you examples. One day I got in a taxicab and there was a gentleman there. He spoke perfect English and he didn't seem to fit what a normal taxicab driver was. I said: Where were you raised?

He said: Bosnia.

How long have you been here?

Seven years.

Did you learn English before you came?

Not a word.

How can you speak perfect English in 7 years?

He said: It helps when you have to.

So I am not about discouraging the utilization of other languages, and this amendment does not do that. What it says is I am dispatched by the taxpayer dollars that are contributing to the division of America rather than let us have an encouragement to pull together in the same language. That is what this is about. It is a fiscally responsible amendment that addresses an

83 percent majority in 31 States that have already taken this act.

I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I have been informed that the gentleman picked the wrong example—Israel—because they have more than one official language, but that is okay. The more the merrier.

The fact of life is that the gentleman picked the example of someone who learned English. Well, everybody wants to learn to speak English. If you go to my community in the South Bronx, you see small-business owners. Those are the best examples. Some of them speak what we would call broken English. Some of them speak perfect English. Their children, half of them no longer speak Spanish; they speak English. Their children are attending Fordham University or a university down South. They are not going to be bodega owners when they grow up, or cab drivers. They most likely will go work on Wall Street or somewhere else or teach.

In other words, we have a pattern in this country that hasn't been broken. What made us great is the fact that people come here, they adapt, they become part of this country, and then they defend this country with everything they have got, including their blood. That happens all the time, it happens all the time, and it is not going to stop happening.

So if you have a worry—and I have heard you for years—that somehow speaking Spanish is going to wreck this country, on the contrary. Just learn to speak Spanish and you will feel much better.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would say in response to the gentleman, I give some thought to the story of the Tower of Babel. We know that the construction manager there was Nimrod. He was building a tower to the heavens. They had the arrogance to believe that they could bypass God and get to heaven without Him. The Lord looked down on the Tower of Babel and He said:

Behold, they are one people, they speak all one language, and nothing that they propose to do will now be impossible for them.

He scrambled their languages and scattered them to the four winds. Humanity on the planet has been at each other's throats ever since. That is the message of the Tower of Babel.

My message is unify us as one people. It is not discouraging the utilization of other languages, but it is discouraging the idea that we should establish ethnic

enclaves in America, that we should isolate ourselves somehow in these neighborhoods and not be assimilating into a broader neighborhood.

I will give an example to the gentleman. When Bush was President and we had a representative from the Department of Labor who came to testify before the Small Business Committee, she said: We have a problem. We don't have enough workers in the factories to run our punch presses and our lathes. Simple industrial work.

Why is that?

She said: Well, the applicants are not literate in the English language, and we have great difficulty in teaching them how to operate these machines.

I said: I can understand that if they are first-generation immigrants. In fact, I can understand it if some of them are second generation.

She cut me off and said: Even third generation.

So the pick-up of the language and the transition into the next generation is not happening at the speed it did because our enclaves are getting larger and more populated and people are more isolated into that.

I want to encourage people to be successful, to go out and get an education and to assimilate more broadly. I want to be able to look across this country and know that I can walk into a city council meeting anywhere and know that it is being conducted in English. I want people to be able to talk and communicate with each other. When I go to a foreign country and they speak their language, I get the sense of that, too.

We gravitate towards common kind, and the more common we can be, the more things we can have in common with each other, the more likely we are to be bonded together. That is what this amendment is about.

I urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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 Iowa will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. LUETKEMEYER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 39 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. 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 in this Act may be used to carry out Operation Choke Point.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chairman, how does the Federal Government get rid of an industry it doesn't like?

Simple. It cuts that industry off from the financial services sector—the lifeblood of every business in this country.

It sounds impossible, doesn't it?

However, that is exactly what the FDIC is doing in conjunction with the Department of Justice. By this point, we are all familiar with Operation Choke Point. It is the program designed to force legally operating and licensed entities out of business by choking them off from the financial services they need.

What started with nondepository lenders has spread to many other industries. Reports indicate that the FDIC and DOJ continue to pressure financial institutions that service the gun, ammunition, and tobacco industries. These are legal industries, and it is my belief that no joint FDIC and DOJ operation should broadly target lawful commerce.

I want to be very clear. I strongly support the FDIC and other Federal banking regulators' authority to monitor financial institutions and identify risky behavior. But what cannot be tolerated is the Federal Government abusing its authority to target entire industries, including those that obey the laws and live within the rules.

This isn't a Republican issue; this isn't a Democratic issue; it isn't a liberal or a conservative issue. This is an issue of the DOJ, FDIC, and potentially other banking regulators stepping outside the law.

We worked on a bipartisan basis to inform the DOJ, FDIC, and others of the consequences of Operation Choke Point, but those concerns have fallen on deaf ears. Operation Choke Point is still happening. In the last few months, I have heard from a debt buyer in California, a tobacco shop in Florida, and, just this week, a veteran-owned shooting sports company in Virginia.

I am now concerned that Operation Choke Point-like tactics have spread beyond the FDIC to the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency. Despite Comptroller Curry's remarks on the dangers of de-risking, we continue to hear from financial institutions that OCC examiners are applying pressure in an effort to force banks to drop longstanding customers and correspondent banking relationships for no valid reason.

I would like to remind my colleagues that similar amendments to prohibit the use of funds for Operation Choke Point were attached without opposition to appropriations bills in fiscal years 2015 and 2016. In February, the House passed a bipartisan vote of 250-169 H.R. 766, the Financial Institution

Customer Protection Act. That legislation included measures that would prohibit Operation Choke Point through increased transparency and responsible governance.

This amendment is an important step in ensuring that the FDIC and other Federal banking regulators continue their job, but do so without abuse of power.

I ask my colleagues for their support of this amendment which, again, has generated no opposition and has been adopted by voice vote in previous years.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, at the behest of the House Republicans' inquiry, the Department of Justice's Office of Professional Responsibility investigated whether there was misconduct or targeting of legal businesses by Operation Choke Point. The DOJ's OPR, in their report from last year, found that absolutely no wrongdoing had occurred.

The DOJ's Office of Professional Responsibility "concluded that the Department of Justice attorneys involved in Operation Choke Point did not engage in professional misconduct," and that, "OPR's inquiry further determined that Civil Division employees did not improperly target lawful participants."

Moreover, a follow-on report from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation inspector general found that the FDIC's involvement in Operation Choke Point was inconsequential to the direction and outcome of the initiative.

Operation Choke Point is an enforcement action by the Department of Justice, whose funding is not addressed by this particular appropriations bill. In fact, that is part of the large problem with this amendment—that it really speaks to issues that belong in another bill.

What this provision really does is tell the banking regulators not to cooperate with law enforcement when the Department of Justice has identified mass market fraud and other abuses of the payments system.

The Department of Justice has made it a priority to hold the perpetrators of consumer fraud accountable. Recently, for example, they prosecuted the operators of lottery scams, the promoters of fake business opportunities, and the criminals behind a telemarketing fraud targeting Spanish-speaking customers.

Preventing banking regulators from cooperating with legitimate law enforcement requests would restrict the ability of the Civil Division's Consumer Protection Branch in enforcing consumer protection statutes throughout the United States.

Operation Choke Point is just one of the Consumer Protection Branch's ef-

forts that require cooperation with banking regulators and which have produced significant results.

□ 1645

For example, the Branch, together with U.S. Attorneys across the country, obtained over 150 criminal convictions and more than \$7 billion in criminal fines, forfeitures, and restitution ordered to victims. Limiting the funding it receives would be a serious blow to consumers who need the protection of the government from the financial predators.

This is something that we should not be doing at this point. We, certainly, shouldn't be doing it in this bill, but we shouldn't be doing it at all. I urge its opposition.

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

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Chair, as somebody who has been on both sides of the table with regard to financial services—as a regulator and on the other side of the table as a businessperson—I think I have a unique perspective on what is going on here.

We also have a couple of reports from the Oversight and Government Reform Committee that took the emails of both of these agencies—their own emails—and showed them to be engaged in Operation Choke Point activities with the intent not to go after somebody who is doing something illegal, but to go after people who are doing something legal. That is the difference.

I support, as the gentleman indicated a minute ago, some of the activities of the regulators in going after bad actors. I support that 110 percent. As a former regulator, I am with the gentleman all the way. My problem is what is going on with Operation Choke Point as we are going after legal businesses that are doing legal business. That is a big difference because their own emails indicate their own, internal attorneys—the legal authorities in their own agencies—questioned their own ability to be doing what they are doing.

This should send a chill down the spine of every single American when you have the Department of Justice's own attorneys telling them we shouldn't be doing this because this is not legal. Yet this is the legal entity that is supposed to be leading our country and providing us protection with the law, itself.

It is interesting because the FDIC has already implemented a lot of these changes that we requested in our bill. In committee—and to me, personally—they admitted what was going on and said: We are going to fix our problems. They admitted Operation Choke Point was going on and that they were targeting legal businesses that were doing legal business. They said: We can't have that. We are going to stop it. The problem is it is continuing to go on, as I indicated in my testimony.

Just this week, there was another one. I have an email address that takes

information from individuals who have been wronged by Operation Choke Point activities. They are in legal businesses, doing legal business. And we got another hit just this week. Over the last several months, we have had numerous hits from different businesses across the country. Yet we have continued to see this happen.

I ask for the support of the amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114-639 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 22 by Mrs. BLACKBURN of Tennessee.

Amendment No. 23 by Mr. BUCK of Colorado.

Amendment No. 25 by Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio.

Amendment No. 28 by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 29 by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 31 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment No. 32 by Mr. GUINTA of New Hampshire.

Amendment No. 34 by Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

Amendment No. 35 by Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

Amendment No. 38 by Mr. KING of Iowa.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 241, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 377]

AYES—182

Abraham	Barton	Blackburn
Allen	Bilirakis	Blum
Amash	Bishop (MI)	Boustany
Babin	Bishop (UT)	Brady (TX)
Barr	Black	Brat

Bridenstine	Hudson	Pittenger	King (NY)	Noem	Serrano	Benishek	Hensarling	Poe (TX)
Brooks (AL)	Huelskamp	Pitts	Kirzinger (IL)	Nolan	Sewell (AL)	Bilirakis	Herrera Beutler	Poliquin
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Poe (TX)	Kirkpatrick	Norcross	Sherman	Bishop (MI)	Hice, Jody B.	Pompeo
Buchanan	Hultgren	Poliquin	Kuster	O'Rourke	Shimkus	Bishop (UT)	Hill	Posey
Buck	Hunter	Pompeo	LaHood	Pallone	Black	Blaine	Holding	Price, Tom
Bucshon	Hurd (TX)	Posey	Langevin	Pascrell	Blackburn	Blackburn	Hudson	Ratcliffe
Burgess	Hurt (VA)	Price, Tom	Larsen (WA)	Payne	Blum	Huelskamp	Reed	Reed
Byrne	Issa	Ratcliffe	Larson (CT)	Pelosi	Boustany	Hultgren	Roe (TN)	Roe (TN)
Carter (GA)	Jenkins (KS)	Ribble	Lawrence	Perlmutter	Brady (TX)	Hunter	Rogers (AL)	Rogers (AL)
Chabot	Johnson (OH)	Rice (SC)	Lee	Speier	Brat	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (KY)	Rogers (KY)
Chaffetz	Johnson, Sam	Roe (TN)	Levin	Peterson	Bridenstine	Hurt (VA)	Rohrabacher	Rohrabacher
Clawson (FL)	Jones	Rogers (AL)	Lewis	Pingree	Brooks (IN)	Issa	Rokita	Rokita
Coffman	Jordan	Rohrabacher	Lipinski	Pocan	Buck	Jenkins (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen	Ros-Lehtinen
Collins (GA)	Kelly (MS)	Rokita	Loeb sack	Polis	Burgess	Jenkins (WV)	Ross	Ross
Conaway	King (IA)	Rothfus	Lofgren	Price (NC)	Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Rothfus	Rothfus
Cook	Kline	Rouzer	Lowenthal	Quigley	Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Rouzer	Rouzer
Cooper	Knight	Royce	Lowey	Rangel	Carter (GA)	Jones	Royce	Royce
Cramer	Labrador	Russell	Lujan Grisham	Reed	Chabot	Jordan	Russell	Russell
Crawford	LaMalfa	Salmon	(NM)	Reichert	Chaffetz	Katko	Salmon	Salmon
Culberson	Lamborn	Sanford	Lujan, Ben Ray	Renacci	Clawson (FL)	Kelly (MS)	Sanford	Sanford
Davidson	Lance	Scalise	(NM)	Rice (NY)	Coffman	King (IA)	Scalise	Scalise
Dent	Latta	Schweikert	Lynch	Richmond	Cole	Kline	Schweikert	Schweikert
DeSantis	LoBiondo	Scott, Austin	MacArthur	Rigell	Collins (GA)	Knight	Scott, Austin	Scott, Austin
DesJarlais	Long	Sensenbrenner	Maloney,	Roby	Collins (NY)	Labrador	Sensenbrenner	Sensenbrenner
Duffy	Loudermilk	Sessions	Carolyn	Rogers (KY)	Comstock	LaHood	Sessions	Sessions
Duncan (SC)	Love	Shuster	Maloney, Sean	Ros-Lehtinen	Conaway	LaMalfa	Shimkus	Shimkus
Duncan (TN)	Lucas	Smith (MO)	Marino	Roskam	Cook	Lamborn	Shuster	Shuster
Ellmers (NC)	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NE)	Matsui	Ross	Cramer	Lance	Smith (MO)	Smith (MO)
Farenthold	Lummis	Smith (NJ)	McCollum	Roybal-Allard	Crawford	Latta	Smith (NE)	Smith (NE)
Fincher	Marchant	Smith (TX)	McDermott	Ruiz	Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)	Smith (NJ)
Fitzpatrick	Massie	Stewart	McGovern	Ruppersberger	Duffy	Culberson	Smith (TX)	Smith (TX)
Fleming	McCarthy	Stivers	McKinley	Rush	Davidson	Loudermilk	Stefanik	Stefanik
Flores	McCaul	Stutzman	McNerney	Ryan (OH)	Davis, Rodney	Love	Stewart	Stewart
Forbes	McClintock	Tiberi	Meehan	Sanchez, Linda	Denham	Lucas	Stivers	Stivers
Foxx	McHenry	Tipton	Meeks	T.	DeSantis	Luetkemeyer	Stutzman	Stutzman
Franks (AZ)	McMorris	Trott	Meng	Sanchez, Loretta	DesJarlais	Lummis	Thompson (PA)	Thompson (PA)
Garrett	Rodgers	Upton	Moore	Sarbanes	Diaz-Balart	Marino	Thornberry	Thornberry
Gibbs	McSally	Wagner	Moulton	Schakowsky	Duffy	Massie	Tipton	Tipton
Gohmert	Meadows	Walberg	Murphy (FL)	Schiff	Duncan (SC)	McCarthy	Trott	Trott
Goodlatte	Messer	Walden	Napolitano	Schrader	Duncan (TN)	McCaul	Upton	Upton
Gosar	Mica	Walker	Neal	Scott (VA)	Emmer (MN)	McClintock	Valadao	Valadao
Gowdy	Miller (FL)	Walorski	Newhouse	Scott, David	Farenthold	McHenry	Wagner	Wagner
Graves (GA)	Miller (MI)	Walters, Mimi			Fincher	McKinley	Walberg	Walberg
Graves (LA)	Moolenaar	Weber (TX)			Fitzpatrick	McMorris	Walden	Walden
Graves (MO)	Mooney (WV)	Webster (FL)			Fleischmann	Rodgers	Walker	Walker
Griffith	Mullin	Westrup	Bost	Lieu, Ted	Fleming	McSally	Walorski	Walorski
Grothman	Mulvaney	Westerman	Brown (FL)	Nader	Flores	Meadows	Walters, Mimi	Walters, Mimi
Guinta	Murphy (PA)	Williams	Delaney	Nugent	Forbes	Messer	Weber (TX)	Weber (TX)
Guthrie	Neugebauer	Wilson (SC)	Hastings	Rooney (FL)	Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)	Webster (FL)	Webster (FL)
Hardy	Nunes	Wittman			Garrett	Miller (MI)	Wenstrup	Wenstrup
Harris	Olson	Woodall			Gibbs	Moolenaar	Westerman	Westerman
Hartzler	Palazzo	Yoder			Gohmert	Mooney (WV)	Westmoreland	Westmoreland
Hensarling	Palmer	Yoho			Goodlatte	Mullin	Whitfield	Whitfield
Hice, Jody B.	Paulsen	Young (IA)			Gosar	Mulvaney	Williams	Williams
Hill	Pearce	Zeldin			Gowdy	Murphy (PA)	Wilson (SC)	Wilson (SC)
Holding	Perry	Zinke			Graves (GA)	Neugebauer	Wittman	Wittman

NOES—241

Adams	Comstock	Fudge
Aderholt	Connolly	Gabbard
Aguilar	Conyers	Gallego
Amodi	Costa	Garamendi
Ashford	Costello (PA)	Gibson
Barletta	Courtney	Graham
Bass	Crenshaw	Granger
Beatty	Crowley	Grayson
Becerra	Cuellar	Green, Al
Benishek	Cummings	Green, Gene
Bera	Curbelo (FL)	Grijalva
Beyer	Davis (GA)	Gutiérrez
Bishop (GA)	Davis, Danny	Hahn
Blumenauer	Davis, Rodney	Hanna
Bonamici	DeFazio	Harper
Boyle, Brendan F.	DeGette	Heck (NV)
Brady (PA)	DeLauro	Heck (WA)
Brownley (CA)	DelBene	Herrera Beutler
Bustos	Denham	Higgins
Butterfield	DeSaulnier	Himes
Calvert	Deutch	Hinojosa
Capps	Diaz-Balart	Honda
Capuano	Dingell	Hoyer
Cárdenas	Doggett	Huffman
Carney	Dold	Israel
Carson (IN)	Donovan	Jackson Lee
Carter (TX)	Doyle, Michael F.	Jeffries
Cartwright	Duckworth	Jenkins (WV)
Castor (FL)	Edwards	Johnson (GA)
Castro (TX)	Ellison	Johnson, E. B.
Cicilline	Emmer (MN)	Jolly
Clark (MA)	Engel	Joyce
Clarke (NY)	Eshoo	Kaptur
Clay	Esty	Katko
Cleaver	Farr	Keating
Clyburn	Fleischmann	Kelly (IL)
Cohen	Fortenberry	Kelly (PA)
Cole	Foster	Kennedy
Collins (NY)	Frankel (FL)	Kildee
	Frelinghuysen	Kilmer
		Kind

NOT VOTING—10

Bost	Lieu, Ted	Takai
Brown (FL)	Nader	Turner
Delaney	Nugent	
Hastings	Rooney (FL)	

□ 1711

Messrs. WOMACK, HIMES, MEEKS, MS. BASS, Messrs. REED, ROGERS of Kentucky, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. MULLIN, TROTT, and ROYCE changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. BUCK

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 197, noes 224, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 378]

AYES—197

Abraham	Amash	Barr
Allen	Babin	Barton

Adams	Cicilline	Edwards
Aderholt	Clark (MA)	Ellison
Aguilar	Clarke (NY)	Ellmers (NC)
Amodi	Clay	Engel
Ashford	Cleaver	Eshoo
Barletta	Clyburn	Esty
Bass	Cohen	Farr
Beatty	Connolly	Fortenberry
Becerra	Conyers	Foster
Bera	Cooper	Foxx
Beyer	Costa	Frankel (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Costello (PA)	Frelinghuysen
Blumenauer	Courtney	Fudge
Bonamici	Crowley	Gabbard
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cuellar	Gallego
Brady (PA)	Cummings	Garamendi
Brooks (AL)	Curbelo (FL)	Gibson
Brownley (CA)	Davis (CA)	Graham
Buchanan	Davis, Danny	Granger
Bucshon	DeFazio	Grayson
Bustos	DeGette	Green, Al
Butterfield	DeLauro	Green, Gene
Capps	DelBene	Grijalva
Capuano	Dent	Gutiérrez
Cárdenas	DeSaulnier	Hahn
Carney	Dingell	Hanna
Carson (IN)	Doggett	Hardy
Carter (TX)	Dold	Heck (NV)
Cartwright	Donovan	Heck (WA)
Castor (FL)	Doyle, Michael F.	Higgins
Castro (TX)	Duckworth	Hinojosa
Chu, Judy		Honda

NOES—224

Adams	Cicilline	Edwards
Aderholt	Clark (MA)	Ellison
Aguilar	Clarke (NY)	Ellmers (NC)
Amodi	Clay	Engel
Ashford	Cleaver	Eshoo
Barletta	Clyburn	Esty
Bass	Cohen	Farr
Beatty	Connolly	Fortenberry
Becerra	Conyers	Foster
Bera	Cooper	Foxx
Beyer	Costa	Frankel (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Costello (PA)	Frelinghuysen
Blumenauer	Courtney	Fudge
Bonamici	Crowley	Gabbard
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cuellar	Gallego
Brady (PA)	Cummings	Garamendi
Brooks (AL)	Curbelo (FL)	Gibson
Brownley (CA)	Davis (CA)	Graham
Buchanan	Davis, Danny	Granger
Bucshon	DeFazio	Grayson
Bustos	DeGette	Green, Al
Butterfield	DeLauro	Green, Gene
Capps	DelBene	Grijalva
Capuano	Dent	Gutiérrez
Cárdenas	DeSaulnier	Hahn
Carney	Dingell	Hanna
Carson (IN)	Doggett	Hardy
Carter (TX)	Dold	Heck (NV)
Cartwright	Donovan	Heck (WA)
Castor (FL)	Doyle, Michael F.	Higgins
Castro (TX)	Duckworth	Hinojosa
Chu, Judy		Honda

Hoyer	McCullum	Rush	Brat	Heck (NV)	Perry	Huffman	McGovern	Sánchez, Linda
Huffman	McDermott	Ryan (OH)	Bridenstine	Hensarling	Pittenger	Israel	McNerney	T.
Huizenga (MI)	McGovern	Sánchez, Linda	Brooks (AL)	Herrera Beutler	Pitts	Jackson Lee	McSally	Sánchez, Loretta
Israel	McNerney	T.	Brooks (IN)	Hice, Jody B.	Poe (TX)	Jeffries	Meehan	Sanford
Jackson Lee	Meehan	Sánchez, Loretta	Buchanan	Hill	Pompeo	Johnson (GA)	Meeks	Sarbanes
Jeffries	Meeks	Sarbanes	Buck	Holding	Posey	Johnson, E. B.	Meng	Schakowsky
Johnson (GA)	Meng	Schakowsky	Bucshon	Hudson	Price, Tom	Jolly	Moore	Schiff
Johnson, E. B.	Mica	Schiff	Burgess	Huelskamp	Ratcliffe	Kaptur	Moulton	Schrader
Jolly	Moore	Schrader	Byrne	Huizenga (MI)	Reichert	Katko	Murphy (FL)	Scott (VA)
Joyce	Moulton	Scott (VA)	Calvert	Hultgren	Renacci	Keating	Napolitano	Scott, David
Kaptur	Murphy (FL)	Scott, David	Carter (GA)	Hunter	Rice (SC)	Kelly (IL)	Neal	Serrano
Keating	Napolitano	Serrano	Carter (TX)	Hurd (TX)	Roe (TN)	Kennedy	Noem	Sewell (AL)
Kelly (IL)	Neal	Sewell (AL)	Chabot	Hurt (VA)	Rogers (AL)	Kildee	Nolan	Sherman
Kelly (PA)	Newhouse	Sherman	Chaffetz	Issa	Rogers (KY)	Kilmer	Norcross	Shimkus
Kennedy	Noem	Simpson	Clawson (FL)	Jenkins (KS)	Rohrabacher	Kind	O'Rourke	Sinema
Kildee	Nolan	Sinema	Coffman	Jenkins (WV)	Roskam	Kinzinger (IL)	Pallone	Sires
Kilmer	Norcross	Sires	Cole	Johnson (OH)	Ross	Kirkpatrick	Pascrell	Slaughter
Kind	O'Rourke	Slaughter	Collins (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus	Kuster	Payne	Smith (WA)
King (NY)	Pallone	Smith (WA)	Comstock	Jones	Rouzer	Langevin	Pelosi	Speier
Kingzinger (IL)	Pascrell	Speier	Conaway	Jordan	Royce	Larsen (WA)	Perlmutter	Swalwell (CA)
Kirkpatrick	Payne	Swalwell (CA)	Cook	Joyce	Russell	Larson (CT)	Peters	Takano
Kuster	Pelosi	Takano	Costello (PA)	Kelly (MS)	Salmon	Lawrence	Peterson	Thompson (CA)
Langevin	Perlmutter	Thompson (CA)	Cramer	Kelly (PA)	Scalise	Lee	Pingree	Thompson (MS)
Larsen (WA)	Peters	Thompson (MS)	Crawford	King (IA)	Schweikert	Levin	Pocan	Titus
Larson (CT)	Peterson	Tiberi	Cuellar	King (NY)	Scott, Austin	Lewis	Poliquin	Tonko
Lawrence	Pingree	Titus	Culberson	Kline	Loeb sack	Loeb sack	Polis	Torres
Lee	Pittenger	Tonko	Davidson	Knight	Lofgren	Lofgren	Price (NC)	Tsongas
Levin	Pocan	Torres	Davis, Rodney	Labrador	Lowenthal	Lowenthal	Quigley	Van Hollen
Lewis	Polis	Tsongas	DeSantis	LaHood	Lowe y	Lowe y	Rangel	Vargas
Lipinski	Price (NC)	Van Hollen	DesJarlais	LaMalfa	Lujan Grisham	Lujan Grisham	Reed	Veasey
Loeb sack	Quigley	Vargas	Diaz-Balart	Lamborn	(NM)	(NM)	Ribble	Vela
Lofgren	Rangel	Veasey	Dold	Lance	Luján, Ben Ray	Luján, Ben Ray	Rice (NY)	Velázquez
Lowenthal	Reichert	Vela	Donovan	Latta	(NM)	(NM)	Richmond	Visclosky
Lowe y	Renacci	Velázquez	Duffy	Lipinski	Lummis	Lummis	Rigell	Walz
Lujan Grisham	Ribble	Visclosky	Duncan (SC)	LoBiondo	Lynch	Lynch	Roby	Wasserman
(NM)	Rice (NY)	Walz	Duncan (TN)	Long	Maloney,	Maloney,	Ros-Lehtinen	Schultz
Luján, Ben Ray	Rice (SC)	Wasserman	Ellmers (NC)	Loudermilk	Carolyn	Carolyn	Roybal-Allard	Waters, Maxine
(NM)	Richmond	Schultz	Emmer (MN)	Love	Maloney, Sean	Maloney, Sean	Ruiz	Watson Coleman
Lynch	Rigell	Waters, Maxine	Farenthold	Lucas	Matsui	Matsui	Ruppersberger	Welch
MacArthur	Roby	Watson Coleman	Fincher	Luetkemeyer	McCollum	McCollum	Rush	Wilson (FL)
Maloney,	Roskam	Welch	Fitzpatrick	MacArthur	McDermott	McDermott	Ryan (OH)	Yarmuth
Carolyn	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (FL)	Fleischmann	Marchant				
Maloney, Sean	Ruiz	Yarmuth	Fleming	Trott				
Matsui	Ruppersberger	Young (IN)	Flores	Upton				

NOT VOTING—12

Bost	Hastings	Nugent
Brown (FL)	Lieu, Ted	Rooney (FL)
Delaney	Marchant	Takai
Guinta	Nadler	Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1715

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIDSON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 217, noes 203, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 379]

AYES—217

Abraham	Barr	Black
Aderholt	Barton	Blackburn
Allen	Bilirakis	Blum
Amash	Bishop (MI)	Boustany
Babin	Bishop (UT)	Brady (TX)

Adams	Cicilline	Doyle, Michael
Aguilar	Clark (MA)	F.
Amodei	Clarke (NY)	Duckworth
Ashford	Clay	Edwards
Barietta	Cleaver	Ellison
Bass	Clyburn	Engel
Beatty	Cohen	Eshoo
Becerra	Collins (NY)	Esty
Benishek	Connolly	Farr
Bera	Conyers	Foster
Beyer	Cooper	Frankel (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Fudge
Blumenauer	Courtney	Gabbard
Bonamici	Crenshaw	Gallego
Boyle, Brendan	Crowley	Garamendi
F.	Cummings	Graham
Brady (PA)	Curbelo (FL)	Grayson
Brownley (CA)	Davis (CA)	Green, Al
Bustos	Davis, Danny	Green, Gene
Butterfield	DeFazio	Grijalva
Capps	DeGette	Gutiérrez
Capuano	DeLauro	Hahn
Cárdenas	DelBene	Hanna
Carney	Denham	Heck (WA)
Carson (IN)	Dent	Higgins
Cartwright	DeSaunier	Himes
Castor (FL)	Deutch	Hinojosa
Castro (TX)	Dingell	Honda
Chu, Judy	Doggett	Hoyer

NOES—203

NOT VOTING—13

Bost	Murphy (PA)	Takai
Brown (FL)	Nadler	Turner
Delaney	Nugent	Williams
Hastings	Rokita	
Lieu, Ted	Rooney (FL)	

Announcement by the Acting Chair
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1718

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 379, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 180, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 380]

AYES—243

Abraham	Amash	Babin
Aderholt	Amodei	Barletta
Allen	Ashford	Barr

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

NOT VOTING—12

Bost	Duncan (SC)	Nugent
Brown (FL)	Hastings	Rooney (FL)
Delaney	Jordan	Takai
DeSaulnier	Nadler	Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1724

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 182, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 382]

AYES—236

Abraham	Black	Calvert
Aderholt	Blackburn	Carter (GA)
Allen	Blum	Carter (TX)
Amash	Boustany	Chabot
Amodei	Brady (TX)	Chaffetz
Babin	Bridenstine	Clawson (FL)
Barletta	Brooks (AL)	Coffman
Barr	Brooks (IN)	Cole
Barton	Buchanan	Collins (GA)
Benishek	Buck	Collins (NY)
Bilirakis	Bucshon	Comstock
Bishop (MI)	Burgess	Conaway
Bishop (UT)	Byrne	Cook

NOES—182

Adams	Clyburn	Fudge
Agullar	Cohen	Gabbard
Ashford	Connolly	Gallego
Bass	Conyers	Garamendi
Beatty	Cooper	Graham
Becerra	Costa	Grayson
Bera	Courtney	Green, Al
Beyer	Crowley	Green, Gene
Bishop (GA)	Cummings	Grijalva
Blumenauer	Curbelo (FL)	Gutiérrez
Bonamici	Davis (CA)	Hahn
Boyle, Brendan	Davis, Danny	Heck (WA)
F.	DeFazio	Higgins
Brady (PA)	DeGette	Himes
Brownley (CA)	DeLauro	Hinojosa
Bustos	DeBene	Honda
Butterfield	DeSaulnier	Hoyer
Capps	Deutch	Huffman
Capuano	Diaz-Balart	Israel
Cardenas	Dingell	Jackson Lee
Carney	Doggett	Jeffries
Carson (IN)	Dold	Johnson (GA)
Cartwright	Doyle, Michael	Johnson, E. B.
Castor (FL)	F.	Kaptur
Castro (TX)	Duckworth	Keating
Chu, Judy	Edwards	Kelly (IL)
Cicilline	Ellison	Kennedy
Clark (MA)	Engel	Kildee
Clarke (NY)	Esty	Kilmer
Clay	Foster	Kind
Cleaver	Frankel (FL)	Kirkpatrick

NOT VOTING—15

Bost	Farr	Sinema
Brat	Hastings	Takai
Brown (FL)	Nadler	Turner
Delaney	Nugent	Walz
Eshoo	Rooney (FL)	Waters, Maxine

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1727

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. GUINTA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. GUINTA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 260, noes 162, answered “present” 1, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 383]

AYES—260

Abraham	Black	Carter (TX)
Aderholt	Blackburn	Chabot
Agullar	Blum	Chaffetz
Allen	Boustany	Clawson (FL)
Amash	Boyle, Brendan	Coffman
Amodei	F.	Cole
Ashford	Brady (TX)	Collins (GA)
Babin	Brat	Collins (NY)
Barletta	Bridenstine	Comstock
Barr	Brooks (AL)	Conaway
Barton	Brooks (IN)	Cook
Benishek	Buck	Cooper
Bera	Bucshon	Costa
Bilirakis	Burgess	Costello (PA)
Bishop (GA)	Byrne	Cramer
Bishop (MI)	Calvert	Crawford
Bishop (UT)	Carter (GA)	Crenshaw

Cuellar	Katko	Rigell	Kildee	Meeks	Sarbanes	Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)	Renacci
Culberson	Keating	Roby	Kilmer	Meng	Schakowsky	Dold	King (IA)	Ribble
Curbeo (FL)	Kelly (MS)	Roe (TN)	Kind	Moore	Schiff	Donovan	King (NY)	Rice (SC)
Davidson	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (AL)	Kirkpatrick	Moulton	Scott (VA)	Duffy	Kinzinger (IL)	Rigell
Davis, Rodney	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)	Kuster	Murphy (FL)	Serrano	Duncan (SC)	Kline	Roby
Denham	King (NY)	Rohrabacher	Langevin	Napolitano	Sewell (AL)	Duncan (TN)	Knight	Roe (TN)
Dent	Kinzinger (IL)	Rokita	Larsen (WA)	Neal	Sherman	Ellmers (NC)	Labrador	Rogers (AL)
DeSantis	Kline	Ros-Lehtinen	Larson (CT)	Nolan	Slaughter	Emmer (MN)	LaHood	Rogers (KY)
DesJarlais	Knight	Roskam	Lawrence	Norcross	Smith (WA)	Farenthold	LaMalfa	Rohrabacher
Diaz-Balart	Labrador	Ross	Lee	O'Rourke	Speier	Fincher	Lamborn	Rokita
Dold	LaHood	Rothfus	Levin	Pallone	Swalwell (CA)	Fitzpatrick	Lance	Ros-Lehtinen
Donovan	LaMalfa	Rouzer	Lewis	Payne	Takano	Fleischmann	Latta	Ross
Duffy	Lamborn	Royce	Lieu, Ted	Pelosi	Thompson (CA)	Fleming	LoBiondo	Rothfus
Duncan (SC)	Lance	Ruppersberger	Loeb	Perlmutter	Thompson (MS)	Flores	Long	Rouzer
Duncan (TN)	Latta	Russell	Lofgren	Peters	Titus	Forbes	Loudermilk	Russell
Ellmers (NC)	Lipinski	Salmon	Lowenthal	Pingree	Tonko	Fortenberry	Love	Salmon
Emmer (MN)	LoBiondo	Sanford	Pocan	Lowe	Torres	Fox	Lucas	Sanford
Farenthold	Long	Scalise	Lujan Grisham	Polis	Tsongas	Franks (AZ)	Luetkemeyer	Scalise
Fincher	Loudermilk	Schradler	(NM)	Price (NC)	Van Hollen	Frelinghuysen	Lummis	Schweikert
Fitzpatrick	Love	Schweikert	Lujan, Ben Ray	Quigley	Vargas	Gibbs	Marino	Scott, Austin
Fleischmann	Lucas	Scott, Austin	(NM)	Rangel	Velazquez	Gibbs	Massie	Sensenbrenner
Fleming	Luetkemeyer	Scott, David	Lynch	Rice (NY)	Visclosky	Gibson	McCarthy	Sessions
Flores	Lummis	Sensenbrenner	Maloney,	Richmond	Walz	Gohmert	McCaul	Shimkus
Forbes	MacArthur	Sessions	Carolyn	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman	Goodlatte	McClintock	Shuster
Fortenberry	Marchant	Shimkus	Maloney, Sean	Ruiz	Schultz	Gosar	McHenry	Simpson
Fox	Marino	Shuster	Matsui	Rush	Waters, Maxine	Gowdy	McKinley	Smith (MO)
Franks (AZ)	Massie	Simpson	McCollum	Ryan (OH)	Watson Coleman	Granger	McKinley	Smith (NE)
Frelinghuysen	McCarthy	Sires	McDermott	Sánchez, Linda	Welch	Graves (GA)	McMorris	Smith (TX)
Garrett	McCaul	Smith (MO)	McGovern	T.	Wilson (FL)	Graves (LA)	Rodgers	Stefanik
Gibbs	McClintock	Smith (NE)	McNerney	Sanchez, Loretta	Yarmuth	Graves (MO)	McSally	Stewart
Gibson	McHenry	Smith (NJ)				Griffith	Meadows	Stivers
Gohmert	McKinley	Smith (TX)				Grothman	Meehan	Stutzman
Goodlatte	McMorris	Stefanik				Guinta	Messer	Thompson (PA)
Gosar	Rodgers	Stewart				Guthrie	Mica	Thornberry
Gowdy	McSally	Stivers				Hardy	Miller (FL)	Tiberi
Granger	Meadows	Stutzman				Harper	Miller (MI)	Tipton
Graves (GA)	Meehan	Thompson (PA)				Harris	Moolenaar	Trott
Graves (LA)	Messer	Thornberry				Hartzler	Mooney (WV)	Upton
Graves (MO)	Mica	Tiberi				Heck (NV)	Mullin	Valadao
Green, Gene	Miller (FL)	Tipton				Hensarling	Mulvaney	Wagner
Griffith	Miller (MI)	Trott				Herrera Beutler	Murphy (PA)	Walberg
Grothman	Moolenaar	Upton				Hice, Jody B.	Neugebauer	Walden
Guinta	Mooney (WV)	Valadao				Hill	Newhouse	Walker
Guthrie	Mullin	Veasey				Holding	Noem	Walorski
Hanna	Mulvaney	Vela				Hudson	Nunes	Weber (TX)
Hardy	Murphy (PA)	Wagner				Huelskamp	Olson	Webster (FL)
Harper	Neugebauer	Walberg				Huizenga (MI)	Palazzo	Wenstrup
Harris	Newhouse	Walden				Hultgren	Palmer	Westerman
Hartzler	Noem	Walker				Hunter	Paulsen	Westmoreland
Heck (NV)	Nunes	Walorski				Hurd (TX)	Pearce	Whitfield
Hensarling	Olson	Walters, Mimi				Hurt (VA)	Perry	Williams
Herrera Beutler	Palazzo	Weber (TX)				Issa	Peterson	Wilson (SC)
Hice, Jody B.	Palmer	Webster (FL)				Jenkins (KS)	Pittenger	Wittman
Hill	Pascrell	Wenstrup				Jenkins (WV)	Pitts	Womack
Holding	Paulsen	Westerman				Johnson (OH)	Poe (TX)	Woodall
Hudson	Pearce	Westmoreland				Johnson, Sam	Poliquin	Yoder
Huelskamp	Perry	Whitfield				Jolly	Pompeo	Yoho
Huizenga (MI)	Peterson	Williams				Jones	Posey	Young (AK)
Hultgren	Pittenger	Wilson (SC)				Jordan	Price, Tom	Young (IA)
Hunter	Pitts	Wittman				Joyce	Ratchliffe	Young (IN)
Hurd (TX)	Poe (TX)	Womack				Katko	Reed	Zeldin
Hurt (VA)	Poliquin	Woodall				Kelly (MS)	Reichert	Zinke
Issa	Pompeo	Yoder						
Jenkins (KS)	Posey	Yoho						
Jenkins (WV)	Price, Tom	Young (AK)						
Johnson (OH)	Ratchliffe	Young (IA)						
Johnson, Sam	Reed	Young (IN)						
Jolly	Reichert	Zeldin						
Jones	Renacci	Zinke						
Jordan	Ribble							
Joyce	Rice (SC)							

NOES—162

Adams	Cohen	Frankel (FL)
Bass	Connolly	Fudge
Beatty	Conyers	Gabbard
Becerra	Courtney	Galleo
Beyer	Crowley	Garamendi
Blumenauer	Cummings	Graham
Bonamici	Davis (CA)	Grayson
Brady (PA)	Davis, Danny	Green, Al
Brownley (CA)	DeFazio	Grijalva
Bustos	DeGette	Gutiérrez
Butterfield	DeLauro	Hahn
Capps	DelBene	Heck (WA)
Capuano	DeSaulnier	Higgins
Cárdenas	Deutch	Himes
Carney	Dingell	Hinojosa
Carson (IN)	Doggett	Honda
Cartwright	Doyle, Michael	Hoyer
Castor (FL)	F.	Huffman
Castro (TX)	Duckworth	Israel
Chu, Judy	Edwards	Jackson Lee
Ciilline	Ellison	Jeffries
Clark (MA)	Engel	Johnson (GA)
Clarke (NY)	Eshoo	Johnson, E. B.
Clay	Esty	Kaptur
Cleaver	Farr	Kelly (IL)
Clyburn	Foster	Kennedy

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Buchanan

NOT VOTING—10

Bost	Nadler	Takai
Brown (FL)	Nugent	Turner
Delaney	Rooney (FL)	
Hastings	Sinema	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1730

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA
OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Michigan (Mr.
HUIZENGA) on which further pro-
ceedings were postponed and on which
the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 236, noes 188,
not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 384]

AYES—236

Abraham	Brady (TX)	Cole
Aderholt	Brat	Collins (GA)
Allen	Bridenstine	Collins (NY)
Amash	Brooks (AL)	Comstock
Amodei	Brooks (IN)	Conaway
Babin	Buchanan	Cook
Barletta	Buck	Cramer
Barr	Bucshon	Crawford
Barton	Burgess	Crenshaw
Benish	Byrne	Culberson
Bilirakis	Calvert	Curbeo (FL)
Bishop (MI)	Carter (GA)	Davidson
Bishop (UT)	Carter (TX)	Davis, Rodney
Black	Chabot	Denham
Blackburn	Chaffetz	Dent
Blum	Clawson (FL)	DeSantis
Boustany	Coffman	DesJarlais

Adams	Conyers	Grayson
Aguilar	Cooper	Green, Al
Ashford	Costa	Green, Gene
Bass	Costello (PA)	Grijalva
Beatty	Courtney	Gutiérrez
Becerra	Crowley	Hahn
Bera	Cuellar	Hanna
Beyer	Cummings	Heck (WA)
Bishop (GA)	Davis (CA)	Higgins
Blumenauer	Davis, Danny	Himes
Bonamici	DeFazio	Hinojosa
Boyle, Brendan	DeGette	Honda
F.	DeLauro	Hoyer
Brady (PA)	DelBene	Huffman
Brownley (CA)	DeSaulnier	Israel
Bustos	Deutch	Jackson Lee
Butterfield	Dingell	Jeffries
Capps	Doggett	Johnson (GA)
Capuano	Doyle, Michael	Johnson, E. B.
Cárdenas	F.	Kaptur
Carney	Duckworth	Keating
Carson (IN)	Edwards	Kelly (IL)
Cartwright	Ellison	Kennedy
Castor (FL)	Engel	Kilmer
Castro (TX)	Eshoo	Kind
Chu, Judy	Esty	Kirkpatrick
Ciilline	Farr	Kuster
Clark (MA)	Foster	Langevin
Clarke (NY)	Frankel (FL)	Larsen (WA)
Clay	Fudge	Larson (CT)
Cleaver	Gabbard	Lawrence
Clyburn	Galleo	Lee
	Garamendi	Levin
	Graham	

NOES—188

Lewis	Pallone	Sewell (AL)	Fincher	LaHood	Rogers (KY)	Maloney,	Poliquin	Slaughter
Lieu, Ted	Pascrell	Sherman	Fitzpatrick	LaMalfa	Rohrabacher	Carolyn	Polis	Smith (WA)
Lipinski	Payne	Sinema	Fleischmann	Lamborn	Rokita	Maloney, Sean	Price (NC)	Speier
Loebsack	Pelosi	Sires	Fleming	Lance	Ros-Lehtinen	Matsui	Quigley	Swalwell (CA)
Lofgren	Perlmutter	Slaughter	Flores	Lahta	Roskam	McCollum	Rangel	Takano
Lowenthal	Peters	Smith (NJ)	Forbes	LoBiondo	Ross	McDermott	Reed	Thompson (CA)
Lowey	Pingree	Smith (WA)	Fortenberry	Long	Rothfus	McGovern	Rice (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Lujan Grisham	Pocan	Speier	Foxx	Loudermilk	Rouzer	McNerney	Richmond	Titus
(NM)	Polis	Swalwell (CA)	Franks (AZ)	Love	Royce	Meeks	Roybal-Allard	Tonko
Luján, Ben Ray	Price (NC)	Takano	Frelinghuysen	Lucas	Russell	Meng	Ruiz	Torres
(NM)	Quigley	Thompson (CA)	Garrett	Luetkemeyer	Salmon	Moore	Ruppersberger	Tsongas
Lynch	Rangel	Thompson (MS)	Gibbs	Lummis	Sanford	Moulton	Rush	Watson Coleman
MacArthur	Rice (NY)	Titus	Gohmert	MacArthur	Scalise	Murphy (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Welch
Maloney,	Richmond	Tonko	Goodlatte	Marchant	Schweikert	Napolitano	Sánchez, Linda	Wilson (FL)
Carolyn	Riskam	Torres	Gosar	Marino	Scott, Austin	Neal	T.	Yarmuth
Maloney, Sean	Roybal-Allard	Tsongas	Gowdy	Massie	Sensenbrenner	Nolan	Sanchez, Loretta	Vela
Matsui	Royce	Van Hollen	Granger	McCarthy	Sessions	Norcross	Sarbanes	Velázquez
McCollum	Ruiz	Vargas	Graves (GA)	McCaul	O'Rourke	O'Rourke	Schakowsky	Visclosky
McDermott	Ruppersberger	Veasey	Graves (LA)	McClintock	Pallone	Pallone	Schiff	Walz
McGovern	Rush	Vela	Graves (MO)	McHenry	Pascrell	Pascrell	Schrader	Wasserman
McNerney	Ryan (OH)	Velázquez	Griffith	McKinley	Payne	Payne	Scott (VA)	Schultz
Meeks	Sánchez, Linda	Visclosky	Grothman	McMorris	Pelosi	Pelosi	Scott, David	Waters, Maxine
Meng	T.	Walters, Mimi	Guinta	Rodgers	Perlmutter	Perlmutter	Serrano	Watson Coleman
Moore	Sanchez, Loretta	Walz	Guthrie	McSally	Peters	Peters	Sewell (AL)	Welch
Moulton	Sarbanes	Wasserman	Hanna	Meadows	Peterson	Peterson	Sherman	Wilson (FL)
Murphy (FL)	Schakowsky	Schultz	Hardy	Meehan	Pingree	Pingree	Sinema	Yarmuth
Napolitano	Schiff	Waters, Maxine	Harper	Messer	Pocan	Pocan	Sires	
Neal	Schrader	Watson Coleman	Harris	Miller (FL)				
Nolan	Scott (VA)	Welch	Hartzler	Miller (MI)				
Norcross	Scott, David	Wilson (FL)	Heck (NV)	Moolenaar				
O'Rourke	Serrano	Yarmuth	Hensarling	Mooney (WV)				

NOT VOTING—9

Bost	Hastings	Rooney (FL)
Brown (FL)	Nadler	Takai
Delaney	Nugent	Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1734

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA OF MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 185, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 385]

AYES—236

Abraham	Brooks (AL)	Costello (PA)
Aderholt	Brooks (IN)	Cramer
Allen	Buchanan	Crawford
Amash	Buck	Crenshaw
Amodei	Bucshon	Culberson
Babin	Burgess	Davidson
Barletta	Byrne	Davis, Rodney
Barr	Calvert	Denham
Barton	Carter (GA)	Dent
Benishek	Carter (TX)	DeSantis
Bilirakis	Chabot	DesJarlais
Bishop (MI)	Chaffetz	Diaz-Balart
Bishop (UT)	Clawson (FL)	Dold
Black	Coffman	Donovan
Blackburn	Cole	Duffy
Blum	Collins (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Boustany	Collins (NY)	Duncan (TN)
Brady (TX)	Comstock	Ellmers (NC)
Brat	Conaway	Emmer (MN)
Bridenstine	Cook	Farenthold

Adams	Cuellar	Hinojosa
Aguilar	Cummings	Honda
Ashford	Davis (CA)	Hoyer
Bass	Davis, Danny	Huffman
Beatty	DeFazio	Israel
Becerra	DeGette	Jackson Lee
Bera	DeLauro	Jeffries
Beyer	DelBene	Johnson (GA)
Blumenauer	DeSaunier	Johnson, E. B.
Bonamici	Deutch	Kaptur
Boyle, Brendan	Dingell	Katko
F.	Doggett	Keating
Brady (PA)	Doyle, Michael	Kelly (IL)
Brownley (CA)	F.	Kennedy
Bustos	Duckworth	Kildee
Butterfield	Edwards	Kilmer
Capps	Ellison	Kind
Capuano	Engel	Kirkpatrick
Cardenas	Eshoo	Kuster
Carney	Esty	Langevin
Carson (IN)	Farr	Larsen (WA)
Cartwright	Poster	Larson (CT)
Castor (FL)	Frankel (FL)	Lawrence
Castro (TX)	Fudge	Lee
Chu, Judy	Gabard	Levin
Ciulline	Galleo	Lewis
Clark (MA)	Garramendi	Lieu, Ted
Clarke (NY)	Gibson	Lipinski
Clay	Graham	Lofgren
Cleaver	Grayson	Loebsack
Clyburn	Green, Al	Lowenthal
Cohen	Green, Gene	Lowe
Connolly	Grijalva	Lujan Grisham
Conyers	Gutiérrez	(NM)
Cooper	Hahn	Luján, Ben Ray
Costa	Heck (WA)	(NM)
Courtney	Higgins	Lynch
Crowley	Himes	

NOES—185

Cuellar	Hinojosa	Walters, Mimi
Cummings	Honda	Weber (TX)
Davis (CA)	Hoyer	Webster (FL)
Davis, Danny	Huffman	Wenstrup
DeFazio	Israel	Westerman
DeGette	Jackson Lee	Westmoreland
DeLauro	Jeffries	Whitfield
DelBene	Johnson (GA)	Williams
DeSaunier	Johnson, E. B.	Wilson (SC)
Deutch	Kaptur	Wittman
Dingell	Katko	Womack
Doggett	Keating	Woodall
Doyle, Michael	Kelly (IL)	Yoder
F.	Kennedy	Yoho
Duckworth	Kildee	Young (AK)
Edwards	Kilmer	Young (IA)
Ellison	Kind	Young (IN)
Engel	Kirkpatrick	Zeldin
Eshoo	Kuster	Zinke
Esty	Langevin	
Farr	Larsen (WA)	
Poster	Larson (CT)	
Frankel (FL)	Lawrence	
Fudge	Lee	
Gabard	Levin	
Galleo	Lewis	
Garramendi	Lieu, Ted	
Gibson	Lipinski	
Graham	Lofgren	
Grayson	Loebsack	
Green, Al	Lowenthal	
Green, Gene	Lowe	
Grijalva	Lujan Grisham	
Gutiérrez	(NM)	
Hahn	Luján, Ben Ray	
Heck (WA)	(NM)	
Higgins	Lynch	
Himes		

NOT VOTING—12

Bishop (GA)	Delaney	Nugent
Bost	Hastings	Rooney (FL)
Brown (FL)	Mica	Takai
Curbelo (FL)	Nadler	Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1737

Ms. FOXF changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 232, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 386]

AYES—192

Abraham	Burgess	Duncan (TN)
Aderholt	Byrne	Farenthold
Allen	Calvert	Fincher
Amash	Carter (GA)	Fitzpatrick
Amodei	Carter (TX)	Fleischmann
Babin	Chabot	Fleming
Barletta	Chaffetz	Flores
Barr	Cole	Forbes
Benishek	Collins (GA)	Fortenberry
Bilirakis	Collins (NY)	Foxx
Bishop (MI)	Conaway	Franks (AZ)
Bishop (UT)	Cook	Frelinghuysen
Black	Blackburn	Garrett
Blackburn	Blum	Gibbs
Blum	Boustany	Gohmert
Boustany	Brady (TX)	Goodlatte
Brat	Brat	Gosar
Bridenstine	Bridenstine	Gowdy
Brooks (AL)	Brooks (AL)	Granger
Buchanan	Buchanan	Graves (GA)
Buck	Buck	Graves (LA)

Graves (MO) Massie
 Griffith McCarthy
 Grothman McCaul
 Guinta McClintock
 Guthrie McHenry
 Harper McKinley
 Harris McMorris
 Hartzler Rodgers
 Hensarling Meehan
 Hice, Jody B. Mica
 Hill Miller (FL)
 Holding Miller (MI)
 Hudson Moolenaar
 Huelskamp Mooney (WV)
 Hultgren Mullin
 Hunter Mulvaney
 Hurt (VA) Murphy (PA)
 Issa Neugebauer
 Jenkins (KS) Noem
 Jenkins (WV) Olson
 Johnson (OH) Palazzo
 Johnson, Sam Palmer
 Jones Perry
 Jordan Pittenger
 Joyce Pitts
 Kelly (MS) Poliquin
 Kelly (PA) Pompeo
 King (IA) Posey
 King (NY) Price, Tom
 Kline Ratcliffe
 Knight Reed
 Labrador Renacci
 LaHood Rice (SC)
 LaMalfa Rigell
 Lamborn Roby
 Latta Roe (TN)
 Long Rogers (AL)
 Loudermilk Rogers (KY)
 Love Rohrabacher
 Lucas Rokita
 Luetkemeyer Roskam
 Lummis Ross
 Marchant Rothfus
 Marino Rouzer

NOES—232

Adams DeFazio
 Aguilar DeGette
 Amodei DeLauro
 Ashford DelBene
 Barton Denham
 Bass Dent
 Beatty DeSaulnier
 Becerra Deutch
 Bera Diaz-Balart
 Beyer Dingell
 Bishop (GA) Doggett
 Blumenauer Dold
 Bonamici Donovan
 Boyle, Brendan F. Doyle, Michael F.
 Brady (PA) Duckworth
 Brooks (IN) Edwards
 Brownley (CA) Ellison
 Bucshon Ellmers (NC)
 Bustos Emmer (MN)
 Butterfield Engel
 Capps Eshoo
 Capuano Esty
 Cárdenas Farr
 Carney Foster
 Carson (IN) Frankel (FL)
 Cartwright Fudge
 Castor (FL) Gabbard
 Castro (TX) Gallego
 Chu, Judy Garamendi
 Cicilline Gibson
 Clark (MA) Graham
 Clarke (NY) Grayson
 Clawson (FL) Green, Al
 Clay Green, Gene
 Cleaver Grijalva
 Clyburn Gutiérrez
 Coffman Hahn
 Cohen Hanna
 Comstock Hardy
 Connolly Heck (NV)
 Conyers Heck (WA)
 Cooper Herrera Beutler
 Costa Higgins
 Costello (PA) Himes
 Courtney Hinojosa
 Crenshaw Honda
 Crowley Hoyer
 Cuellar Huffman
 Cummings Huizenga (MI)
 Curbelo (FL) Hurd (TX)
 Davis (CA) Israel
 Davis, Danny Jackson Lee

Russell Neal
 Salmon Newhouse
 Sanford Nolan
 Scalise Norcross
 Schweikert Nunes
 Scott, Austin O'Rourke
 Sensenbrenner Pallone
 Sessions Pascrell
 Shimkus Paulsen
 Shuster Mica
 Simpson Pearce
 Smith (MO) Pelosi
 Smith (NE) Perlmutter
 Smith (NJ) Peters
 Smith (TX) Peterson
 Stivers Pingree
 Stutzman Poe (TX)
 Thornberry Polis
 Tiberi Price (NC)
 Trott Quigley
 Trott Rangel
 Wagner Reichert
 Walberg Ribble
 Walden Rice (NY)
 Walker Richmond
 Walorski Ros-Lehtinen
 Weber (TX) Bost
 Webster (FL) Brown (FL)
 Wenstrup Delaney
 Westerman Westmoreland
 Whitfield Whitfield
 Williams Williams
 Wilson (SC) Wittman
 Wittman Womack
 Woodall Woodall
 Yoder Yoder
 Yoho Yoho
 Young (AK) Young (AK)
 Zeldin Zeldin

Roybal-Allard Thompson (MS)
 Royce Tipton
 Ruiz Titus
 Ruppersberger Tonko
 Rush Torres
 Ryan (OH) Tsongas
 Sánchez, Linda T. Upton
 Sánchez, Loretta T. Valadao
 Sarbanes Van Hollen
 Schakowsky Vargas
 Schiff Veasey
 Schrader Vela
 Scott (VA) Velázquez
 Scott, David Visclosky
 Serrano Walters, Mimi
 Sewell (AL) Walz
 Sherman Wasserman
 Sinema Schultz
 Sires Waters, Maxine
 Slaughter Watson Coleman
 Smith (WA) Welch
 Speier Wilson (FL)
 Stefanik Yarmuth
 Swalwell (CA) Young (IA)
 Takano Young (IN)
 Thompson (CA) Zinke

NOT VOTING—9

Hastings Rooney (FL)
 Nadler Takai
 Nugent Turner

□ 1741

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. 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. CARTER of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, 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.

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 809; and

Adoption of House Resolution 809, if ordered.

All electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question 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 abuse; and for other purposes, 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.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 244, nays 179, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 387]

YEAS—244

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

Yoho Young (IA)
Young (AK) Young (IN)
NAYS—179

Adams Fudge
Aguilar Gabbard
Ashford Gallego
Bass Garamendi
Beatty Graham
Becerra Grayson
Bera Green, Al
Beyer Green, Gene
Bishop (GA) Grijalva
Blumenauer Gutiérrez
Bonamici Hahn
Boyle, Brendan Heck (WA)
F. Higgins
Brady (PA) Himes
Brownley (CA) Hinojosa
Bustos Honda
Butterfield Hoyer
Capps Huffman
Capuano Israel
Cárdenas Jackson Lee
Carney Jeffries
Carson (IN) Johnson (GA)
Cartwright Johnson, E. B.
Castor (FL) Kaptur
Castro (TX) Keating
Chu, Judy Kelly (IL)
Cicilline Kennedy
Clark (MA) Kildee
Clarke (NY) Kilmer
Clay Kind
Cleaver Kuster
Clyburn Langevin
Cohen Larsen (WA)
Connolly Larson (CT)
Conyers Lawrence
Cooper Lee
Costa Levin
Courtney Lewis
Crowley Lieu, Ted
Cuellar Lipinski
Cummings Loeb sack
Davis (CA) Lofgren
Davis, Danny Lowenthal
DeFazio Lowey
DeGette Lujan Grisham
DeLauro (NM)
DelBene Luján, Ben Ray
DeSaulnier (NM)
Deutch Lynch
Dingell Maloney,
Doggett Carolyn
Doyle, Michael Maloney, Sean
F. Matsui
Duckworth McCollum
Edwards McGovern
Ellison McNerney
Engel Meeks
Eshoo Meng
Esty Moore
Farr Moulton
Foster Murphy (FL)
Frankel (FL) Napolitano

NOT VOTING—10

Bost McDermott
Brown (FL) Nadler
Delaney Nugent
Hastings Rooney (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1749

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. 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 243, noes 177, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 388]

AYES—243

Abraham Guinta
Aderholt Guthrie
Allen Hanna
Amodei Hardy
Babin Harper
Barletta Harris
Barr Hartzler
Barton Heck (NV)
Benishek Hensarling
Bilirakis Herrera Beutler
Bishop (MI) Hice, Jody B.
Bishop (UT) Hill
Black Holding
Blackburn Hudson
Blum Huelskamp
Boustany Huizenga (MI)
Brady (TX) Hultgren
Hunter Brat
Bridenstine Hurd (TX)
Brooks (AL) Hurt (VA)
Brooks (IN) Issa
Buchanan Jenkins (KS)
Buck Jenkins (WV)
Bucshon Johnson (OH)
Burgess Johnson, Sam
Byrne Jolly
Calvert Jones
Carter (GA) Jordan
Carter (TX) Joyce
Chabot Katko
Chaffetz Kelly (MS)
Clawson (FL) Kelly (PA)
Coffman Kind
Cole King (IA)
Collins (GA) King (NY)
Collins (NY) Kinzinger (IL)
Constock Kirkpatrick
Conaway Kline
Cook Knight
Costello (PA) LaHood
Cramer LaMalfa
Crawford Lamborn
Crenshaw Lance
Culberson Latta
Curbelo (FL) LoBiondo
Davidson Long
Davis, Rodney Loudermilk
Denham Love
Dent Lucas
DeSantis Luetkemeyer
DesJarlais Lummis
Diaz-Balart MacArthur
Dold Marchant
Donovan Marino
Duffy Massie
Duncan (SC) McCarthy
Duncan (TN) McCaul
Ellmers (NC) McClintock
Emmer (MN) McHenry
Farenthold McKinley
Fincher McMorris
Fitzpatrick Rodgers
Fleischmann McSally
Fleming Meadows
Flores Meehan
Forbes Messer
Fortenberry Mica
Foxy Miller (FL)
Franks (AZ) Miller (MI)
Frelinghuysen Moolenaar
Garrett Mooney (WV)
Gibbs Mullin
Gibson Mulvaney
Gohmert Murphy (PA)
Goodlatte Neugebauer
Gosar Newhouse
Gowdy Noem
Granger Nunes
Graves (GA) Olson
Graves (LA) Palazzo
Graves (MO) Palmer
Grothman Paulsen

NOES—177

Adams Beyer
Aguilar Bishop (GA)
Amash Blumenauer
Ashford Bonamici
Bass Boyle, Brendan
Beatty F.
Becerra Brady (PA)
Bera Brownley (CA)

Castro (TX) Chu, Judy
Cicilline Hoyer
Clark (MA) Huffman
Clarke (NY) Israel
Clay Jackson Lee
Cleaver Jeffries
Clyburn Johnson (GA)
Cohen Kaptur
Connolly Keating
Conyers Kelly (IL)
Cooper Kennedy
Costa Kilmer
Courtney Kuster
Crowley Labrador
Cuellar Langevin
Cummings Larsen (WA)
Davis (CA) Larson (CT)
Davis, Danny Lawrence
DeFazio Lee
DeGette Levin
DeLauro Lewis
DelBene Lieu, Ted
DeSaulnier Lipinski
Deutch Loeb sack
Dingell Lofgren
Doggett Lowenthal
Doyle, Michael Lowey
F. Lujan Grisham
Duckworth (NM)
Edwards Luján, Ben Ray
Ellison (NM)
Engel Lynch
Eshoo Maloney,
Esty Carolyn
Farr Maloney, Sean
Foster Matsui
Frankel (FL) McCollum
Fudge McGovern
Gabbard McNerney
Gallego Meeks
Garamendi Meng
Graham Moore
Grayson Moulton
Green, Al Murphy (FL)
Green, Gene Napolitano
Griffith Neal
Grijalva Nolan
Gutiérrez Norcross
Hahn O'Rourke
Heck (WA) Pallone
Higgins Pascrell
Himes Payne
Hinojosa Pelosi

NOT VOTING—13

Bost Johnson, E. B.
Brown (FL) McDermott
Castor (FL) Nadler
Delaney Nugent
Hastings Pingree

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1755

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 809, S. 2943, as amended, is considered as passed.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 794 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House on 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 Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly resume the chair.

Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright

□ 1756

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. COLLINS of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 38 printed in House report 114-639, offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. MESSER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 40 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. MESSER. 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 by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to commence any administrative adjudication or civil action under section 1053 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 more than 3 years after the date of discovery of the violation to which the adjudication or action relates.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), for his great work on this important bill.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering today is a simple and modest proposal. It ensures that the CFPB follows the statute of limitations established by Dodd-Frank during agency administrative proceedings.

This amendment is a response to the CFPB blatantly ignoring the express statute of limitations in Dodd-Frank and the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act, otherwise known as RESPA.

□ 1800

In January of 2014, CFPB launched an administrative proceeding against the PHH Corporation alleging a violation of RESPA. In the case, CFPB Director Richard Cordray claimed the express 3-year statute of limitations within Dodd-Frank did not apply to the CFPB's administrative proceedings process—deliberately ignoring the law.

Using this unprecedented rationale, the CFPB retroactively imposed fines of \$109 million against PHH Corporation for alleged violations dating back to 1995, meaning that the CFPB im-

posed fines for alleged violations that occurred 19 years after the statute of limitations had expired—again, 19 years past the express statute of limitations.

These fines are illegal under Dodd-Frank, and they deny businessowners basic liability protections guaranteed to them under the statute of limitations. Without those protections, the CFPB could threaten litigation forever, handcuffing businesses' ability to create jobs in perpetuity.

You can't just make it up. This is lawless behavior and it is dangerous for the rule of law.

My amendment is very simple. It prohibits the CFPB from using any funds to take administrative actions past the express 3-year statute of limitations in Dodd-Frank.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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, this amendment prohibits funds from the CFPB to commence any administrative adjudication or civil action beyond the 3-year statute of limitation in Dodd-Frank.

In doing so, it would limit the board's ability to bring enforcement action against wrongdoers. This represents a free pass for bad actors who have swindled borrowers on a host of practices and products under the Bureau's jurisdiction—credit cards, student loans, mortgages, auto loans, debt collection practices, and payday loans, just to name a few.

Title X of Dodd-Frank does provide a 3-year statute of limitations for claims being brought by the Bureau under that title. However, the Bureau has argued in court that the statute of limitations does not govern claims brought under the enumerated consumer protection laws transferred to the Bureau—laws like the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, the Truth in Lending Act, the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, and the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act.

While some of these enumerated statutes have their own statutes of limitations, others do not. The board has argued in court that, even under those laws that do have statutes of limitation, they do not apply to the Bureau, but instead only apply to private litigation.

Of the enumerated laws that do not have statutes of limitation, the Bureau has argued in court that no statute of limitation applies.

When it comes to administrative law judge proceedings, rather than those brought in court, the Bureau also contends the statute of limitation does not apply.

In the final analysis, this is currently being adjudicated by the Bureau and

defendants in the courts. It would be premature and disruptive for Congress to step in with this amendment, which tilts the playing field in court toward the side of special interests.

Moreover, both the House and Senate authorizing committees of jurisdiction have not even considered this issue during hearings or markups. At the very least, it would be premature to adopt this amendment, which significantly alters existing law and throws into flux cases pending before the courts, without any regard for regular order.

Finally, this amendment creates uncertainty and complications as to how our regulatory agencies can enforce the law.

The Wall Street Reform Act transferred enforcement authority to the Bureau for a host of consumer protection statutes. Yet banking and other market regulators have retained authority on a number of those laws, thereby creating two sets of standards: one for banking and market regulators, where the statute of limitations would still be being interpreted by the courts, and one for our lead consumer regulator, the Bureau. This will only serve to confuse the industry.

That is the main reason why I oppose the amendment and urge a "no" vote.

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), the chairman.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment. It is common sense. We all believe in regulation, but we believe in reasonable regulation. What the gentleman is trying to do is just kind of curtail some of this regulatory overreach.

When this agency was set up, it was outside the appropriations process. They get a check from the Federal Reserve for \$600 million with no strings attached. Nobody asks anything. In our underlying bill, we put them under the appropriations process. We say: You ought not just have a single director. Have a five-member commission like a lot of these regulatory agencies. So it is a good amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, what I would ask the gentleman to do is to consider the fact that this is being still dealt with in the courts, and this is not the right time for us—or any time—to get involved before the court has decided. That is one of the problems that we have on many of these issues, that we get involved and we try to get our will, our

way on an issue, before the courts have decided what to do with it.

This is a big issue for them to decide, and I would hope that we can see our way to letting those decisions be made before we set a tone that kind of sways what the final outcome might be, and that is not the right thing to do.

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

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Chairman, I respect the gentleman's position. I would just submit that the express language of Dodd-Frank says what we should do here. It creates a 3-year statute of limitations for the CFPB, and the CFPB is ignoring the rule of law and ignoring that express language. All this amendment does is say that the CFPB cannot use dollars to violate the express letter of the law. I urge my colleagues for their support.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Very briefly, Mr. Chairman, there are other parts covered by the Bureau that have their own statute of limitations. That is why these questions are being asked. While the gentleman is correct that Dodd-Frank says 3 years, in other areas it is not 3 years. It is being settled, and we should stay out of it until then.

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

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

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

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 Indiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. PALMER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 41 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. PALMER. 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 (including title IV and title VIII) may be used to carry out the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014 (D.C. Law 20-261) or to implement any rule or regulation promulgated to carry out such Act.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like, first of all, to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW) for his work on this bill.

My amendment would prohibit funds from being used to implement the District of Columbia's Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014, or RHNDA.

The Declaration of Independence declares that: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness."

These founding principles remain true today. The reason life was included by our Founders as the first principle is because without life there is no liberty; it is a prerequisite for liberty. Without life, there is no pursuit of happiness. In fact, it is self-evident, without life, there isn't even a discussion about any rights.

Liberty encompasses social and political freedoms, and the tenets associated with liberty were those used in drafting the First Amendment to the Constitution. With life and liberty, you can pursue happiness. Take away either and the pursuit becomes difficult or impossible.

My amendment protects all three, but I will focus my comments on liberty as it relates to the free exercise of religion clause in the First Amendment.

The First Amendment states in part that: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Without my amendment, some employers in the District of Columbia would not only be prohibited from exercising their religion, but would be forced to embrace the beliefs of the 13 members of the D.C. Council.

The District of Columbia allows abortions until the moment of birth, but a number of employers in the District of Columbia believe in the sanctity of life and protecting it. In fact, many organizations in D.C.—such as March for Life, Americans United for Life, and the National Right to Life Committee—exist solely to protect life. The Constitution provides them the right to exercise those beliefs, just like it does those who oppose it.

That is why when the District of Columbia passed the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014, former Mayor Vincent Gray expressed concerns about the law. In December 2014, Gray wrote a letter to the D.C. Council about RHNDA, describing it as "legally problematic" and saying: ". . . the bill raises serious concerns under the Constitution and under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993. Religious organizations, religiously affiliated organizations, religiously driven for-profit entities, and political organizations may have strong First Amendment and RFRA grounds for challenging the law's applicability to them."

Employers who oppose abortions and paying for them as part of a compensation package have every right to exercise their freedom not to do so, and those who want to receive abortions or have them paid for have every right to seek employment from someone willing to do so. That is how freedom works. It does not work with one group imposing its version of freedom on the other, which is what this District law currently provides for.

In its 2012 opinion in the case of *Hosanna Tabor v. EEOC*, the Supreme Court unanimously affirmed the right of religious organizations to hire employees that support the mission of the organization where their employees are responsible for carrying out its mission. The opinion says: "The interest of society in the enforcement of employment discrimination statutes is undoubtedly important. But so too is the interest of religious groups in choosing who will preach their beliefs, teach their faith, and carry out their mission."

Would you require PETA to hire someone that comes to an interview in a fur coat? Would you require Planned Parenthood to hire a nun or anyone adamantly opposed to abortion? Neither of these situations makes sense, nor does requiring a pro-life organization to hire someone who explicitly contradicts their moral conscience or religious beliefs. The Supreme Court agrees.

My amendment would restore religious freedom to employers inside the District of Columbia. Those who want to have abortions do not have to work for employers who oppose them. They have life and the liberty to pursue their own interests with another employer.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to vote "yes" on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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 strong opposition to the amendment. This amendment would, once again, overreach into the District of Columbia's local affairs by prohibiting funds for D.C.'s local law, the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014.

The D.C. law this amendment would vacate prohibits discrimination based on reproductive health decisions. This amendment would allow workplace discrimination if the employer disagrees with the employee's use of contraception, in vitro fertilization, and even perhaps a medically necessary abortion.

D.C. is attempting to protect workers from losing their jobs because their supervisors may or may not agree with their personal decisions. This amendment offered today would strip those protections from D.C. workers.

In addition to being bad policy, this amendment goes around the law which states that Congress has 30 days to review bills passed by the D.C. Council. The 30 days are up, and the Republican-controlled Congress did not legally stop these laws from going into effect. The House passed a resolution disapproving the D.C. bill on reproductive health, and the Republican-controlled Senate did not.

The Congress had time to act on these issues, and it failed to do so. D.C. residents should not be subject to endless efforts to overturn its laws. It continues to be part of what I always complain about, this desire that we have on the other side to tell the District of Columbia what to do.

□ 1815

In this case, there was actually protection for the Congress if the Congress had acted within 30 days. But it didn't, and now we want to, in this bill, get around that lack of action by putting in new action to overturn their law.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, obviously, Article I, section 8, clause 17 of the Constitution states that Congress shall have power "to exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District."

Moving aside the jurisdictional issue, I take exception to my colleague's point that it is acceptable to infringe on the religious liberties of certain people, those who actually believe in protecting life. If those who don't believe in protecting life want to find employment, let them find employment at like-minded organizations.

The D.C. government should not be able to compel pro-life organizations to hire pro-abortion employees. That is exactly what the Religious Freedom Restoration Act was in place to protect, as Mayor Gray pointed out in his letter to the D.C. Council. I can't say that I always agree with the Mayor, but his serious concerns were, and remain to be, completely valid.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, very carefully let me say that there are many instances where people have disagreements, but the law prevails. Not every employer agrees with everything that the employee does and vice versa, but if there is a law in place, then the law prevails. Here there is a law in place, number one.

Number two, we should continue to try not to meddle in the District of Columbia's issues.

Number three, I repeat, we had a period, a legal period for us to act—some would say a constitutional period for us to act—and we didn't act. Now we want to get around that by using this bill improperly to undo what the people in the District of Columbia, through their representatives, found to be correct for them, just like other States, other communities throughout

this country, maybe communities even in the gentleman's and many of the gentlemen and gentlewomen on the other side's districts.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose this amendment. The amendment prohibits the District of Columbia from using its local funds, consisting of local taxes and fees, to enforce a local nondiscrimination law, the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act, giving employers license, in the name of religion, to discriminate against employees, their spouses and their dependents based on their private, constitutionally protected reproductive health decisions. Contrary to the sponsor's claim, the D.C. law does not require employers to provide insurance coverage for reproductive health decisions. The law states expressly: "This section shall not be construed to require an employer to provide insurance coverage related to a reproductive health decision."

The amendment permits employers to fire a woman for having an abortion due to rape, or to decline to hire a woman for using in vitro fertilization, or to fire a man for using condoms, or to reduce the salary of a parent for buying birth control for his or her child.

The D.C. law is valid under both the U.S. Constitution and federal law. Indeed, the law has been in effect for more than a year, and there appear to have been no lawsuits challenging it.

Under the U.S. Constitution, laws may limit religious exercise if they are neutral, generally applicable and rationally related to a legitimate governmental interest. The D.C. law applies to all employers, does not target religion and promotes workplace equality. Under the federal Religious Freedom Restoration Act, which applies to D.C., laws may substantially burden religious exercise if they further a compelling governmental interest in the least restrictive means. D.C. has a compelling interest in eliminating discrimination, and the D.C. law is the least restrictive means to do so.

The D.C. law protects religious liberty. The law is subject to constitutional and statutory exceptions to non-discrimination laws. The Constitution's narrow ministerial exception allows religious organizations to make employment decisions for ministers and ministerial employees for any reason whatsoever. D.C. law permits religious and political organizations to make employment decisions based on religion and political views. Under the D.C. law, employees must be willing to carry out employers' missions and directives.

I urge Members to vote NO on this amendment in order to protect employees' reproductive health decisions, workplace equality and D.C.'s right to self-government.

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

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 Alabama will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 42 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. MULLIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 43 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO), I offer amendment No. 43.

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 finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the proposed rule entitled "Voluntary Remedial Actions and Guidelines for Voluntary Recall Notices" published by the Consumer Product Safety Commission in the Federal Register on November 21, 2013 (78 Fed. Reg. 69793).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit funds for the voluntary recall proposed rule at the Consumer Product Safety Commission and prevent them from moving forward with a rule that would cripple the highly successful voluntary recall program currently in place.

Congress has expressed significant concerns over this proposed rule. Two years ago, the House approved this amendment, and Congress has repeatedly made it clear to the CPSC that it would cease in its quest to make unnecessary changes to a recall system that has worked well over the past 40 years. This system—one based on a successful partnership between businesses and the Commission—has helped ensure that consumer products sold in the U.S. are the safest in the world.

Congressional intent has been expressed in House-passed legislation, report language, letters from lawmakers, and oversight hearings. However, the Commission has failed to withdraw the proposed rule and has continued to indicate in its operating plan that it will move forward.

The CPSC does not even have the statutory authority to issue the rule. The CPSC has presented absolutely no evidence supporting its proposal, and all but one comment submitted expressed serious concerns over how the proposed rule would actually delay recalls and harm the effectiveness of our recall program.

The Commission unilaterally seeks to transform the voluntary recall process into a legal negotiation equivalent to a settlement agreement. The proposed changes would require companies seeking to implement a recall to hire an attorney, dragging out the process and creating a financial burden for small businesses.

The CPSC's proposed rule on voluntary recalls would slow down a process meant to be conducted with speed

and without red tape. Consumers would ultimately be more at risk as recalls are delayed. This proposed rule would make it more difficult to remove defective products from the marketplace.

Mr. Chairman, passage of this amendment would remind the Commission that its mission is to protect the public against unreasonable risks of injury associated with consumer products in an efficient and reasonable manner. The proposed rule to significantly alter the voluntary recall process is contrary to that mission.

I urge Members to adopt this amendment.

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. I rise in opposition to this amendment. It would prohibit the CPSC from taking action on the proposed rule on voluntary recall actions and voluntary recall notices.

The Notice of Proposed Rulemaking was published in 2013. There has been no further official rulemaking action taken on it since then, so this amendment is not necessary.

For that reason, I oppose the amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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 Oklahoma will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. POSEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 44 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. POSEY. 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 implement, administer, enforce, or codify into regulation, the guidance relating to "Commission Guidance Regarding Disclosure Related to Climate Change", affecting parts 211, 231, and 249 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations (as described in Commission Release Nos. 33-9106; 34-61469; FR-82).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit the Securities and Exchange Commission from using funds under this act to pursue a political agenda on climate change and, instead, return its focus to their three-part mission: to protect investors; maintain fair, orderly, and efficient markets; and facilitate capital formation.

My amendment relates to the SEC's 2010 interpretive guidance for companies to disclose the impact that global climate change may have on their businesses.

My amendment is necessary and timely, given the SEC's recent regulation S-K Concept Release that suggests the SEC is moving toward further action on this issue. It is even more important, in light of a campaign by several States' attorneys general, to impede the First Amendment rights of those who dare question the accuracy of climate change science.

More and more, we have seen the Federal securities laws and disclosure system abused for political purposes—from the median pay ratio disclosure requirement of Dodd-Frank to conflict minerals, to climate change. These politically motivated and mandated disclosures are not about protecting investors, they are about shaming companies, or at least attempting to shame companies, into adopting their agenda.

It is a waste of resources for the companies, for their shareholders, and for the SEC. Publicly traded companies are already required to disclose all material information. Having companies disclose information on immaterial issues, like the climate, is highly speculative and dubious at best.

Regardless of how you feel about climate change policy, securities law is not the place for it. We already have agencies in place to help protect our environment. The SEC's job is to protect investors, and that means making sure they have material information to make sound investments.

The SEC's guidance is also at odds with the FAST Act of 2015—legislation the President signed—and that requires the SEC to simplify, not make more complex, the current disclosure regime by June 1, a deadline which the SEC has already missed. Clearly, there are better, more pressing, uses for the SEC's finite resources.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment and refocus the SEC on their core mission.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to be funny here, but I am trying to figure out what political climate issues are. Maybe it is Democrats manipulate the weather so it only hurts certain people. I don't know what it means.

Mr. Chairman, indeed, this amendment would prevent the SEC from enforcing or codifying into law its 2010 interpretive guidance to public companies intended to provide greater transparency to investors on the material risks—and opportunities—of those companies to climate change.

This guidance was put forth after nearly 100 investors, representing \$7 trillion in wealth management, specifically petitioned the SEC for this clarity.

Additionally, the guidance doesn't create new climate change regulatory frameworks or mandates. Instead, it simply provides clarity on what companies should view as a "material" risk or opportunity that ought to be disclosed to investors.

Given that Hurricane Sandy caused \$70 billion in damage, it is difficult to say that climate change doesn't have an impact on business, unless you deny the existence of climate change in the first place.

Democrats support efforts by the SEC to modernize public company disclosures so that investors are appropriately apprised of the material risks, including the risks of climate change.

H.R. 4792, for example, represents a bicameral effort by Democrats to encourage the SEC to do more, not less, to ensure investors are aware of climate change risks like the effect of carbon costs on oil and gas companies.

This amendment always runs counter to a recent decision by the SEC to require ExxonMobil to allow a shareholder proposal from the New York State Common Fund and the Church of England to come up for a vote on this issue. That proposal would require ExxonMobil to disclose to shareholders how climate change may impact their profits.

Indeed, shareholders are increasingly craving this information. Since the beginning of 2016, eight shareholder proposals have gone to a vote at oil and gas and utility companies requesting increased disclosure of their plans to mitigate the impact from climate change on their operations. Average support for the proposal was 31 percent, but at Occidental Petroleum, nearly a majority of shareholders voted in favor. In comparison, in 2015, climate change-related proposals received an average of 17.5 percent support, with the highest support of 36.3 percent at Marathon Oil Corporation.

If the SEC guidance on this was stronger, and if the SEC enforced this mandate, these shareholder proposals, which go further than voluntary disclosures, would not be necessary.

As the impacts of climate change continue to be felt by individuals and businesses alike, shareholders will demand more information about the risks associated with their investments. The SEC should do more, not less, to clarify to companies the material risks they must disclose to their shareholders and owners.

I urge opposition to this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1830

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chair, I apologize if I wasn't clear.

This amendment does not stop companies from mentioning bona fide weather and environmental risks in their disclosures. If a company wants to weigh in on climate change, nothing in this amendment would prevent it from volunteering that information; but the reality is that companies are already required to disclose all material information.

We shouldn't allow the disclosure system to continue to be used as a tool for special interests. Instead of forcing agendas on companies, the SEC should be focused on protecting investors, maintaining fair, orderly, and efficient markets, and facilitating capital formation. The SEC let Bernard Madoff run free for 10 years—a decade—while he evaporated \$70 billion worth of people's life savings and hard-earned money. They were asleep at the switch. They were busy doing something else like this. Their job is to protect investors, and that is the intent of this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I have been in public office for 42 years, 43 years, and only once in those years in the New York State Assembly and in Congress did an agency come before me and say: "We don't want any more money. We have enough." That was the SEC in the old days, under another administration. They didn't want any more money, and I was shocked. No agency ever does that. Then, when Wall Street fell apart, we found out why. They didn't want any more money because they didn't want to enforce anything.

The gentleman is right in that Madoff got away with a lot of stuff; but now, when we have an SEC that looks at things differently—that says that we should ask questions, that we should, for instance, tell shareholders what they are doing to mitigate the problems that they may face as shareholders—we want to stop them. We can't have it both ways.

I agree with the gentleman in that Madoff and people like him got away with things, but not because this SEC, in these modern times, was looking the other way. It was because it was during a period of time when they didn't care, when they didn't enforce anything. A lot of people didn't enforce anything. I will give you an example which is related.

To my understanding, not a single person from Wall Street went to prison. I don't know if that is possible anywhere else.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have left.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chair, with regard to the new SEC and the old SEC, I have been here a little less than 8 years, but I heard the new SEC Secretary say, well, there is really nothing to worry about and that half of the 38 employees who were culpable in allowing Madoff to run free are no longer with the agency. She couldn't tell us what happened to them, if they were with another Federal agency or if they retired on the public dime. That is just like saying a pedophile changed neighborhoods—problem solved.

The fact is that we need to have the SEC focus on protecting investors. That is their main course. That is what they are supposed to do, and that is what the public expects them to do. That is what this amendment will allow them to do.

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

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

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 Florida will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MR. ROSKAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 45 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chair, 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 to the Department of Treasury by this Act may be used to issue a license pursuant to any Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) memo regarding Section 5.1.1 of Annex II to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action of July 14, 2015 (JCPOA), including the January 16, 2016, OFAC memo titled, "Statement of Licensing Policy For Activities Related to the Export Or Re-Export to Iran of Commercial Passenger Aircraft and Related Parts and Services" and any other OFAC memo of the same substance.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chair, we have an opportunity to do a good thing, and the good thing is this: to prohibit the Iranian regime from getting a product that is fungible militarily. One begins to ask oneself: What can that be, and how could the Congress be involved in that? It is very simple.

There is a large American company, which is the Boeing Company, that is

now seeking to do a deal, and the deal that they are seeking to do is to sell billions of dollars' worth of planes to the Iranians.

Now, the Iranian regime—let's stipulate that everybody agrees—is the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism. When I say "everybody," I mean everybody. Capitol Hill agrees; the administration agrees; the President says that is true; the Secretary of State says that is true. Yet they are on the verge of getting something that can be used for a military purpose. What is that? That is a Boeing plane.

This is a tweet from May of this year when the Boeing Company tweeted this: "These airplanes don't retire. They're getting another 20 years of life. See how. #freighters."

That is exactly it. Boeing, in a moment of candor, overdisclosed one of the interesting things—and they are really attractive things—about their products. Why? Their products can be used as freighters. Their products can be used to transfer things on behalf of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps, whom everybody acknowledges has been complicit in terror.

This amendment is very simple, and it is very clear. It says that the Treasury Department cannot use money that is appropriated to license this deal.

I urge its passage.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, if you listen to the last comment by the gentleman, for whom I have a lot of respect, this is really not about this particular situation. It is about the Iran deal. Anything to make it look bad—to make the agreement look bad, to make any future work on it look bad, to make any future vote on it look bad—some folks will do.

What he says is not to allow any dollars to be appropriated by this committee to help in any way, shape, or form, or to get involved with the Iran deal. That is a situation we see a lot of on this committee, and it shouldn't be. It doesn't belong here. It belongs in another committee.

If you are opposed to what the President has proposed—with what the President is trying to do and with what many of us believe is correct—then we should work on that but not necessarily work on trying to cut funding and say that this particular part cannot be done and that that particular part cannot be done. It simply speaks to a larger issue, and I think we should be fair and honest with ourselves and say: I oppose this whole deal. I oppose this proposal. I oppose all of this, and I am simply trying to get at it in another way.

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

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chair, the gentleman has conflated a number of issues, so let me explain and try to bring some clarity to this.

There is, really, a false notion and a false narrative, which is to collapse the JCPOA—that is the nuclear deal—and the activity around Iran and the ability to sell. So what am I saying? The Iranians, under the JCPOA, are entitled to civilian aircraft, but it is to use for civilian purposes.

Boeing, by their own admission, Mr. Chair, says this: “Building on success: Boeing’s commercial jetliners make an ideal platform for a variety of military derivative aircraft.” Mr. Chair, this is Boeing’s language from their own promotional materials.

How about this? This is according to Boeing: “Good news. Modifications can take 3 months to 2 years. It all depends on how much militarization they want to do.”

Don’t you see the point, Mr. Chair? Don’t you see the point? To give these types of planes to the Iranian regime, which is still the world’s largest state sponsor of terror, is to give them a product that can be used for a military purpose. We are not talking about baby formula. We are not talking about licorice. We are not talking about sandals, for crying out loud. We are talking about aircraft that can be used.

What can fit in a Boeing 747? This can fit in. It can fit 100 Shahab ballistic missiles or 15,000 rocket-propelled grenades or 25,000 AK-47 assault rifles.

Let’s not do this. Adopt this amendment.

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

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

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chair, let me point out one other piece of literature. Again, this comes from the Boeing Company. This is from their *Frontiers Magazine*: “Military derivatives front and center.” This is a continuing problem.

Look, this is in stark contrast, Mr. Chair, for a company like Lockheed Martin. Lockheed Martin has said they are not going to do business with the Iranians. God bless Lockheed Martin. They could be assembling helicopters—they could be doing all kinds of things—but they recognize that they ought not to be complicit in this adventure.

It is also interesting to me to say that, a couple of minutes ago, my friend, the gentleman from New York, was echoing a criticism from the U.S. Chamber. The U.S. Chamber said this: “Congress should avoid intervening in commercial contract agreements in instances such as these where national security matters are not involved.”

Okay. It is wrong on two counts. Number one, it is an assertion that this is a commercial deal. I am asserting that it is military, and that is true by definition. It is true by Boeing’s own admission. Secondly, when do we defer to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce for military and national security advice?

This is a good amendment. It is targeted. It is thoughtful. I urge its passage.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, in closing, it is interesting that he singles out this particular situation, because, if we were to look at every place to which we send any kind of armament that, maybe, some people would disagree with sending it to, we may not be selling anything to anyone throughout the world because there are plenty of people who oppose just about everything. I mean, we probably would only be sending stuff to the British and to no one else, perhaps, and everybody else would be in trouble. So that is not such a strong argument.

The thing is that, if we start nitpicking—and I am not saying the gentleman is—this piece and that piece and that piece, then we could find so much that we can’t send to Iran, and we will have no relationship at all. The whole purpose of what we are trying to do here is to establish some sort of understanding of who they are and an understanding of what their behavior is, but to still hope that, through conversation, through diplomacy, through other means, we can reach agreements that are good for us, good for them, and good for the world and world peace.

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

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank the gentleman for acknowledging that we are not nitpicking.

Mr. Chair, let me just say this. Look, let’s set aside every other country in the world. Let’s come together, and let’s agree on one thing. As for the world’s largest state sponsor of terror that has been involved and complicit in killing thousands of Americans—the number one of the hit parade of evil regimes that are projecting terror and malevolence—let’s agree not to give them more capacity.

I urge the passage of this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. ROSKAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 46 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chair, 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 authorize a transaction by a U.S. financial institution (as defined under section 561.309 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations) that is ordinarily incident to the export or re-export of a commercial passenger aircraft to the Islamic Republic of Iran.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

□ 1845

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, similar theme, this is a limitation amendment that would prohibit the administration from being involved in expediting the financing for the Boeing sale to Iran.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chair, the last amendment dealt with the actual sale of the planes. The Iran nuclear deal, the JCPOA, does provide that we should license those planes if we are sure they are going to be used for civilian purposes. So there is, at least, some argument about what Iran is supposed to get under the JCPOA.

This amendment deals with whether we finance airplanes, whether they are made by Boeing or Airbus or anybody else, and exactly what we are going to let our banks finance.

This amendment has nothing to do with the JCPOA, the Iran nuclear deal. Nothing in that agreement promises, hints, or even discusses the possibility that we would go so far as to lend money to one of the state sponsors of terrorism.

I know there is concern: Do we want to boycott everybody in the world? There are only three countries that are state sponsors of terrorism, and two of them—Syrian and Sudan—no bank would lend money to. So this is one country that we have to deal with that is a state sponsor of terrorism that might borrow money.

Why shouldn’t we allow it?

First, because we shouldn’t allow our banks to endanger their depositors’ money with loans to Iran.

Second, because we don’t want major banks lobbying this Congress and saying: “Oh, my God, you have got to be nice to the Iranians or we won’t get paid back and we might fail and then you will have to bail us out.” We don’t need Wall Street to become a lobbyist for Iran.

Finally, because when it comes to fairness under the Iran deal, some say the Iranians have violated it. Some say they are barely technically complying. But everyone agrees they are not overperforming, they are not erring in the direction of being consistent with the overall purposes of the deal. There is no reason we should massively overperform and provide financing we didn’t even hint that we might do.

Finally, keep in mind what we would be financing if we finance these planes.

Hundreds of thousands of Syrians have been killed. Most of the country is either in an internal exile or is fleeing the country. Bodies wash up on the beaches of Greek islands from people who risk their lives to escape an Assad regime that is kept in power by the thugs, the money, and the weapons carried to Damascus by Iran.

We don't have to finance this terrorism. We're not obligated to do so, even if we are going to be in the strictest compliance with the JCPOA. We shouldn't expose our banks to that risk.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chair, 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, this amendment has the same purpose as the amendment we just debated, that is, to undermine the Iran agreement and penalize American manufacturing companies.

We have already gone over this, but it is worth repeating. The JCPOA closed the four pathways through which Iran could get to a nuclear weapon in less than a year. We do not gain anything by putting limitations on the United States' ability to engage or monitor Iran's compliance with the agreement.

My objection to this amendment is the same objection I had to the last amendment: I see no need to proactively cut off domestic industry's access to a large market and, at the same time, undermine the commitment under the agreement regarding the exportation of commercial passenger aircraft and related parts and services to Iran.

The financial mechanism for any transaction regarding U.S.-manufactured commercial aircraft has not yet been determined. Once the contracts are completed, Iran Air will decide how it wants to finance its purchases. Like the discussion on the gentleman's last amendment, all payment matters will be done in full compliance with U.S. sanctions.

I understand that there is concern amongst some that the financing of any arrangement would be done through the Export-Import Bank of the United States. I would just note here that the Export-Import Bank of the U.S. is prohibited from providing financing to any Iranian airline. We should not be dictating the finance mechanisms for the purchase of American-made commercial aircraft, consistent with an international agreement and U.S. law and policy.

Mr. Chairman, I am afraid I have repeated myself. So let me just say this: The amendment harms U.S. manufacturing jobs and ensures that U.S. companies will be locked out of a large aerospace market which is expected to grow for decades to come.

Under this agreement, Iran is being subjected to the most comprehensive,

intrusive inspection regime ever negotiated to monitor a nuclear program. If Iran tries to cheat, if they try to build a bomb covertly, we will catch them.

The President has repeatedly said that he will continue to take aggressive steps to counter any activities in violation of existing sanctions. There is no reason to believe that the next President will not do the same.

I strongly oppose this harmful amendment and encourage my colleagues to oppose it as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Quickly, there is the nuclear deal over here. There is Iran, the terrorism regime, over here. What we are focusing on is the latter, the terrorism regime.

This is a map. This is a map that was put together by the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies. It shows flights.

A few weeks ago, an Airbus A300 aircraft belonging to Iran Air, which historically has been on the terrorist watch list by the way, took off from an airfield in southwestern Iran. The commercial jet left Abadan, a logistical hub for the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, and left for Syria. This is not a regularly scheduled flight. There is nobody with a straight face that can say these were tourists, this was commercial travel. Complete nonsense. This is illicit behavior.

Let me show you one other slide. This is from yesterday, Mr. Chair. Iran's air force flew a Boeing 747 from Tehran to Damascus yesterday, and this is the documentation of it. Iran systemically uses commercial aircraft to spread death, destruction, and mayhem; and we can do something about it.

So divorce in your mind, Mr. Chairman, the notion of the nuclear deal that the gentleman from New York was speaking about. It is completely separate. This is our ability to stop an iconic American company that has basically said: "Well, look, somebody else is doing it."

Let me ask you one question in closing, Mr. Chairman. When does history ever treat well the entity that said: "I did this terrible thing because somebody else did it too"?

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 2 minutes remaining.

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

This is about the Iran deal, and you could paint it any way you want. Anyone can say what they want about it, but it is about a deal that people would like to destroy. And so any opportunity we find, we do it.

The charts that you showed are very good. The charts that the gentleman

showed, Mr. Chair, are very good, are very strong, with a lot of information. But I am wondering, aren't those charts being shown to our military? Aren't those charts, in fact, being seen by our government? Isn't our President aware of whatever the gentleman claims?

He makes it sound like it is a secret that somehow folks on the other side found out. Whatever is happening, if something is happening, our government, our military will react to it.

He says to separate the Iran deal from what is going on. Well, separate the military from this President that the other side doesn't like. The military very carefully looks at this and advises the President. So, if something was going on that was out of order within the deal, they would tell him immediately. I know that, and I am confident of that.

This, I repeat, is just one of the many ways that we will see, not only tonight and have seen today, but on many other bills and for as long as we can, to see if we can undo the Iran deal, just the same way some people are trying to undo some other deals that were put together recently by this President.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 47 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. SANFORD. 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 in this Act may be used to administer or enforce part 515 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (the Cuban Assets Control Regulations) or section 910(b) of the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7209(b)) with respect to any travel or travel-related transaction. The limitation described in this section shall not apply in the case of the administration of a tax or tariff.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I want to be clear that in just a few moments, I am going to be withdrawing my amendment.

Before I do so, I just want to say a couple of things because this amendment was a very simple and straightforward amendment that did nothing more than allow Americans to travel to Cuba, which is to say this amendment ultimately was about American liberty.

We just heard a long conversation about Iran, and yet, as an American,

you can travel to Iran. You could travel to Syria. You could travel to North Korea. There is no prohibition for any other place on the globe, except for one, and that is Cuba. And that may have made sense 50 years ago.

The reality of today is that it does not make sense today. And so this has ultimately been about American liberty. It has been about the bundle of rights that come with liberty. The Supreme Court has said that as real as the food that we eat or the clothes that we wear or the books that we read, the ability to choose where you come and go, where you travel to, is an American liberty.

So Jefferson said 200 years ago that the normal course of things was for government to gain ground and for liberty to yield. And I think it is very, very important wherein we run into policies that have outlived their usefulness, that may have made sense 50 years, that don't make sense today, that we push back against them. That is what this amendment was about and, again, affording people the true American way, which is to travel as they choose, not as government sees.

Two, it is about bringing change. I signed on to the original Helms-Burton language. The definition of insanity is continuing the same process and expecting a different result. We have tried this approach for 50 years. We have the longest-serving dictatorship in the world in the form of the Castro brothers in Cuba. And it would seem to me, if it hadn't worked in 50 years, might we not trying something different?

It was Ronald Reagan that encouraged engagement. In fact, that has been the policy of this country. So I don't like what goes on in Russia or in China or in Vietnam, but we allow Americans to travel there, believing that that personal diplomacy is part of changing those places.

Finally, this is about government regulation. It is interesting that we are at the eve of real connections, real flights going down to Cuba. But we will have to sign affidavits. We will have to store records for 5 years. We will be subject to 10 years in prison and \$250,000 in penalties if we fill out a form wrong. And so this is also about easing government regulation.

So, in my closing, I would just like to say a couple of thoughts. I want to thank KEVIN CRAMER, TOM EMMER, RICK CRAWFORD, TED POE, JIM MCGOVERN, KATHY CASTOR, BARBARA LEE, and about 130 other Members of this House who signed on to this bill. I want to thank Senators JEFF FLAKE, JERRY MORAN, MIKE ENZI, and others over on the Senate side.

I want to thank the U.S. Chamber, who is going to key vote this vote tonight, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Washington Office of Latin America, Engage Cuba, the Farm Bureau, the Americans for Tax Reform, and a long list of others who said that this is something that makes sense.

Finally, I want to say, there is real momentum. As I just mentioned, just today U.S. transportation is outlining eight airlines that will be able to travel to Cuba. Last night, I think there was something of a deal struck between ag interests and the ability to export product or a deal that will be formed in exporting product to Cuba. I think that makes sense.

Given the fact that the Speaker is working against this amendment, I see the handwriting on the wall. I think it best to withdraw, so that is exactly what I am going to do.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 49 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. CARNEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 50 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. DELANEY), I offer amendment No. 50.

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 by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to remove any area from the list of areas considered to be HUBZones, until such area has been designated as a redesignated area by the Administrator for at least 7 years (as such terms are defined under section 3(p) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p))).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chair, I rise tonight to offer this amendment on behalf of my colleague and good friend, Congressman JOHN DELANEY of Maryland. Unfortunately, Mr. DELANEY couldn't be with us this evening. His father passed away a few days ago, and he is at the funeral in north Jersey tonight. He did ask me to make sure that this amendment was given consideration as a part of this legislation.

□ 1900

Mr. Chairman, the Delaney amendment is a simple reform to the Small Business Administration's HUBZone program to give affected communities additional time to respond to the potential loss of their HUBZone status. The Committee on Small Business has expressed a desire to reform the program more broadly, but there are more than 2,000 HUBZones that are affected

by this right now, so we can't wait to see if such a provision is enacted as part of those reforms. Our communities and the economies in those areas need help now.

The SBA's HUBZone program was created in 1997. It was designed to encourage economic growth in historically underutilized areas, areas that have often struggled with poverty and a lack of opportunity. Small businesses in SBA HUBZones receive contracting assistance and a pricing preference for Federal contracts.

For the last two decades, this program has enjoyed bipartisan support. It benefits communities in both rural and urban areas. Right now the Census Bureau works with the SBA to update the locations of Federal HUBZones and, in some cases, to remove an area's HUBZone status. Many small businesses and communities that lose their HUBZone status, including in Mr. DELANEY's district in Garrett County, Maryland, believe that the process is just too abrupt, there is not enough time for these small businesses and the communities they support to adjust.

The short redesignation process also inhibits long-term investment in these communities, which is badly needed. This does not give local lawmakers in those areas enough time to adjust to potentially large job losses that would negatively impact those communities. The Delaney amendment extends the redesignation process, giving underserved areas additional time to respond to the loss of their HUBZone status. This is good for small businesses that are using the HUBZone program; this is good for the employees who work for those businesses; and it is good for the communities that are benefiting from these additional local jobs.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my friend and colleague, Congressman DELANEY, I urge support of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia). The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the chairman of the Committee on Small Business.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the House Committee on Small Business, which I chair, has oversight responsibility of the HUBZone program. Our committee has not yet had the opportunity to hold hearings on the program to uncover ways it can properly be improved. It wouldn't be prudent to extend or expand the program until the committee has had the opportunity to perform its due diligence.

I am committed to working in a bipartisan manner with our ranking member, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and others to hold hearings and develop legislation to update and reform and improve the

HUBZone program. I would therefore urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment, but I invite them all to share their ideas as we work through regular order in the committee process. That way we can be sure to take the action that best serves American small businesses and this country.

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman for his willingness to work in a bipartisan way with the Committee on Small Business—in particular, my colleague Ms. VELÁZQUEZ—on this issue and the reforms therein.

Mr. DELANEY, I know, would like to see an extension, which is why he has offered this amendment, so that the affected communities have some time to react to the phaseout, potential phaseout of the HUBZones in their areas. I would again urge support of Mr. DELANEY’s amendment to extend the HUBZone redesignation period.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Over the years, the Committee on Small Business has seen the HUBZone program move further and further away from its goal, and this amendment would only amplify this problem. Allowing a massive expansion of the program, as has been proposed, would greatly reduce the efficacy of the program by steering contracts away from active economically distressed areas.

The amendment will also dilute the competition in HUBZone contracting opportunities as well as in the free and open marketplace. In some cases, agencies will even be required to pay up to 10 percent more for goods and services to companies that would otherwise not qualify for the program. The chairman and I are committed to working on the HUBZone program.

The committee plans on conducting a hearing in the fall, and I am working on a comprehensive reform bill. We will welcome Mr. DELANEY’s participation as we look further into how we can improve this program, while ensuring that contracts are awarded to those areas that need them most.

However, I cannot, in good conscience, support the inclusion of this provision. It has not been vetted by the committee of jurisdiction, and there is not any evidence that this amendment will further the mission of the HUBZone program of supporting economically disadvantaged areas. I therefore ask my fellow Members to vote “no” on this amendment.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, let me close by saying that we know there is some concern about redesignating the HUBZones, but we have listened, and I think it is best that we wait and let the authorizing committees of jurisdiction work through this issue; and so, therefore, I urge a “no” vote.

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

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

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

Mr. CARNEY. 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 Delaware will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. ZELDIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 51 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS), I offer amendment No. 51.

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 final judgments, awards, compromise settlements, or interest and costs specified in the judgments to Iran using amounts appropriated under section 1304 of title 31, United States Code, or interest from amounts appropriated under such section.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ZELDIN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this year, the Treasury Department transferred \$1.7 billion to Iran’s Central Bank to resolve a long-running financial dispute regarding Iran’s arms purchases before the revolution of 1979.

The agreement involved the return of \$400 million in Iranian funds that the United States seized after the revolution plus an additional \$1.3 billion in interest. This financial transaction was carried out through the Department of the Treasury Judgment Fund, a permanent, indefinite appropriation that was created by Congress in 1956 to pay judgments entered against the United States.

While the U.S. Department of the Treasury claims that the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, IRGC, remains sanctioned under our current sanctions regime, an associate fellow at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies, Saeed Ghasseminejad, recently noted that Iran’s Guardian Council approved the government’s 2017 budget that instructed Iran’s Central Bank to transfer that \$1.7 billion to Iran’s military establishment, which includes the IRGC.

According to administration officials, outstanding legal claims against

the United States by Iran remain, meaning that future payments could be made as a result of any resulting settlement.

It is unacceptable for additional U.S. taxpayer dollars to flow into the hands of the world’s leading state sponsor of terrorism, and that is why this amendment is needed. It prohibits funds from being used to pay final judgments, awards, compromise settlements, or interests and costs specified in the judgments to Iran using amounts appropriated under section 1304 of title 31, United States Code, or interest from amounts appropriated under such section.

Mr. Chairman, 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 amendment would put the United States in breach of its international legal obligations. It would also lead other countries to question U.S. integrity and reliability in entering into settlements and dispute resolution clauses in a wide range of treaties that directly affect our international economic interests, including treaties designed to protect U.S. investors abroad.

Under the 1981 Algiers Accords, awards of the Iran-U.S. Claims Tribunal are final and binding and enforceable in the courts around the country. If the U.S. does not pay, Iran will attempt to enforce the awards against U.S. assets around the world, which are significant. Even if not successful, Iran could tie up U.S. assets in litigation for years.

In almost every administration, the United States has entered into settlements with Iran, including especially with respect to claims at the Iran-U.S. Claims Tribunal. Settling certain cases with Iran is key to the U.S. ability to avoiding far greater liability where we believe the Iran-U.S. Claims Tribunal is likely to award a far larger award against the United States.

The U.S. has settled certain cases or parts of cases in the past for this reason, including most recently the settlement in January involving the Iran FMS Trust Fund. In cases where the administration does not believe we have serious exposure, it litigates vigorously.

In sum, this amendment would put the United States in breach of its international obligation, expose U.S. assets abroad to needless attachment litigation, and remove our ability to assess U.S. litigation risk regarding claims against the United States and prevent the United States from making important settlement decisions that are in the U.S. taxpayers’ interest.

For that reason, for trying not to expose our country to those problems, I urge opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment offered by Mr. DESANTIS of Florida, which has been part of a very effective effort on behalf of Mr. DESANTIS advocating for a more effective foreign policy, especially in light of a deal entered into approximately 1 year ago with Iran that is not in our best interests.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, in closing, the gentleman just proved to me what we already know, and that is that this is about feelings about the deal that we arranged some time ago. It is also an attempt to embarrass the people who put the deal together, embarrass our President, whatever the issue may be; but this one is a dangerous one, because this one exposes the United States to various situations throughout the world that we should not be caught up in.

We have a reputation about paying our debts, about keeping to our treaties, about keeping to our arrangements, even with people we may not be crazy about. If that is what the idea is and that is what the deal is, we should live up to it, and this amendment goes against that. I still oppose the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. ZELDIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 52 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS), I offer amendment No. 52.

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 by the Secretary of the Treasury to modify regulations that prohibit, or impose strict conditions on, the opening or maintaining in the United States of a correspondent account or a payable-through account by a foreign financial institution that the Secretary finds knowingly engages in any activity described in subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), or (E) of section 104(c)(2) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-195; 22 U.S.C. 8513(c)(2)).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, I present this amendment on behalf of Mr. DESANTIS of Florida.

Section 401 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 requires the Sec-

retary of the Treasury to prescribe regulations to prohibit, or impose strict conditions on, the opening or maintaining in the United States of a correspondent account or payable-through account by a foreign financial institution that the Secretary finds knowingly engages in Iran's illicit activities.

□ 1915

Under section 401(f), the Secretary of the Treasury may waive these prohibitions or conditions if the Secretary determines that such a waiver is necessary to the national interest of the United States, and submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report describing the reasons for the determination.

However, as noted in a recent Congressional Research Service report, section 401 was not waived to implement the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, while many entities with which transactions would have triggered sanctions under section 401 were delisted in accordance with the deal.

This delisting is unacceptable, given that the U.S. Department of the Treasury claims to be more than aware of the "concerns that remain" regarding Iran, "such as transparency issues, corruption, and regulatory obstacles," as reported in a recent Free Beacon article.

Given that the U.S. Department of the Treasury is circumventing the law, this amendment was introduced to prohibit funds from being used by the Secretary of the Treasury to modify regulations that prohibit or impose strict conditions on the opening or maintaining in the United States of a correspondent account or a payable-through account by a foreign financial institution that the Secretary finds knowingly engages in any activity described in section 401(c)(2) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010.

I would encourage my colleagues in this Chamber to support this amendment.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chair, it is the same thing. I am repeating myself over and over again. That is redundant. Anyway, it is just the same thing. It is that we are not happy with the Iran deal and want to try to find any way possible to undo it.

There is enough support all around to at least try to reach a new day with the Government of Iran and try to find a way to have a better understanding. You know, I am a big supporter of this situation, and people have asked: Why?

Simply because I have seen, I have been a Member of Congress during wartime, I have been alive during wartime, I have been alive during peacetime,

both as a Member of Congress and out of Congress. I would rather give peace a chance. The Iran deal allows for that situation.

Secondly, the Iran deal closed many of the pathways that Iran had to building a bomb within a year. And those are still there.

The President, trust me—do I know this for a fact? Am I in the room there in the oval office? No—if there is one item the President does not want to fail, it is on this one. So there are people looking at this on a daily basis. Any chart we come up with, any photograph we come up with, they have it at the White House, I assure you, and they are dealing with this on a daily basis.

So I understand the gentleman from New York, my colleague, has this amendment representing someone else, but he believes in it, and I respect him for that, but I think we should give this an opportunity to work. And if it doesn't work, the very people who supported it, I assure you, will be the first ones criticizing it and making sure that it gets undone or is done away with. But this needs a chance to work, and it is the best we can do. It is the responsibility we have to bring peace to future generations.

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

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. DESANTIS for bringing this important amendment as we strive to hold Iran accountable.

There are many other bad activities Iran has been involved in directly impacting the United States, our allies in the Middle East, and around the rest of the world. So I do commend the gentleman from Florida for bringing this amendment. I would ask all of my colleagues to vote for it this evening.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MR. YARMUTH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 54 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. YARMUTH. 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 in contravention of section 317 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 317).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment with Ms. ESHOO,

Mr. LUJÁN, and Mr. WELCH that will make it easier for the American people to figure out who is trying to influence their votes through campaign ads.

In today's political reality of nonstop campaigning, our system continues to fail the American people by allowing special interests and shadow groups to flood our airwaves with anonymous ads, with no true disclosure whatsoever.

Section 317 of the Communications Act of 1934 requires broadcasters to disclose the true identity of political ad sponsors on air during the ad. The FCC currently relies on an outdated 1979 staff interpretation of this law that does not account for the dramatic changes in our campaign system that have taken place over the last 6 years. This has resulted in a major loophole in which special interests and wealthy donors can anonymously spend limitless sums of money to influence the outcomes of our elections.

To be honest, when an ad disclaimer says, "Paid for by Americans for Kittens and Puppies," or "Paid for by Americans for a Brighter Tomorrow," that really doesn't help the American voter understand who may be behind those ads. This is not what Congress intended. Despite having the authority to do so, the FCC has yet to take action to close this loophole.

In January, 168 Members joined Ms. ESHOO and me in sending a letter to the FCC to unmask secret sponsors of political ads. They have yet to act. It is my hope that our amendment, which simply states that none of the funds may be used in contravention of section 317, will send a strong message to the FCC that it is time to uphold the original congressional intent.

But this is not just congressional intent; it is also the intent of the Supreme Court. In the widely discussed Citizens United decision—something that I certainly don't support—Justice Kennedy, writing for the majority, said:

The First Amendment protects political speech; and disclosure permits citizens and shareholders to react to the speech of corporate entities in a proper way. This transparency enables the electorate to make informed decisions and give proper weight to different speakers and messages.

He also wrote:

There was evidence in the record that independent groups were running election-related advertisements while hiding behind dubious and misleading names.

In the McCutcheon decision, which basically said that anybody can give unlimited sums to Federal elections, Chief Justice Roberts wrote:

Disclosure of contributions minimizes the potential for abuse of the campaign finance system. Disclosure requirements are, in part, justified based on a governmental interest in providing the electorate with information about the sources of election-related spending.

So what we are hearing here is not just congressional intent, but also the recognition by the Supreme Court that disclosure is an important part of guar-

anteeing transparency in our electoral process.

We all know that dark money has flooded our politics, weakened accountability in government, and made it harder for voters to develop a true opinion of the individuals to Congress to represent them. This amendment will help change that and, hopefully, restore a minimum level of honesty in our electoral system.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I have been looking at this amendment and what it says is that none of the funds made available by this act may be used in contravention of section 317 of the Communications Act. This says that you can't do anything against what the law says. I guess that is another way of saying you have got to do what the law says. We call that a double negative.

It doesn't make a whole lot of sense, but I guess it is a good opportunity for my good friend to stand up and talk about Citizens United and make his points, which I find interesting, and I am willing to listen some more.

I want to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this somewhat superfluous amendment that maybe would prevent the FCC from actually doing its job. That is my observation. And I respect my good friend a great deal. I am just curious as to why he filed this amendment, other than to talk a little bit about what he has been talking about.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of my good friend from Florida. I understand that this amendment has no legal impact in terms of forcing the FCC to do what it is statutorily required to do. It is just a prod. It is a way to say to them: We expect you to do your job.

We are in the middle of a very, very contentious political season in which hundreds of millions of dollars are being spent anonymously to influence voters' opinions and their votes. And we think that it is time for the FCC to act.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, which will help ensure that the public knows exactly who is trying to influence their vote during elections.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I hope the FCC got the urge.

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

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

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

Mr. YARMUTH. 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 Kentucky will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 55 will not be offered.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 57 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MR. JENKINS OF WEST VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 58 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. 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:

Page 34, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

Page 37, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, one of the most effective tools in fighting the drug crisis is the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program. It is also known as HIDTA.

This program works at Federal, State, and local levels, bringing together law enforcement to stop drug trafficking in our communities. In my district, the funding is to provide necessary resources to local police departments and county sheriffs' offices to help facilitate efforts to stop drug trafficking. It teams up with local law enforcement, the FBI, and the DEA to get drugs off our streets and lock up traffickers.

The police chief in my hometown of Huntington, West Virginia, says HIDTA is critical to the success of their counterdrug mission. They rely on HIDTA funding to support training and operational activities.

The amendment I offer today is straightforward and completely offset. It will increase funding for the HIDTA program by \$2 million. The increase will go a long way in ensuring our sheriff and police departments can continue making strides in combating the drug crisis.

I want to thank Chairman CRENSHAW and the committee for their tireless efforts to fund programs making a difference in our communities. His work on this bill and continued support of HIDTA are truly making a difference in combating the drug epidemic.

□ 1930

Mr. Chairman, while I have only served on the Appropriations Committee for 2 years, it has been a pleasure working with my colleague from Florida, Mr. CRENSHAW.

Again, thanks to the chairman, Chairman CRENSHAW, and I ask for support for my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. GALLEG0

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 68 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mr. GALLEG0. 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 appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to revise any policy or directive relating to hiring preferences for veterans.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 794, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank, first, my colleagues, Congresswoman KIRKPATRICK and Congressmen TAKANO and AGUILAR, for helping me with this amendment. We strongly believe that veterans who served our Nation in uniform deserve the chance to serve our Nation in the Federal Government.

Unfortunately, a provision slipped unseen into this 1,700-page document, the Senate defense authorization bill, severely undermines these policies that have been helping veterans get jobs with the Federal Government. Specifically, it will prevent veterans from benefiting from the preference system if they are already employed by the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, this misguided provision was never the subject of a public hearing, it was never the subject of a public debate, it was never the subject of a roll call vote, and it was never voted on in the committee or on the Senate floor. I am willing to bet the vast majority of my colleagues in the Senate do not know that this provision is in the National Defense Authorization Act.

America's veterans deserve better. We deserve the chance to proudly and publicly make our case for veterans preference, a system which has done so much to help courageous Americans returning from war to find good jobs so they can provide for their families. That is why I am offering this amendment. I want to give the Members of this body the chance to go on record in support of our Nation's veterans.

Mr. Chairman, this issue is deeply personal to me. After I got back from Iraq, I saw my friends and fellow veterans struggle to find employment and to get on with their lives. I personally

witnessed the physical and emotional toll that joblessness can take on a veteran's life and on their families.

Simply put, the Senate language is a step in the wrong direction. After years of painful progress in combating economic distress and homelessness among our veterans, now is not the time to dilute a system that is working, that has been proven highly successful in promoting veteran employment.

The American people recognize that we owe an immense debt of gratitude to the brave men and women that have served our country. Many of them left civilian jobs, left their lives behind for months, or even years, to risk their lives to defend our Nation.

The veterans preference system helps create a fair playing field for veterans by compensating them for the time they spent fighting overseas instead of working in government or the private sector.

Instead of getting master's degrees, veterans were going door to door looking for insurgents. While other civilians were building their résumé in civilian jobs, our men and women in uniform put in time away from their family, in dangerous situations, with little monetary compensation.

Veterans are not asking for a hand-out. We have earned this preference through the blood, sweat, and tears we have given this country.

Mr. Chairman, this provision sends the wrong message to our troops. It establishes the wrong policy for our government and for our country and sets the wrong precedent for our future.

On behalf of America's veterans, I urge every Member of this House to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his amendment. I did not have as illustrious a military career as he had, but in the sixties I was proud to serve our country.

There is something that troubles me a lot, and I have to say it. There is always so much talk about our veterans, our veterans, our veterans, and yet, at the same time, people cut the Veterans Health Administration. At the same time, they try to take away preferences that they have gotten and they have earned the hard way.

When we think of veterans, we shouldn't only think of that picture we always see of the person in uniform and so on. There is also the veteran in a wheelchair. There are the young kids that come here and greet us Monday nights sometimes, with a missing limb and so on.

So, to me, I am either a contradiction or I am the way a lot of people should be. I will have to be really forced into voting for Congress to de-

clare war. Given a choice, I don't want any war.

But coming back from that war, I have become a big-spending liberal when it comes to veterans. Give them whatever they want. Give them whatever they need. Give them whatever they deserve. And I mean that sincerely.

So this, to me, is an important amendment that the gentleman brings up. This, to me, is one that sticks to our comments that we care about the veterans. If we start chipping away at the benefits that veterans get, the day will come when we treat veterans just like any other Federal agency and cut away all their benefits and all the support that they need from us.

So I strongly support this amendment, and I hope that everybody else will do the same.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0).

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

Mr. GALLEG0. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MRS. HARTZLER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 70 printed in House Report 114-639.

Mrs. HARTZLER. 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 by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection for a contract for consumer awareness and engagement tools and resources communication.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would limit the CFPB's ability to unilaterally enter into fiscally irresponsible contracts for the purpose of advertising.

The CFPB has shown itself to be irresponsible with their spending and politically motivated with their choice of advertising firms. In fiscal year 2016, the CFPB has so far spent \$15.3 million on Internet ads which have achieved questionable results. The CFPB is devoting a greater portion of its budget to advertising than nearly every other Federal agency.

Moreover, nearly all the CFPB's advertising dollars, including a \$12.5 million contract signed in February of this year, are going to a single advertising firm that just happened to be used by the Presidential campaigns of President Barack Obama and former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. This is reckless, out-of-control government spending at its worst, and it reeks of cronyism.

Congress must act to rein in this abusive waste of taxpayer funds and stop the agency from throwing away money. We need to end this misuse of tax dollars by passing my amendment. And I thank the Rules Committee for making my amendment in order.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW).

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I want to thank her for bringing this before the body tonight, and urge its adoption.

This underlying bill talks about the CFPB, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. We have talked about it a lot tonight. One of the things the underlying bill does is it puts it under the appropriations process, and this is a pretty good example of why they ought to be under the appropriations process.

Most other agencies in the Federal Government are. They come to Congress, and they say: This is what we plan our spending on and here is how much we would like. But they are not accountable to anybody. So we are just trying to bring some transparency.

But this is the classic example of why they ought to be under the appropriations process. If they would walk in and say, "We just want to spend \$15 million of hard-earned taxpayer dollars on advertising," we might ask them questions about that.

So it is a good amendment, and I urge its adoption.

Mrs. HARTZLER. I thank the Chairman. I really appreciate his support.

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, this is an ambiguous and punitive amendment which could prevent the Bureau from making seniors, servicemembers, and students aware of predatory financial practices, interrupt the Bureau's ability to work with consumer advocates and the financial services industry on consumer education, and keep American consumers in the dark about the only agency designed specifically to protect their interests.

For every dollar spent on financial education, \$25 is spent on financial marketing. You can see that for yourself by searching for a "car loan" or "credit card offer" on Google, or looking through the junk you get in your mailbox every week. In fact, marketing of these products has become so perva-

sive, Google recently banned advertising for payday loans on the basis they were harmful to Google's own customers.

The Bureau has developed a number of tools that we should all be helping to make Americans more aware of, including a great set of resources on home ownership and mortgages called "Know Before You Owe," as well as an online tool that arms consumers with the information they need to identify the most competitively priced loans in the marketplace.

The Bureau has used Internet advertising, as well as TV advertising, through GSA-approved contractors that offer advertising management services to get the word out about these important resources that help consumers plan for their financial futures and save their hard-earned money.

While Republicans claim to support transparency and competition in markets, they want to shut down the Bureau's efforts to educate consumers on how to get the best deals on financial services and avoid debt traps.

At the same time, Republican allies have spent millions of dollars on Internet and television for a smear campaign cynically named "Protect America's consumers," which has falsified quotes from Members of Congress and misrepresented Bureau activities to discourage taxpayers from taking advantage of the Bureau's services.

One Sunlight Foundation analysis found that this bogus group spent \$58,000 just on television advertisements smearing the Bureau. What real consumer nonprofits have that kind of money to throw around? Not anyone that I know.

Fortunately, none of the Republican attacks have been able to keep the Bureau from returning \$11.4 billion to consumers, or from providing financial advice to more than 12 million unique visitors to their Web site.

We would, however, like to thank the Republicans for giving the Bureau some free advertising for those who are watching the debate. Make sure you visit consumerfinance.gov for more information on mortgages, student loans, credit cards, and banking accounts. And that is consumerfinance.gov, just in case anyone missed it.

I urge opposition to the amendment. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I would just thank the gentleman for giving some free advertising there to the agency and proving my point: that we don't need to spend over \$15 million of taxpayer money on this. All these services are available already online. Consumers can find this information.

This is about fiscal responsibility and accountability. We weren't even aware that the CFPB was spending this amount of money. As the chairman mentioned, there is no accountability for the agency. So Congress didn't know until a newspaper article did an investigation on it. That is how we be-

came aware that this agency has spent 2.5 percent of its budget this year on ads, the second-highest level among all Federal departments and comparable regulatory agencies for this year to date.

So this is egregious. There is no accountability. It is not needed. So I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1945

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

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Chairman, I encourage all my colleagues to support this commonsense measure to save the taxpayer dollar and to curb irresponsible spending. More thorough oversight of the CFPB is necessary, and I believe this is a step in the right direction.

So I thank the chairman for his support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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 Missouri will be postponed.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) having assumed the chair, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, 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.

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 7 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia) at 8 p.m.

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) kindly take the chair.

□ 2001

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 Ms. FOXX (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 70 printed in House Report 114-624, offered by the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114-639 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 40 by Mr. MESSER of Indiana.

Amendment No. 41 by Mr. PALMER of Alabama.

Amendment No. 43 by Mr. MULLIN of Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 44 by Mr. POSEY of Florida.

Amendment No. 50 by Mr. CARNEY of Delaware.

Amendment No. 54 by Mr. YARMUTH of Kentucky.

Amendment No. 68 by Mr. GALLEGO of Arizona.

Amendment No. 70 by Mrs. HARTZLER of Missouri.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. MESSER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 235, noes 179, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 389]

AYES—235

Abraham	Amodei	Barr
Allen	Babin	Barton
Amash	Barletta	Benishek

Bilirakis	Hardy
Bishop (MI)	Harper
Bishop (UT)	Harris
Black	Hartzler
Blackburn	Heck (NV)
Blum	Hensarling
Boustany	Herrera Beutler
Brady (TX)	Hice, Jody B.
Brat	Hill
Bridenstine	Holding
Brooks (AL)	Hudson
Brooks (IN)	Huelskamp
Buchanan	Huizenga (MI)
Buck	Hultgren
Bucshon	Hunter
Burgess	Hurd (TX)
Byrne	Issa
Calvert	Jenkins (KS)
Carter (GA)	Jenkins (WV)
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)
Chabot	Johnson, Sam
Chaffetz	Jolly
Clawson (FL)	Jones
Coffman	Jordan
Cole	Joyce
Collins (GA)	Katko
Collins (NY)	Kelly (MS)
Comstock	Kelly (PA)
Conaway	King (IA)
Cook	King (NY)
Costello (PA)	Kinzinger (IL)
Cramer	Kline
Crawford	Knight
Crenshaw	Labrador
Culberson	LaHood
Curbelo (FL)	LaMalfa
Davidson	Lamborn
Davis, Rodney	Lance
Denham	Latta
Dent	LoBiondo
DeSantis	Long
DesJarlais	Loudermilk
Dold	Love
Donovan	Lucas
Duffy	Luetkemeyer
Duncan (SC)	Lummis
Duncan (TN)	MacArthur
Elmers (NC)	Marchant
Emmer (MN)	Marino
Farenthold	Massie
Fincher	McCarthy
Fitzpatrick	McCaul
Fleischmann	McClintock
Fleming	McHenry
Flores	McKinley
Forbes	McMorris
Fortenberry	Rodgers
Fox	McSally
Franks (AZ)	Meadows
Frelinghuysen	Meehan
Garrett	Messer
Gibbs	Mica
Gibson	Miller (MI)
Gohmert	Mooney (WV)
Goodlatte	Mullin
Gosar	Mulvaney
Gowdy	Murphy (PA)
Granger	Neugebauer
Graves (GA)	Newhouse
Graves (LA)	Noem
Graves (MO)	Nunes
Griffith	Olson
Grothman	Palazzo
Guinta	Palmer
Guthrie	Paulsen
Hanna	Pearce

NOES—179

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

Perry	Garamendi
Pittenger	Graham
Pitts	Grayson
Poliquin	Green, Al
Pompeo	Green, Gene
Posey	Grijalva
Price, Tom	Gutiérrez
Ratcliffe	Hahn
Reed	Heck (WA)
Reichert	Higgins
Renacci	Himes
Ribble	Hinojosa
Rice (SC)	Honda
Rigell	Hoyer
Roby	Huffman
Roe (TN)	Israel
Rogers (AL)	Jackson Lee
Rogers (KY)	Jeffries
Rohrabacher	Johnson (GA)
Rokita	Johnson, E. B.
Rooney (FL)	Kaptur
Ros-Lehtinen	Keating
Roskam	Kelly (IL)
Rothfus	Kuster
Rouzer	Kennedy
Royce	Kildee
Russell	Kilmer
Salmon	Kind
Sanford	Kirkpatrick
Sanford	Kuster
Scalise	Langevin
Schweikert	Larsen (WA)
Scott, Austin	Larson (CT)
Sensenbrenner	Lawrence
Sessions	Lee
Shimkus	Levin
Shuster	Lewis
Simpson	Lieu, Ted
Smith (MO)	Lipinski
Smith (NE)	Loeback
Smith (NJ)	Lofgren
Smith (TX)	Lowenthal
Stefanik	
Stewart	Aderholt
Stivers	Bost
Stutzman	Brown (FL)
Thompson (PA)	Clay
Thornberry	Delaney
Tiberi	Diaz-Balart
Tipton	Eshoo
Trott	
Upton	
Valadao	
Wagner	
Walberg	
Walden	
Walker	
Walorski	
Walters, Mimi	
Weber (TX)	
Webster (FL)	
Wenstrup	
Westerman	
Westmoreland	
Whitfield	
Williams	
Wilson (SC)	
Wittman	
Womack	
Woodall	
Yoder	
Young (AK)	
Young (IA)	
Young (IN)	
Zeldin	
Zinke	

Lowey	Rush
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Ryan (OH)
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Lynch	Sanchez, Loretta
Maloney	Sarbanes
Carolyn	Schakowsky
Maloney, Sean	Schiff
Matsui	Schrader
McCollum	Scott (VA)
McDermott	Scott, David
McGovern	Serrano
McNerney	Sewell (AL)
Meeks	Sherman
Meng	Sinema
Moore	Sires
Moulton	Slaughter
Murphy (FL)	Smith (WA)
Napolitano	Speier
Neal	Swalwell (CA)
Nolan	Takano
Norcross	Thompson (CA)
O'Rourke	Thompson (MS)
Pallone	Titus
Pascrell	Tonko
Payne	Torres
Perlmutter	Tsongas
Peters	Van Hollen
Peterson	Vargas
Pingree	Veasey
Pocan	Vela
Polis	Velázquez
Price (NC)	Visclosky
Quigley	Walz
Rangel	Wasserman
Rice (NY)	Schultz
Richmond	Waters, Maxine
Roybal-Allard	Watson Coleman
Ruiz	Welch
Ruppersberger	Wilson (FL)
	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—19

	Hastings	Poe (TX)
	Hurt (VA)	Ross
	Miller (FL)	Takai
	Moolenaar	Turner
	Nadler	Yoho
	Nugent	
	Pelosi	

□ 2023

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. PALMER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 223, noes 192, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 390]

AYES—223

Abraham	Bilirakis	Bridenstine
Allen	Bishop (MI)	Brooks (AL)
Amash	Bishop (UT)	Brooks (IN)
Amodei	Black	Buchanan
Babin	Blackburn	Buck
Barletta	Blum	Bucshon
Barr	Boustany	Burgess
Barton	Brady (TX)	Byrne
Benishek	Brat	Calvert

Carter (GA)	Jenkins (KS)	Renacci	Keating	Meng	Schrader	Coffman	Issa	Ratcliffe
Carter (TX)	Jenkins (WV)	Ribble	Kelly (IL)	Moore	Scott (VA)	Cole	Jenkins (KS)	Reed
Chabot	Johnson (OH)	Rice (SC)	Kennedy	Moulton	Scott, David	Collins (GA)	Jenkins (WV)	Reichert
Chaffetz	Johnson, Sam	Rigell	Kildee	Murphy (FL)	Serrano	Collins (NY)	Johnson (OH)	Renacci
Clawson (FL)	Jones	Roby	Kilmer	Napolitano	Sewell (AL)	Comstock	Johnson, Sam	Ribble
Cole	Jordan	Roe (TN)	Kind	Neal	Sherman	Conaway	Jolly	Rice (SC)
Collins (GA)	Joyce	Rogers (AL)	Kirkpatrick	Nolan	Sinema	Cook	Jones	Rigell
Collins (NY)	Kelly (MS)	Rogers (KY)	Kuster	Norcross	Sires	Costa	Jordan	Roby
Comstock	Kelly (PA)	Rohrabacher	Langevin	O'Rourke	Slaughter	Costello (PA)	Joyce	Roe (TN)
Conaway	King (IA)	Rokita	Larsen (WA)	Pallone	Smith (WA)	Cramer	Katko	Rogers (AL)
Cook	King (NY)	Rooney (FL)	Larson (CT)	Pascrell	Speier	Crawford	Kelly (MS)	Rogers (KY)
Cramer	Kinzinger (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Lawrence	Payne	Stefanik	Crenshaw	Kelly (PA)	Rohrabacher
Crenshaw	Kline	Roskam	Lee	Pelosi	Swalwell (CA)	Culberson	King (IA)	Rokita
Culberson	Knight	Ross	Levin	Perlmutter	Takano	Curbelo (FL)	King (NY)	Rooney (FL)
Davidson	Labrador	Rothfus	Lewis	Peters	Thompson (CA)	Davidson	Kinzinger (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Davis, Rodney	LaHood	Rouzer	Lieu, Ted	Pingree	Thompson (MS)	Davis, Rodney	Kline	Roskam
Denham	LaMalfa	Royce	Loeb	Pocan	Titus	Denham	Knight	Ross
DeSantis	Lamborn	Russell	Lofgren	Poliquin	Tonko	Dent	Labrador	Rothfus
DesJarlais	Lance	Salmon	Lowenthal	Price (NC)	Torres	DeSantis	LaHood	Rouzer
Donovan	Latta	Sanford	Lowey	Quigley	Tsongas	DesJarlais	LaMalfa	Royce
Duffy	Lipinski	Schweikert	Lujan Grisham	Rangel	Van Hollen	Diaz-Balart	Lamborn	Russell
Duncan (SC)	LoBiondo	Scott, Austin	(NM)	Reed	Vargas	Dold	Lance	Salmon
Duncan (TN)	Long	Sensenbrenner	Lujan, Ben Ray	Rice (NY)	Veasey	Donovan	Latta	Sanford
Ellmers (NC)	Loudermilk	Shimkus	(NM)	Richmond	Vela	Duffy	LoBiondo	Scalise
Emmer (MN)	Love	Shuster	Lynch	Roybal-Allard	Velazquez	Duncan (SC)	Long	Schweikert
Farenthold	Lucas	Simpson	Maloney, Sean	Ruiz	Visclosky	Duncan (TN)	Loudermilk	Scott, Austin
Fincher	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)	Carolyn	Rush	Walz	Ellmers (NC)	Love	Sensenbrenner
Fleischmann	Lummis	Smith (NE)	Maloney, Sean	Ryans	Wasserman	Emmer (MN)	Lucas	Sessions
Fleming	MacArthur	Smith (NJ)	McCollum	Ryan (OH)	Schultz	Farenthold	Lummis	Shimkus
Flores	Marchant	Smith (TX)	McDermott	Sánchez, Linda	T. Waters, Maxine	Fincher	MacArthur	Shuster
Forbes	Marino	Stewart	McGovern	T. Sanchez, Loretta	Watson Coleman	Fleischmann	Marchant	Simpson
Fortenberry	Massie	McCauley	McNerney	Sarbanes	Welch	Fleming	Marino	Smith (MO)
Fox	McCarthy	McClintock	McSally	Schakowsky	Wilson (FL)	Flores	Massie	Smith (NE)
Franks (AZ)	McCauley	McHenry	Meehan	Schiff	Yarmuth	Forbes	McCarthy	Smith (NJ)
Frelinghuysen	McClintock	Thompson (PA)	Meeks			Fortenberry	McCauley	Smith (TX)
Garrett	McKinley	Thornberry				Fox	McClintock	Stefanik
Gibbs	McMorris	Tiberi	Aderholt	Delaney	Nadler	Frelinghuysen	McHenry	Stivers
Gohmert	McMorris	Tipton	Bost	Diaz-Balart	Nugent	Gibbs	McKinley	Stutzman
Goodlatte	Meadows	Trott	Brown (FL)	Fitzpatrick	Poe (TX)	Garrett	McMorris	Thompson (PA)
Gosar	Messer	Upton	Clay	Hastings	Takai	Gibson	Rodgers	Thornberry
Gowdy	Mica	Valadao	Cleaver	Hurt (VA)	Turner	Gohmert	McSally	Tiberi
Granger	Miller (FL)	Wagner	Crawford	Moolenaar	Yoho	Meadows	Goodlatte	Tipton
Graves (GA)	Miller (MI)	Walberg				Gosar	Gowdy	Trott
Graves (LA)	Mooney (WV)	Walden				Gowdy	Granger	Upton
Graves (MO)	Mullin	Walker				Granger	Mica	Valadao
Griffith	Mulvaney	Walorski				Graves (GA)	Miller (FL)	Wagner
Grothman	Murphy (PA)	Walters, Mimi				Graves (LA)	Miller (MI)	Walberg
Guinta	Neugebauer	Weber (TX)				Graves (MO)	Moolenaar	Walden
Guthrie	Newhouse	Webster (FL)				Griffith	Mooney (WV)	Walker
Hardy	Noem	Wenstrup				Grothman	Mullin	Walorski
Harper	Nunes	Westerman				Guinta	Mulvaney	Walters, Mimi
Harris	Olson	Westmoreland				Guthrie	Murphy (PA)	Weber (TX)
Hartzler	Palazzo	Whitfield				Hanna	Neugebauer	Webster (FL)
Heck (NV)	Palmer	Williams				Hanna	Neugebauer	Webster (FL)
Hensarling	Paulsen	Wilson (SC)				Hardy	Newhouse	Wenstrup
Herrera Beutler	Pearce	Wittman				Harper	Noem	Westerman
Hice, Jody B.	Perry	Womack				Harris	Nunes	Westmoreland
Hill	Peterson	Woodall				Hartzler	Perry	Whitfield
Holding	Pittenger	Yoder				Heck (NV)	Palazzo	Williams
Hudson	Pitts	Young (AK)				Hensarling	Palmer	Wilson (SC)
Huelskamp	Pompeo	Young (IA)				Herrera Beutler	Paulsen	Wittman
Huizenga (MI)	Pompeo	Young (IN)				Hice, Jody B.	Pearce	Wittman
Hultgren	Posey	Zeldin				Hill	Perry	Woodall
Hunter	Price, Tom	Zinke				Holding	Peterson	Yoder
Hurd (TX)	Ratcliffe					Hudson	Pittenger	Yoder
Issa	Reichert					Huelskamp	Pitts	Young (AK)
						Huizenga (MI)	Poliquin	Young (IA)
						Hultgren	Pompeo	Young (IN)
						Hunter	Posey	Zeldin
						Hurd (TX)	Price, Tom	Zinke

NOES—192

Adams	Cohen	Farr
Aguilar	Connolly	Foster
Ashford	Conyers	Frankel (FL)
Bass	Cooper	Fudge
Beatty	Costa	Gabbard
Becerra	Costello (PA)	Gallego
Bera	Courtney	Garamendi
Beyer	Crowley	Gibson
Bishop (GA)	Cuellar	Graham
Blumenauer	Cummings	Grayson
Bonamici	Curbelo (FL)	Green, Al
Boyle, Brendan	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
F.	Davis, Danny	Grijalva
Brady (PA)	DeFazio	Gutiérrez
Brownley (CA)	DeGette	Hahn
Bustos	DeLauro	Hanna
Butterfield	DelBene	Heck (WA)
Capps	Dent	Higgins
Capuano	DeSaulnier	Himes
Cárdenas	Deuth	Hinojosa
Carney	Dingell	Honda
Carson (IN)	Doggett	Hoyer
Cartwright	Dold	Huffman
Castor (FL)	Doyle, Michael	Israel
Castro (TX)	F.	Jackson Lee
Chu, Judy	Duckworth	Jeffries
Cicilline	Edwards	Johnson (GA)
Clark (MA)	Ellison	Johnson, E. B.
Clarke (NY)	Engel	Jolly
Clyburn	Eshoo	Kaptur
Coffman	Esty	Katko

NOT VOTING—18

Aderholt	Delaney	Nadler
Bost	Diaz-Balart	Nugent
Brown (FL)	Fitzpatrick	Poe (TX)
Clay	Hastings	Takai
Cleaver	Hurt (VA)	Turner
Crawford	Moolenaar	Yoho

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2027

Mr. HUDSON changed his vote from
“no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. MULLIN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr.
MULLIN) on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the ayes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 240, noes 179,
not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 391]

AYES—240

Abraham	Bishop (MI)	Buchanan
Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Buck
Allen	Black	Bucshon
Amash	Blackburn	Burgess
Amodei	Blum	Byrne
Babin	Boustany	Calvert
Barletta	Brady (TX)	Carter (GA)
Barr	Brat	Carter (TX)
Barton	Bridenstine	Chabot
Benishek	Brooks (AL)	Chaffetz
Bilirakis	Brooks (IN)	Clawson (FL)

NOES—179

Adams	Clark (MA)	Engel
Aguilar	Clarke (NY)	Eshoo
Ashford	Cleaver	Esty
Bass	Clyburn	Farr
Beatty	Cohen	Foster
Becerra	Connolly	Frankel (FL)
Bera	Conyers	Fudge
Beyer	Cooper	Gabbard
Bishop (GA)	Courtney	Gallego
Blumenauer	Crowley	Garamendi
Bonamici	Cuellar	Graham
Boyle, Brendan	Cummings	Grayson
F.	Davis (CA)	Green, Al
Brady (PA)	Davis, Danny	Green, Gene
Brownley (CA)	DeFazio	Grijalva
Bustos	DeGette	Gutiérrez
Butterfield	DeLauro	Hahn
Capps	DelBene	Heck (WA)
Capuano	DeSaulnier	Higgins
Cárdenas	Deuth	Himes
Carney	Dingell	Hinojosa
Carson (IN)	Doggett	Honda
Cartwright	Doyle, Michael	Hoyer
Castor (FL)	F.	Huffman
Castro (TX)	Duckworth	Israel
Chu, Judy	Edwards	Jackson Lee
Cicilline	Ellison	Jeffries

Johnson (GA) McGovern
 Johnson, E. B. McNerney
 Kaptur Meeks
 Keating Meng
 Kelly (IL) Moore
 Kennedy Moulton
 Kildee Murphy (FL)
 Kilmer Napolitano
 Kind Neal
 Kirkpatrick Nolan
 Kuster Norcross
 Langevin O'Rourke
 Larsen (WA) Pallone
 Larson (CT) Pascrell
 Lawrence Payne
 Lee Pelosi
 Levin Perlmutter
 Lewis Peters
 Lieu, Ted Pingree
 Lipinski Pocan
 Loebsock Polis
 Lofgren Price (NC)
 Lowenthal Quigley
 Lowey Rangel
 Lujan Grisham Rice (NY)
 (NM) Richmond
 Luján, Ben Ray Roybal-Allard
 (NM) Ruiz
 Lynch Ruppertsberger
 Maloney, Rush
 Carolyn Ryan (OH)
 Maloney, Sean Sánchez, Linda
 Matsui T.
 McCollum Sanchez, Loretta
 McDermott Sarbanes

Schakowsky Carter (GA)
 Schiff Carter (TX)
 Schrader Chabot
 Scott (VA) Chaffetz
 Scott, David Clawson (FL)
 Serrano Coffman
 Smith (AL) Cole
 Sherman Collins (GA)
 Sinema Collins (NY)
 Sires Comstock
 Slaughter Conway
 Smith (WA) Cook
 Speier Cramer
 Swalwell (CA) Crawford
 Takano Crenshaw
 Thompson (CA) Culberson
 Thompson (MS) Davidson
 Titus Davis, Rodney
 Tonko Denham
 Torres Dent
 Tsongas DeSantis
 Van Hollen DesJarlais
 Vargas Diaz-Balart
 Veasey Donovan
 Vela Duffy
 Velázquez Duncan (SC)
 Visclosky Duncan (TN)
 Walz Ellmers (NC)
 Wasserman Emmer (MN)
 Farenthold Love
 Fincher Lucas
 Fitzpatrick Luetkemeyer
 Fleischmann Lummis
 Fleming MacArthur
 Flores Marchant
 Forbes Marino
 Fortenberry Massie
 Foxx McCarthy
 Franks (AZ) McCaul
 Frelinghuysen McClintock
 Garrett McHenry
 Gibbs McKinley
 Gohmert McMorris
 Goodlatte Rodgers
 Gosar McSally
 Gowdy Meadows
 Granger Messer
 Graves (GA) Mica
 Graves (LA) Miller (FL)
 Graves (MO) Miller (MI)
 Griffith Moolenaar
 Grothman Mooney (WV)
 Guinta Mullin
 Guthrie Mulvaney
 Hardy Murphy (PA)
 Harper Neugebauer
 Harris Newhouse
 Hartzler Noem
 Heck (NV) Nunes
 Hensarling Olson
 Herrera Beutler Palazzo
 Hice, Jody B. Palmer
 Hill Paulsen
 Holding Pearce
 Hudson Perry
 Huelskamp Pittenger
 Huizenga (MI) Pitts
 Hultgren Pompeo

Posey
 Price, Tom
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney (FL)
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Royce
 Russell
 Salmon
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Stutzman
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tiberi
 Tipton
 Trott
 Upton
 Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Young (IN)
 Zeldin
 Zinke

Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Kuster
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 Loebsock
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lynch
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott

Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schrader
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Sires
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Speier
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Poliquin
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rangel
 Reichert
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sanford

NOT VOTING—14

Bost Hastings
 Brown (FL) Hurt (VA)
 Clay Nadler
 Delaney Nugent
 Franks (AZ) Poe (TX)

Stewart
 Takai
 Turner
 Yoho

Thornberry
 Tipton
 Trott
 Upton
 Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Young (IN)
 Zeldin
 Zinke

NOT VOTING—10

Hastings
 Nadler
 Nugent
 Poe (TX)
 Takai
 Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2031

So the amendment was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. YOHO. Madam Chair, on rollcall Nos. 389, 390, and 391, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on all three.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. POSEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 193, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 392]

AYES—230

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Amodei
 Babin
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Benishek
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Black
 Blackburn
 Blum
 Boustany
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Bridenstine
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Buchanan
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert

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

Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Esty
 Farr
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Gibson
 Graham
 Grayson
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutierrez
 Hahn
 Hanna
 Heck (WA)
 Higgins
 Himes
 Hinojosa
 Honda
 Hoyer
 Huffman
 Israel
 Jackson Lee

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2034

So the amendment was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. CARNEY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CARNEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 131, noes 292, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 393]

AYES—131

Adams
 Aderholt
 Ashford
 Barletta
 Benishek
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Brady (PA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carney
 Cartwright
 Cicilline
 Clarke (NY)
 Clyburn
 Connolly
 Cooper
 Costa
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Dent
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dold
 Donovan
 Doyle, Michael
 F.
 Duckworth
 Esty
 Fitzpatrick

Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Hahn
Hanna
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Honda
Huffman
Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kennedy
Kilmer
Kind
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lieu, Ted
LoBiondo

NOES—292

Abraham
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barr
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Billirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Clark (MA)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Conyers
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DeSantis
DesJarlais

Loeb sack
Lowenthal
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McNerney
Meeks
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
Pallone
Pascrell
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Poliquin
Polis
Quigley
Rangel
Richmond

Rogers (AL)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Scott (VA)
Scott (AL)
Shimkus
Sinema
Smith (WA)
Stefanik
Swailwell (CA)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Vela
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson Coleman
Welch
Zeldin

O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Pompeo
Posey
Price (NC)
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer

Roybal-Allard
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Takano
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton

Trott
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Waters, Maxine
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zinke

Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fortenberry
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gibson
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones

Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin

Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rigell
Roybal-Allard
Ruster
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Stefanik
Swailwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—232

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Billirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Boustany
Byrne
Calvert
Capps
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chu, Judy
Clark (MA)
Clawson (FL)
Cleaver
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Conyers
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DeSantis
DesJarlais

Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Elliott (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hardy
Harper
Harris

NOT VOTING—10

Bost
Brown (FL)
Clay
Delaney
Hastings
Nadler
Nugent
Poe (TX)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2038

Mr. PAULSEN changed his vote from
“aye” to “no.”
Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. KENNEDY
changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”
So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MR. YARMUTH
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YAR-
MUTH) on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the noes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.
The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 189, noes 232,
not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 394]

AYES—189

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper

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

NOT VOTING—12

Bost	Hastings	Poe (TX)
Brown (FL)	Nadler	Speier
Clay	Nugent	Takai
Delaney	O'Rourke	Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2042

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 409, noes 14, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 395]

AYES—409

Abraham	Bilirakis	Buchanan	Chabot	Guthrie	McKinley	Sherman	Tipton	Watson Coleman
Adams	Bishop (GA)	Bucshon	Chaffetz	Gutiérrez	McMorris	Shimkus	Titus	Weber (TX)
Aderholt	Bishop (MI)	Burgess	Chu, Judy	Hahn	Rodgers	Shuster	Tonko	Webster (FL)
Aguilar	Bishop (UT)	Bustos	Ciциlline	Hanna	McNerney	Simpson	Torres	Welch
Allen	Black	Butterfield	Clark (MA)	Hardy	McSally	Sinema	Trott	Wenstrup
Amodel	Blackburn	Byrne	Clarke (NY)	Harper	Meadows	Sires	Tsongas	Westerman
Ashford	Blum	Calvert	Clawson (FL)	Harris	Meehan	Slaughter	Upton	Westmoreland
Babin	Blumenauer	Capps	Cleaver	Hartzler	Meeks	Smith (MO)	Valadao	Whitfield
Barletta	Bonamici	Capuanu	Clyburn	Heck (NV)	Meng	Smith (NE)	Van Hollen	Williams
Barr	Boustany	Cárdenas	Coffman	Heck (WA)	Messer	Smith (NJ)	Vargas	Wilson (FL)
Barton	Boyle, Brendan	Carney	Cohen	Hensarling	Mica	Smith (TX)	Veasey	Wilson (SC)
Bass	F.	Carson (IN)	Cole	Herrera Beutler	Miller (FL)	Smith (WA)	Vela	Wittman
Beatty	Brady (PA)	Carter (GA)	Collins (GA)	Hice, Jody B.	Miller (MI)	Speier	Velázquez	Womack
Becerra	Brady (TX)	Carter (TX)	Collins (NY)	Higgins	Moolenaar	Stefanik	Visclosky	Woodall
Benishek	Bridenstine	Cartwright	Comstock	Hill	Mooney (WV)	Stewart	Wagner	Yarmuth
Bera	Brooks (IN)	Castor (FL)	Conaway	Himes	Moore	Stivers	Walberg	Yoder
Beyer	Brownley (CA)	Castro (TX)	Conolly	Hinojosa	Moulton	Stutzman	Walden	Young (AK)
			Conyers	Holdering	Mullin	Swalwell (CA)	Walker	Young (IA)
			Cook	Honda	Mulvaney	Takano	Walorski	Young (IN)
			Cooper	Hoyer	Murphy (FL)	Thompson (CA)	Walters, Mimi	Young (IN)
			Costa	Hudson	Murphy (PA)	Thompson (MS)	Walz	Zeldin
			Costello (PA)	Huelskamp	Napolitano	Thompson (PA)	Wasserman	
			Courtney	Huffman	Neal	Thornberry	Schultz	
			Cramer	Huizenga (MI)	Neugebauer	Tiberi	Waters, Maxine	
			Crawford	Hultgren	Newhouse			
			Crenshaw	Hunter	Noem			
			Crowley	Hurd (TX)	Nolan	Amash	Kelly (PA)	McClintock
			Cuellar	Hurt (VA)	Norcross	Brat	King (IA)	Palmer
			Culberson	Israel	Nunes	Brooks (AL)	Long	Perry
			Cummings	Issa	O'Rourke	Buck	Lummis	Yoho
			Curbelo (FL)	Jackson Lee	Olson	Franks (AZ)	Marino	
			Davidson	Jeffries	Palazzo			
			Davis (CA)	Jenkins (KS)	Pallone			
			Davis, Danny	Jenkins (WV)	Pascarell	Bost	Hastings	Takai
			Davis, Rodney	Johnson (GA)	Paulsen	Brown (FL)	Nadler	Turner
			DeFazio	Johnson (OH)	Payne	Clay	Nugent	
			DeGette	Johnson, E. B.	Pearce	Delaney	Poe (TX)	
			DeLauro	Johnson, Sam	Pelosi			
			DeBene	Jolly	Perlmutter			
			Denham	Jones	Peters			
			Dent	Jordan	Peterson			
			DeSantis	Joyce	Pingree			
			DeSaulnier	Kaptur	Pittenger			
			DesJarlais	Katko	Pitts			
			Deutch	Keating	Pocan			
			Diaz-Balart	Kelly (IL)	Poliquin			
			Dingell	Kelly (MS)	Polis			
			Doggett	Kennedy	Pompeo			
			Dold	Kildee	Posey			
			Donovan	Kilmer	Price (NC)			
			Doyle, Michael	Kind	Price, Tom			
			F.	King (NY)	Quigley			
			Duckworth	Kinzinger (IL)	Rangel			
			Duffy	Kirkpatrick	Ratcliffe			
			Duncan (SC)	Kline	Reed			
			Duncan (TN)	Knight	Reichert			
			Edwards	Kuster	Renacci			
			Ellison	Labrador	Ribble			

Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight

NOES—179

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper

Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)

Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson

Bost
Brown (FL)
Delaney
Gutiérrez

Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires

NOT VOTING—12

Hastings
Larson (CT)
Meadows
Nadler

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Peters moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5485 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

In the "Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence—Salaries and Expenses" account, on page 4, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Page 92, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

Page 96, line 17, after the dollar amount relating to rental of space, insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not require that it go back for further action. My amendment would increase funding for the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence by \$5 million.

It is our responsibility as a Congress to provide the American people with financial security, national security, and security in the belief that their voice counts in Washington, D.C. Instead, the underlying bill rolls back reforms put in place after the 2008 financial collapse, further undermines the campaign finance system, reduces access to affordable health care, and underfunds the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence, which is tasked with targeting the finances of terrorist groups.

In an era of new and dynamic threats, we need a tough, smart national security strategy to keep Americans safe. Even as we counter aggressors like China and Russia, we are faced with threats from nonstate terrorist groups like ISIS, al Qaeda, and the Taliban.

Our military has taken the fight to them. In May, an American drone strike in Pakistan killed Taliban leader Mullah Akhtar Muhammad Mansour, and as of June 28, the U.S. military and its coalition partners had conducted over 13,000 strikes against ISIS. Those strikes have destroyed over 26,000 targets in Iraq and Syria.

Coupled with our brave special operators on the ground, this air campaign has helped our allies make considerable progress in the fight against ISIS. ISIS has lost 45 percent of the territory it once held in Iraq and 20 percent of what it once held in Syria, and ISIS no longer occupies strongholds like Fallujah and Ramadi. Pentagon spokesman Captain Jeff Davis recently said: "There has been no strategic victory for ISIS in over a year now."

But even as we have taken back territory and degraded their capabilities, the last few months have demonstrated ISIS' prevailing ability to direct or inspire attacks in the West. Paris, Brussels, Baghdad, Istanbul, and recently Orlando—ISIS' ability to direct or inspire attacks poses a clear threat to our security and to American lives at home and abroad.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2050

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the last two lines.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2017".

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) having assumed the chair, Ms. FOXX, 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, and, pursuant to House Resolution 794, she reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PETERS. I am in its current form.

In the United States, we have seen how difficult it is for our law enforcement and intelligence agencies to stop lone-wolf attackers inspired by ISIS, and in Europe we have seen the devastation that highly coordinated ISIS-directed terrorist attacks can inflict on soft targets like airports and train stations. These attacks involved terrorist fighters financed by ISIS using military-grade weaponry. In many cases, the fighters traveled to and from the Middle East to be trained.

Even as we kill their leaders, destroy their safe havens, and take back their territory, the threat from ISIS will not be eliminated until we remove their ability to direct and finance terrorist attacks.

Created by President Bush in 2004, the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence has extensive and critical responsibilities that include combating terrorist financing domestically and internationally. They work with law enforcement, diplomats, and intelligence agencies, and with the private sector and foreign governments to identify and eliminate sources of financing for terrorist networks. They also combat financial support for the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence cuts lines of financial support, freezes assets, and makes it harder for terrorist cells to finance and carry out attacks. By hitting the terrorists where it hurts—in their wallets—our financial intelligence officers make Americans safer.

My amendment will provide the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence with the additional resources it needs to carry out this mission; and moving forward, the House should also consider bipartisan legislation introduced by Representatives SINEMA and FITZPATRICK to develop a coordinated governmentwide strategy to combat terrorist financing.

By supporting this smart, targeted approach to undermining terrorist networks, we can support the American pilots and special operators who are risking their lives in the fight against terrorism, and we can help prevent future attacks.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I would really like to thank the gentleman for bringing this motion to recommit to increase funding for the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence by \$5 million because it makes an excellent point as to why this bill is such a good bill, because this bill already funds the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence higher than it has ever been funded in the history of

that office. I don't think we need to give them another \$5 million. They have got more than they can deal with right now. They are happy we did that.

What this bill does is deal with the big problems we face here in Washington. Number one, we spend money that we don't have, and up here in Washington, we exercise power that nobody gave us, and we deal with that right here.

We lower the spending under this bill by 5.6 percent. We are getting a handle on the out-of-control spending.

But we spend money where we ought to spend it, like the SBA. They help small businesses get the loans and make the next big deal. They grow the economy. They create jobs.

□ 2100

The Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence enforces sanctions. They get extra money. That is great. But guess what? The way we reduce spending overall is we take money away from those agencies that waste money. In fact, we cut spending on 12 different agencies. We lower spending and we eliminate 6 agencies altogether.

So we are dealing with that part of it. And, by the way, one of the big problems in Washington is exercising all this regulatory overreach. We kind of rein that in here. We say to some of these agencies: Stop, stop, stop. Pause.

The Federal Communications Commission, they oversee one of the most creative, innovative aspects of our economy; and yet they are more active than ever before. So we say: Stop making these politically charged rules and get back to your core mission.

So at the end of the day, it is a good bill. Let me just tell you I have got four good reasons, but let me tell you two quick good reasons. This is the fourth time I have brought this bill before the House. Every year, the bill gets better and better. I am going tell you right now, this is the best bill that I have ever brought before the House. That ought to be one good reason. The other reason is, since I am leaving this year, this is the last time I will ever bring the bill.

Finally, just let me say to everybody here, if everybody is willing to rein in this wasteful spending, then you will like this bill; if you are ready to exercise a little courage and say to those nameless, faceless bureaucrats, We are going to put an end to regulatory rampage, then vote "no."

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise for one purpose. I rise to recognize the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW) on his last Financial Services bill.

Mr. Speaker, I know they are not rising because it is his last bill. They are rising because this man has always been a gentleman and a statesman regardless of what side of the aisle he has been on.

He has represented the Fourth District of Florida for 15 years. His leadership will be shown on so many pieces of legislation, but his heart, his passion, and his persuasion was really shown on the ABLE Act. He never gave up. Because of the ABLE Act, it is now helping millions of Americans with disabilities lead more independent lives. He has changed their lives.

So I think I speak for all Members in wishing him well in his retirement and his quest to become a scratch golfer.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for the electronic vote on the question of passage.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 183, nays 241, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 397]
YEAS—183

Adams	Dingell	Levin
Aguilar	Doggett	Lewis
Ashford	Doyle, Michael	Lieu, Ted
Bass	F.	Lipinski
Beatty	Duckworth	Loeb sack
Becerra	Edwards	Lofgren
Bera	Engel	Lowenthal
Beyer	Eshoo	Lowey
Bishop (GA)	Esty	Lujan Grisham
Blum	Farr	(NM)
Blumenauer	Foster	Lujan, Ben Ray
Bonamici	Frankel (FL)	(NM)
Boyle, Brendan	Fudge	Lynch
F.	Gabbard	Maloney,
Brady (PA)	Gallago	Carolyn
Brownley (CA)	Garamendi	Maloney, Sean
Bustos	Graham	Matsui
Butterfield	Grayson	McCollum
Capps	Green, Al	McDermott
Capuano	Green, Gene	McGovern
Cárdenas	Grijalva	McNerney
Carney	Gutiérrez	Meeks
Carson (IN)	Hahn	Meng
Cartwright	Heck (WA)	Moore
Castor (FL)	Higgins	Moulton
Castro (TX)	Himes	Murphy (FL)
Chu, Judy	Hinojosa	Napolitano
Cicilline	Honda	Neal
Clark (MA)	Hoyer	Nolan
Clarke (NY)	Huffman	Norcross
Clay	Israel	O'Rourke
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Pallone
Clyburn	Jeffries	Pascarell
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Payne
Connolly	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi
Conyers	Jones	Perlmutter
Cooper	Kaptur	Peters
Costa	Keating	Peterson
Courtney	Kelly (IL)	Pingree
Crowley	Kennedy	Pocan
Cuellar	Kildee	Polis
Cummings	Kilmer	Price (NC)
Davis (CA)	Kind	Quigley
Davis, Danny	Kirkpatrick	Rangel
DeFazio	Kuster	Rice (NY)
DeGette	Langevin	Richmond
DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
DelBene	Larson (CT)	Ruiz
DeSaulnier	Lawrence	Ruppersberger
Deutch	Lee	Rush

Ryan (OH) Sires
 Sánchez, Linda Slaughter
 T. Smith (WA)
 Sanchez, Loretta Speier
 Sarbanes Swalwell (CA)
 Schakowsky Takano
 Schiff Thompson (CA)
 Schrader Thompson (MS)
 Scott (VA) Titus
 Scott, David Tonko
 Serrano Torres
 Sewell (AL) Tsongas
 Sherman Van Hollen
 Sinema Vargas

NAYS—241

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

NOT VOTING—9

Bost Hastings Poe (TX)
 Brown (FL) Nadler Takai
 Delaney Nugent Turner

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2109

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.” So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 185, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 398]

YEAS—239

Abraham Forbes MacArthur
 Aderholt Fortenberry Marchant
 Allen Foyx Marino
 Amodei Frelinghuysen McCarthy
 Ashford Garrett McCaul
 Babin Gibbs McClintock
 Barletta Gibson McHenry
 Barr Gohmert McKinley
 Barton Goodlatte McMorris
 Benishek Gosar Rodgers
 Bilirakis Gowdy McSally
 Bishop (MI) Granger Meadows
 Bishop (UT) Graves (GA) Meehan
 Black Graves (LA) Messer
 Blackburn Graves (MO) Mica
 Blum Griffith Miller (FL)
 Boustany Grothman Miller (MI)
 Brady (TX) Guinta Moolenaar
 Brat Guthrie Mooney (WV)
 Bridenstine Hanna Mullin
 Brooks (IN) Hardy Mulvaney
 Buchanan Harper Murphy (PA)
 Bucshon Harris Neugebauer
 Burgess Hartzler Newhouse
 Byrne Heck (NV) Noem
 Calvert Hensarling Nunes
 Carter (GA) Carter (GA) Herrera Beutler Olson
 Carter (TX) Carter (TX) Hice, Jody B. Palazzo
 Chabot Chabot Hill Palmer
 Chaffetz Chaffetz Holding Paulsen
 Clawson (FL) Clawson (FL) Hudson Pearce
 Coffman Huelskamp Huelskamp Perry
 Cole Huizenga (MI) Peterson
 Collins (GA) Collins (GA) Pittenger
 Collins (NY) Collins (NY) Hunter Pitts
 Comstock Comstock Hurd (TX) Poliquin
 Conaway Hurd (VA) Pompeo
 Cook Issa Posey
 Costello (PA) Jenkins (KS) Price, Tom
 Cramer Jenkins (WV) Ratcliffe
 Crawford Johnson (OH) Reed
 Crenshaw Johnson, Sam Reichert
 Cuellar Jolly Renacci
 Culberson Jordan Ribble
 Curbelo (FL) Joyce Rice (SC)
 Davidson Katko Rigell
 Davis, Rodney Kelly (MS) Roby
 Denham Kelly (PA) Roe (TN)
 Dent King (NY) Rogers (AL)
 DeSantis Kinzinger (IL) Rogers (KY)
 DesJarlais Kline Rohrabacher
 Diaz-Balart Knight Rokita
 Dold Labrador Rooney (FL)
 Donovan LaHood Ros-Lehtinen
 Duffy LaMalfa Roskam
 Duncan (SC) Lamborn Ross
 Duncan (TN) Lance Rothfus
 Ellison Latta Rouzer
 Ellmers (NC) Emmer (MN) Royce
 Emmer (MN) Farenthold Russell
 Farenthold Long Loudermilk
 Fincher Salmon
 Fitzpatrick Love
 Fleischmann Lucas
 Fleming Luetkemeyer
 Flores Lummis Scott, Austin

Sensenbrenner Tiberi
 Sessions Tipton
 Shimkus Trott
 Shuster Upton
 Simpson Valadao
 Smith (MO) Vela
 Smith (NE) Wagner
 Smith (NJ) Walberg
 Smith (TX) Walden
 Stefanik Walker
 Stewart Walorski
 Stivers Walters, Mimi
 Stutzman Weber (TX)
 Thompson (PA) Webster (FL)
 Thornberry Wenstrup

NAYS—185

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

NOT VOTING—9

Bost Hastings Poe (TX)
 Brown (FL) Nadler Takai
 Delaney Nugent Turner

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

□ 2115

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IT IS TIME FOR ACTION

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I said this earlier today. When I left my hometown, four people were gunned down during the July Fourth holiday, and over the time period we have all been working to find common ground on making sure that we have sensible, safe gun legislation.

But right now, outside the United States Capitol are throngs of individuals who have come because of the incidents of the last 48 hours, the loss of Mr. Sterling in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, in an unfortunate and unspeakable and inexplicable shooting by law enforcement; and then, unfortunately, the tragic shooting of Mr. Castile, a cafeteria manager loved by children and a licensed gun owner.

We love our police. We call 911. But there have to be hearings, meetings with the Attorney General, and an understanding of how we can address the question of the shootings of African American men.

The numbers are high, the statistics documented, and we must find relief—not a moment of silence, but action.

The phone in my office is ringing constantly. People are in pain. Young people want to ask the question, “Do Black lives matter?” and we want to answer the question, “Yes.” We want to do it in a bipartisan, multicultural way.

America has to address these concerns and do it now.

SOMETHING IS WRONG IN THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart, knowing what has transpired in the last 48 hours has been horrific. Two men—fathers, brothers, sons—gunned down by law enforcement.

We understand that our police have a job to do that can be difficult, but we need restraint from our law enforcement officers until they are able to determine whether there is a threat or not. You cannot be a threat just because you are an African American in a car.

No one should die being stopped for a taillight. And Mr. Castile, in Minnesota, was very compliant. He had told the officer he was reaching for his wallet and lost his life.

There is something wrong in the United States of America, and we need to address it soon.

AN AMERICAN PROBLEM

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I made a request in the Judiciary Committee to our chairperson to have hearings on this issue. We have a bill that would require each State to set up a system of independent prosecutors to look at law enforcement killings, shootings.

The fact is an Attorney General can't look at a law enforcement shooting without prejudicing their ability to do their jobs. They work hand in glove with law enforcement, and if they have to police law enforcement, they have a problem in effectively doing their jobs later on.

We have asked that each State set up a system of independent prosecutors so people know there is justice and fairness and oversight. That is reasonable, and we should have hearings.

What happened in Baton Rouge, what happened in Minnesota has happened in New York, has happened in North Charleston. It has happened in Cleveland, Ohio. It has happened in Memphis, Tennessee. And African American men are subject to being shot for reasons that others aren't.

Police need to be more careful, and we need to see that our country takes this, as President Obama has in his statement from Europe: this is an American problem.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today after 6 p.m. and for the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

Mr. TURNER (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for July 6 after 7:30 p.m. and for the balance of the week on account of his address to the Heads of State and Government in his role as President and Chairman of the U.S. Delegation to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Assembly at the 2016 Warsaw Summit of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3766. An act to direct the President to establish guidelines for covered United States foreign assistance programs, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1252. An act to authorize a comprehensive strategic approach for United States foreign assistance to developing countries to reduce global poverty and hunger, achieve food and nutrition security, promote inclusive, sustainable, agricultural-led economic growth, improve nutritional outcomes, especially for women and children, build resil-

ience among vulnerable populations, and for other purposes.

S. 2845. An act to extend the termination of sanctions with respect to Venezuela under the Venezuela Defense of Human Rights and Civil Society Act of 2014.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 8, 2016, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

5912. A letter from the Under Secretary, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Community Facility Loans (RIN: 0575-AD05) received July 5, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5913. A letter from the Chairman, Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting the annual report for CY 2015, in accordance with Sec. 5.64 of the Farm Credit Act of 1971, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5914. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the total dollar value of Department of Defense purchases from foreign entities during FY 2015, pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 8305; Public Law 104-201, Sec. 827 (as amended by Public Law 111-350, Sec. 3); (124 Stat. 3833) and Public Law 113-235, Sec. 8028; (128 Stat. 2258); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5915. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michael S. Tucker, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5916. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting a proposed Letter of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Israel, Transmittal No. 16-40, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b)(1); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(b) (as amended by Public Law 106-113, Sec. 1000(a)(7)); (113 Stat. 536); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5917. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's Major final rule — Disclosure of Payments by Resource Extraction Issuers [Release No.: 34-78167; File No.: S7-25-15] (RIN: 3235-AL53) received June 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5918. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a report entitled “Coming Into Focus: the Future of Juvenile Justice Reform, 2014 Annual Report”, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5617; Public Law 93-415, Sec. 207 (as added by Public Law 100-690, Sec. 7255); (102 Stat. 4437); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5919. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and

Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled "The Comprehensive Community Mental Health Services for Children with Serious Emotional Disturbances", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 290ff(c)(2); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title V, Sec. 565(c)(2) (as amended by Public Law 106-310, Sec. 3105(c)) (114 Stat. 1175); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5920. A letter from the Director, Office of Technology Transitions, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's report entitled "Technology Transfer and Related Technology Partnering Activities at the National Laboratories and Other Facilities for Fiscal Year 2014", pursuant to the Technology Transfer and Commercialization Act of 2000; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5921. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Integrated Light-Emitting Diode Lamps [Docket No.: EERE-2011-BT-TP-0071] (RIN: 1904-AC67) received July 1, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5922. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions to Exceptions Applicable to Certain Human Cells, Tissues, and Cellular and Tissue-Based Products [Docket No.: FDA-2014-N-1484] received June 30, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5923. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Administration's 2016 status report on the Best Pharmaceuticals for Children Act and the Pediatric Research Equality Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5924. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 2015 Compounding Quality Act Annual Report as required by the Compounding Quality Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5925. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Standard Review Plan for Renewal of Specific Licenses and Certificates of Compliance for Dry Storage of Spent Nuclear Fuel [NUREG-1927, Revision 1] received July 5, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5926. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Safety Evaluation of the BWRVIP-234 Report "BWR Vessel and Internals Project: Thermal Aging and Neutron Embrittlement Evaluation of Cast Austenitic Stainless Steel for BWR Internals (BWRVIP-234)" [TAC No.: ME5060] received July 5, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5927. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Lebanon that was declared in Executive Order 13441 of August 1, 2007, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5928. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to transnational criminal organizations that was declared in Executive Order 13581 of July 24, 2011, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5929. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Inter-American Foundation, transmitting proposed legislation to authorize the Inter-American Foundation to create a subsidiary corporation, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 290f; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5930. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's strategic plan for fiscal years 2016 through 2021 in compliance with the Government Performance and Results Act; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5931. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Pittsburgh, transmitting the Federal Home Loan Bank of Pittsburgh 2015 Statement on the Systems of Internal Controls and the 2015 audited financial statements, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; Public Law 97-258, Sec. 9106; (96 Stat. 1044); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5932. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Agency Response for the period of October 1, 2015 to March 31, 2016, in accordance with Sec. 5 of Public Law 94-452, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5933. A letter from the District of Columbia Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled "Review of Sustainable Energy and Energy Assistance Trust Funds"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5934. A letter from the Executive Director, World War One Centennial Commission, transmitting the Commission's periodic report for the period ended March 31, 2016, pursuant to Public Law 112-272, Sec. 5(b)(1); (126 Stat. 2450); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5935. A letter from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a decision on *United States v. Pawlak*, No. 15-3566, 2016 WL 2802723 (6th Cir. May 13, 2016), pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 530D(a); Public Law 107-273, Sec. 202(a); (116 Stat. 1771); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5936. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a letter with information on locating the annual report on bankruptcy statistics online, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 159(b)(3); Added by Public Law 109-8, Sec. 601(a); (119 Stat. 119); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5937. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the Court's annual report to Congress concerning intercepted wire, oral, or electronic communications, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2519(3); Added by Public Law 90-351, Sec. 802; (82 Stat. 222); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5938. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Danville, AR [Docket No.: FAA-2015-4836; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ASW-16] received June 28, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5939. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of

Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Ketchum, OK [Docket No.: FAA-2016-1288; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ASW-23] received June 28, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5940. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1428; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-026-AD; Amendment 39-18499; AD 2016-09-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 28, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5941. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Report to the Congress Concerning the Emigration Laws and Policies of Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2432(b); Public Law 93-618, Sec. 402(b); (88 Stat. 2056) and 19 U.S.C. 2439(b); Public Law 93-618, Sec. 409(b); (88 Stat. 2064); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5942. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the report to Congress entitled, "Alternative Payment Models and Medicare Advantage", pursuant to Public Law 114-10, Sec. 101(e)(6); (129 Stat. 123); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

5943. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 2016 Indian Health Service and Tribal Health Care Facilities' Needs Assessment Report to Congress; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Natural Resources.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 5651. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Transportation from approving under subtitle VII of title 49, United States Code, any project for the relocation of Runway 24R at Los Angeles International Airport, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 5652. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for coverage by high deductible health plans of medical management of a chronic disease without deductible; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 5653. A bill to require reporting on acts of certain foreign countries on Holocaust era assets and related issues; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COOK, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LONG, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BRAT, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. ROGERS

of Alabama, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MARINO, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. JONES, Mr. OLSON, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BARTON, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. YOHO, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LATTI, Mr. BUCK, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CULBERSON, and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana):

H.R. 5654. A bill to ensure that State and local law enforcement may cooperate with Federal officials to protect our communities from violent criminals and suspected terrorists who are illegally present in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 5655. A bill to establish programs related to prevention of prescription opioid misuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 5656. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to authorize States to restrict interstate waste imports and impose a higher fee on out-of-State waste; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H.R. 5657. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to reform and reduce fraud and abuse in certain visa programs for aliens working temporarily in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H.R. 5658. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to codify the Presidential Innovation Fellows Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri (for himself, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SCHRAEDER, and Mr. MARINO):

H.R. 5659. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to expanding Medicare Advantage coverage for individuals with end-stage renal disease (ESRD); to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Ms. MOORE):

H.R. 5660. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide that the stable retail deposits of an insured depository

institution are not considered to be funds obtained by or through a deposit broker, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5661. A bill to establish the Flag Office Revolving Fund for services provided by the Flag Office of the Architect of the Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GUINTA, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 5662. A bill to provide an exception to certain mandatory minimum sentence requirements for a person employed outside the United States by a Federal agency, who uses, carries, or possesses the firearm during and in relation to a crime of violence committed while on-duty with a firearm issued by the agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 5663. A bill to amend the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 to deliver high-quality career and technical education opportunities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 5664. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to strengthen debt collection exemptions to protect debtors and their families from poverty or bankruptcy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 5665. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to provide for a net benefit review of certain covered transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 5666. A bill to limit the authority of States and local governments to impose taxes payable with respect to the sale of certain firearms or ammunition, or to impose new or increased taxes payable for background checks incident to sales of firearms or ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas (for herself and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 5667. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the way beneficiaries are assigned under the Medicare shared savings program by also basing such assignment on services furnished by Federally qualified health centers and rural health clinics; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia (for himself, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. MULLIN):

H.R. 5668. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Energy and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from taking the social cost of carbon or the social cost of methane into account when taking any action, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia:

H.R. 5669. A bill to provide emergency unemployment compensation to coal mining workers who lost their jobs due to Federal environmental regulations, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 5670. A bill to guarantee the right of individuals to receive Social Security benefits under title II of the Social Security Act in full with an accurate annual cost-of-living adjustment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois (for herself, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. LEE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. BASS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 5671. A bill to expand economic opportunities, improve community policing, and promote common-sense gun violence prevention in underserved communities, and for other purposes; eliminate the requirement that a firearms dealer transfer a firearm if the national instant criminal background check system has been unable to complete a background check of the prospective transferee within 3 business days; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Financial Services, Ways and Means, Small Business, Oversight and Government Reform, Agriculture, Rules, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 5672. A bill to help small businesses access capital and create jobs by reauthorizing the successful State Small Business Credit Initiative; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 5673. A bill to authorize the President to provide major disaster assistance for contamination of drinking water from public water systems; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 5674. A bill to provide for the award of medals or other commendations to handlers of military working dogs and military working dogs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. YOHO, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. YODER, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 5675. A bill to provide for the conversion of temporary judgeships to permanent judgeships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. BOST):

H.R. 5676. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6300 N. Northwest Highway in Chicago, Illinois, as the "Officer Joseph P. Cali Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 5677. A bill to establish the United States-Israel joint commission to address

Iranian compliance with the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 5678. A bill to authorize assistance and training to increase maritime security and domain awareness of foreign countries bordering the Persian Gulf, the Arabian Sea, or the Mediterranean Sea in order to deter and counter illicit smuggling and related maritime activity by Iran, including illicit Iranian weapons shipments; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. REED):

H.R. 5679. A bill to establish a grant program at the National Science Foundation to encourage States and local school districts to develop and implement sustainable engineering education programs in elementary and secondary schools, through public-private partnerships; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 5680. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 with respect to periodic beach renourishment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California (for herself and Mr. ROSKAM):

H.R. 5681. A bill to require the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation to test the efficacy of providing Alzheimer's Disease caregiver support services in delaying or reducing the use of institutionalized care for Medicare beneficiaries with Alzheimer's Disease or a related dementia; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 5682. A bill to support educational entities in fully implementing title IX and reducing and preventing sex discrimination in all areas of education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. STEFANIK (for herself, Ms. MENG, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ASHFORD, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. JONES, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. COOK, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 5683. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize, in connection with the permanent change of station of a member of the Armed Forces requiring relocation to another State, the reimbursement of the member for qualified relicensing costs incurred by the spouse of the member to secure a license or certification required by the State to which the member and spouse relocate, to encourage States to expedite license portability for military spouses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BECERRA (for himself, Mr. KNIGHT, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MCCARTHY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. HAHN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ

of California, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. GRAHAM, Ms. LEE, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GALLEGRO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. LEVIN):

H. Con. Res. 142. Concurrent resolution supporting the bid of Los Angeles, California to bring the 2024 Summer Olympic Games back to the United States and pledging the cooperation of Congress with respect to that bid; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself, Mr. ASHFORD, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUM, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOLD, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GOHMERT, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISSA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOYCE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. MENG, Mr. MICA, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. REED, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. RUPERSBERGER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SIREs, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. ZELDIN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARSON of

Indiana, Mr. CLAY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FARR, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TAKAI, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H. Res. 810. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the life and work of Elie Wiesel in promoting human rights, peace, and Holocaust remembrance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. DUFFY):

H. Res. 811. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 2016 as National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. COOPER, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. FINCHER):

H. Res. 812. A resolution commending the Tennessee Valley Authority on the 80th anniversary of the unified development of the Tennessee River system; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROONEY of Florida:

H. Res. 813. A resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives to exclude provisions relating to existing or proposed water resources development projects of the Corps of Engineers from the definition of congressional earmark, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana (for himself, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H. Res. 814. A resolution calling on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to invoke Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty and conduct a military campaign against the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 5651.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 5652.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution which states, "(t)he Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 5653.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 5654.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 of the United States Constitution which grants Congress

the authority to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5655.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5656.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

Article I; Section 8; Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 5657.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H.R. 5658.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 which grants to the Congress power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 5659.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 5660.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 ("To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes")

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5661.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 5662.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The attached language falls within Congress' enumerated authority to provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States, found in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, and to make rules for the government, found in Article I, Section 8, clause 14 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5663.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 5664.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 5665.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 5666.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution gives Congress the power to "lay and collect taxes, duties, imports and excises."

Article VI, Clause 2 clarifies that federal law "shall be the supreme law of the land."

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:

H.R. 5667.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia:

H.R. 5668.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia:

H.R. 5669.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 5670.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. KELLY of Illinois:

H.R. 5671.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clauses 1 & 3

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 5672.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 5673

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. LANCE:

H.R. 5674.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 1, of the United State Constitution This states that "Congress shall have the power to . . . lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 5675.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 9: The Congress shall have Power to . . . constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power to . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Power, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 5676.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 5677.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 5678.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 5679.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 5680.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7—"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California:

H.R. 5681.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 5682.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. STEFANIK:

H.R. 5683.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 239: Ms. KAPTUR.
 H.R. 430: Mr. FOSTER.
 H.R. 449: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 546: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 571: Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 610: Mr. HUELSKAMP.
 H.R. 612: Mr. BABIN and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
 H.R. 711: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SCALISE, and Ms. BORDALLO.
 H.R. 775: Mrs. NOEM.
 H.R. 932: Mrs. TORRES.
 H.R. 1076: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. VELA.
 H.R. 1151: Mr. VALADAO.
 H.R. 1192: Mr. NADLER, Mr. VALADAO, and Ms. MENG.
 H.R. 1217: Mr. VELA.
 H.R. 1358: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 1439: Mr. WELCH, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mrs. TORRES.
 H.R. 1459: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

- H.R. 1464: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1549: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1559: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 1608: Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. FINCHER.
H.R. 1643: Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 1752: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 1904: Ms. ESTY and Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 1905: Ms. ESTY and Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 2058: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. ASHFORD, and Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 2096: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
H.R. 2142: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 2189: Mr. COSTA.
H.R. 2216: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2221: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 2302: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 2315: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2342: Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. VELA.
H.R. 2566: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 2799: Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. VELA, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 2846: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2887: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 2903: Mr. THORNBERRY and Mr. LOUDERMILK.
H.R. 2962: Ms. TITUS and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2994: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
H.R. 3012: Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 3051: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 3092: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 3108: Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 3110: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 3308: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 3312: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.
H.R. 3381: Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 3395: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 3406: Mr. WELCH.
H.R. 3411: Mr. MEEKS and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 3666: Mr. NOLAN.
H.R. 3706: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 3710: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 3815: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 3888: Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 3929: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. COSTA, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. HAHN, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 4043: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 4172: Mr. BARR.
H.R. 4177: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 4186: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 4247: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 4352: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 4362: Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 4381: Mr. GIBSON.
H.R. 4474: Mr. HUELSKAMP and Mr. KING of Iowa.
H.R. 4479: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 4481: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 4526: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 4559: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 4584: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 4591: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 4594: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 4603: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 4616: Ms. MCSALLY and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
H.R. 4625: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 4626: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. LONG, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.
H.R. 4632: Mr. VALADAO and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 4681: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4764: Ms. GRANGER and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 4828: Mr. SCALISE.
H.R. 4864: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 4893: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. WOODALL.
H.R. 4918: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 4932: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 4954: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 4992: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 5009: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 5025: Mr. COHEN, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 5045: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 5082: Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 5119: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 5127: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 5129: Mrs. LUMMIS.
H.R. 5146: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 5172: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 5180: Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 5183: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 5187: Mr. VALADAO and Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 5232: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H.R. 5258: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 5263: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 5292: Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 5299: Mr. ZELDIN and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 5324: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 5365: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.
H.R. 5374: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 5396: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 5423: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 5440: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 5475: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 5488: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 5513: Mr. KATKO and Mr. BRAT.
H.R. 5523: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
H.R. 5543: Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H.R. 5545: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 5555: Mr. BERA and Mr. TAKAI.
H.R. 5560: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 5578: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 5587: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 5589: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 5593: Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 5594: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. STIVERS, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.
H.R. 5598: Ms. ESHOO, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 5599: Ms. ESHOO and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 5606: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 5607: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.
H.R. 5619: Mr. BLUM.
H.R. 5625: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 5639: Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. ESTY, and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 5646: Mr. BARLETTA.
H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. SHERMAN.
H. Con. Res. 140: Mr. HIMES, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mrs. BLACK.
H. Res. 28: Ms. PLASKETT.
H. Res. 112: Mr. NOLAN.
H. Res. 130: Mr. CICILLINE.
H. Res. 174: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H. Res. 393: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H. Res. 647: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H. Res. 729: Mr. POLIS, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.
H. Res. 752: Ms. BASS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. DOLD, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. POSEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. KIND, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. JOLLY.
H. Res. 784: Ms. NORTON, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. COOK, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 807: Ms. STEFANIK.
H. Res. 808: Mr. POMPEO.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. NUNES

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in H.R. 5631 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.