

**AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 2898, WESTERN WATER AND AMERICAN FOOD SECURITY ACT OF 2015**

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of H.R. 2898, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross-references, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill, including striking the instruction "line 20" and inserting "after line 19" in amendment No. 7.

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

There was no objection.

**LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM**

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader, Mr. MCCARTHY, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule of the week to come and thereafter.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 1734, the Improving Coal Combustion Residuals Regulation Act, sponsored by Representative DAVID MCKINLEY. This bill is essential to protect and create jobs.

If we do not act, the EPA will replace the existing successful State-based regulatory program with harmful new regulations that will cost hundreds of thousands of jobs and result in billions of dollars in burdensome costs for job creators.

□ 1245

The House will also consider H.R. 1599, the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act, sponsored by Representative MIKE POMPEO. This bipartisan bill will ensure uniform national labeling of foods from genetically engineered plants. By addressing the patchwork of conflicting labeling laws, we will fix the growing problem of inconsistent and confusing information for consumers.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the House is expected to consider the conference report for the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his information with respect to the legislation for next week.

As the gentleman knows, we have now passed six appropriation bills. Last week, consideration of the Interior bill was postponed. The gentleman and Mr. ROGERS have both made representations that they hope to do all 12 appropriations bills.

You did not announce any appropriations bills on the schedule for next week. Can the gentleman tell me whether or not he expects to bring additional appropriations bills to the floor prior to the August break?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Yes, it is our intention to get back to the appropriations process as soon as possible. As the gentleman does know, there are some very serious and sensitive issues involved. We are in the midst of a constructive and bipartisan conversation on how we can resolve these issues. I will be sure to keep the Members updated as the appropriations bills are scheduled for continued consideration.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comment, particularly in terms of the willingness to work in a bipartisan fashion.

As the majority leader knows, there is, on his side of the aisle and on our side of the aisle, a great concern that the 302 allocations to the Appropriations Committee are insufficient to meet their responsibilities. Mr. ROGERS, as you know, your chairman of the Appropriations Committee, a Member of your side of the aisle from Kentucky, has characterized the sequestration numbers as unrealistic and ill-advised.

The Senate has not passed any appropriations bills, as the gentleman knows. It is my hope, and I would like to ask the majority leader whether he contemplates any bipartisan discussions with reference to how we might come to an agreement so that appropriations bills could, in fact, be enacted, sent to the President, and signed by the President.

The President, as you know, sent down a budget which was paid for, which had Defense numbers at the numbers that your side of the aisle used by utilizing Overseas Contingency Operation funds to bridge the gap between the sequester number and the President's number.

My question to you is: Is there any contemplation, either before we break or shortly after we come back—because October 1 will be on us very, very quickly—to have bipartisan discussions, a la Ryan-Murray, to get to a number that we can agree on and that we can pass appropriations bills, have conferences, and send them to the President and be signed, hopefully, be-

fore October 1, but if not before October 1, certainly before December 18?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding and his continuous questions throughout the months on this.

It is still our intention on this side of the aisle to get our business done, uphold the current law which is in place. I know you and I have had many debates back and forth that we know that sequestration started in the White House, and we continue to play by what the law states today and move our bills in a bipartisan manner, with a very open process on the floor where any Member can bring an amendment up, and we will continue to use that process as we move forward.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

The majority leader, Mr. Speaker, regularly brings up that sequester started in the White House. He knows I very severely disagree with that. And he voted for a Cut, Cap, and Balance Act which had in that bill—which no Democrat, I think, voted for—sequester. And it was passed 5 days before our Republican friends, Mr. Speaker, alleged that Mr. Lew suggested that to Mr. REID as a way we could get by the House's refusal, up to that point in time, to extend the debt limit, which meant we couldn't pay our bills. But I don't think that is very useful in discussing how we get by this loggerhead that we have met on the appropriations process.

I served on the Appropriations Committee for 23 years before I became a leader, and we did pass bills—not always on time, but we had an ability, Republicans and Democrats working on the Appropriations Committee, working in the Congress, to get our bills done.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether you recall. I presume you will recall that when we got to a similar impasse, Mr. RYAN, the then-chairman of the Budget Committee, Ms. MURRAY, the then-chairwoman of the Budget Committee in the Senate, got together and came up with some figures that we could agree on on a bipartisan basis. Until that time, we had the same kind of scenario that we are now confronted with.

Mr. Speaker, it is my view that, unless we have such a meeting of the minds, we are going to put this country in another crisis of our own making.

We, Democrats, are prepared to enter into some sort of an agreement, consistent with HAL ROGERS' belief, that we can get to a realistic and advised compromise, not this unrealistic and ill-advised—Mr. ROGERS' words, Republican chair of the Appropriations Committee, not mine.

And if we don't do so, when we get to September 30, or we get to December 18, let's not wring our hands and say, How did this happen? We will know exactly how it happened, and it will have happened because we refused to sit down, as the majority leader just said

a few minutes ago, in a bipartisan way to do the people's business in a responsible, collegial way in which we can get to an agreement so the bills can be passed.

I think this argument about who is responsible for sequestration—clearly, we have a different point of view—and a bill that passed before the suggestion was made by Jack Lew so we could get by the impasse and America pay its bills is really not very useful.

Mr. Leader, let me go to another subject. The gentleman moved, on two occasions, to refer to the House Administration Committee legislation which related to the use of the Confederate battle flag. Both of those issues are now pending in the House Administration Committee. One of them has been there for some 3 weeks now.

Can the gentleman tell me whether there is any suggested action by the committee, whether there have been any hearings scheduled, and whether or not we may see that legislation brought to the floor at any time in the foreseeable future?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Just to clarify before I answer your other question on some of your other statements, I am concerned about what the rest of the summer looks like. A lot of my concern stems from what I hear on the other side of the aisle, especially in the Senate side.

As the gentleman knows from his years of working for more than two decades on appropriations, the appropriations process we have today is the most open this House has ever seen. Never in history, while you were on the Appropriations Committee, was it as open a process that any Member from any side of the aisle could just offer an amendment, not even prewritten, just a closed process.

But your comments about sequester, what I am really concerned about is the comments of Senator SCHUMER, Senator REID, that they were going to have the summer of the shutdown, the destruction, that they were going to shut everything down, and I am concerned about some of your comments that are leading in that direction. I don't want to go there. I want to finish our work as we have been doing here.

And history, I can't rewrite it. I mean, Bob Woodward, respected journalist as we all know from his days back to Watergate, today, in his "The Price of Politics," he wrote of the time in history. Sequester was not debated here on this floor or created on this floor, not even in the Senate as well. You can read it in his book. It was created in the White House of this administration. It is the law of the land. We will uphold the law of the land and do our work based upon those numbers.

Now, the question you had before me was dealing with what we referred to House Administration. I have met with the chair and I have met with Members on the gentleman's side of the aisle. We

have nothing scheduled for next week, but we are currently working towards solving this, to me, a very serious and sensitive issue, and I look forward to getting it done and working with you to make it happen.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the fact that we might be bringing something to the floor so that we can express the opinion of this House. As the house and senate in South Carolina expressed its opinion, it surely is appropriate for this House of Representatives, representing the values of our country, sworn to uphold our Constitution that stands for equality of all, that we can express ourselves and take appropriate action. I appreciate the gentleman's view.

I have great respect for Mr. Woodward. Mr. Woodward, shortly after that book came out, I called him. He came into my office. We had a discussion about that representation. I will tell the gentleman that I believe Mr. Woodward was incorrect. He did not have information I gave him. I don't mean that he necessarily says he is incorrect.

But there is no doubt, when you want to talk about history, you passed a bill 5 days before the suggestion was made by Jack Lew, which was, presumably, coming out of the White House, to Mr. REID, the majority leader. Five days before that, you passed, on this floor, a bill which was called Cut, Cap, and Balance, which had sequester as your fall-back policy.

So you are right. You can't change history. That is history. I have said that a number of times. The gentleman has not corrected me. I presume that, therefore, he believes that I am accurate in that representation of the timing.

But very frankly, that history is irrelevant. What is relevant, as the gentleman and I, I think, both agree, if we don't get to an agreement on a number that is as we did in Ryan-Murray—we have done this before. We have done this before. Now, my view is we did it because you didn't want to have your Members vote on legislation that had numbers that were draconian before the election, but that may be only my personal perspective.

But the fact of the matter is the American people expect us to get their work done. Getting their work done, at minimum, means funding the government at appropriate levels. And, again, I would say that Mr. ROGERS does not believe the sequester—I agree with you. It is the law of the land. I think it is wrong. I think it is a bad law. It was not a law that was intended to go into effect. It went into effect simply because the supercommittee that was established in that same legislation couldn't come out with a solution.

In 13 months, the Congress couldn't come out with a solution, and, therefore, on January 1, 2014, we were confronted with these draconian, ill-conceived numbers, according to Mr. ROGERS. Let's not be confronted with those

numbers 60 days from now on October 1 where we are unable to do our business. So I would urge my friend, and I would be glad to work with him toward that end.

We just passed a bill, Mr. Leader, which I voted for. We passed it on a bipartisan basis—the majority of my Members voted for it; the majority of your Members voted for it—a highway bill. It was, however, I know on our side, and I know that in discussions with you, your feeling as well, that it is not what we ought to be doing.

What we ought to be doing is passing a long-term, at least 6-year reauthorization bill for the highway program so that Governors, mayors, county executives, local officials, contractors, and construction workers would all have some confidence that there would be a revenue stream to fix our roads, repair our bridges, and build roads where they are needed.

Can the gentleman tell me whether he believes that there is a plan to get to the—and I know he and I have discussed it—but a plan to get to, before the December 18 date that the present bill calls for, a long-term highway reauthorization?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his work and help on passing the highway bill this week.

As the gentleman knows, nobody in this House wants to pass a short-term highway bill. We want certainty. We want to make sure the money goes the furthest and in the most efficient and effective way.

The reason why we are going to a short-term, December 18, is because it is our plan and our intention, together, to be able to find the resources to have a highway bill that can be 5 years.

□ 1300

It is our intention to be able to have that.

We have a plan, I believe, we are working towards, and the first step was extending highways to the December 18 date. All we have next is to pass the Senate.

If they pass our highway bill, we will be in the right place, prepared to have it done before December, a 5-year that we could all work together in a bipartisan manner to have done.

Mr. HOYER. I hope we do that.

In the short term, however, we have done another item which we have not reauthorized, and that is the Export-Import Bank.

Senator MCCONNELL believes that that has the votes in the Senate, and he believes that the highway bill that we have just sent them is a vehicle to add that Export-Import Bank proposal to. And my presumption is it will be in that bill when it comes back to us.

Hopefully, it will come back within the next few days because, of course, the highway authorization ends at the end of this month, in which case there will be no authorization to spend money on the highway program.

Can the gentleman tell me whether or not, if that comes back, it will be on the floor? I have heard some discussion about the fact that the Speaker says it will be on the floor, but the Export-Import Bank would be open to amendment.

Would the gentleman tell me whether or not there are any plans along those lines.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me one more time.

The gentleman is well aware of how I feel about the Export-Import Bank, and we have a difference of opinion. I am one who has always believed in the principle that you should just deal with the subject that is before you.

We have passed the highway bill. The best advice I can give to the Senate—it is a clean highway bill until December 18—is to pass a clean highway bill and move it to the President.

Mr. HOYER. I understand that that is the gentleman's desire. I know he is opposed to the Ex-Im Bank reauthorization.

As you know, we passed it in a bipartisan fashion when the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Cantor) was the majority leader, and the gentleman voted for it. He has changed his mind. Certainly many of us do that from time to time.

But my question to him is: If they don't do what the gentleman suggests—i.e., a clean highway bill—and they send it back, as, apparently, Leader McCONNELL thought that they would do, consistent with his representation to the Senator from Washington State and others—if they add the Ex-Im Bank to that bill and it comes back—I know the gentleman is reluctant to speculate. But we have a very, very short period of time left in this session before the August break.

Does the gentleman believe that, if it comes back and is in the highway bill, that we would make the Export-Import Bank portion of that bill at least open to amendment?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

And if I just may correct the gentleman, he took the liberty of saying whether I changed my mind. I did vote for the Ex-Im Bank 2 years ago, but I voted for an Ex-Im Bank that had reform in it. I have not seen that reform. I did not change my mind. I kept my principle. The same principle that I have is my best advice to the Senate.

I know you want to talk hypotheticals, and I know our colloquy is about next week. But none of that is scheduled for next week.

But to the gentleman and to the Senate, my best advice for them is to pass our clean highway bill and send it to the President.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the problem with the suggestion the majority leader makes is the Export-Import Bank will be out of business. If that happens, Speaker

BOEHNER has said it is going to adversely affect jobs in America. It will adversely affect the ability of small, medium, and large businesses to sell our goods overseas by people working here in America.

The Export-Import Bank is about jobs, and to simply let it twist in the wind and let it be unauthorized simply because of inattention, when it has the majority of votes on this floor? Mr. Speaker, I have said that over and over again and have not been contradicted.

There are 60 Republicans who have sponsored the Export-Import Bank's reauthorization. There are 188 Democrats—or at least 185 Democrats who will vote for it. That is 249 votes. All you need is 218. There is no doubt that the Export-Import Bank has the votes to pass this House and the Senate, and, yet, we fiddle while jobs are being burned.

Mr. Speaker, that is not good policy for our country. It is not good policy for our workers. It is not good policy for our businesses, for our exporters. It makes us uncompetitive with the rest of the world. Sixty countries have a similar facility. I know in a perfect world perhaps that wouldn't exist. But 60 of our competitors around the world have such a facility that make their goods cheaper than we will be making ours.

That is not good sense. It is not good policy. It is not the expectation, I think, of the American people. And it is not the will of this House.

I regret that we have not addressed this already. But I certainly hope when the Senate—as I expect them to do—adds it to the House highway bill—and I am not sure whether it will be our bill or their bill or our bill amended—we may have to go to conference or we may have to get to an agreement.

But one way or the other, we ought to adopt the will of this House and reauthorize the Export-Import Bank so that we will protect jobs.

It was Speaker BOEHNER who said that it was shortly after we took the action we took on June 30 and allowed the Export-Import Bank to expire that we would lose jobs. In fact, that is happening. So I would hope that that would not be the case.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the majority leader this: I get a lot of rumors on my side. I know you get a lot of rumors on your side. And I sort of smile at them and I say, "I think not."

But I have had 20 Members today ask me, Mr. Speaker, are we not going to be here the last week of July that is presently scheduled. And I would like to clear that up.

I yield to my friend for a definitive answer on the schedule for—this is a scheduling question, by the way, as to whether or not, in fact, we are going to be here the last week of July.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I smile because the only rumor I heard more of was about Taylor Swift in the Capitol the other day.

I think this is just wishful thinking of the Members. But the American people expect us to get our work done. We have a lot of work to get done. No, we will be here, as the schedule says, and we will finish it. But we will not be leaving early.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the majority leader's clarification. My Members will not necessarily appreciate it, but I understand it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, JULY 16, 2015, TO MONDAY, JULY 20, 2015

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next and that the order of the House of January 6, 2015, regarding morning-hour debate not apply on that day.

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

There was no objection.

#### FETAL BODY PARTS TRAFFICKING

(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, evidence has been made public that the largest abortion provider in America has been actively engaged in the illegal and horrific practice of trafficking of fetal body parts.

Planned Parenthood performs over 300,000 abortions annually. This organization financially gains from the destruction of innocent, unborn children and now has been shown to profit from the selling of children's organs to fetal tissue brokers.

Those who defend Planned Parenthood and these evil practices argue these clinics simultaneously provide access to other needed health services. Well, Mr. Speaker, one does not justify the other.

Throughout the United States, there is no shortage of faith-based health service providers that, unlike Planned Parenthood, honor, respect, and care for all women and unborn children. They do not prey on vulnerable individuals for profit.

Mr. Speaker, I have joined my colleagues, calling for an investigation into the trafficking of fetal tissue and activities of abortion providers, such as Planned Parenthood, companies that broker fetal tissue, and any incentives created by National Institutes of Health funding for research using body parts of unborn children.

#### PRIDE PARADE FESTIVAL IN ISTANBUL, TURKEY

(Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)